United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 16, 2014*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 16, 2014.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

HONORING JUDGE TOM GRAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and exemplary member of our community, Judge Tom Gray.

Judge Gray has led a distinguished career in Sumner County, Tennessee, serving as a judge since 1982 and as a chancellor of the 18th judicial district since 1986. As he will soon step aside from his career in public service to spend more time with his family, I wanted to take this opportunity to highlight just a few of the reasons Judge Gray has been so important to our community.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Gray is a Tennessean through and through. He graduated from Central High School in Shelbyville, received his bachelor's and master's degrees from George Peabody College, and received his law degree from the Nashville YMCA Law School.

During his exemplary career in the Tennessee legal community, Judge Gray served as treasurer and secretary of the Tennessee Judicial Conference. He has served on committees to improve education and domestic relations, as well as to improve work between the bench and the bar. He has hosted student groups at the courthouse and has spoken to local civic clubs and churches.

As a proud Sumner County resident, he has served as the president of the Gallatin Rotary Club. His long resume of community activities includes work with the Sumner County Historical Society, the Rosemont Society, Habitat for Humanity, as well as the Sumner County Museum.

Judge Gray is a proud member of the Hendersonville United Methodist Church and a proud husband, father, and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, my friends and I in Sumner County wish all the best to our friend Tom as he retires from the bench. I look forward to watching Judge Gray begin the next chapter of his life. It is my honor to speak on his behalf here today.

ORCA CAPTIVITY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, while the documentary ''Blackfish'' ignited a public and passionate debate over whether orcas should be held in captivity for the purposes of display and entertainment, as they are at Sea World and other parks around the world, marine mammal experts have, for decades, been engaged in a longer discussion about the scientific value and morality of keeping killer whales in captivity.

''Blackfish'' documents the history of the captivity of orcas in the United States, focusing on one whale named Tilikum, who figured in the deaths of three of his trainers.

Public displays of animals can engage our children and kindle a lifelong interest in and respect for wildlife. They can sometimes add to our scientific body of knowledge. Indeed, these are often cited as the justifications for keeping animals in captivity. Yet the shows in which these animals are displayed often have more in common with a rock concert than a scientific exposition, and many believe that the psychological and physical harm done to these magnificent animals far outweighs any benefits reaped from their display.

Here are a few facts that call into question the propriety of keeping these animals in captivity.

In the wild, orcas frequently swim 100 miles a day and dive to great depths in search of food. In captivity, they are held in tiny, shallow concrete pools where they often wallow listlessly when not being asked to perform.

In the wild, the average life expectancy for male orcas is 30, and for females it is 50 years; whereas, most captive orcas die before they reach the age of 25. Remarkably, a 103-year-old orca was recently spotted off the coast of Canada.

In the wild, dorsal fin collapse is extremely rare, but all adult male orcas in captivity have collapsed dorsal fins. Many scientists attribute this phenomenon to the condition of their captivity, such as repetitive circular swimming patterns, gravitational pull from spending the vast majority of the time at the surface of the water, and dehydration.

Marine mammals are some of the most intelligent nonhuman animals on Earth. They are highly social and live in matrilineal pods that can be as large as 40 individuals. Pod members are interdependent. Pods often have their own hunting techniques and communication styles that some argue are akin to language or dialect. Orcas in marine parks do not live in natural pods, and separation of calves and

mothers has been documented on multiple occasions.

In the wild, not a single human death has been attributed to an orca, but captive orcas are responsible for numerous injuries and deaths. Because of this, the Labor Department's OSHA office has conducted an investigation and issued new rules aimed at protecting human trainers and handlers of orcas by prohibiting those trainers from getting in close contact with the animals during the shows. These rules have recently been upheld by the court of appeals.

Last month, my colleague JARED HUFFMAN and I advanced an amendment to require USDA to finalize long-delayed regulations pertaining to the captivity of orcas. It is my hope that USDA will do so based on sound science and recognition of the harm these animals suffer in captivity, and not grounded in an effort to placate the interests of the industry that showcases them.

We cannot be responsible stewards of our natural environment and propagate messages about the importance of animal welfare when our policies and practices do not reflect our deeply held principles.

From my own point of view, I believe it is time to phase out killer whale captivity. This means no more captive breeding, no more wild captures. Orcas held in captivity now should live out their lives in their current habitats if they cannot likely survive in the wild. But with the death of this generation of captive orcas, we should draw a line: no more confinement in tiny tanks; no more forced social structures; no more captivity for our entertainment.

High mortality rates, aberrant behavior among orcas, the consistent collapsed dorsal fins, and the tragic deaths of trainers themselves all point in the same direction—an end to the forced captivity of these majestic creatures.

Mr. Speaker, while the documentary Blackfish ignited a passionate public debate over whether orcas should be held in captivity for the purposes of display and entertainment, as they are at Sea World and other parks around the world, marine mammal experts have, for decades, been engaged in a longer discussion about the scientific value and morality of keeping killer whales in captivity.

Blackfish documents the history of the captivity of orcas in the United States, focusing on one whale named Tilikum, who figured in the deaths of three of his trainers.

Public displays of animals can engage our children, and kindle a lifelong interest in and respect for wildlife. They can sometimes add to our scientific body of knowledge. Indeed, these are often cited as justifications for keeping these animals in captivity. Yet the shows in which these animals are displayed often have more in common with a rock concert than a scientific exposition, and many believe that the psychological and physical harm done to these animals far outweighs any benefits reaped from their display.

Here are some very simple facts that call into question the propriety of keeping these magnificent animals in captivity:

In the wild, orcas frequently swim 100 miles in a day and dive to great depths in search of food. In captivity, they are held in tiny, shallow concrete pools, where they often wallow listlessly when not being asked to perform.

In the wild, the average life expectancy for male orcas is 30, and for females is 50, whereas most captive orcas die before they reach the age of 25. Remarkably, a 103-year-old orca was recently spotted off the coast of Canada.

In the wild, dorsal fin collapse is extremely rare, but all adult male orcas in captivity have collapsed dorsal fins. Many scientists attribute this phenomenon to the conditions of their captivity—such as repetitive circular swimming patterns, gravitational pull from spending the vast majority of the time at the surface of the water, and dehydration.

Marine mammals are some of the most intelligent non-human animals on Earth. They are highly social and live in matrilineal pods that can be as large as 40 individuals. Pod members are interdependent and pods have their own hunting techniques and communication styles that some argue are akin to different languages.

Orcas in marine parks do not live in natural pods, and separations of calves and mothers have been documented on multiple occasions. When I watched the Blackfish, I was particularly struck by the description of a mother's visceral reaction when her calf was taken away from her and transported to another park—crying out with long-distance calling sounds—noises not heard previously by marine biologists at the park.

As the film Blackfish documents, several factors lead to severe psychological and physical problems for these animals when in captivity, and in many instances, can result in premature death—not to mention putting the lives of their handlers at risk. In the wild, not a single human death has been attributed to an orca, but captive orcas are responsible for numerous injuries and deaths. Because of this, the Labor Department's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) conducted an investigation and issued new rules aimed to protect the human trainers and handlers of orcas by prohibiting trainers from getting in close proximity to the animals during shows. These rules were recently upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Last month, my colleague Rep. JARED HUFFMAN and I advanced an amendment to require USDA to finalize long delayed regulations pertaining to the captivity of orcas. It is my hope that USDA will do so based on sound science and recognition of the harm these animals suffer in captivity, and not grounded in an effort to placate the interests of the industry that showcases them. We cannot be responsible stewards of our natural environment and propagate messages about the importance of animal welfare when our policies and practices do not reflect our deeply held principles.

From my own point of view, I believe it's time to phase out killer whale captivity. That means no more captive breeding, no more wild captures. Orcas held in captivity now should live out their lives in their current habitats, if they cannot likely survive in the wild. But with the death of this generation of captive orcas, we should draw a line. No more confinement in tiny tanks. No more forced social structures. No more captivity for our entertainment.

High mortality rates, aberrant behavior among orcas, the consistent collapsed dorsal fins, and the tragic deaths of the trainers themselves all point in the same direction—an end to the forced captivity of these majestic creatures.

AMERICA'S DEBT IMPACTS ILLEGAL ALIEN CHILDREN SOLUTION

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America's deficits have averaged a trillion dollars a year for 5 years. America's total debt has blown through the $17 trillion mark, and our Comptroller General warns America that our financial path is unsustainable.

Last year, America's debt service cost roughly $250 billion—which is five Federal transportation or 14 NASA programs we can't afford because we have to pay debt service.

If not fixed, what do these deficits and debt mean?

On a micro level, America must learn from Detroit and Stockton, where bankruptcy courts battle over pension plan funding. On a macro level, we must learn from Greece and Spain, where unemployment is 26 and 28 percent worse than America at any time during the Great Depression. We must learn from Argentina and Venezuela, where inflation rates were 28 percent and 56 percent in one year, in 2012.

Closer to home, we must learn from Puerto Rico, the home for 3.5 million Americans. In February, Puerto Rico's sovereign debt was downgraded to junk bond status, thereby damaging Puerto Rico's economy for years, if not decades, to come.

This brings me to the taxpayer cost of today's massive flood of illegal alien children surging across America.

According to Customs and Border Protection data, in fiscal year 2012, 24,000 illegal alien children surged across our border. That surge increased by 59 percent, to 39,000 illegal alien children in FY 2013. That surge increased by another 58,000 illegal alien children so far this fiscal year, with an estimated total of 90,000 crossing our borders for all of fiscal year 2014—a startling 132 percent increase.

How should America fix this problem?

First, the Obama administration must stop enticing illegal alien children to America with promises of amnesty and money. America cannot give free food, free clothing, free shelter, free health care, free transportation,

free entertainment, and billions of dollars a year in fraudulent tax refunds to illegal aliens and then wonder why we have an illegal alien crisis.

Second, illegal alien children from Central America and Mexico must be treated equally—prompt returns to parents and homes without costly and time-consuming deportation hearings. All contrary laws must be repealed or amended.

Third, America must immediately fly illegal alien children home by the least expensive means possible. It costs as little as $258 at cheapflightnow.com to fly from Houston to Managua, Nicaragua. United Airlines flies from San Antonio to Guatemala City for as little as $363 and to San Salvador, El Salvador, for as little as $292.

At roughly $300 a pop, it costs less than $20 million to fly 60,000 illegal alien children home. That is everyone so far this fiscal year. If America used C–5 military aircraft and counted flight time as pilot training time, the cost is even less.

Given America's perilous financial condition, the illegal alien children surge issue must be considered in the context of America's debt threat that risks a debilitating American insolvency and bankruptcy.

President Obama demands $3.7 billion to spend in just the next few months on a policy that does not solve the illegal alien children problem. Think about that. The President proposes spending $3.7 billion to not solve the problem. Yet spending $20 million wisely does solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a no-brainer. It is financially irresponsible—no, financial insanity—to spend $3.7 billion America does not have, must borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back when we can spend $20 million and get better results and better border security.

23 IN 1—BRACKETTVILLE, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this morning, as I continue highlighting places in the 23rd District, which comprises nearly 24 percent of the land area of Texas, I would like to talk about the city of Brackettville. With a population of a little over 1,500 people, it is a small town with a big history.

Located as the county seat in Kinney County, Brackettville was once the drive-in movie capital of Texas. It was founded in 1852 as Las Moras, the name of a nearby spring and creek it feeds. The town initially was a supply stop on the old San Antonio-El Paso Road and a supply depot for the U.S. Army's Fort Clark, which was also established in 1852.

The town was later called Brackett, after Oscar B. Brackett, the owner of the first dry goods store in the area. It is a name that still sticks among locals. In 1873, when a post office opened in the town, the ''ville'' was added to ''Brackett'' in order to differentiate it from another town.

The town grew exponentially in the 19th century with the expansion of the garrison at Fort Clark during the Indian wars. During that time, the town's fortune was completely tied to Fort Clark.

□ 1015

For many years, Fort Clark was the headquarters of the famous Buffalo Soldiers, made up of African Americans. At that time, Brackettville had a large proportion of Black Seminoles, who were people of mixed African American and Seminole ancestry, who originated in Florida. The Black Seminoles were recruited by the U.S. to act as scouts for the Buffalo Soldiers, and they settled with their families in Brackettville. During slavery years, the Black Seminoles began living in a settlement in northern Mexico in order to escape conditions in the U.S. Their language, Afro-Seminole Creole, was developed in Florida. Impressively, even today, Afro-Seminole Creole is still spoken by some in Brackettville. After the Buffalo Soldiers moved out to Fort Clark with the waning of the Indian Wars, Brackettville became a cavalry post.

In 1914, the Seminole Negro Indian Scouts were finally disbanded, but these scouts had an amazing history of service. In fact, the Seminole cemetery near Brackettville has the highest number of Congressional Medal of Honor winners resting there per capita than has any other cemetery in the country. Virtually every cavalry unit in the U.S. Army was stationed at or was trained at Fort Clark at one time or another, and many famous soldiers, including John Pershing and George Patton, were there. Others just visited, people like George Armstrong Custer and Phil Sheridan, who nearly lost his life near Fort Clark to a Comanche war party. It was there that he made his famous statement: ''If I owned Texas and hell, I would rent out Texas and live in hell.''

In 1943, during World War II, the U.S. Army activated the 2nd Cavalry, which was the last horse-mounted unit. By 1944, even the 2nd Cavalry had been mechanized. Fort Clark, so long the center of mounted cavalry, was targeted for closure, but before it closed, it was used as a German prisoner of war camp.

Because of the families of soldiers at the fort and the African American veterans and the descendants of those who had settled in Brackettville during the war, the U.S. Government funded the construction of a high school for Black students. The school opened in 1944 so that the children of these veterans could be educated. At that time, Texas was still racially segregated. This high school is believed to have been the only federally built school of its kind between San Antonio and El Paso.

After Fort Clark closed in 1946, it had a variety of uses. It was converted to a resort or a retirement center, and the Historic District of Fort Clark is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. North of the town are the remains of the Alamo Village, built in the 1950s as the set for John Wayne's movie ''The Alamo,'' and scenes of the 1969 comedy ''Viva Max!'' were also shot there.

I invite everyone to visit the city of Brackettville to learn more about the cultures and traditions of the incredible 23rd District of Texas.

THE UNITED STATES—A NATION OF LAWS

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that we are a kind and caring Nation. We have always welcomed those who have come to this country in order to make better lives for themselves and their families. In fact, many of the successes we have achieved in the fields of science, business, and art are directly attributable to individuals coming here with their ideas and ambitions.

But we are a Nation of laws.

Granting amnesty to those who have come here illegally not only erodes the rule of law, but it is unfair to the millions of folks who have respected our legal system and are working to gain citizenship in the right way. Further, undocumented immigration poses a threat to our national security. We have no way of tracking whether these individuals who are crossing our borders have ties to criminal enterprises, terrorism, or whether they are even carrying dangerous communicable diseases.

This is why it is critical we secure our borders.

The recent surge of illegal immigration at the border is a direct result of the Obama administration's failed policies. According to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, over the past year, there has been a 92 percent increase in the number of unaccompanied children crossing over our southwestern border. By usurping the legislative process and changing parts of existing laws while refusing to enforce others, the Obama administration has created an immigration policy that rewards those who have come here illegally.

Now the President has requested $3.7 billion to purportedly combat this immigration crisis. Unfortunately, according to the administration's own

proposal, only a small portion of that money—roughly 9 percent—would be used to actually secure our southern border. Rather, if history has shown us anything, it is that, if we give this President a blank check, he will simply squander it on furthering his far-left agenda. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the President's request and to, instead, use our resources, including the National Guard, in an effort to strengthen our border security and deport those who have come here illegally.

United States immigration policies are some of the most generous in the world, but we simply cannot condone illegal immigration. To that end, I will continue to support by any means necessary, whether legislative or legal, to ensure our current laws are enforced and to prevent this President from unilaterally implementing policies that circumvent our rule of law.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an anniversary that has pained the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for 40 years.

On July 20, 1974, in a blatant violation of international law, Turkey violently invaded Cyprus and captured much of the northern part of the island. Since the invasion, Turkey has occupied nearly 40 percent of Cyprus. Settlers were sent to inhabit homes that were previously owned by Greek Cypriots, forcibly relocating 160,000 Greek Cypriots. Religious artifacts and cultural relics have been destroyed in the wake of the Turkish Army's invasion, and after 40 years of displacement, they are now lost to time. Hundreds of churches and monasteries have been shamefully desecrated, losing all sense of their historic and religious significance.

Despite this neglect, the Republic of Cyprus recognizes Turkish Cypriots as citizens of the Republic of Cyprus, and provides numerous benefits to them as they would any citizen. Turkish Cypriots are entitled to official passports, which allow them to enjoy the benefits of EU membership, including the freedom of movement within EU member countries. Turkish Cypriots are recipients of free medical care from public hospitals, and they are eligible for benefits from the Republic's Social Insurance Scheme.

These policies have resulted in Greek and Turkish Cypriots living among each other with little trouble. Indeed, there have been millions of crossings at the Green Line without incident. So why the Turkish troops? Why the continued occupation? Despite the increase in citizen-level cohesion, the ''Cyprus problem'' remains a diplomatic challenge at the highest levels of government.

Greek and Turkish Cypriots deserve an end to this senseless division. In February of this year, it looked like progress was being made for legitimate negotiations that would lead to a real solution based on the rule of law. There is potential for significant economic value from the discovery of offshore gas reserves in the eastern Mediterranean, which stand to benefit a unified Cyprus. By reaping these natural resources, Cyprus' allies—the United States, Greece, Israel, and many European countries—will also flourish.

In the face of the optimism for financial recovery and other incentives to unify, this year, Turkish Cypriot leaders have refused to implement even the simplest of confidence-building measures, which would be a sign of good faith and would foster an atmosphere of honest negotiation. The failure to enact the most basic, practical steps continues to impede a process for reunification that is long overdue. Words lose their meaning when inaction is all that follows.

Today, the United States stands in a unique role as a friend of both Cyprus and Turkey. As an honest broker to both sides, we can help them see that a unified future is far more promising than the present. The United States' relationship with all of its allies, Turkey included, must be based on shared values and mutual respect. At the core, the rule of law must be respected above all else. It is our duty to continually reinforce this message that 40 years of illegal occupation is 40 years too long.

It is time for Turkey to engage in sincere negotiations and in concrete confidence-building measures instead of going through the motions and creating more obstacles when tough decisions are on the table. Both sides know a solution will demand compromise and cooperation. The time to talk is nearing its end. The time to act is here. Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States, and we owe our support for both peace and the end of this illegal occupation.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 16, 2014 at 9:51 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 517.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2014 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Barbara Kennelly, vice president of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:05 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of history, when former Members return to Congress, it offers an opportunity to reflect upon the great heritage of representative government that is America's historical legacy.

The record of Congress holds old and familiar stories, strong exhortations, repeated corrections, and consoling confirmations of hopes made real through difficult but persistent compromise in the forming of enduring programs and legislation.

May the presence here of former Members bring a moment of pause, where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died, as we especially remember today Robert Roe of New Jersey, who passed only yesterday. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning.

And bless those here gathered, that they may bring joy and hope to the

present age and supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your holy name, now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Barbara Kennelly led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

Ms. KENNELLY. We will be visited by some Members of Congress, and as they come in, I will recognize them.

Right now I recognize the chair, the Honorable Connie Morella.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Barbara. It is always a distinct privilege to be back here in this revered Chamber and we appreciate so much the opportunity to present today the 44th annual report of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities and projects of our organization since our last report to Congress in May of last year. But first of all, I would like to ask the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, as follows:

Ms. Byron of Maryland
Mr. Carnahan of Missouri
Mr. Carr of Michigan
Mr. Clement of Tennessee
Mr. Costello of Illinois
Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania
Mr. Delahunt of Massachusetts
Mr. de Lugo of the Virgin Islands
Mr. Frey of Florida
Mr. Glickman of Kansas
Mr. Hertel of Michigan
Mr. Hughes of New Jersey
Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut
Mr. Kolbe of Arizona
Mr. Konnyu of California
Mr. Kramer of Colorado
Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
Mr. LaRocco of Idaho
Ms. Long of Louisiana
Mr. Lungren of California
Ms. Morella of Maryland
Mr. Nelligan of Pennsylvania
Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
Mr. Skaggs of Colorado
Mr. Smith of Florida
Mr. Stearns of Florida

Ms. KENNELLY. The Chair announces that 26 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Ms. MORELLA. I want to thank you all for joining us today. Our association, as you know, was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of the charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion, and there will be numerous programs and projects with which you now are quite familiar. This is a sign of our association's stability and purpose. We are extremely proud of our long history, of creating lasting and impactful programs that teach about Congress and representative government, and of our ability to take long-standing projects and expand them and improve them.

In addition, you will hear today about a number of new endeavors, ones that either were implemented during the last year or are now in the planning stages for implementation in the near future. We will report on our programming in just a minute.

Those of you who have been with us on previous occasions for this report know that we traditionally bestow on a former Member our association's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award. During this presentation in the House Chamber we traditionally have done that. For a number of reasons, we will have the ceremony later today during a special luncheon, and I certainly hope that all of you in attendance here this morning can join us for the luncheon also.

Our 2014 distinguished service honoree is former Indiana Representative Lee Hamilton, who has been an inspiration and a mentor to so many of us. While the ceremony is not going to take place right now, I do want to read into the RECORD the inscription of the plaque that he will receive:

The 2014 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress to the Honorable Lee H. Hamilton.

Congressman Hamilton has devoted his professional life to public service and the advancement of our national prosperity and security. In serving for over 30 years as a Member of Congress representing the Ninth District of Indiana, cochairing numerous Presidential Commissions tasked with making our Nation more secure, directing the invaluable work of the Woodrow Wilson Center, and creating a Center on Congress at Indiana University to improve public understanding of Congress, Lee Hamilton has approached every test with the utmost integrity, insight, and good judgment. For half a century, Congressman Hamilton has served our Nation with honor by forging bipartisan solutions to our world's complicated problems. Colleagues from both sides of the aisle salute him as a distinguished and dedicated public servant.

Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

Maybe we should just give him a round of applause, and again, join us later for the luncheon honoring him.

Now back to our report.

Ms. KENNELLY. Madam President? Excuse me, our leader is here.

Ms. PELOSI. Good morning, everyone.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you for joining us, Leader PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Hi, Connie. We see each other so often. We really do. Say hi to Tony.

Good morning, everyone. My pleasure to welcome you once again to the Capitol, to take the occasion to thank you all very much for your service to our country, for the contributions that you have made over time. Many of you, as I look around this room, served at a time when it was a little more collegial atmosphere here. We hope to return to that.

But so much of the work that we do is built on foundations that you all have laid. And we thank you for that. Your legacy will live into the future. I saw in the paper this morning that our former Chairman Roe passed away. The paper called him ''Mr. Jobs,'' and I thought, what a wonderful title. Wouldn't we all like to be having that as what people remember us by? But that's what our thrust is going to be.

I just might add, Madam Chair and Madam President, that this morning on the steps of the Capitol Members will be going out there to talk about jobs, about how to keep America number one. And all that we have in there is stuff that we worked for in a bipartisan way, which is to recognize the productivity of the American worker, the most productive in the world, so to recognize that and have policies that help people, as STENY would say, make it in America. That is A, American-made.

Build the infrastructure of our country and build small businesses. It is about building. It is about recognizing that that entrepreneurship and that innovation to keep America number one begins in the classroom.

So our investments in education, especially making higher education affordable, is a critical part of our agenda and recognizing also that education begins at the earliest time. That is the childhood education.

But what I am excited about is to say the central core of what we are about is, when women succeed, America succeeds. That is the title of our economic agenda for families and the middle class. But it is not just a title; it is a statement of fact. When women succeed, America succeeds. The best thing we can do to grow our economy is to unleash the power of women, increase the involvement of women, and that is with fair pay, with paid sick leave, with, again, getting back to the affordable child care, children learning, parents earning.

So we are very excited about helping that in the debate and the coming elections—that it is not just about who wins, it is about how the debate centers on family, American workers, our productivity, their productivity, our economic success to keep America number one—anything that we all haven't worked together on in the past.

So it's wonderful to see all of you. Congratulations.

Did I hear Lee Hamilton was getting the award? How lovely. Congratulations to him and you, he bringing luster to your award, you bringing honor to him.

But again, on behalf of all of our Members, I extend the warmest of welcomes back to you, and in friendship

and in love of our great country. So good morning, good luck in your conversations and your deliberations. I look forward to seeing you in the Halls of Congress as you do your work here on this visit. It is always a very special treat to see. I am looking at each and every one of you and having very happy memories about it all.

And thank you, Madam Chair, for your leadership; Connie, for yours. Thank you all very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Madam Leader.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Leader PELOSI, for your inspiring words, for coming here to greet us, your former colleagues, and for explaining the initiative on jobs and elevating women.

Leader PELOSI, I hope you noticed that this will be my last time as president of the association. But you know, I am succeeded by another woman.

Ms. PELOSI. All right.

Ms. MORELLA. So you see, we are moving ahead. This association is progressive.

So now back to our report. Our association is bipartisan. It was chartered by Congress in 1983. The purpose of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, abroad and in the United States. About 600 former Senators and Representatives belong to the association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization in their desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy.

We are proud to have been chartered by Congress. We are also proud to receive no funding from Congress. Well, I don't know. But nevertheless, we receive no funding from Congress, which gives us the independence. All our activities, which we are about to describe, are financed via membership dues, program-specific grants and sponsors, or via our fundraising dinner. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our most recent audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running our association in a fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

It has been a very successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects. We are expanding others. And we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools, both in the United States and abroad.

When this organization was created over 40 years ago, the former Members who founded our association envisioned this organization to take the lead in teaching about Congress and encouraging public service. They were hoping that former Members could inspire the next generation of America's leaders. Over the years, we have created a number of programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program, to do just that.

We continue to work with our great partner, the Stennis Center for Public Service. We thank them for their invaluable assistance in administering the Congress to Campus program.

It is now my pleasure to yield to a former president of our association, Larry LaRocco of Idaho, who, along with Jack Buechner of Missouri, co-chairs this great program.

Larry.

Mr. LAROCCO. Thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to report on this outstanding program. As most of you know, the Congress to Campus program is FMC's flagship domestic program, and the one that can engage former Members from all over the country.

Congress to Campus sends former Members in bipartisan teams to colleges, universities, and high schools across the country and around the world to educate the next generation of leaders about the value of public service. The former Members volunteering their time communicate with the students and faculty about their personal experiences and knowledge about Congress. During each visit, our bipartisan teams lead classes, meet one-on-one with students and faculty, speak to campus media, participate in campus and community forums, and interact with local citizens.

Institutions are encouraged to market the visit to the entire campus community, not just to those students majoring in political science, history, or government. Over the course of 2½ days, hundreds of students from all areas of academic studies are exposed to the former Members' message of public service and civility.

For the 2013–2014 academic year, the association visited over 20 college campuses, including visits to the United States Naval Academy, Louisiana State University, Millersville University Miami of Ohio, New York University, and University of Hawaii. More than 30 former Members participated during the calendar year and academic year, and I want to thank all of you who donated your time—pro bono—to this vital program.

I also want to encourage our newest former Members and those who have not yet had the opportunity to go on a visit to consider doing so, and to encourage a friend from across the aisle to join you. It is an excellent opportunity to continue your public service after Congress. You can also make a pledge to connect with a host school, for example, your alma mater, a college in your old district, or a university your children or grandchild attends. Our staff will then follow up with you to make the arrangements. Sharon Witiw runs the program and has all of the information you need.

We are also thrilled to have continued our excellent partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service in the administration of the program, and we owe a special debt of gratitude to Brother Rogers, the associate director of the Stennis Center, for his fine work. Our staffs work very closely together to make the program such a success.

The Congress to Campus program's international outreach sends delegations to other countries. This past year we again sent two delegations to the UK for 1 week to meet with several universities and hundreds of British students studying foreign policy and the United States.

And just a heads-up to my colleagues: former Member participation in these overseas trips is based on how actively you participate in the domestic visits. The visiting former Members become quasi-ambassadors on behalf of the United States and really get to engage with these foreign students.

This year we piloted a new concept within the Congress to Campus program. Our pair of former Members was joined by two former German Bundestag Members, who were also from opposing parties, for a weeklong Congress to Campus visit to seven different college campuses. While continuing to promote the role of public service, the former legislators also spoke of the strong bilateral and multilateral relationship between the United States and Germany, and Europe. The program was well received, and we hope to replicate the program and possibly expand it to include other international former legislators.

This fall, because of a grant award we received from iCohere, we will be trying a new concept and will be hosting a virtual Congress to Campus seminar program. This seminar will take place over 3 days and will reach hundreds of community college students throughout the country. In two of the three sessions, the former Members will focus on a substantive topic, and the third session will incorporate those topics with the upcoming midterm elections and the impact of the results.

We also continue our relationship with the People to People programs, an organization that provides hands-on learning opportunities for elementary school, middle school, and high school students visiting Washington, D.C. On each visit, former Members meet and speak with students about the importance of public service, their personal experiences in Congress, and the value of character and leadership.

In the spring of 2014, two speaking engagements were held in ''Congressional Panel'' format. The events take

place on Capitol Hill, and not only feature a former Member speaker, but also several Hill staffers and interns. This gives students the opportunity to learn what it is really like to work in the U.S. Congress.

People to People visits are oftentimes in the middle of the business day, and we are grateful to those former Members who take time out of their schedules to connect with students touring our Nation's Capital. It is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Finally, I would like to take a moment to thank former Member Matt McHugh, who has retired as cochair of the Congress to Campus program this year. Matt, who held that position for over 7 years and was also the association's president, provided thoughtful and considerable leadership to this program. His insight and guidance to the staff can be directly associated with the success of the program. I want to say again how grateful I am personally and on behalf of all of our membership for his dedication and support of our principal and longest-standing program. I have big shoes to step into by replacing Matt as the cochair of the Congress to Campus program, but I know that, along with Jack, I will continue Matt's good work and hope to help the program grow.

We are grateful to Matt, Jack, and all former Members who have participated over the years to help make the Congress to Campus program such a success in its 37 years. I strongly encourage all of my friends and colleagues to participate in the program, either by making a visit to a school or by recommending a school to host the program. It is easy. My alma mater, the University of Portland, has had a program. My other alma mater, Boston University, is hosting a program this year. So all you have got to do is pick up the phone and contact them. It will work, believe me.

As you know, a democracy can prosper only if its citizens are both informed and engaged, and as former legislators, we have a particular opportunity and responsibility to encourage such involvement. This program gives us the opportunity to do so, particularly with our young people.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Larry. As a matter of fact, we have the same alma mater, Boston University. We are doing a Congress to Campus program very soon. We appreciate the great work that you and Jack do on behalf of this very important undertaking.

And let me associate myself with your remarks about Matt McHugh. He has been an invaluable and a much-appreciated leader of this organization, whether during his time as president or, more recently, as cochair of this program. Matt, this entire organization thanks you for your sage counsel and outstanding governance for so many years. Let's hear it for Matt.

As you may recall from our last report to Congress, the association has put some energy and focus into the question of bipartisanship and civility in our political dialogue. We are furthering this important work via the Common Ground Project. The purpose of the Common Ground Project is to involve citizens in a dialogue about the issues of the day, have a vigorous debate that is both partisan and productive, and benefit from the experience of respecting a differing point of view. Some of our existing undertakings already fit in very nicely with this objective, for example, the Congress to Campus program that we just had Larry LaRocco report on.

And to give you more background about the Common Ground Project, I invite my colleague from Tennessee, former Member Bob Clement, to share a report.

Bob.

We interrupt this about-to-be report for the Chair.

Ms. KENNELLY. And we are really very honored to be able to welcome the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning.

Good morning, and let me just say welcome back to all of you. It has been a long year since you were here last, but over the course of the year I think you all know we lost former Speaker Tom Foley. We lost our good friend Bill Young. And over the course of the last 6 months or so we have had a number of retirements, from HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER, to DAVE CAMP and DOC HASTINGS, BUCK MCKEON, and my good friend TOM LATHAM.

And so the institution, the institution is actually doing pretty well. I know from the outside people don't quite see that, but I think a lot of you know I am committed to an open process on the floor, amendments from both sides of the aisle. We have had a much more open process, and I think the result of that is we are beginning to see more bipartisan legislation.

Last week we came to an agreement with the House and the Senate in a bipartisan, bicameral way on a job training and retraining bill to consolidate programs and make it easier for people to get the kind of training they need for the jobs that are out there today.

And then when it comes to the appropriations process, we have been trying to restart this process over the last 3 or 4 years. Today on the floor I think we have got our seventh appropriations bill of the year. Of course, you know, our challenge is always across the Capitol, because they have done exactly none, no appropriation bills. But I do think it is important for us to get this appropriation process up and running in the way it should. It hasn't happened for the last 6 or 7 years, and I think we here in the Congress lose our ability to really direct spending as a result of that.

But by and large, I feel pretty good about where we are. You know, it is an election year, so you all have a pretty good idea of what that means in terms of what happens around here. My big job is making sure we avoid all the potholes between now and election day, and there are some out there.

But anyway, my job this morning is to just say hi to all of you, and welcome you back, and hope that you all have a nice visit here in your old home, the U.S. House.

Thanks.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Speaker BOEHNER.

The program will continue.

Mr. CLEMENT. Well, thank you, Connie.

My report is about the Common Ground Project. One of the many joys of being active with this wonderful association is that it brings together Republicans and Democrats for our many programs, such as during our annual meeting and charitable golf tournament and for panel discussions, as well as other presentations. Everything we do is bipartisan. Our board is divided evenly between Republicans and Democrats, and our leadership rotates between the parties.

As we all know, currently, our Congress—and indeed our country—is going through a period of great polarization and partisanship. While we certainly don't leave our political beliefs at the door when participating in association activities, we pride ourselves in creating an environment where an across-the-aisle dialogue not only is possible, but also the norm. We have institutionalized this approach in a program that we call the Common Ground Project.

The purpose of Common Ground is to create venues and events where our bipartisan approach can involve the public in a dialogue on the issues of the day. Our long-standing programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program, already fit neatly into the vision of the Common Ground Project. Other undertakings were created specifically by us to further this project.

For example, we are extremely proud of our partnership with the National Archives, which has brought dozens of former Members from both sides of the aisle together with the public for panel discussions and a productive, as well as a respectful, political dialogue.

Our most recent panels include a look at the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act and their impact 50 years after passage. Another discussion focused on women in politics and political leadership, which included Leader PELOSI. Even though she is not a former Member, we let her participate.

Just last month, we brought together former Members John Tanner, Chris Shays, and Speaker Denny Hastert, with Washington Post journalist Bob Woodward and former Clinton press

secretary Mike McCurry for a conversation about the role Congress plays in our foreign policy and international crises.

We also try to involve current Members in our Common Ground Project. One thing you will hear quite often from former Members is that we were able to spend more time with our colleagues from either side of the aisle and had more of an opportunity to get to know each other on a personal basis. For a number of reasons, current Members no longer have that time and the luxury of building personal relationships. It is awfully hard to negotiate with someone and to trust someone when you don't have a foundation that is rooted in knowing one another.

One small way of bringing current Members together was accomplished again in partnership with the National Archives. We invited freshman Members from both parties to bring their families to the National Archives for an open house around Christmas time. While the Members and their spouses had a chance to view some of the documents and treasures at the Archives, their kids were able to explore the great learning center the Archives created for research and treasure hunting. The Members then learned from Archives staff about congressional papers and the responsibility Members have making their personal papers part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are quite a number of other activities that contribute to our Common Ground Project, and the list is too long to include. I know and you know that a lot of us attack the issues rather than our fellow colleagues, whether they be Democrat or Republican. We knew how to compromise. We knew how to work together to get things done, and I think the time has come when we need to identify all the problems associated with this Congress, how we can help them, how we can support them, and how we can show them where we have gotten off track.

This is something Common Ground can do because the fact is that Common Ground is an opportunity for us to solve a lot of problems that have not been solved, and it is time for us and for this Congress and future Congresses to start solving problems, and there is nothing wrong with the word ''compromise.''

I know my Aunt Anna Belle Clement O'Brien was in the State senate, and she used the expression—and you all sent me to the U.K. recently, and they don't call it political science. They call it politics. They don't call it political science. When you ask a student what they major in, they say: Oh, I major in politics.

Well, I picked up on that because my Aunt Anna Belle in Tennessee would always end her speeches:

Politics builds roads. Politics builds schools. Politics builds mental hospitals. Politics is compromise.

Maybe we can all work together on Common Ground Project and make it happen again because this is too great of a country for us to be wandering.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much, Bob.

I am glad you listened to your aunt. We appreciate also the work you have done on this very important project and also the fact that you are on our board of directors, and that is very helpful.

A great example of how productive and powerful bipartisan can be is our annual congressional golf tournament. It is chaired by our immediate past president, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, and fellow board member, Ken Kramer of Colorado. I would now yield the floor to Ken Kramer to give us a brief report about the charitable golf tournament.

Ken.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I note the adjective ''brief,'' and I will try to comply.

Seven years ago, we took a 35-year tradition, our annual golf tournament which pits Republicans against Democrats, and we gave it a new and bigger mission. We converted it into a charitable golf tournament to aid severely wounded vets that are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Our beneficiaries are Warfighter Sports, which is a program of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee it up for the Troops, which use golf and other sports to help our wounded veterans readjust to life after sustaining very severe injuries. They involve the entire family in the sport. They provide equipment. They provide training.

Our seventh charitable event will be held in 2 weeks, July 28th, at Army Navy Country Club in Arlington. All together, these tournaments are closing in on raising almost a half a million dollars for these outstanding programs, and I might add that, since this statement was written, recent receipts would indicate that we have now hit that half million dollar mark.

During each of our past tournaments, we have had several dozen current and former Members from both sides of our aisle come together to support these troops, and they have met in the process with dozens of these warriors, many of whom play with us in our foursomes, and I might add some of our double amputees are much better than our Members. It is an incredibly humbling, rewarding—and I mean humbling—rewarding and memorable experience to spend the day in the presence of these outstanding men and women.

I want to thank everyone at the association, particularly Sharon Witiw, as well as Dennis Hertel, our tournament's cochair, for all that they have done to make our tournament such a success, and equally important, I am happy to report that we again have secured the leadership of our two outstanding current cochairs from last year, Congressman MIKE MCINTYRE of North Carolina and Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee.

Their leadership has really energized our event and contributed big time to its success. I also want to thank our many sponsors for their generous contributions, and many of these sponsors have come back year after year to support this worthy cause.

It is an honor to help such an incredibly deserving group, and again, our tournament is on July 28th. For those of you who have not signed up, we hope that you will do so.

We now call this tournament The Members, by the way, but unlike The Masters, you don't need to play at that pro level to have an enjoyable day. All you have to do is show up and help raise some much-needed funds, and you don't have to worry about your skill set to be able to participate. It is 100 percent about helping these warriors. Your handicap is not really that important. Your individual score is not kept. We play a scramble format, and this event can only be successful if you out there will give it your time and attention.

If you only golf once a year, this is the day to do it. Please let us know if you can either help or you know any people that we can recruit as sponsors, and thank you for your time and attention, and I hope I met the instruction of brief.

Ms. MORELLA. Congratulations to you, Ken, on the success of the program. It is patriotic, it is humanitarian, it is very moving. We are very honored that the association can play a small role in the rehabilitation of these amazing young men and women.

In addition to the domestic programs that we have described so far, our association also has a very active and far-reaching international focus. We conduct programs focused on Europe and Asia. We bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures that are overseas. We work with our Department of State to talk about representative democracy with audiences overseas, and we partner with former parliamentarians from other countries for democracy-strengthening missions.

Some of these programs involve former Members as active participants. Others focus on current Members who benefit from the input and contributions of former Members in Congress' international outreach.

I want to yield right now the floor to a former president of our association, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, to report on these international projects that are predominantly former Member driven.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Well, thank you, Madam President.

I like the sound of that. Maybe we will see that soon in our future for our country.

You know, we have this great privilege of being able to come on the House floor and to bring groups on the House floor, and one of the first things that I tell the students that I am able to take here is what a great—one of the greatest changes I have seen take place in the last 30 years is the number of women in Congress and in the House and the Senate. It is just amazing.

My wife says we still have a long way to go because women are 51 percent of the population, but we have made tremendous strides, and it was a great honor to have former Speaker PELOSI here this morning, the first woman Speaker, and have her talk about women in the economy and what they are proposing, the changes that we are making.

In our association, you know, recently, we lost Lindy Boggs, who was our first woman president, and she was just such a wonderful mentor and example for all of us, and now, we have been privileged to have President Connie Morella of our association, who has achieved so much and expanded our reach in so many areas—in all areas, really, internationally with more contacts and more visits by our former Members, more exchanges, and more education because of that.

As far as being able to strengthen our association as far as raising funds, nobody has made the strides that Connie Morella has made for us, especially by bringing in the international community because of her experience as an Ambassador, and I have always said, as I saw it here in the legislature and then in Congress with my experience, women were able to accomplish more.

They have this network, but more than a network, they have this attitude of let's get it done, and I think they have been bipartisan leaders in the Congress, in the House, and in the Senate, and are an example for our entire Nation.

So it is my great privilege to thank, on behalf of the association, Connie Morella for all she has done.

Connie, would you please come up here for a minute?

We have a plaque, which can never capture all that she has done, but from the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, it says:

To the Honorable Connie Morella, in recognition and appreciation of her strong leadership as president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. Her tremendous enthusiasm and effectiveness will always be remembered by her grateful colleagues.

Washington, D.C., July 16, 2014.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much. Thank you, Dennis. This is a great surprise. It reminds me of something that Will Shakespeare—and I think really it was his wife who wrote it—who said:

For these great blessings heaped upon me, I can nothing render but allegiant thanks.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HERTEL. I echo what Connie said about continuing now with a woman vice president becoming our president today, Barbara Kennelly.

Let me talk about the international programs briefly. I am going to try to move through it because I know the Members have heard this information before. I already got rid of two pages here.

They are more or less divided into two types of projects. One is composed of international projects that include former Members in democracy-strengthening missions, such as election monitoring. The other is composed of international projects, where our association serves as a bridge between current Members and their peers in legislative branches overseas.

During my time as president, I always felt it was this international work that really gave our association an opportunity to make a very important contribution that was unique. Because our Members, unlike the dropping in for a meeting today and going to another country, as current Members have to do, and getting back here for session—which is the biggest difference between our Congress and the other Parliaments, since our Congress has more power, the power of the budget, the power of the purse under the Constitution, and it is not from the top down.

Our Members are so independent. They are so busy on their schedules and never able to attend the international conferences as much as the former Members are, who are also able to hang around the country and do some actual democracy building and not just drop in on election day for monitoring, so that is what I have been most proud of what we have been able to accomplish, and I think that there is a much wider area for us to go in.

I know, Pete, I haven't been anyplace in the last 4 years, and I think a lot of Members here haven't, and we are looking forward to more opportunities for our Former Members Association because of that difference that we can make in so many ways.

We have internationalized the outreach of the Global Democracy Initiative and have worked in a wonderful partnership with our Canadian and European colleagues on that to strengthen democracy abroad. This has always been some of the most rewarding work that we have done as an association, and I think we can do more.

Frankly, we have had a problem of funding. The Canadians were able to get us some international funding to keep us going from their government, but we have to reach out to do more monitoring in foreign nations, and we have to convince international and national charities and foundations that we are the ones that can do it better than others.

When we put you guys on the ground, you will know the first day what the politics of the situation is. Other people, you know, can't be trained to have those kinds of instincts and knowledge that you have, so, you know, I know that our people can make a greater difference if we can have more opportunities.

We also have numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets.

I learn so much more, and I have to sometimes explain the elections of Ohio and Florida to our international visitors and contacts because all the questions aren't just in foreign countries.

Our voting percent in this country is only 50 percent, and 100 years ago, that percentage was 85 percent. If we look at our primary elections, which we just saw in Virginia as a prime example, we are seeing less than 20 percent of the people vote. When you divide that into two political parties, it is less than 12 percent of the people are electing a candidate in the way the gerrymandered districts are. That is only of registered voters. If you talk about the total population, we are down to about maybe 8 percent of the population of those districts electing people to Congress.

So we have a lot of reform to do in our country, and I think we can be the leaders in that, also in showing not only what we can do internationally, but nationally.

Our most recent group from the Middle East and North Africa was composed of young professionals from Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and included young men and women working in the private sector or in their governments and coming to Washington for a monthlong fellowship that we facilitate with offices on Capitol Hill.

Larry LaRocco has been a great leader in this, and these are young people, for the most part, that can learn from our experience and programs. We promote a positive relationship between the United States and north Africa, which in light of the Arab Spring and all the crises we see today—and tragedies—is more vital than ever.

Our association connects the fellows with former Members, who they meet with several times over the course of their stay. The former Members act as a kind of mentor to these young men and women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending program discussions and events.

I have been very impressed at how much time our former Members spend and how much personally they are able to make connections with these people, and these ongoing relationships that can last for years, and many of these people will be in areas of leadership in the future in their country.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and north Africa, and we are very proud of what the association has accomplished.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas, and we are hoping to increase that and engage overseas audiences—students, government officials, NGOs, and corporate representatives—in a dialogue about the many challenges that are global in nature and require across-border communications.

You already heard that our Congress to Campus program has a very active international component and that we've brought the program to numerous universities and countries, such as Turkey, the U.K., and Germany. Other overseas delegations—we call them ExDELs—have traveled to countries where dialogue is often difficult—we have to get a better term than ExDELs—but it is also an incredibly important one.

Of the major ones that we have been able to start a few years ago is with China, and we are privileged to have Mark Gold with us here on the House floor here today, who really set up this program for our association.

It has been one of the most extensive that we have because we have a group of former House Members go, but also an additional group of former Senators go, and again, it is always bipartisan. Lou Frey has been one of the leaders in this and was on our first trip.

Since our inaugural delegation, we have sent six additional delegations to China over the past three years. Just last month, five former Members—Jim Slattery, Tim Roemer, Steve Bartlett, Jon Christensen, and Don Bonker—made up our seventh China delegation.

This bipartisan delegation traveled to Beijing, Chengdu, and Shanghai. They met with an incredible array of people, including Chinese scholars, the American Chamber of Commerce, China's Foreign Ministry, students at Beijing University, the National People's Congress, and, of course, the U.S. Embassy.

The delegation arrived in China the day after our government announced pursuing an indictment against the Chinese military for hacking our computers, so you can imagine what the main topic of conversation was. For a while, it looked like the Chinese were going to cancel all our meetings, but thankfully, cooler heads prevailed, and the delegates had a very open and very productive exchange with the Chinese on a number of important topics, including energy policy, the South China Sea, North Korea, and trade relations.

In my mind, there is no better and no more powerful exchange than one that is face to face and builds a network of contacts. I think the China project is an excellent example of the great contribution our association can make.

We have now sent seven ExDELs to China over the past three years. We serve as an American voice overseas while in China, and we debrief both Congress and the State Department upon our return.

I should make sure to thank your partners for this project, who have worked with us to make all seven ExDELs possible. We really appreciate the great partnership we have with the China-United States Exchange Foundation and the China Association for International Friendly Contact.

It pains me when I see current Members of Congress get beaten up in the press for traveling overseas. There really is not a single issue that does not have global implications or could not benefit from the point of view of someone who has dealt with the same issue in their country.

One of the great liberating aspects of being a former Member is that we can travel and explore and have discussions without having to worry how the press may misconstrue our journeys in some cynical way, and in addition, I greatly enjoyed getting to know my fellow travelers from both sides of the aisle, so there is some real bipartisan camaraderie that comes from having this common experience.

I am very glad that our association can support Congress' international outreach in such a meaningful, productive, and bipartisan way.

Thank you.

Thank you, Connie. While I appreciate very much the opportunity to report on our international programs, I would first like to invite Connie Morella back to the dais please, and I'd also like to have Barbara Kennelly come down to the dais for a second. I think we're ok without a Presiding Officer for a quick moment. Connie Morella has done a tremendous job as our Association's President, and Barbara has been an excellent Vice President. Let's please give the two of them a round of applause. Thank you! Connie is now moving into the Immediate Past President position on our executive committee and Barbara will take over as President. I just wanted to take a moment to thank Connie for her tremendous leadership, which has elevated our organization to new heights and we have taken yet another leap forward thanks to Connie's energy and commitment. On behalf of our membership, board of directors, and our staff, I would like to present to Connie this plaque as a small token of our appreciation. It reads:

"To the Honorable Connie Morella in recognition and appreciation of her strong leadership as President of the US Association of Former Members of Congress. Her tremendous enthusiasm and effectiveness will always be remembered by her grateful colleagues. Washington, DC July 16, 2014."

I'd like everyone to please join me in a well-deserved round of applause for Connie Morella.

Thank you! And now let me continue our report by telling you about our many international programs, which are more or less divided into two types of projects: one is composed of international projects that include former Members in democracy strengthening missions such as election monitoring; and the other is composed of international projects where our Association serves as a bridge between current Members and their peers in legislative branches overseas. During my time as President of this Association, I always felt that it was this international work that really gave our Association an opportunity to make an impactful and important contribution. As a matter of fact, we institutionalized this outreach in what is now the Global Democracy Initiative, and have worked in wonderful partnership with our Canadian and European colleagues to strengthen democracy abroad. This has always been some of the most rewarding work I've done with our Association, and I am thrilled that we continue to put so much effort into this aspect of our programming.

Via the former Members Association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies who have come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets, and I learn as much—if not more—from our visitors as they do from me. In addition to elected officials, our Association has had an active project—in partnership with a great NGO called Legacy International—bringing young professionals from the Middle East and North Africa to the United States. Our most recent group was composed of young professionals from Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, and included young men and women working in the private sector or in their governments and coming to Washington for a month-long fellowship that we facilitate with offices on Capitol Hill.

Our program promotes a positive relationship between the United States and North Africa, which, in light of the Arab Spring is now more vital than ever. Our Association connects the Fellows with former Members, whom they meet with several times over the course of their stay. The former Members act as a kind of mentor to these young men and women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending program discussions and events.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and North Africa, and I am very proud that our Association can be a part in such a vital dialogue.

I had the opportunity to meet wonderful young women and men through this project. They are inspirational and impressive, and I benefited greatly by having spent some time with them.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our Association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas and engage overseas audiences—students, government officials, NGOs and corporate representatives—in a dialogue about the many challenges that are global in nature and require across-border

communication. You already heard that our Congress to Campus Program has a very active international component, and that we've brought the program to numerous universities in countries such as Turkey and the UK. Other overseas delegations, we call them ExDELs, have travelled to countries where a dialogue is often difficult but nonetheless incredibly important.

I had the privilege to participate in our very first ExDEL to China a number of years ago. Some of my travel companies, for example Lou Frey, are here today, and they can attest to what an educational and impactful experience that China ExDEL was. Since our inaugural delegation, we have sent six additional delegations to China over the past three years. Just last month, five former Members—Jim Slattery, Tim Roemer, Steve Bartlett, Jon Christensen, and Don Bonker, made up our seventh China delegation. This bipartisan delegation traveled to Beijing, Chengdu, and Shanghai. They met with an incredible array of people, including Chinese scholars, the American Chamber of Commerce, China's Foreign Ministry, students at Beijing University, the National People's Congress, and, of course, the U.S. Embassy. The delegation arrived in China the day after our government announced pursuing an indictment against the Chinese military for hacking our computers, so you can imagine what the main topic of conversation was! For a while it looked like the Chinese were going to cancel all our meetings, but thankfully cooler heads prevailed and the delegates had a very open and very productive exchange with the Chinese on a number of important topics, including energy policy, the South China Sea, North Korea, and trade relations.

In my mind there is no better and no more powerful exchange than one that is face-to-face and builds a network of contacts. I think the China project is an excellent example of the great contribution our Association can make. We have now sent seven ExDELs to China over the past three years. We serve as an American voice overseas while in China, and we debrief both Congress and the State Department upon our return. And I should make sure to thank your partners for this project, who have worked with us to make all seven ExDELs possible. We really appreciate the great partnership we have with the China U.S. Exchange Foundation and the China Association for International Friendly Contact.

It pains me when I see current Members of Congress get beaten up in the press for traveling overseas. There really is not a single issue that does not have global implications or could not benefit from the point of view of someone who has dealt with the same issue in their country. One of the great liberating aspects of being a former Member is that we can travel and explore and have discussions without having to worry how the press may misconstrue our journeys in some cynical way. And in addition, I greatly enjoyed getting to know my fellow travelers from both sides of the aisle, so there is some real bipartisan camaraderie that comes from having this common experience. I am very glad that our Association can support Congress' international outreach in such a meaningful, productive and bipartisan way. Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thanks, Dennis.

I particularly liked the tribute you gave me. Thank you very much. Thanks for your leadership and your active involvement in the international programs. I am very acutely aware of the power of personal interaction and people making an effort to bridge the cultural divide. The examples that you mentioned, the China ExDELs and the north African Legislative Fellows Program, certainly are important contributions we can make.

Actually, not all of our programs focus exclusively on former Members. As was mentioned earlier, we have a number of projects that benefit from former Member leadership that involve primarily current Members and their peers overseas. We call these programs Congressional Study Groups. Our focus is on Germany, Turkey, Japan, Europe as a whole.

To give you more background about the Congressional Study Groups, which are working so satisfactorily, I want to invite former Member Russ Carnahan of Missouri to the dais.

Russ.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Connie, and thank you for your leadership of the association. I also want to thank the staff of the Former Members that really back up and make these programs work for all those who participate.

Just on a personal note, I want to recognize and acknowledge the passing of our friend and former Member, Ike Skelton of Missouri this past year.

It is really a great pleasure to work on, to report on the four Congressional Study Groups for Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Europe, the flagship international programs for the Former Members of Congress over three decades.

The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding.

We have great leadership from both Houses that are bipartisan. The Study Group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, trade issues that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad.

Highlights from the past year include our inaugural Member delegation to Japan in February, and also here in Washington hosting the Study Groups. They welcomed several groups of legislators and executive branch members throughout the year from Germany, Japan, Turkey, and the EU Parliament.

Looking ahead to the fall, we want to continue our longstanding Congress-Bundestag Seminar by welcoming a group of Bundestag members to Washington and Pennsylvania in September.

The work of the Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of three dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutions and foundations and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair and Ms. Junko Chano of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Mr. Friedrich Merz and Ms. Eveline Metzen of Atlantik-Brucke, Ms. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater and Ms. Margaret Mihori of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission for their support as our Study Group Institutional Funders.

And finally, a shout-out to the international business community here in Washington, and the list of those supporters is much too long to mention here in my formal remarks. Those will be submitted for the RECORD here today, but it is because of their financial support, our activities not only helped to build vital bilateral relationships between legislators, but also bipartisan relationships with our own Congress.

This mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are critical to solving pressing problems both here and abroad. As former Members, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in their continued international outreach.

Thank you.

It gives me great pleasure to report on the work of The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey and Europe, the flagship international programs of FMC for over three decades. The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic partners.

Each Study Group is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of Members of Congress. I would like to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs. The Congressional Study Group on Germany, celebrating its 31st anniversary of bringing Members of the U.S. Congress together with their counterparts in the German Bundestag, has been led over the past year by Senator JEFF SESSIONS, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TIM RYAN. Our Japan Study Group celebrates its 21st anniversary this year led by Senator MAZIE K. HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, Representative

DIANA DEGETTE, Representative BILLY LONG, and Representative JIM MCDERMOTT.

Representative GERRY CONNOLLY and Representative ED WHITFIELD continue to lead The Study Group on Turkey. And Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH chair our Study Group on Europe, our newest and fastest growing Study Group. Finally, The Study Groups would also like to extend special acknowledgement to its Honorary Co-Chairs, former Speaker Dennis Hastert and Secretary Norman Y. Mineta, who remain active in our programming.

The Study Group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, and trade issues that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad. Instead of lengthy speeches, an informal atmosphere has proved to better promote relationship building and understanding among international legislators. Over the past year, topics of conversation have included TTIP and TPP trade negotiations, natural gas exports, and security concerns in the East China Sea and Eastern Europe among others. The cornerstone of our programming is periodic roundtable discussions on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress and visiting foreign and U.S. officials and dignitaries. In addition, The Congressional Study Groups on Germany and Japan offer travel opportunities for Members of Congress in the form of Annual Seminars both at home and abroad, and all four Study Groups conduct bipartisan study tours abroad for senior congressional staff.

Highlights from the past year included our inaugural Member delegation to Japan in February, which included in-depth meetings with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, U.S. Ambassador Caroline Kennedy, and the Ministers of Agriculture, Defense, Foreign Affairs, and Economy, Trade, and Industry. Here in Washington, The Study Groups welcomed several groups of legislators and executive branch members throughout the year from Germany, Japan, Turkey, and the EU Parliament. Looking ahead to the fall, we look forward to continuing our longstanding Congress-Bundestag Seminar by welcoming a group of Bundestag Members to Washington and Pennsylvania in September.

The work of The Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of three dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addition to The Congressional Study Groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our four core Study Groups.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutions, foundations, and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair and Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Mr. Friedrich Merz and Ms. Eveline Metzen of Atlantik-Brücke, Ms. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater and Ms. Margaret Mihori of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission for their support as our Study Group Institutional Funders.

The Congressional Study Groups are also grateful for the support of the international business community here in Washington, D.C., represented by each Study Group's Business Advisory Council. Companies of the 2014 Council include Allianz; Airbus Americas; Honda; B. Braun Medical; Central Japan Railway Company; Cheniere Energy; Daimler; Deutsche Telekom; DHL Deutsche Post; Eli Lilly and Company; Fresenius; Hitachi; Lufthansa German Airlines; Marubeni America Corporation; Mitsubishi International Corporation; Mitsui; Representative of German Industry and Trade; Sojitz; Toyota Motor North America; United Parcel Service; and Volkswagen of America.

Because of your financial support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad. As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by The Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach. Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Russ. And I know you abbreviated some of your comments, which will be in the RECORD. Our Association certainly has a very active and impressive international portfolio, and we appreciate your leadership in these endeavors.

And while our focus is on international relations, let me welcome our special guests from other former legislators associations.

We have a wonderful and very productive partnership with our Canadian colleagues, and we are thrilled to welcome from Ottawa former parliamentarians Andy Mitchell and Gerry Weiner. And for having traveled the furthest goes to former parliamentarian Hamish Hancock, who represents the New Zealand Association.

Gentlemen, thank you for joining us today. We are honored by your presence.

In addition to the programs that you have heard about so far, we are also tasked with highlighting the achievements of former Members and providing former Members with opportunities to stay connected with their former colleagues after leaving Capitol Hill. One of our premier events which achieves both these goals is our Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner.

In April of this year, we hosted our 17th dinner, and like the preceding 16, it was chaired by our good friend Lou Frey of Florida. Imagine 17 dinners he has chaired. Lou was supported by a number of cochairs, including me, former Members, Dennis Hertel, Martin Frost, and our Association's CEO, Pete Weichlein.

I would now like to invite Lou Frey to report on the highly successful 17th Statesmanship Awards Dinner.

Lou.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you very much.

I don't know who got this idea and where those 17 years go, but I guess we are going right ahead with the 18th. The dinner is our biggest fundraising event, and it reaches out to a whole number of people at all different levels, and it also shows what can be done when you can work together and work and achieve a goal.

We have brought, I think, with the dinner, focus on what this group is. There is frankly more intelligence in this group than anyplace you want to put it together. It is an incredible bunch of people that we have here who have given back to this country and continue to give back. And as I look around and see the different friends who worked on it and made a difference, all I can say is thank you. It was never a one-person deal. It was always a deal, a partnership deal.

The partnership has grown a lot bigger for us, and this dinner itself is becoming not easier, it is just bigger. As a matter of fact, Madam President, this was the most productive dinner that we have had. I think we raised, Pete, over—what?—$500,000, give or take a penny here and there, but never lost its focus.

In a great country, we have a problem because nobody knows what we have. We have a country where everybody knows basketball terms and so forth and that and knows how to play the game, but we have a question of people understanding. For instance, in my home State of Florida, your home State of Florida, we know that 40 percent of the people can't name the three branches of government and 42 percent can't explain separation of powers, and 73 percent of our fourth graders—our fourth graders—can't pick the Constitution out as our leading legal document.

This dinner and the people that work on this dinner have a desire to make a change, and we can make a change. We are making a change. We are making a big change. It is sort of fun to be along for the ride, for watching what has happened in that. Look where we were; turn the clock back. It was a total different deal.

It was a social organization when it started. It wasn't going anywhere, bouncing along; and thanks to the leadership we have had presently and in the past, it is a different organization. It is one that I am certainly proud of, and it is nice to look out here and know there are going to be a lot of cochairmen. When I call on the phone and say: Hey, Larry, you know, here we go. There is a dinner on March 25, put that on your calendar, because you are going to get a call. You are going to get a call from me and from the other people, and, Madam President to be, I am sure that you will be right there

continuing to help us with what we are doing.

So thanks for everything you have done. Five hundred tickets sold, more than the 16 preceding dinners, tremendous honorees that we have had.

Gentleman, former—well, a Member of Congress, but also the Corporate Statesmanship Award of former Secretary GUTIÉRREZ. And we also have, who came up the hard way literally, in terms of what he was doing as a kid, became our third honoree with Operation Homefront, represented by the CEO, Jim Knotts.

And we had a return this year by Gary Sinise, who came back. He had been given the honor. He came back and spent an hour working with the former Members. You know, you give people an hour, they don't come back ever in this thing, but he came back and did it and that.

So we are really proud of what we have of the dinner. We are proud of all the help that went into it. We look forward to a more successful dinner this time and with the people here who will all get involved in it. Thanks so much. It was a privilege to be involved with you all. I appreciate it

Ms. MORELLA. Keep it going, Lou. You are doing a great job.

You know, all of the programs that we have described of course require both leadership and staff to implement. Our association is blessed to have top people in both categories.

I want to take this opportunity to thank our board of directors—these are 30 former Members divided equally between parties—thank them for their advice and counsel. It is really appreciated.

I also want to thank the many partners and supporters we have that have made our programs possible. We are truly lucky to have assembled a group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work and make our success possible, and we very much value their partnership.

I would also be remiss if I didn't thank the other members of our association's executive committee: our vice president, Barbara Kennelly; our treasurer, Jim Walsh; secretary, Bill Delahunt; our past president, Dennis Hertel. They have all made this association a stronger and better organization than it had ever been before, and we want to thank them for their time and their energy. Let's hear it for all of them.

And to administer these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. Actually, I used to say to my staff: My rod and my staff, they comfort me and prepare the papers for me in the presence of my constituents. And so again, our staff has done the same for us.

Sean Pavlik is our newest staff member. He joined us as a legislative fellow focused on our Japan program, and he has done such a terrific job. We had to hire him full-time. He even speaks Japanese.

Rachel Haas joined our association as office manager a little over a year ago, and she has by now become indispensable for a great number of reasons. Many of you met her this morning. We need to think of a better job title for her because the current one does not describe at all the many different levels that she contributes.

Andrew Shoenig, who is our international programs manager. He makes all the international programs that you have heard about possible. He truly does. He started as an intern and has now been with us full-time for over 2 years. We are really very fortunate to have him.

Sharon Witiw, she is our member services manager. You probably have gotten emails from her. She takes exceptionally good care of our 600 association members and all their various requests, needs, and inquiries. Also, without her, our most important domestic program, the Congress to Campus Program, would not be in as good a shape as it is.

Sabine Schleidt is our international programs director and oversees all the current Member programs which are so impressive and important. In the 3 years that she has been with us, she has transformed all the Study Groups into substantive and incredibly productive exchanges that now involve more current Members than ever, including a Diplomatic Advisory Council, which now has about 30 ambassadors from the region that belong.

Pete Weichlein, he is our CEO, and he has been with the organization for 15 years. Pete, I call him the renaissance man because he does so many things and does them all so well: managing, extending our services to other programs, finding synergy in places we never even thought existed. He is there every step of the way, and we very much value his leadership.

And so I would like to have you give a round of applause. It is amazing, so few people can do so much. You heard about the programs, just think, these are the people who help it happen.

In addition to our wonderful staff, we benefit greatly from volunteers who lend their talents and their expertise pro bono. None deserve more appreciation than Dava Guerin. She has taken on the role of our communications director. She tells our story and connects us with the media.

Thank you, Dava. We really appreciate all that you do also. And I hope you are watching this program, although we will see the minutes.

Every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I therefore now will read to you the names of the candidates for board members and officers. They are all running unopposed. I have never run in an election unopposed. They are all running unopposed, and I therefore ask for a simple ''yea'' or ''nay'' as I present to you the list of candidates as a slate.

For the association's board of directors the candidates are:

Mary Bono of California
Vic Fazio of California
Martin Frost of Texas
Bart Gordon of Tennessee
Jim Kolbe of Arizona
Steve LaTourette of Ohio
David Scaggs of Colorado
Cliff Stearns of Florida
Jim Walsh of New York
Albert Wynn of Maryland.

All in favor of electing these ten former Members to our board of directors, please say, ''yea.'' I hear it unanimously. All opposed? Hearing no objection, the slate has been elected by the membership.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. The candidates for our executive committee are: Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut for president, Jim Walsh of New York for vice president, Martin Frost of Texas for treasurer, Mary Bono of California for secretary.

All in favor of electing these four former Members to our Executive Committee, please say, ''yea.'' I hear it. All opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. I shall join the executive board in my capacity as immediate past president. And let's have a round of applause for all those newly elected members of our board and our officers.

Well, now it is my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report. I ask all of you, including any visitors, to rise as I read the names, and at the end of the list we will pay our respects to their memory with a moment of silence.

We honor these men and women for their service to our country, and they are:

Howard Baker, Jr. of Tennessee
Ben Garrido Blaz of Guam
Lindy Boggs of Louisiana
Harry F. Byrd, Jr. of Virginia
Howard Callaway of Georgia
William Coyne of Pennsylvania
Butler Carson Derrick, Jr. of South Carolina
Alan Dixon of Illinois
Thomas Foley of Washington
John Gilligan of Ohio
Rod Grams of Minnesota
Kenneth James Gray of Illinois
William Gray of Pennsylvania
William Hathhaway of Maine
Jack Hightower of Texas
Donald Irwin of Connecticut
Andy Jacobs, Jr. of Indiana
Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey
John McCollister of Nebraska
Jim Oberstar of Minnesota
Major Owens of New York
Otis Pike of New York
Robert Roe of New Jersey

William Roy of Kansas
William Scranton of Pennsylvania
E. Clay Shaw of Florida
Ike Skelton of Missouri
David Michael Staton of West Virginia
Michael L. Strang of Colorado
Arlan Strangeland of Minnesota
Barbara Vucanovich of Nevada
George C. Wortley of New York
Charles Young of Florida.

Thank you.

That concludes the 44th report to Congress by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered Chamber and to report on our association's activities. We thank them also personally for their comments to us and encouragement. We look forward to another active and productive year.

Thank you.

Ms. KENNELLY. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 a.m.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

For all of us, some days are better than others, some tasks more difficult than others, but You have shown grace and favor to our country since its inception. Please guide our Nation's leaders to make wise decisions in the best interests of citizens everywhere.

For those who feel called by You to serve, let them say, ''Here I am. Send me.'' Grant all of the Members of this House integrity of action so that they act not for their own honor and glory but, rather, for the welfare of all of their constituents.

Lord, we also pray for all former Members of Congress, many of whom are gathered here at the Capitol today. Continue to guide them along their way, revealing to them the truth and bringing them to the fullness of life. May their examples of heroic statesmanship be an inspiration to all.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BORDER TRIP

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the immigration crisis taking place on the southern border of my home State of Texas demands our undivided attention as well as immediate action.

That is why, unlike the President, I will head to the Rio Grande Valley on Friday. This area covers over 320 river miles and 19 counties, equating to over 17,000 square miles. Knowing this, there is no way to fully grasp the scope and depth of the crisis through a simple briefing in Washington.

The President and HARRY REID just don't get it. Last night, HARRY REID declared, ''The border is secure.'' That blew my mind. If he and the President spent any time at the border, they would see just how out of touch they are.

Mr. President, Americans, particularly Texans, have been waiting 5½ years for a secure border. It is time to secure our border. It is time to enforce our immigration laws.

ACCESS TO BIRTH CONTROL FOR WOMEN

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped we would have settled this debate decades ago. Yet here we are in 2014, and we are still arguing over access to birth control for women.

According to the five-man Supreme Court majority in the Hobby Lobby case, it wasn't enough for politicians to have a say in women's access to health care. Apparently, their employers should have a say, too. This decision is yet another example of the constitutional rights of individual Americans being trumped by the apparent rights of corporations. So a woman is entitled to her own religious beliefs as long as they don't get in the way of the religious beliefs of the corporation she works for.

The Court's ruling in Hobby Lobby allows for for-profit companies to interfere with the personal health decisions of their employees, opening the door for employers to discriminate against women who are simply seeking practical medical care.

Justice Ginsburg said it best in her scathing dissent: ''The Court has ventured into a minefield.'' Now it is up to Congress to find a way out.

ISRAEL

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with full and unwavering support that I stand beside our greatest friend and ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

We condemn the violent terrorist attacks that have been executed in the name of jihad, and the resolution we passed in the House reaffirms Israel's right to defend herself.

When 5 million innocent Israelis wake up every morning to the threat of deadly rocket attacks, they have the right to protect themselves.

When Hamas, a terrorist organization that has fired more than 600 rockets from Gaza in the last month alone, calls for the destruction of the State of Israel, the people have the right to respond.

This Congress will stand beside them as they do.

Our resolution reaffirms Israel's right to defend herself, and it calls on Hamas to immediately cease its deadly rocket attacks.

We must come together as a Congress and as a country to condemn the terrorist attacks against the people of Israel. Furthermore, we urge this administration, as it moves forward in its nuclear negotiations with Iran, to take

a somber look at Iran's support of Hamas.

#BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago, over 200 Nigerian schoolgirls were abducted and a hashtag went viral—#bringbackourgirls.

While talking about the girls may no longer be trendy, it is more important now than ever to bring them home. Every moment they are gone is a moment they are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, 3 months without our girls means that the time is now to keep pressure on the Nigerian Government. We must tweet with a fervent passion that extends beyond the glamour of a breaking news story. We cannot slow down. We cannot lose momentum. We cannot rest until our girls are home.

Every morning between 9 and 12, tweet ''Bring Back Our Girls'' with a hashtag—#bringbackourgirls, #bringbackourgirls, and #joinrepwilson, #joinrepwilson. Tweet, tweet, tweet. Keep tweeting until we bring back our girls.

AMERICA WILL STAND WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the continued attacks by Hamas on our Middle East ally Israel causes innocent Israelis to live under the daily threat of rocket attacks from Hamas at any given moment.

Our closest ally in the region must defend itself against vicious attacks aimed at its civilians. Each rocket attack that Hamas launches to kill civilians in Israel is an act of war. The United States must not underestimate how serious these attacks are and how crucial it is that we continue to support Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the Obama administration intends to continue funding the Palestinian Authority. Their decision to form a new government with Hamas is appalling, and we must respond appropriately.

How can we possibly continue funding a foreign government that has embraced a terrorist group currently attacking one of our closest allies and that has refused to acknowledge its right to even exist?

Our message to the world must be clear: America will always stand with Israel, and America will always punish acts of terror.

#BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark over 3 months since Boko Haram kidnapped over 270 girls from a school in northeastern Nigeria.

Abducting innocent young girls and forcing children into marriage or slavery is unconscionable, and no child in any part of the world should live in such fear. These kidnappings are not just a concern for Nigerian students but an issue that impacts all nations that respect basic human rights, including a person's right to pursue an education.

I stood with my colleagues in Congress in support of a resolution, sponsored by my friend and colleague Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, condemning Boko Haram and their heinous acts. Boko Haram relies on the tactics of fear and intimidation to make their victims feel helpless, and will try to convince these girls that the world has forgotten them and that no one cares about them.

The United States and the international community must continue to send a loud message that we have not forgotten about these girls and that we will continue to work with Nigeria and all of our allies in the region to bring back our girls.

OBAMA'S FAILED FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today deeply disturbed by the failed foreign policy of President Obama's—a policy of collapses, defeats, failures, and fiascoes. With every day of Obama's Presidency, the safety of Americans abroad deteriorates.

Desperate for anything that may seem like a foreign policy success, President Obama and Secretary Kerry are steaming full speed ahead toward another foreign policy calamity with Iran. Sunday is the deadline for nuclear negotiations with Iran. Let me remind you who we are dealing with. The rockets falling into Israel today were largely supplied by Iran. Hezbollah, Iran's proxy in Lebanon, is supporting Assad, Syria's genocidal dictator, and thousands of Iranian-supplied bombs have killed and maimed Americans in Iraq.

Mr. President, as you, yourself, have said, a bad deal is worse than no deal at all. A deal that allows Iran to continue enriching uranium and pursuing a military nuclear program while supporting terrorism around the world is a bad deal, and we in Congress will oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FIRST SHILOH HOUSING CORPORATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the First Shiloh Housing Corporation for its efforts in transforming the Ellicott Town Center and its surrounding neighborhood.

Two decades ago, the 14-acre former public housing property was abandoned and was the center of an unsafe, high-crime area. Today, the Ellicott Town Center is an almost fully occupied, mixed-use development with a diverse community of residents in patio homes, town houses, apartments, and a senior citizens center. This past Saturday, I was honored to attend the First Shiloh Housing Corporation's ''celebration of ownership'' to reflect on how far this neighborhood has come and to mark the beginning of its next chapter.

Mr. Speaker, the Ellicott Town Center is the result of public-private partnership, including Federal low-income housing tax credits, and it has stimulated new private sector development and economic opportunity. This is the type of work that the Federal Government should be involved in doing.

Congratulations to the First Shiloh Housing Corporation, its board of directors, and its church members on their success in taking back a neighborhood and rebuilding a community.

BORDER CRISIS REQUIRES IMMEDIATE AND DECISIVE ACTION

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the crisis on our southern border is one of the President's making.

His policies and failure to secure the border have encouraged tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien children to attempt to enter the United States. On the way, they are exposed to exploitation, violence, sex trafficking, health risks, and other dangers.

The situation on the border is a humanitarian crisis, and it requires our Chief Executive's immediate and decisive action. Rather than leading from behind, President Obama should convene a meeting with the leaders of Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and demand their cooperation in finding a solution. He should work with our border State Governors and deploy the National Guard to provide security and humanitarian relief.

President Obama should work with Congress to actually solve the problem. That would include changing the law to allow for the prompt repatriation of those coming from Central America and providing the administrative and social service resources needed to reunite the children with their relatives in their native countries.

The President bears responsibility for the chaos on the border and in these children's lives. It is time for him to lead.

□ 1215

IN MEMORY OF OFFICER MELVIN SANTIAGO

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, my district endured a tremendous tragedy. Early Sunday morning, Jersey City Police Officer Melvin Santiago was shot at close range and killed in the line of duty by a madman with a gun.

At the young age of 23, Officer Santiago had his whole life ahead of him. He recently graduated from the police academy and had performed his job with such dedication. Neighbors and family members said that he was an angel who was proud to say he was a Jersey City police officer.

To me, to the people of Jersey City, and the people of the 10th Congressional District, Officer Santiago was a hero.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another reminder that we, as leaders of this country, must take action to address the growing gun violence.

Parents, children, and families are living in fear to walk to school, to shop at the corner store, or go to the movies. In the greatest country on Earth, fear of gun violence should not consume our daily lives.

I want to offer my condolences to Officer Santiago's family.

ENCOURAGING INTERNATIONAL ADOPTIONS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there is a loving family in my congressional district who has a safe home for a little boy who needs a lot of love and care.

The Rieglers, who live in Muncie, adopted their son, Chiza, last August. This adorable little boy is stuck in the Congo for political reasons that have nothing to do with his specific situation or his health.

As a Nation, we should refuse to accept the continued separation of Congolese children from their adoptive American parents, especially children like Chiza with urgent medical needs.

All children, regardless of where or the circumstances into which they are born, deserve loving families. I will continue working to make that dream a reality for Chiza and the Rieglers and other families like them who simply want to love and care for their adoptive children who desperately need both.

THE MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act.

States and cities have seen a dramatic decline of sales tax revenue due to the increase in online sales, where a sales tax that is already owed is not collected. This means that potholes go unfilled and streets go unpaved, and it is unfair to the brick-and-mortar stores that do collect it, but this can be changed.

When my home State of California changed the law to require the collection of this already owed online sales tax, it brought in $260 million in its first year. The potential for future growth is even greater, with $1 billion more that could be collected in California alone.

Last night, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced a bill that combines the Marketplace Fairness Act, which would require this collection, with a 10-year extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

With this act, we can stop the closing of businesses on Main Street and have a fighting chance to keep the jobs they provide our communities.

We cannot wait to pass legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act.

LIBERAL NATIONAL MEDIA HELPED CAUSE BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the crisis at the border is a result of the President's allowing half a million illegal immigrants to stay in the country, and the national liberal media also are responsible for creating the crisis.

The Media Research Center found that, from June 8 through July 1, 89 percent of news stories on ABC, NBC, and CBS failed to mention that President Obama's policies have encouraged the surge of illegal minors at the border.

Accuracy in Media editor, Roger Aronoff, pointed out that another story ignored by the media are the hundreds of thousands of adult illegal immigrants who have crossed the border since April.

He also said that the media push a pro-amnesty agenda and have dropped the term ''illegal'' from their vocabulary, but there is a huge difference between legal and illegal immigrants. The national media should give the American people all of the facts, not tell them what to think.

THE TRAGIC LOSS OF OFFICER MELVIN SANTIAGO

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tragic loss of Melvin Santiago, a young police officer from Jersey City, New Jersey.

Melvin Santiago, at just 23 years old, made the ultimate sacrifice and gave his life to protect his community. Officer Santiago served as a role model for both his family and his community, working hard to set a positive example for his brothers and cousins.

He knew from an early age he wanted to become a police officer, to follow in the footsteps of his uncle, a retired detective of the Jersey City Police Department.

His death is a deep loss, not only to his mom, Cathy; dad, Melvin, Sr.; stepfather, Alex McBride; his brothers, Jordan and Alex, Jr.; but to the entire city of Jersey City.

We depend on our police officers such as Melvin and the men and women of the Jersey City Police Department to protect us and give us trust that there is order in the world. It is a sacrifice too often taken for granted.

I would like to express my condolences and gratitude to the family of Melvin Santiago and thank all the public safety personnel, police officers, fire, and EMS on the daily sacrifices that they make to protect us.

OBAMACARE IS A THREAT TO JOBS

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, Montanans have long known that ObamaCare's taxes and mandates are a direct threat to thousands of jobs, and this fact is becoming all too clear for in-home care providers.

ObamaCare's burdensome employer mandate would force in-home care businesses to cut jobs or employee wages and, in turn, hurt the elderly, the disabled, and low-income Montanans who rely on them for critical services.

The Ensuring Medicaid and Medicare Access to Providers Act protects Montanans' access to care by exempting their health providers from ObamaCare's oppressive employer mandate, and it protects health care workers from losing their jobs or getting their hours or their pay cut.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5098 and help ensure that disabled and vulnerable Americans can continue to receive critical health services in the comfort of their own homes.

ATTACKS AGAINST ISRAEL

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with Israel in its fight to defend itself and its people against Hamas, a known terrorist organization.

The recent rocket attacks from Hamas have proven it is dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel. We must stand by Israel during this time of conflict and continue to demand that Hamas stop firing rockets and accept the Egyptian proposal for a cease-fire.

We must stand by Israel during this time of conflict. I hope that the people of Israel and Palestine will soon find peace and security in their homes. Hamas has made it clear that they do not share this goal.

Until peace does come, it is vital that we continue to work toward strengthening our military partnership with Israel, as well as offer our support and solidarity in these trying times, and continue to push for a path of a two-state solution, so Israel citizens and Palestinian citizens may live in peace.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN SEIGENTHALER

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, America lost a giant this week. John Seigenthaler, the longtime editor of the Nashville Tennesseean, was buried on Monday, but his life transcended Nashville, Tennessee, and became literally a part of American history.

Born to humble beginnings in Nashville, Tennessee, he was first a star reporter, then a confidant of Bobby Kennedy, then a defender of the Freedom Riders, then the crusading editor of a Pulitzer Prize-winning Southern newspaper, then founding editor of USA Today, and then the founder of the First Amendment Center at Vanderbilt University.

John Seigenthaler had the Irish gift for friendship and words. He epitomized the best of journalism, and he was always on the right side of history because he helped everyone, including politicians, listen to the better angels of their nature.

Because of John Seigenthaler's leadership, Nashville is one of the most dynamic and welcoming cities in the world today.

Over 4,000 people from Nashville and around the country attended his visitation. The Catholic Church was packed for his funeral. It was broadcast on local television.

Mr. Speaker, a truly great American has died and will never be replaced.

HOW LONG? TOO LONG

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a mother and a parent. I could offer that I am a Congresswoman, but I think we need to embrace those mothers whose girls are still missing.

How long? Too long. How long? Too long.

Next Wednesday will be 100 days since they have been gone. I join to say #bringbackourgirls.

I also want Shekau, the leader of the Nigerian terrorist group, Boko Haram, to be brought to justice. I want you to know that they are attacking girls and women.

I want President Goodluck Jonathan to establish the victims fund that he says he has established, but to utilize it for the victims that already exist. He announced that he established a victims fund after we, women of Congress and myself, pleaded with him to establish it when we went to Nigeria with my colleagues, Congresswoman WILSON, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Ms. FRANKEL.

We must do as Malala has done. We must hug them and know them and love them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have to bring the girls back. Hauwa Mutah, Hauwa Takai, Serah Samuel, these are the names. Bring the girls back.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, sadly, 3 months ago this week, 300 girls were abducted in the middle of the night from their beds in a school in rural Nigeria. As time passes, we cannot allow ourselves to forget these girls. Kummai, Kwanta—these girls are our daughters, our granddaughters, our sisters—Rebecca, Esther, Aisha.

The militant terrorist group, Boko Haram, aims to end the education of girls in Nigeria through fear and intimidation. They have publicly stated their plans to sell these young girls into sex slavery for $12 a girl—Ruth, Naomi, Rhoda.

As a mother and grandmother, I cannot imagine the pain the parents of these girls are experiencing, and we as a nation are praying for the immediate and safe rescue of these young women to bring this awful nightmare to an end.

I support our President's effort in helping the Nigerian Government bring these girls home and return to school where they belong—Christie, Solomi, Tabitha.

As a nation, we must continue to do everything in our power to bring back our girls.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been three long painful months since nearly 300 schoolgirls were kidnapped from their classrooms in Borno State, Nigeria, by the terrorist group Boko Haram.

Since the kidnapping, these terrorists refer to these girls as slaves and threaten to sell them in the market.

Congresswomen WILSON, JACKSON LEE, and FRANKEL were brave and bold enough to visit Nigeria, and I thank them for continuing to beat the drum to bring our girls back.

While some of these girls have escaped, tragically, more than 200 are still missing, and Boko Haram continues to terrorize villages across northern Nigeria and surrounding countries.

Today, I stand here, as a mother and as a grandmother, to reaffirm our demand to bring our girls back and to make it clear that mass kidnapping and threat of human trafficking are human rights violations that cannot be ignored.

Every child has a right to live. Every child has a right to receive an education in a safe and protected environment.

Maifa Dame, Ruth Kollo, Esther Usman, Awa James are but a few of these girls being traumatized and terrorized by Boko Haram.

We call on the international community, especially African nations and the African Union, to work together to find these girls and bring our girls back.

□ 1230

3 MONTHS SINCE THE KIDNAPPING OF NIGERIAN GIRLS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to stand with my colleagues in sending a clear message that we will not tolerate the hateful terrorism and deplorable actions of Boko Haram. The denial of respect for human life with which this group operates is deplorable.

I am honored to stand with my dear friend and colleague from Florida, FREDERICA WILSON, and I admire her and honor her for her tenacious pursuit of justice for the 300 Nigerian girls that were captured by Boko Haram 3 months ago. We stand in solidarity with these girls, their families, and every other victim of this hateful group's wrath.

As the days turn into weeks, the weeks into months, and the months have now turned into 3 long months, the international outcry has faded. But

make no mistake about it, these girls are still captive, and they are still lost, and they are still suffering.

Dr. King taught us that ''injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' These girls are our daughters. We must continue to galvanize pressure to obtain freedom of the kidnapped girls and remain ever-vigilant. We must bring back our girls.

APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee has been busy doing the hard work the American people expect, working in a bipartisan way to pass the needed appropriations bills required to fund the various agencies and programs in our Federal Government.

We have focused on reducing and reforming spending, while prioritizing funding for important programs—for job training, cancer research, and veterans' programs—while holding the line on out-of-control government waste.

With the passage this week of the House Financial Services Appropriations bill, led by Chairman CRENSHAW, we will have passed seven of the 12 required appropriations bills across the House floor. We will continue our work to finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, as my House colleagues on both sides of the aisle do the hard work to control spending and reform government programs, sadly, the Senate has yet to take up one spending bill. As the September 30 deadline approaches, I thank my House colleagues, and hope springs eternal that the Senate someday may take up a spending bill under regular order.

BOKO HARAM

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, 3 months have passed since Boko Haram kidnapped nearly 300 schoolgirls in northeastern Nigeria. Today, as the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join my colleagues to say that the girls have not been forgotten, and we remain committed to getting them home safely—#bringbackourgirls.

I want to commend, particularly, our colleague Ms. FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, who has led the charge in this regard, and we are united in not stopping until our girls are brought home.

This year, Boko Haram has killed more than 2,000 people in nearly 100 attacks. They have kidnapped more women. They have terrorized villages in northeastern Nigeria and have launched attacks on the capital of Abuja and Lagos, Nigeria's commercial center. Their leader has demanded that Boko Haram militants be released in exchange for the schoolgirls, and he has called for the murder of Christians. He must be brought to justice.

My prayers remain with the kidnapped girls and their families and all Nigerians who live under the shadow of Boko Haram. We must continue to push back against this group and work for the safe return of the kidnapped schoolgirls.

Bring back our girls.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark 40 years that Turkish troops have unlawfully occupied the Republic of Cyprus, an occupation that undermines stability in an already volatile eastern Mediterranean, weakens the NATO alliance, and defies the European Union's peace project.

For 40 years, Turkey has frustrated every meaningful attempt to advance a just solution in Cyprus. Instead, its program has been one of systematically dismantling the religious, cultural, and ethnic identity of the island. The sad irony of Turkey's forced division of Cyprus is that it separates two communities, Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot, that are, themselves, ready and willing to seek reunification.

This Congress, this administration, our Nation must insist that Turkey act in good faith to achieve what the people of Cyprus—all the people of Cyprus—so deeply desire: an end to this tragic occupation.

BOKO HARAM

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month, I joined colleagues on a trip to Nigeria. The focus of our journey was the kidnapping of 270 innocent young girls at the hands of the Boko Haram terrorists.

It has been 90 days since their taking from their school, their families, off to conditions unimaginable. So I once again rise and urge the Nigerian Government to do everything possible to negotiate the return of these beautiful children of humanity.

We have not forgotten. We will not forget. Bring the girls home.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5016, and that I may include tabular materials on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1237

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCAS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. STIVERS. Chairman CRENSHAW, I rise today to address a proposed amendment I was going to offer related to the Securities and Exchange Commission's Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative, or the MCDC. This is a program that was announced by the Securities and Exchange Commission in March, which is related to the issuance of municipal securities.

Under the MCDC, the SEC is asking municipal bond issuers and underwriters to self-report potential technical inconsistencies associated with the financial information recording practices of State and local governments.

On its face, this seems to be reasonable. However, the States and localities that the SEC is trying to protect do

not support this program and feel it is very punitive.

In fact, the Government Finance Officers Association, or GFOA, which represents the Nation's State and local government finance directors, supports my proposed amendment because the MCDC initiative is both costly and unreliable for government issuers, taxpayers, and underwriters. In addition, the proposal changed rules midstream, applying one standard when the regulators' reporting apparatus was not even operable.

I appreciate the chairman's time and his willingness to agree to work with me and the Financial Services Committee to find a resolution to this problem should the SEC not choose to curtail this program on their own. We want to make sure it is fair and equitable to our States and local municipalities.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this initiative to my attention.

As he said, the SEC recently announced that issuers and underwriters of municipal securities are required to self-report violations of the Federal securities laws relating to representations and bond offerings. I understand the gentleman's concern that this is a massive undertaking, and to identify all the series of bonds sold and to make sure that all disclosures are made accurately and timely is a huge undertaking.

So I look forward to working with you regarding your concerns and to find some solutions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles—such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel—by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Financial Services Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I hope it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is, by far, the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

If they can do this in Brazil, then we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide what is best for them.

And let me say, my amendment, cosponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), would demand and mandate that all cars produced in America be flex fuel cars. It would cost less than $100 per car to do that. And we are foolish, in my opinion, not to do that as well.

But here in the Federal fleet, expanding the role that energy resources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil market.

So I would ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. WENSTRUP from Ohio, and I yield to him.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The IRS has admitted to paying politics with our Tax Code, going as far as singling out certain groups for having ''patriot'' in their name. Unfortunately, much of the targeting that occurred happened in my district's backyard, in the IRS field office in Cincinnati. Americans have the right to be outraged, and they deserve better.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for ensuring that free speech rights are protected in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wrote to you in April asking that we prohibit funding to implement proposed rules on 501(c)(4) organizations, and my constituents are appreciative that you acted. By prohibiting funding for certain IRS activities, this bill would prevent these IRS abuses from becoming law. Importantly, this bill is designed to make sure the government works for its citizens, not against them.

While the House continues its efforts to get to the bottom of the IRS political targeting, this is a meaningful action we can take now to make sure the behavior isn't repeated. Every American has the right to participate and engage in civic debate and must be protected from partisan bureaucrats.

IRS targeting isn't just an affront to the Constitution, but a threat to all Americans seeking to exercise their First Amendment rights. I thank the chairman and his committee again for their diligent work on this bill.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I share his outrage over the Internal Revenue Service giving extra scrutiny to certain 501(c)(4) groups based on their political ideology.

This bill includes numerous, but necessary, provisions in response to their numerous inappropriate activities. These activities must not be tolerated, and voting for this bill will go a long way toward making Congress' and the public's displeasure felt.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as ''too big to fail'';

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a ''systemically important financial institution''; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the

activities of such company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in an attempt to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of ''too big to fail'' into even greater parts of our economy. You see, under Dodd-Frank, FSOC, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, has the power to designate companies as SIFIs, systemically important financial institutions.

I have heard people say that SIFI status does not mean too big to fail, but that is a ridiculous claim—on par with the reassurances we used to get that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie, the GSEs.

In the real world, everyone knows that the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. It is basically the government's stamp of approval, if you will, that says that we really care about this company. And every time FSOC designates a SIFI, it exposes all of us, the American taxpayers, to literally billions and billions of dollars in potential losses.

You see, first FSOC designates the megabanks as being too-big-to-fail SIFIs. Now they are claiming that nonbank firms such as insurance companies and asset managers also should be designated as SIFIs, as well. I really don't think that FSOC will be satisfied until every company in this country is a SIFI. So, obviously, this has got to stop.

That is why I am offering an amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the chair of the Securities Exchange Commission, both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. You see, SIFI status puts nonbank companies under Federal Reserve regulation. And then the Fed, which only understands banks, imposes its bank-type capital standards on them, and it doesn't really seem to care if that makes no sense at all for these companies. I guess basically if all you have is a hammer, then everything else out there looks like a nail.

And so when companies become SIFIs, they cease to be part of the free market. Instead, they become something else. They become protected entities that are spared the costs and consequences that normal companies face. And, so, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed's risk-averse regulation will sap the energy and also the competitiveness from these companies.

Do you know what? Creative thinking and management will be seen as too radical, and innovative business structures will be stamped out as too risky. Meeting some G–13's definition of ''safety'' will take the place of building shareholder value. Instead, lobbying and political donations will become the biggest, highest, and best use of capital for these companies. And government will corrupt the private sector and, in turn, it will corrupt government.

You only have to look at the corporate culture over at Fannie Mae to see what sheltering a company from market discipline does to it. What do I mean by that? If you like the GSEs, then you are going to love SIFIs. And so we should not allow too big to fail to take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies are too important as a counterbalance to the megabanks for us to ruin them with crony capitalism.

You see, Dodd-Frank was based on a faulty premise, and this is it: that the financial crisis was caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that intrusive government regulation could have prevented all this and prevented the crisis by keeping them from making all these risky investments.

So with these ideological blinders on, it is no surprise that we ended up today with FSOC and SIFIs. Instead of solving the problem of too big to fail, Dodd-Frank basically codified it.

FSOC is not working out as intended. And with every reckless designation of a nonbank company as a SIFI, FSOC steps in and makes our economy more dangerous and makes it more unstable. As they say, if you find yourself in a hole, you should do what? Stop digging.

So I respectfully request that you support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as too big to fail, as paragraph 1 of the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions, both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial to addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis: too many nonbanks were in the shadows and escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as SIFI means being subject to regulation above and beyond current requirements, including living wills that will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent.

The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to stress-test the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank that ''many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation'' and that being designated as a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as too big to fail.

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, we urge you to oppose the Garrett amendment as not necessary.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, obviously the markets have already disagreed with the gentleman by the pricing of their shares.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment points out that you have got to have a thorough review, and if you don't consider the true implications on the U.S. economy and the U.S. taxpayers, then you have got a problem. So it is a good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce Revenue Ruling 2012–18 (or any guidance of the same substance).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. As the Chair knows, I find several of the Federal agencies very frustrating, but among the most frustrating is the Internal Revenue Service.

One of the more interesting rulings of the Internal Revenue Service deals with the reclassification of certain gratuities as wages when they were meant to be tips. And having grown up in the restaurant business, I will tell you that there is a tremendous difference—not only to the employer, but to the employee—as to whether a wage is classified as a wage or whether it is classified as a gratuity. I know that firsthand from growing up in a family-run and local restaurant.

Revenue rule 2012–18 has forced businesses to change the way that they have traditionally handled consumer checks, and that has resulted in a burdensome and logistical challenge for small and local businesses across the country.

Mr. Chairman, for over 50 years, restaurants have had a longstanding practice of treating these automatic gratuities as tips. For example, if you have a large party of 50 people, then you want to make sure that your waiter or waitress is well taken care of. And for a while there it was 15 percent, now it is about 18 percent, that is added on as a gratuity. That gratuity is meant to go to the waiters and waitresses who have helped your party.

Yet, the way the IRS would treat that, the IRS would treat that not as a tip, not as a gratuity, but as part of their wage, which means it is counted against the employer for income purposes, and then it is counted again against the employee for income purposes. The revenue ruling clearly, clearly, clearly is against years and years and years of practice by the IRS.

Now, a lot of bigger restaurants may have the ability to forgo the automatic gratuities without experiencing any significant challenges, but for small and local restaurants, that is a big deal. Wait staff are often subject to inadequate tips on large parties. And if restaurants continue to utilize automatic gratuities, if they continue to say, please put an additional 15 percent on here for your waiter or waitress, then they can no longer take advantage of the Fair Labor Standards Act tip credit for employees who serve these tables, even if the restaurants distribute these gratuities to the employees. So even if the employee gets the money in the end, it is still counted against the restaurant as income and taxed in one place, and then it is again taxed as income to the employee.

For many small businesses, an inability to collect this tip is a really big burden. It is very difficult to determine wages for employees when they are simultaneously performing tipped and non-tipped work because you cannot add that gratuity for large parties without it being classified in one direction, but for smaller parties you can do a different thing.

Restaurants have treated automatic gratuities as tips for years, and they have been passed on to the employee. That is very important to the employees. It is a big part of the money that they make. And so as the champion of small and local businesses, I have very real concerns about the implications of the revenue rule 2012–18. I would like the IRS to delay it and reconsider their characterization of these tips and service charges.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to step forward and raise my concerns, as well as the ranking member. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for the opportunity.

At this point, because of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:–

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to enforce any provision of the Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 17–372), the Inoperable Pistol Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 17–388), the Firearms Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–170), or the Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–295).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop the District of Columbia from taking any action to prevent law-abiding citizens from possessing, using, or transporting a firearm.

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in District of Columbia v. Heller that struck down the D.C. handgun ban, as well as the unconstitutional gunlock provision, it is still difficult for D.C. residents to exercise their God-given right to bear arms.

Congress has the authority to legislate in this area pursuant to article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the authority to ''exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the District of Columbia.

Through unreasonable regulation, arbitrary time limits and waiting periods, and a ridiculous registration renewal process for guns that have already been registered, the government bureaucrats in the District continue to interfere with the D.C. residents' rights to self-defense.

As The Washington Times reported earlier this year, the District of Columbia has passed the first law ever in the United States that requires a citizen who has already legally registered a gun to pay a fee for re-registration, go to police headquarters, and submit to invasive fingerprinting and photographing.

This is pure harassment. Why would the D.C. government want to punish and harass law-abiding citizens who simply want to defend themselves?

As everyone with even the smallest bit of common sense knows, criminals, by definition, do not follow the law. They will get guns any way they can. Does anyone actually believe that strict gun controls laws will prevent criminals from getting guns?

Strict gun control laws do nothing but prevent good people from being able to protect themselves and their families in the event of a robbery, home invasion, or other crime.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. It is amazing. Like President Reagan once said to President Carter in debate, here you go again.

I rise to oppose the amendment. We often hear people running for office rail against politicians who have gone Washington. This amendment is an interesting representation of that phenomenon. We are part of a group of folks here who would like to treat Washington, D.C., as their own little colony. Back home, they tell the world they want no part of Washington, but over here, they not only want part of it, they want to tell her how to act.

This amendment would limit commonsense gun regulation put in place by the elected representatives of the

District of Columbia. Under our Constitution, States and localities, including D.C., have the ability to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens.

Even the Supreme Court has recognized that some level of regulation is necessary in order to uphold those goals. The Republican Party usually stands for states' rights, but not when it comes to the District of Columbia.

Our former colleague, the great David Obey, used to say that if Members of Congress wanted to get involved in the District of Columbia's affairs, then perhaps they should run for the D.C. City Council. That may be an option that the gentleman from Kentucky would like to consider.

I strongly oppose the amendment. I think it continues to be more than just a gun amendment. It is an anti-D.C. amendment, and we should stop this behavior once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. As John Lott, author of ''More Guns, Less Crime,'' says:

The District of Columbia should have learned the problems with gun control the hard way. There is only 1 year after D.C.'s handgun ban went into effect in 1977 where its murder rate was as low as it was prior to the ban. The D.C. murder rate rose dramatically, relative to other cities after the ban, with its murder rate ranking either number one or number two among the 50 most populous U.S. cities for half the time the ban was in effect and always in the top two-thirds.

However, as soon as the ban and, more importantly, the gunlock regulations were struck down in 2008, the murder rate fell, dropping by 50 percent over the next 4 years. Indeed, every place in the world that has banned guns has seen an increase in murder rates.

This experience can be seen worldwide. Island nations supposedly present ideal environments for gun control because it is relatively easy for them to control their borders, but countries such as Great Britain, Ireland, and Jamaica have experienced large increases in murder and violent crime after gun bans.

For example, after handguns were banned in 1997, the number of deaths and injuries from gun crimes in England and Wales increased 340 percent in the 7 years from 1998 to 2005.

Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that the other side of the aisle, when we talk about voting rights, they are very opposed to voter ID and to photograph IDs for voting. I think they would be very opposed to fingerprinting and photographing in order to exercise that basic fundamental right to vote, which is what they often say.

Well, I would remind them that the Second Amendment says a right to bear arms is a basic right. If they argue that fingerprinting and photographing is invasive and disproportionately disenfranchises minorities from that basic right to vote, how can they not argue the same thing about the basic right to own and bear guns?

In closing, my amendment states that none of the funds made available in this bill to the District of Columbia will be used by the D.C. government to prohibit the activity of people in possessing, acquiring, using, selling, or transporting firearms.

It defunds four laws passed in the wake of Heller that constitute an attempt by the D.C. government to overrule and ignore the Heller decision. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. I would like to first say that we only oppose certain regulations about voting issues when they are meant to suppress the vote.

I would like now to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) who—get this—is the only elected Member from Washington, D.C., who is in this Congress at this time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky is not accountable to the residents of the District of Columbia, but he is offering an amendment to effectively wipe out all of the District's gun safety laws now and in the future.

Even if one were to agree with him, his is an entirely inappropriate amendment on an appropriation bill. A pending bill right now in this House would accomplish this end. He is a Member of the majority. If he wants to end gun laws, he has the authority to bring that bill to the floor.

This amendment is being offered by a Member who claims, at every turn, to support the principle of local control or local affairs, yet he is using the big foot of the Federal Government to overturn local laws.

Turning to the amendment itself, if this amendment passes, every gun law in this big city—which shares the same gun violence issues with other big cities and is also the Nation's capital—would be gone.

While we are still reviewing the full effects of this amendment, it appears to prohibit the District government, including the Metropolitan Police Department, from enforcing almost all of the gun laws of the District of Columbia, making the District perhaps the most permissive gun jurisdiction in the country.

The D.C. government would not be able to stop a person from carrying, openly or concealed, an assault weapon, including a .50-caliber sniper rifle with a magazine holding an unlimited number of bullets on any street and in any building except, of course, Federal buildings, like the one where we now stand.

You want to buy a gun in a private transaction without undergoing a background check? The D.C. government couldn't stop you if this bill passed. Angry, want to buy a gun right now with no waiting period? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Want to buy 100 handguns today? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Want to carry a gun in a D.C. government building, including a polling place or the DMV? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Convicted of a violent misdemeanor this week and want to buy and carry a gun? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Every single Federal court that has ruled on the constitutionality of the District's post-Heller gun laws has upheld them. They have upheld our assault weapons ban, upheld our ban on large capacity ammunition-feeding devices, and upheld our registration requirements.

The Supreme Court only struck down D.C.'s effective gun ban law, holding only that a resident is entitled to have a gun in his home only. This bill goes well beyond the Supreme Court. It is a flagrant abuse of democracy by a Member who comes here with Tea Party principles that says power should be devolved to the local level.

He is playing with the lives of American citizens who are not accountable to him, who live in my city, and he is playing with the lives of the Federal officials and visitors from across the country who we are charged to defend and protect while they are in our city.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''The White House—Salaries and Expenses'', by $2.13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, based on the debates and discussions we have had in this Chamber, I have come to the conclusion that my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that $7.25 is enough to raise a family on in America. That is the current Federal minimum wage.

Since we haven't had any ability to change it, to move it up, I assume that they assume that it is good enough for people, but I can't imagine that they think $2.13 is enough, but that is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers in America today. That is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers, and it is an appalling condition, and it should be an outrage for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, 3.3 million Americans are trying to make it on $2.13 an hour, plus tips; and 75 percent of those, Mr. Chairman, are women.

□ 1315

What does it translate to? What does it all mean? It means that millions of Americans go to work every day and are forced to interview every time they serve a customer for their money. Every time they meet a new customer and take an order, they have to do a tryout or an interview to see if they are going to get paid. It is wrong, and we shouldn't tolerate it in this society. Tip workers are twice as likely as other workers to fall below the poverty line and three times as likely to rely on food stamps to close the gap between what they are paid and what they have to survive on.

Mr. Chairman, the companies that pay them these tip wages in many cases are relying on us, the Federal Government, through the food stamp program, to make up the wages that they will not pay. At least we should make them pay their own freight for their own workers. People don't want to go to food stamps, but they need to, and the Federal Government helps them by setting food stamps.

What if the employers themselves were required to pay a better wage? Tip workers are likely to experience wage theft. From 2010 to 2012, the Department of Labor conducted investigations of full-service restaurants and found violations in nearly all, including tip violations. A tip violation might be when an employer refuses to ''top up'' the pay to ensure that they are getting at least $7.25 when tips are low. Tip violations could also include making employees do work that doesn't earn tips, like cleaning or cooking, but still paying them $2.13 an hour. It happens, and it shouldn't happen.

If we lifted the minimum wage to $10.10 for all tip workers, 700,000 tip workers would be lifted out of poverty—half of whom would be people of color—and $12.7 billion in more wages would be pumped into the economy.

Mr. Chair, in February, President Obama signed an executive order requiring Federal contractors, including those with contracts to provide concessions like restaurants, to pay $10.10.

No one who works full-time should have to live in poverty. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I urge all Members of this body to at least demand that we don't have to make up wages that are not paid in the form of government supports.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think when you look at the amendment, the gentleman wants to take money away from the Supreme Court and give money to the White House. What he had to say didn't seem to bear any relevance to what the amendment said. It was entertaining talk. I know he is free to offer any amendment he wants to offer. He could come down and do a 1-minute and talk about what he just talked about, and he could do a 5-minute Special Order and talk about what he talked about.

I am not sure that the amendment that he offered is serious in the sense of why he is tampering with Supreme Court funding and tampering with White House funding. I just would urge my colleagues to say we enjoyed the chat. I appreciate him bringing that to our attention.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, make, finalize, or implement any rule, regulation, interpretive rule, or general statement of policy issued after the date of enactment of this Act, that is issued pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to rules, regulations, interpretive rules, or general statement of policy excepted under section 553(a) of title 5, United States Code, or that are made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing under sections 556 or 557 of such title.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order due to scoring or budget concerns. While I intend to cooperate and withdraw this amendment, I would like to acknowledge that this body has a history of waiving points of order on similar legislation that would result in substantive regulatory reforms, which is exactly what my amendment could accomplish.

One specific example would be the REINS Act, of which I am a cosponsor, passed in this Congress and passed in the last Congress, which would very meaningfully overhaul our rulemaking system, much like this amendment would. Prior to the passage of that bill, we rightfully waived all points of order, including one being applied against my amendment here this afternoon, presumably.

Mr. Chairman, I would propose that this body should wave points of order on legislation that would significantly and positively reform our regulatory process so that we can significantly help our economy by getting the boots of the regulatory and bureaucratic systems off the necks of those who create jobs in this country.

For too long, the executive branch has continued to build its power through expanding the regulatory state. The agencies that we in Congress have tasked with the execution of the laws we now pass is in contravention of our intent, acting improperly as legislative bodies, with no really direct accountability to the voter.

Whether through ''interpretive rules,'' ''general statements of policy,'' or through regulations themselves, administrative agencies have placed extreme burdens on all Americans without the transparency or electoral accountability that our Founders envisioned.

Today, that process has yielded nearly 175,000 pages of regulations, growing by roughly 1,500 pages per week, written by unelected people who rarely consider the impact on our economy or the lives of the people the rules impact. In fact, the only thing growing faster around here, Mr. Chairman, is our public debt load. This has been a decades-long abdication of duty by Congresses past, and we must correct it.

Currently, informal rulemaking is the method of choice for proposing rules and regulations around here and simply requires: one, publication of a rule; two, an opportunity for public comment, but has no requirement to give weight to those comments from the public. In fact, any time I have questioned an agency witness during my 3½ years here, not one has been able to answer one simple question, and that is: What weight do you give public comments during the rulemaking process? What formula do you use? They can't answer the question because the answer is this: they don't care; it doesn't matter. What everyone wants or what the comment may be, if it stands in the way of the agenda of the rule, it gets no weight.

So I am offering this amendment today to require all new rules and regulations to follow the formal rulemaking process which is already in law—it is in the Administrative Procedure Act—while leaving in place existing emergency exceptions to the rulemaking process, fully recognizing, though, that we have to address the definition of ''emergency'' at some point as well.

Several reforms passed by this House go a long way in providing relief to the end of the regulatory process—at least to improving it. My amendment provides relief at the beginning of the rulemaking process, slows the regulatory state, and increases transparency of this increasingly opaque and secret bureaucracy.

Formal rulemaking requires a trial-like procedure, requiring parties to make their case for or against a rule in public. As a result, the administration, no matter the party, must prove the worth of their rules and regulations on the Record rather than relying on a closed-door balancing of public comments. Again, there is a record made, so we know—just like all of America knows from the proceedings on the floor of this House, we know the reasons for the final makeup of the rule; and, if need be, we can further challenge the rule.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is consistent with the intent of the 79th Congress, which created this law for the agency rulemaking process. In the Judiciary Committee report of the law, the committee stated that:

> Matters of great import, or those where the public submission of facts will be either useful to the agency or a protection to the public, should naturally be accorded more elaborate public procedures.

The formal rulemaking process, Mr. Chairman, does that. So while, Mr. Chairman, I think that, in order to protect the public and the Republic, the rampant regulatory state must be stopped and agencies must afford the public weighted input and transparency during rulemaking.

Out of respect for the chair and its appropriations process, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''The White House—Salaries and Expenses'', by $7.25.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment—and I say this in anticipation and hope that the Chair and the gentleman from Florida doesn't think I am tampering. Tampering has a very negative connotation to it. What I would like to think we are doing is legislating today, and I would hope that it is taken in that light.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would decrease part of the bill before us by $7.25 and increase the budget of the White House by that same amount.

Why would I offer this amendment? It is such a small amount of money after all—$7.25. But just ask the millions of Americans who make only $7.25 an hour, otherwise known as the current minimum wage.

What can the executive branch do with this money? They can buy pens, Mr. Chairman. They can buy pens that the President could use to keep signing executive orders focused on raising the wages of hardworking Americans.

Last February, in light of no action from this Republic-controlled Congress, the President took the small but legal step of raising the minimum wage of employees working on Federal contracting projects, such as fast-food employees in Federal buildings and on our military bases.

What has become crystal clear is that the Republican majority has no intention of putting forward an agenda focused on lifting hardworking Americans out of poverty. They have no intention of putting forward a jobs agenda. They have no intention of helping to foster economic growth in our country, but this administration wants to. And where Congress has failed, the administration has not faltered.

Today, let's give $7.25 to the President so he can keep up that necessary work. If Republicans would join us in raising the minimum wage and lifting up American workers instead of putting language in this bill to forbid the President from trying to raise the wages of hardworking Americans, we wouldn't have this conversation today.

That is right. Apparently it is not enough for Republicans to refuse to bring legislation for a vote that would raise the minimum wage; now they are also trying to stop the President from taking the small steps that he can do to raise the wages of Federal contractors, like those in the fast-food industry.

They added sections 203 and 204 to this bill to specifically prohibit an executive order to do just that. I mean, come on, give us a break. Not only won't they allow a vote on the minimum wage, but now they want to tie the President's hands so that he can't help advance the issue either when they won't.

Why are they fighting so hard against supporting working people in American families? No one working full-time should live in poverty. At $7.25 an hour, that is the reality facing 16.5 million Americans.

So, when you hear that Congress is debating another huge spending bill, I want America to know that the Republican majority has snuck in language into this bill that actually prevents working people from getting a raise in their hourly pay. Democrats have a bill to raise the minimum wage and it is ready to go, but Republicans in Congress refuse to allow a simple up or down vote on that bill.

What would happen if the Congress raised the minimum wage for every American from $7.25 an hour to $10.10 an hour? 16.5 million American workers would see a raise, not just the 2 million workers on Federal contracts.

□ 1330

We would experience a boost to the economy, since more people with more money equals more spending in our economy; and we would be helping families and breadwinners, since the facts show adults make up 88 percent of the low wage workers. The average age of a minimum wage employee is 35 years of age.

Raising the minimum wage helps others as well. It also helps people who earn more by reducing the need for full-time workers to rely on public assistance such as food stamps and Medicaid. So raising the pay of our lowest paid workers is not only good for minimum wage workers, but for all taxpayers.

No one who works full-time should live in poverty. We need to raise the

minimum wage, and we need to prevent any and every effort by House Republicans to roll back any incremental increases in pay the President can legally give to workers on Federal contracts.

Let's pass this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's effort in terms of minimum wage legislation, but I would simply remind him that this is an appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction as it relates to minimum wage.

As he points out, if he has legislation ready to go, I would just encourage him to introduce that at the appropriate place, have the appropriate discussions, and move forward there. But this is not the time or the place. Again, I appreciate his effort to legislate.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to study, promulgate, draft, review, implement, or enforce any rule pursuant to section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act or amendments made by such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a study in unintended consequences.

This body determined that they wanted to have more oversight over people that are called broker-dealers of investment funds. They would be handled the exact same way as investment advisers that handle high-end, large investments from wealthy individuals across the country. So the two are trying to be merged together. The Department of Labor and SEC are both trying to come up with their own version of a set of rules.

Here is the unintended consequence that is coming at America: those folks on the lower end and the middle end of America are about to lose a lot of people that helped them with investment advisers.

Here is how it works:

Say you have a newlywed couple, just out of school, just getting started, making $26,000 a year combined, as a couple, and determine they are going to do the responsible thing. They are also going to open up a retirement account and get started thinking about decades from now. We encourage that couple to start thinking about their retirement.

Would that couple making $26,000 a year, with what they are going to put into retirement—$15 a month, maybe—are they going to be attractive to an investment dealer? No, they are not going to be attracted to them. It is a very small amount; $15, $20. But one of these broker-dealers, that is what they love to do. They sign up couples just like that.

The rules coming down from Dodd-Frank will put a new set of standards on those individuals that are providing retirement investment opportunities for people at the very beginning of their investment time. This hits exactly the wrong people, and the benevolent thoughts at the beginning are now coming down to unintended consequences across our country that there will actually be a disincentive to provide retirement vehicles for those with lower and middle income.

The middle-income Americans should have every incentive and every opportunity to save. This simply says to the SEC they cannot promulgate that rule. They need to set it aside and keep the same standards that are already in place. This is not an unregulated industry. They are a heavily regulated industry already.

Keep the same standards in place, and do not discourage investments for retirement from going into lower- and middle-income Americans.

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

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

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

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

The gentleman may not remember the financial meltdown of 2007–2008, but one of the causes was lax oversight by the previous administration's financial regulators. Dodd-Frank has addressed many of these issues and restored safety and security in the marketplace. It has increased oversight over the financial sector in order to protect those on Main Street from abuses on Wall Street.

This is not the time or place to change that landmark legislation. Any attempt to do so will create greater uncertainty in the marketplace and among many Americans, including retirees, who depend upon Federal regulators to protect them. We should not undermine the much-needed reforms of Dodd-Frank, let alone in an appropriations bill.

This is yet another example of the other side attempting to add legislative riders to must-pass legislation that they could not pass through their regular legislative process. I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would remind everyone that we continue to find ways to try to undo either the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, which is already law and approved by the Supreme Court, or Dodd-Frank, which is the law of the land. The sad part of it all is that we seem to have very short memories. We seem to forget that we are still suffering from the effects of 2007 and 2008 and what happened in my city on Wall Street and how it had the effect throughout the Nation.

We have to regulate, whether we like it or not. We don't have to overburden industry; we don't have to harm anyone; but we can't allow people to do what they did before, which is hurt the economy and put us in the bind we are still in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think we all believe in commonsense regulation—and we have plenty of that—but the gentleman has pointed out that so often well-intentioned rules and regulations have unintended consequences.

I don't think anybody believes that we don't have enough regulation. Any time there is a problem, somebody suggests that we spend more money, we pass another rule, we pass another law.

What I think we need and what this gentleman is talking about is that we need common sense. We need to protect investors, but we need to do it in a reasonable way.

So this is an amendment that I think makes the point that so often the rules are bad for investors, they are bad for the economy, and that shouldn't be the case.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just close by saying the 2008 financial meltdown was not caused because middle-income Americans didn't have access to retirement funds.

This is a way to be able to protect middle-income Americans, protect their retirement, and to encourage them to save in the future, not decreasing the number of options they have out there. I would like to have lots of folks out there encouraging lots of Americans to be able to save in not just the largest investment dealers in the country, trying to go after the

largest, highest-income Americans. So this is something that we should support to maintain the regulations that are already in place and not decrease the options for Americans.

I yield back the balance my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to make any changes to its policies with respect to broadcast indecency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, last year, the FCC published a notice that stated they had greatly reduced their backlog of complaints on indecent and obscene language and images on TV and sought comments on whether they should change their policy on enforcement moving forward. However, they reduced their backlog by 70 percent by closing out roughly 1 million cases that seemed too old to pursue or, as they believed, not within their justification to enforce. The end result was that the FCC unilaterally decided to leave complaints of incidents where TV content was offensive or inappropriate to be aired at times children are likely to be in the audience to be uninvestigated and unenforced.

Moving forward, they asked the public if the FCC should make it the official policy of the Commission that they should only investigate the most serious violations of indecency on television. For instance, they wanted to know if a complaint against repeated expletives in a program warrants enforcement, while maybe an incident of one or two expletives does not. To many parents, this is an unreasonable distinction to make.

As Chief Justice Roberts has mentioned in some of his opinions on this, this is not an incidence of only having a brief instance of nudity, that that shouldn't be warranted, when extensive nudity is not.

While the FCC has not acted to formally finalize this regulation, it is in the public's best interest that they not continue down this road. If they do institute it, it will give the FCC the ability to decide, on behalf of the viewing public, what is indecent and what is not based on the rules that they have now.

This is a significant shift away from the standards that have been set, and the American public wants to be able write in and complain about what their children have access to. Many of us as Americans have real concerns about what is happening in television and the enforcement now of existing law.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to even allow your children to watch commercials nowadays, much less the television during the children's viewing hour. This is simply a statement to say to the FCC that they should retain and continue the current enforcement they already have.

I understand that there are some issues with this amendment. I understand full well there are some issues we need to deal with in the FCC in days ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUCAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 1411

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. HECK of Washington.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 236, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—236

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)
Roybal-Allard

□ 1446

Messrs. HANNA, GARRETT, BUCSHON, YOUNG of Alaska, STOCKMAN, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, GARCIA, RICHMOND, and RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HALL, Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. ROKITA, LABRADOR, DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. ISSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 138, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—282

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—138

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Castro (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)
Roybal-Allard

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1452

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—193

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1457

Mr. MULLIN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 192, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—231

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1501

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 351, noes 71, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—351

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—71

Bass
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
DeGette
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Fattah
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hoyer
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Quigley
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
Cole
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1505

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 157, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—264

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—157

Amodei
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez

Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Veasey
Westmoreland
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1509

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—168

Amash
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—256

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1513

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 184, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—239

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—184

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Barton
Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1517

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote No. 422 on H.R. 5016, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 200, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—200

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

□ 1520

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Holding
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1524

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 181, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—241

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—181

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Holding
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Ruppersberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1527

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 425, I was unavoidably detained due to my responsibilities as the Ranking Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015''.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 661, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1530

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NOLAN. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5016 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 62, line 9, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 16, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 3, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 88, line 21, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Today, the proposal that I offer is a modest proposal, but it has the potential for great gain for this country. My amendment provides for $5 million additional for the Small Business Development Centers across this country and an additional $5 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The simple truth is that it is small businesses that drive this economy—28 million of them. Half of the workforce in this country comes from the small business community in this country. Two-thirds of all of the new jobs that are created are created by small businesses. We don't want to be a part of having missed the next great idea, because not only do small businesses create jobs and drive the engine of this economy, but they are the genesis of the next great new idea that will revolutionize the world, change and improve and better our lives.

But guess what? I am an old business guy myself. As a matter of fact, I am quite sure I have never had any ideas of genius, but I will tell you what. Even if you do, that doesn't mean you know how to run a business, and that is what the Small Business Development Centers do—they do it for veterans, they do it for women, they do it for minorities. They teach them how to put together a business plan. They teach them how to put together a finance

plan that will resonate with a curmudgeonly old banker. They teach you how to put together a sales and marketing plan. They show you how to put together engineering and design and production plans. They show you how to do sales and marketing and export plans to export your products overseas.

I have a woman in my district, Alicia Overby, who created a great little company called Baby Elephant Ears. With the help of the Small Business Administration, in 2 years she grew her company from $12,000 to $1.5 million in income, producing all kinds of wonderfully good-paying jobs, and all she needed to be able to do that was to get a little help from the Small Business Administration.

As a businessperson, I don't mind telling you, when times are hard, when times aren't good, you don't start cutting across the board. You look to where, maybe, you need to spend a little bit more money, to get a little more of an efficient production system, to, maybe, do a little better sales and marketing, to learn how to put together a finance plan so your banker will give you the working capital that you need to grow and expand and create jobs.

My friends, that is what this is all about. The Small Business Administration serves over 500,000 clients. Yes, that is right—500,000 clients. It generates $4.5 billion in private capital that otherwise wouldn't get invested in new business, creating new jobs for people in this country. That is what this motion is all about.

Initially, it provides some additional moneys for Consumer Product Safety. What has that Commission done? Oh, it has only saved hundreds of thousands of lives. It has saved children from poisoning, saved children from dying in crib deaths, saved children from suffocating in refrigerators, and 4.5 million fewer foreign-made consumer products have been denied entry into this country. Is that worth an additional $5 million to save the lives of someone's loved ones and children? You had better believe it is.

This amendment is all about creating jobs, creating business, creating opportunity for women, for minorities, for entrepreneurs. Why? Because it works. That is why. Do you want to know why it also works? I will tell you. It is because, when women and minorities succeed in this country, what happens? When entrepreneurs and businesses succeed in this country, what happens? When workers get good-paying jobs, what happens?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Florida opposed to the motion?

Mr. CRENSHAW. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, let me just tell the gentleman that he will be happy to know that we have already taken care of all of his concerns in this bill.

We have a pretty good bill that we have worked on, Mr. Speaker. The bill has been on the floor now for 3 days. This is the first time this subcommittee bill has actually been to the full House since 2007. All of the Members of the House had a chance to look at the bill, and they had a chance to offer amendments. After that process, we now have a good bill that is even better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Minnesota please clear the well while another Member is under recognition?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for clearing the well.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have a good bill that this process has actually made even better. It is a spending bill, and we know that the government needs money to provide services. Government needs something more right now, and we have tried to provide that. The government needs discipline to rein in spending. The government needs the courage to make decisions even when they are hard, and government needs a commitment to make sure that every task of government is accomplished more efficiently and more effectively than it ever has been before, because I will tell you, if life is going to change in America, life has to change right here in Washington, D.C., and this bill takes a giant step forward in making that change.

First of all, we rein in this out-of-control spending that has been going on for so long. We have said for four straight years we are spending less money this year than we spent last year, and that is quite an accomplishment in itself. How do we do that? We do it just like every American business does, like every American family. They sit down. They take the money that they have, and they set priorities. Then they make some tough choices. That is what we have done.

We take agencies and programs that are no longer vital to the operation of the Federal Government or that have a history of wasting taxpayer resources, and in some cases, we get rid of them. Nine agencies are gone under this bill. We also take things like the Small Business Administration, which actually supports small business and assists in private sector job creation, and we add money to it because it is going to help turn the country around.

Another thing we do is rein in this out-of-control administration and out-of-control bureaucracy. How do we do that? Let's just take, for instance, the IRS.

I think most people in this House would say that the IRS has betrayed the trust of the American people and that they have got a long way to go before they restore that trust. So what we have done in this bill is we have said we are going to rein in that out-of-control spending because your funding is going to be reduced. We send you back to the core issues, and we are not going to give any more money until you prove to us that you can be a good steward of the money that we have already given you.

□ 1545

We also say to the IRS no more wasting money on lavish conferences and silly videos. We say no more intimidating individuals and groups of individuals based on their political philosophy. No more.

We say no more drafting rules and trying to shut down freedom of speech, which is guaranteed by our Constitution. We say, listen, we don't want you meddling anymore in our daily lives, much less our health care.

If you are like me and you are tired of seeing taxpayers' dollars go down the drain, if you are like me and you are tired of seeing nameless, faceless bureaucrats invade your life more and more and more, well, then join with me in saying we want responsible spending, we want reasonable regulation, we want to unleash the individual responsibility that has made our country great.

Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit and vote ''yes'' on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—198

Barber	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Barrow (GA)	Brady (PA)	Carney
Bass	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Huelskamp
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

□ 1552

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Moore	Richmond	Speier
Moran	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Takano
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tierney
Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Titus
Nolan	Sarbanes	Tonko
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Pallone	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pascrell	Schneider	Vargas
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Veasey
Payne	Schwartz	Vela
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Visclosky
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Walz
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman Schultz
Pingree (ME)	Shea-Porter	Waters
Pitts	Sherman	Waxman
Pocan	Sinema	Welch
Polis	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Quigley	Smith (WA)	
Rangel		

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne	Hanabusa	Nunnelee
Campbell	Kingston	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Miller, Gary	Rush

□ 1602

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, a conference report on the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Barber moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 701 of the Senate amendment (relating to the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to recede from disagreement with section 601 of the Senate amendment (relating to authorization of major medical facility leases).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard so much about the challenges that the VA faces and how it has totally, thoroughly, and completely failed many of our veterans.

This motion to instruct the conferees would be a motion to ask that we essentially recede to the Senate provisions on leases per VA facilities.

What this would do would be to provide and expand 26 VA facilities from across the country and improve access to care for our Nation's veterans, including the 1.7 million veterans from across Texas.

In the district that I represent, as an example, District 23, which comprises about 24 percent of the land area of Texas, it is 800 miles or so from one corner of the district to the other, and in that district are a very large number of veterans. The challenge is, first off, to be able to get the veterans who have served, who are from the rural areas, to get them access to the nearest VA facility.

From my hometown of Alpine, for example, to El Paso, where there is a VA clinic, it is some 220 miles. If you live further south in Brewster County, that distance is longer. If you live here in Eagle Pass, in Maverick County, for example, you have got to go all the way down to the Rio Grande Valley before you find the nearest veterans facility—actually, all the way down to Corpus.

The Senate provisions would allow for an additional 26 facilities, including a new facility in Lubbock and improvements and consolidations to facilities in San Antonio that are critical to veterans and their families. New facilities will help address the wait times for medical care where it is needed for veterans in our communities.

Frankly, these facilities will help open up appointment slots. According to an internal VA audit that has been released, there are more than 57,000 patients who have waited at least 90 days for their first appointment. Unfortunately, some VA facilities in Texas have among the highest average of wait times in the Nation, and that is totally inexcusable. It fails the people who stood up and served their country and did so much to maintain and protect our freedom.

While we need to explore all our options, including more contracted care to address the backlog, we also have to make sure that the VA has the capacity to fill the needs of our vets, and especially for those who have unique health care needs.

I maintain that regardless of where you live in Texas or any other State, you have as much right to health care as any veteran from any other part of the State. And by creating an additional 26 facilities, you would actually be creating more slots and giving more access to more people.

For rural vets who face additional barriers—for example, if you are driving from Alpine to El Paso, that is 220 miles, and you need a driver, and that driver has to take time off from work; you need probably to spend the night in El Paso, that is a hotel room; and you have got to eat while you are there, so that is meals—all of those, additional expenses.

The other thing, frankly, is that many of the rural vets tend to be older, sicker, and poorer than the general population. These additional facilities may very well be lifesavers for that population.

These new facilities will help address wait times for medical care where it is needed, and they are crucial. Frankly, I know there has been a conversation on the House side with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about creating more facilities than 26.

I know that my friends from Oklahoma, for example, would like to see an additional clinic in Tulsa that would serve Oklahoma. Oklahoma veterans, as Texas veterans, as veterans across the board in every State, deserve more access to health care and better access to health care.

This week, in fact, the Acting Secretary of the VA, Secretary Gibson, told members of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee that we need to increase the internal capacity at the VA. And while we need to do a lot more than just that, these additional facilities would help achieve that goal.

One thing is clear. We have a growing demand for care. As we draw down from all of the places where we are right now—Afghanistan, for example—as we change the shape of our military going into the future, we will have more and more veterans entering the health care system. They deserve better treatment than the veterans in our health care system have had.

Frankly, the entire system needs to be upgraded and to provide A–1 quality health care to each and every person

who has served in uniform and their families. We must grow the capacity. We must continue to ensure quality and to meet the growing demand for our veterans.

These leases that I am talking about in some 18 States, they will help address some of the underlying problems that lead to treatment delays. If you look at it, we are funneling all of the veterans into a very few health care facilities across the country. If we accede to the Senate's suggestion for additional facilities, we will have community-based outpatient clinics, for example, or primary care clinics or specialty clinics. It will be a huge help to everyone, and that is incredibly important.

As you look at this map, it gives you some idea of just one microcosm in one congressional district in this country what difference additional VA facilities would make.

Look at the distance from the nearest facilities. If you live here along the Texas-Mexico border and you are trying to go up to the nearest facilities, which are either in El Paso or in Big Spring or over here in San Antonio, the distances are enormous. That is so much to ask of a World War II vet or a Korean war vet who is getting older, who is having to ask for help from somebody, for somebody to take time off of work to take them for a basic appointment, and then, frankly, as we have seen, to be unable to get the health care that he or she needs and deserves.

There is no part of the population in this country that is more deserving of health care than our veterans who have served in uniform in any conflict; or, frankly, even if they haven't been in conflict, they have stepped forward, they have put themselves at the Nation's disposal, and they have protected our freedom each and every day that they wore that uniform. They deserve much better than they have gotten over the course of history.

And I would point out, this isn't a new issue. There were more than 15 reports at the VA that have indicated that care was substandard. Congress has known about this for a long time.

The challenge with Congress is that it is a crisis management institution. Whatever the crisis of the day is, that is what Congress responds to. And if there is a subsequent crisis that takes the first crisis off of the front page, then suddenly Congress is reacting to the new crisis and forgets about the old one.

This is too important to forget about. This is too critical to our veterans. It has to be taken care of; it has to be resolved; and it has to be resolved once and for all so that there are not an additional 15 reports out there about problems at the VA, so that we don't hear every day from the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars or any of these other organizations that for years have been telling Congress that the VA has problems.

Let's step forward. Let's fix it. Let's fix it now, once and for all. And we can take that first step, as a body, Mr. Speaker and Members. We can take that first step as a body by making sure that there are at least—at least—26 new leased facilities across the country that will take care of this issue and that will provide additional service to our veterans across the country.

□ 1615

I point out that these additional facilities are in places like Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee, Illinois, Nebraska, South Carolina, Arizona, New Mexico, New Jersey, Georgia, Hawaii, and Kansas.

Whether you are a Democratic Member of this body or a Republican Member of this body, you should be in favor of additional VA facilities. You should be in favor of broadening up that funnel so that it is not so clogged up and we are not trying to put so many people through such a narrow slot and create all of these problems where people don't get the health care that they need and deserve.

New facilities, as I said, will help address the wait times for medical care where it is needed. And as a guy who represents a vastly rural area but who also represents urban areas in El Paso and San Antonio, I will tell you that this helps everybody. It helps every single veteran, whether you are a rural guy or an urban guy, whether you served in uniform in World War II or whether you are a serviceman or -woman from the most recent conflict. You deserve, and America has made a commitment to you, that you will get health care, and you will get quality health care.

This is the first step in that direction. It is incredibly important that, right, left, center, Democrat, Republican, or Independent, whatever you think you are, you ought to be in favor of additional facilities for the VA, you ought to be in favor of better health care for our veterans, and you ought to be in favor of using the Senate language.

Frankly, again, I know that there are some Members, my colleagues who are from Oklahoma, who would like to see additional facilities and who would want one in their State. I agree with that too. The more that we can do to help our veterans and to meet our commitment, the more we ought to do. And, frankly, we ought to do a lot more than we have been doing.

Again, I move that we instruct the conferees on H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, to recede to the Senate provisions on leases for VA facilities under title 6, section 601. It is incredibly important not only to me, not only to the 23rd, but it is important to 435 Members of this body, and it is important to every single veteran in every single one of our congressional districts.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I can appreciate the work that has been done on the other side of this building over in the Senate, I would remind the House that it has been the House committee that has conducted the oversight that has brought this issue to light. The corruption and the arrogance that has taken root at the Department of Veterans Affairs did not, as my colleagues say, did not happen overnight.

But I just want to tell my colleagues a little of the history about what brings us here today. From the 9th of June to July 24, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will have held 12 full committee hearings highlighting the problems that exist at the Department of Veterans Affairs. But beginning with the 112th Congress, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held 196 hearings, of which 126 were oversight hearings, and in the 113th Congress alone, we have held 96 hearings to date. We are doing our work.

As a result of our work, both the House and the Senate correctly moved to address the problems that exist at the Department. And as is often the case, the bills we pushed through have reflected our good intentions, but there has been a vacuum while waiting for the CBO to score the bills.

It is important to remember that the current scandal at VA really entails two issues: timely access to the health care that veterans have earned, and accountability because of the culture of corruption that exists among far too many senior leaders who have put their own welfare ahead of those they are supposed to be serving.

The CBO finally provided us with a formal score on the Senate amendment on the 17th of July. Since that time, and even prior to that time, my staff has been in daily contact with our Senate counterparts, and we are making progress on the conference report.

There are differences of opinion as to what the final conference report, in fact, is going to say. That is the nature of our work. But to my knowledge, there is no impasse that has been reached at this point. Now, I am confident that the good will on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Hill will present a report that both the House and the Senate can pass before the August recess, so it really makes no sense to take the Senate position on the leases at this time. In fact, some of

the provisions in the Senate version are similar to the House bills that have been waiting in the Senate for months, and they could have been sent—any one of them—on to the President for his signature.

That brings me to the specifics of the motion to instruct today. On December 10, 2013, the House passed H.R. 3521 by a vote of 346–1. That bill contained provisions to authorize 27 VA community-based outpatient clinics. It includes the Tulsa, Oklahoma, clinic that my colleague referred to as not being in the Senate bill. And like nearly a dozen other House bills passed in a bipartisan fashion, they are stalled in the Senate. The Senate could pass and send the 27-clinic bill that we sent over to them in December today.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that on a total of six different occasions, Senator VITTER from Louisiana and others, both Republican and Democrat, have gone to the Senate floor to request a vote on H.R. 3521 and have been blocked by the Democrats in the Senate. Perhaps the motion to instruct today should be revised to instruct the majority leader of the Senate or others in the Senate Democratic Caucus.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are making progress on the conference report, and to recede at this point to the Senate position would be premature at best.

Now, let me spend a few moments talking about the VA budget needs. In each of our annual budget hearings, Members have repeatedly asked the Secretary of the VA: Do you have the resources that you need to get the job done? And every single time, the Secretary has said ''yes.'' And now today, suddenly because of the oversight of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Acting Secretary Gibson testified before the Senate that they will need approximately $17.6 billion in additional resources to meet current demand for the remainder of this year and into 2017.

In his testimony, Acting Secretary Gibson stated that about $10 billion of this money would go to purchase care and to hire 10,000 new clinical staff. He further stated that the purchased care would decline over time with a gradual shift back to reliance on internal VA care. He also said about $6 billion would be spent on new infrastructure.

So, what the Acting Secretary is saying is, give us billions of more tax dollars to continue reliance upon care that will continue to force veterans to drive, as my colleague has said, in far too many cases hundreds of miles for the care that they have earned, and, oh, by the way, give us billions of more dollars to dump into our construction program that has been shown to be so ineptly managed to result in major projects being on average 35 months—not days—35 months behind schedule and at least $366 million over cost.

Now, again, Mr. Speaker, why would we automatically stand up, salute, and write a check when the inspector general and the GAO have both said we cannot trust VA's numbers on multiple occasions? So the Department, which Rob Nabors describes as having a ''corrosive culture,'' now asks for nearly $18 billion.

Look, we can't allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue to consider itself a sacred cow above serious oversight on how the already significant resources we provide to the Department have been spent. Decades of a kid-glove approach by Congress to holding VA accountable has led us to the issues that confront us today. So I would urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct.

At this time, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, respectfully, to this motion not because anybody here opposes expanded access to care. I believe we all do. But I oppose it today because it interferes, I believe, with the urgency of getting a clean bill out of conference.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has done great work. There are bills over there that the Senate could approve tomorrow. But if we encumber our conferees and we encumber this conference committee any more, we risk delaying final passage of a bill that is intended to get health care to the veterans now to clear the wait list now. That is the urgency.

We all have ideas for long-term reforms. This Member has his own ideas for long-term reform. We have to work those through the process. I believe we should consider giving every veteran a Choice Card and let them choose where they want to go. I believe we should consider competitively awarding management contracts for many of our VA health care facilities so that veterans who want to stay in the VA health care system can do so but can rely on more efficient and more responsible management. I think we should consider streamlining DOD health with TRICARE, with the VA, and look for efficiencies there.

But those are all matters for another day, for another committee hearing, for another bill, and for another piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we should not encumber our conferees any more than they already are in having to negotiate with the Senate. The fact is the Senate bill is encumbered with labor provisions and directed projects, and these labor provisions and these directed projects do absolutely nothing—nothing—to get the veterans off the wait list now.

Let's have the conferees agree to what we can agree to, which is, if you live more than 40 miles away from a VA facility, then give them immediate access to private care. If they are on a wait list, give them immediate access to private care. We can pass those now. The conferees can agree to that.

And here is the absolute absurdity to all of this. I am a new Member with a new perspective. I understand how this body works. But we have 2 to 3 weeks left before we go back to our districts for August recess. We have a President who, every single day, demands that this Congress provide funding for expanded health care to those who are coming here illegally right now. We cannot honestly have a dialogue and suggest that we need to immediately fund health care for those who are coming here illegally if we have a VA bill that is stuck in a conference committee and is encumbered by unnecessary provisions.

We should demand that our veterans receive the health care services that they deserve before we begin to have a conversation with the President about how we ever expand health care services to those who come here illegally.

So I appreciate my colleagues' concern for expanded care, and I agree with that. There is a bill that has been passed and is sitting in the Senate. The Senate should pick it up and pass it. But encumbering the conferees is not the right way to do this. Frankly, it complicates the process and delays the process. We need a VA reform bill back here from conference committee as quickly as possible to ensure that our veterans receive the health care that, frankly, this House supported with 390 votes when this bill passed. This is not a controversial measure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's work on this, and I know that the chairman has the same dedication that my colleague does to expanded care. We will continue to work these issues. But the immediate need is to expand health care choices for our veterans today, and as I mentioned, before we ever begin to talk to the President about expanding health care for those who come here illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

□ 1630

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 18½ minutes remaining.

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

I am in my first term as a Member, and growing up as a kid in Alpine, Texas, I always heard the saying with respect to things that were really, really hard, and that saying was it takes an act of Congress to do that, and for the first time in my life, Mr. Speaker,

I finally understand what that means because part of our challenge as an institution is that we are so wrapped up with who goes first, whether it is the House or the Senate.

The House passed a bill by 390 votes. That is great. The Senate version passed by 93–3, and here, we are discussing whether the House version or the Senate version is better, and in the meantime, we are failing our veterans.

My own view is that people across the political spectrum, veterans and nonveterans alike, are tired of the political blame game and the finger-pointing. Notice that not once did I ever really talk about the differences between Democrats and Republicans because, frankly, there are both Democratic veterans and Republican veterans and Libertarian veterans and Independent veterans and apolitical and nonpolitical veterans.

The issue of veterans should not be something that we pound each other over the head on. The issue of veterans is something that should bring us all together in a cohesive fashion, so that we can move forward as a country and show the rest of America that Congress can actually function as intended, that it can actually work its will as a body and move a product forward.

The idea that we would have to wait for a clean bill, that we would have to wait for procedure to take its course and for things to happen is telling people we will get to it.

Along the border, there is a saying, and that saying is mañana. Mañana seems to be the busiest day of Congress' week. Mañana, we will do it tomorrow. Tomorrow seems to be the day that Congress takes action on every single issue, and veterans are too important to be left until tomorrow.

The American people view Congress as an institution that is very full of hot air, and they don't understand why we recess in August when it is hot here because we would fit right in with the rest of the environment in the month of August.

The approval ratings for Congress are lower than they have ever been since the Gallup organization started taking polls, and it would appear to me that there is good reason for that.

I have great respect for the chairman and the other Members of this body. Their work, I admire. I don't admire, though, how much time it takes for this Congress to move forward. Another day, another hearing, another conversation, another headline—all of that while another veteran waits, and another veteran waits, and another veteran waits.

My motion to instruct doesn't touch topside or bottom the rest of the Senate bill. My motion to instruct talks about one particular provision of the Senate bill, and that one particular provision deals with additional space—additional leases for additional facilities.

It doesn't talk about choice cards or private pay or the rates or any of those other things which are crucial issues and important. My motion just deals with this issue that I talked about earlier, which is the funnel. We have such a narrow opening in this funnel that we try to channel all of our veterans through, and there is not enough space.

There are not enough resources there. We don't have adequate health care providers in the mental health fields, for example. We don't have enough specialists. We don't have enough places to put them. We don't have enough facilities. People have to go too far in order to get their health care, and as a result, they are not getting their health care at all.

Mr. Speaker, mañana isn't good enough. Mañana, tomorrow, should not be the busiest day of our week. This is not an issue or question that should be left for tomorrow. This is an issue that Congress can decide now, immediately.

We can instruct our conferees not on the rest of the aspects of the bill because I understand that takes time and negotiation, but we can come together on one part of the bill. We can come together to the one part of the bill that says we need additional facilities, not only in Texas—although Texas needs them—but in other States as well. That serves all of our veterans well.

This isn't about a Democratic position or a Democratic Senate versus a Republican position and a Republican House. This is about our veterans who served every day in uniform, who sacrificed every day, so that 435 people here in this body and 100 people in the body across the way could serve and do our jobs and vote and participate in the American democratic experiment.

We wouldn't be here participating in this American democratic experiment, but for the service and the sacrifices of our veterans. If we recognized that, if we truly recognized that, then we would step forward now, not tomorrow. We would step forward now and admit that we desperately need additional VA facilities.

We desperately need those 26 additional places. We could put off for the conferees and allow the conferees the latitude to discuss all of the rest of the bill, but we ought to be able to come together on that one thing, and that one thing is those additional 26 facilities.

Waiting for a clean bill, I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, how many times in meeting with the VA or the VFW or the American Legion or any one of the number of organizations like the Vietnam Veterans, I can't tell you how many times they tell me they have been asked to wait another day—wait, you will get your bill; wait, we will take care of you; wait, we understand you are important.

They don't need a pat on the head. They don't need a pat on the shoulder. What they need is what they have earned, and what they have earned is health care. Those 26 additional facilities would help us get them their health care and help us get them exactly what they need and what our government has committed to them, regardless of party, regardless of rhetoric, regardless of partisanship, regardless of blame, regardless of whatever.

If I started by saying it takes an act of Congress to do this, this is a great opportunity for Congress to step forward and say, through an act of Congress, we understand how important the veterans are, and we are not saving that until tomorrow—you will get your 26 facilities, your 26 additional facilities.

We will broaden that pipeline, so that more veterans across this country will have access to health care, and we will do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is too much to ask.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close. The gentleman from Florida has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

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

It is curious to me that my colleague talks about not waiting, not waiting, not waiting—mañana.

The House passed a bill in December—in December. How much longer do veterans have to wait before the bill that resides in the Senate is passed? That is what we have been waiting for.

I cannot figure out what my colleague has against the veterans in Tulsa, Oklahoma, because that is the clinic that is missing out of the bill that he is wanting to instruct us to accept. Why would we not give access for care to the veterans in Oklahoma? It doesn't make any sense.

So when my colleague says mañana, saying that, for some reason, we are trying to delay access to care, I say, oh, no—oh, no. What this bill actually does is it expands care way beyond what VA has ever purported to be able to do.

The clinics that we are talking about authorizing may not even be necessary in future years—I am not talking about these specific clinics—because veterans will be able to go out into the private sector.

No longer will there be a bottleneck within the Department of Veterans Affairs providing access to care for the veterans. You see, that is what has happened with VA really since the 1940s.

They have been trying to force veterans to drive for hours to facilities to get their care in places that they don't

want to have to get their care at, to get their care when VA says they will get their care, not when the veteran says they want their care, so let's change the formula a little bit. Let's give veterans their care where they want to get it and when they want to get it.

So I say to my friend that if we truly want to service the most veterans, you have got to ask the Senate to pass the bill that we passed in December because, for some reason, the Senate doesn't want to put a clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers at this time, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me start by, in all sincerity, saying that I have the greatest respect for Chairman MILLER and the work that he has been doing. I follow his comments and his remarks and his committee regularly because the issue of veterans is an issue that is near and dear to my heart, as it is to so many of us, and I have great respect for his views and his expertise.

While I may differ in my opinion, I certainly would never, ever think that his motives are impure because they are not. He is very sincere and very driven to help, but here is what I don't understand. For veterans across the country, they don't care, in my view, if the first two letters on a bill are H.R. or S.

That makes no difference, topside or bottom, to any veteran that I have ever talked to. I would urge my colleagues to talk to as many veterans as they can and to ask them specifically: Does it matter to you if this is a Senate bill or a House bill? I guarantee you that every veteran across the country will say, no, it doesn't matter.

So the idea that we are stuck here at this point in the process because the House wants a House bill and the Senate would like a Senate bill, frankly, that is ludicrous, and it is offensive to the veterans who have served our country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. It is not a House bill or a Senate bill question because this is a House bill that the Senate amended, so it is not a matter of whether it is a House bill, House resolution, Senate bill, Senate resolution, it is a House bill that the Senate has amended.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1645

Mr. GALLEGO. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield.

I would point out that part of the conversation that we have had is asking the Senate to take action on a bill that the House sent over, when that is even a better argument for this motion, because the House bill is already back from the Senate in the House, and we can settle this question once and for all by instructing our conferees to accept that language.

I would urge that we have 26 additional facilities. I would commit to the chairman that I will do all I can to make sure that it is not just 26 facilities, that if it needs to be 27, I am happy to do that. I have worked in a very bipartisan fashion with the Democratic and Republican members of the Armed Services Committee, particularly the freshman members of the committee, in order to do that.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I am always happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Thank you very much.

The problem we are going to have is that a conference report is a privileged report. It is not amendable. So you will not be able to add an additional clinic in the conference report.

Even if we recede to the Senate position, we will be stuck with 26 clinics. That is why it is critical that the House bill that has been languishing for 7 months that is over there be passed and sent to the President today.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, again, I am always happy. I love the process, and I am a huge believer in the democratic system, but I will tell you that the idea that we are stuck at 26 and we are stuck at 26 forever is not a credible argument because there are other vehicles in the process that would be just as rapid and just as fast if we would get over this idea, this pride of authorship, and if we would all work together on a bipartisan basis to fashion a solution that all veterans can live with. That is incredibly important. For me, this is a starting point, not an ending point.

It is important, it seems to me—and I hope to do that by example, Mr. Speaker, that we stay away from the finger-pointing and the blame game—that we not be guilty of the fiery rhetoric I have never understood.

As a west Texan, my instinct is always to put fires out. It is never my instinct to add additional fuel. So the partisan fires that rage in this building, it seems to me, need to be put out, and the interest of the American people and, in this case, the American veteran need to be put first and foremost and at the front and center of everything that we are doing.

We shouldn't stand and salute the VA, as the chairman has indicated—I agree with that—but we should stand and salute every single veteran who has served and every single veteran who deserves health care and who doesn't get it.

We should apologize, Mr. Speaker, to every single veteran who has stood in line for those months and months at the VA and not been able to make it through that small funnel, and we should apologize to them if we don't broaden that funnel to allow more people to get more care.

Yeah, there may be changes to the system, but those changes to the system are further down the hall, further down the way, further down the road, further down whatever. Today, here, we are talking about additional VA facilities. That one question we can settle, we can settle tonight or tomorrow, whenever the vote is on this, and we can make sure that we expand that pipeline, so that we don't try to push so many veterans through this really narrow pipeline, so that some of them get squeezed out of the system.

We should make that pipeline bigger so that more people get served, and each of us, each of us—Republican, Democrat, Independent, Libertarian, agnostic—each of us should be proud of that vote.

Stand up and salute our veterans, stand up and salute our people who served, and stand up and admit that they need access to health care. That is what this motion does, Mr. Speaker.

On that note, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NEW DATA ON MARCELLUS PRODUCTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, natural gas production in the Marcellus and Utica shale formations is projected to grow 36 percent by 2035, according to a recently released industry report from ICF International.

According to the report, which is released quarterly:

Well data from producers suggests ultimate recovery of gas in the Marcellus will average 6.2 billion cubic feet per well, up from 5.2 billion cubic feet per well in the last report.

According to a recent Energy Information Administration drilling report, gas production in Pennsylvania alone has more than quadrupled from 2009 to 2011.

Today, Bloomberg News reports:

Record natural gas production from the Marcellus is helping send U.S. output to an alltime high.

Another recent industry report from Morningstar, Incorporated, noted that Pennsylvania is now ranked third in the Nation for natural gas production and that the Marcellus is expected to account for nearly one-fourth of all U.S. gas output by 2015.

Mr. Speaker, natural gas continues to provide jobs and family-sustaining incomes that are much needed in the Nation's slow economic recovery. At the same time, we are moving closer to energy independence.

UNFUNDED LIABILITIES—THE GREATEST THREAT TO OUR FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), I believe it is southeast Illinois.

CELEBRATING THE LIVES OF ALAN DIXON AND KENNY GRAY

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today to celebrate the lives of two extraordinary public servants, both considered from southern Illinois—one from deep southern Illinois—Senator Alan Dixon and Congressman Kenny Gray. Both passed within the last week or so, but our mourning has turned into remembrance and reverence for their undeniable commitment to all of us.

Senator Alan Dixon—or as he was commonly known, Al the Pal, as we from Illinois knew him, and eventually everyone else in this institution and in Washington knew him as that also—was a larger-than-life personality, with a can-do spirit, if you will.

He came to Washington to get things done, particularly for his beloved Illinois. From his beginnings in Belleville and St. Clair County to being State treasurer and secretary of State, he modernized the offices he served in to better serve the people of the State.

Elected to the U.S. Senate in 1980, he soon realized that Illinois lacked a cohesive message in Washington, D.C.

With Senator Chuck Percy, he began a monthly Illinois get-together that continues to this day. It brings together Members of the House and the Senate, downstate, Chicago, Republican, Democrat, conservative, moderate, and liberal. We sit around, and we talk about the Illinois agenda and how we can work together to advance it.

Our prayers and best wishes go out to his wife, Jody, and his family and friends.

I would also like to single out a couple of other people who were very special in his life. One was Gene Callahan and Scott Shearer. Their public service on his behalf is emblematic of that of all those who worked with my friend, Al the Pal.

Just as a side note to my colleague, we have a colleague here who is a Member of Congress, CHERI BUSTOS, who is the daughter of Gene; and there is that great connection of, in essence, a politically active family that continues to serve.

We will miss Al the Pal. He was a great friend and a great public servant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to Kenny Gray. Kenny Gray was a very colorful Member of this Chamber, well known for spending many hours in the chair. He loved this House so much that, after he retired, he ran again and came back.

He was known as really a cult of personality. In a sea of Washington grey suits, white shirts, and red ties, Kenny stormed through this place in a flurry of colors that had never been seen before, but you dare not look away, as the Prince of southern Illinois was here, and he was determined to fight for his constituents.

Kenny made a big difference in southern Illinois. As the coal industry started suffering challenges, he worked hard. He was known as the Prince of Pork and the Prince of southern Illinois.

He worked diligently to bring the interstate system to southern Illinois, and he is also credited to bring a major water conservancy, Rend Lake, which brings and provides much of the needed drinking water to southern Illinois, and I would argue deep southern Illinois.

I am reminded of how he helped young people from southern Illinois come and grow here in D.C. A favorite example is my friend Brenda Otterson of West Frankfort, who came out to D.C. a few years back.

She came here as a Republican—Kenny is a Democrat—but as a Republican. Brenda came from a family of Democrats. Try as he might, Kenny worked hard to convert her.

When he finally realized she wasn't budging, he said, fine, and he helped her get a full-time job with a Republican Member. She served with distinction and never forgot her Kenny Gray roots.

Kenny's wife, Toedy, and their family deserve a special prayer and thanks from all of us.

Mr. Speaker, time comes, and time goes—rabid debates, a flurry of activities. We always take time out to remember those of our colleagues from future generations who are served, served nobly, and then gone home.

I think it is just fitting to remember that we remember those who served selflessly for many years as we take up their call to continue to do the same.

It is also important to remember to enjoy each and every day, enjoy life, work hard—because everything has its time under the Sun and everything is passing. That is why I appreciate the opportunity to serve. I love the Chamber. I love my colleagues.

With that, thank you for this opportunity, my colleague, Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Mr. SHIMKUS.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I came to the floor and did a bit of a presentation of some of the numbers we were seeing on what was actually happening in our debt, in our future economic growth, why we were so stagnant in today's economy, and the overhang that was, I believe, the very thing that was slowing down future economic growth.

I had a number of phone calls and a number of emails and a few comments on Facebook asking for a little more definition, a little more presentation. So I thought I would come to the floor this evening, take some of this leadership hour, and walk through some of the numbers.

I have to apologize to everyone right now, I am going to throw out a lot of math, a lot of numbers, but you are going to see a theme here of what is coming at us, and it is coming at us very, very fast.

After we do this, I want to do a little talking about a piece of legislation that I have that has made it through committee, and I am hoping, over the next couple of months, we will come to the floor and what that piece of legislation, I believe, means to sort of transparency here in our government with the EPA and hopefully as just sort of the future of how we deal with data in this Federal Government.

The chart alongside me—and I know there are lots of lines in it and it is hard to read, but it has a very, very, very simple theme—I am going to show variations of this on a couple of different boards.

□ 1700

The red you see down at the bottom is what we call discretionary spending. That is what we substantially get to come down and vote on.

That discretionary spending, if you look at the next decade on this chart, basically stays the same. So the military, the Park Service, the FBI, education, and these things that are programatic that we come down and vote for on the discretionary side of

the budget are pretty much staying even for the next 10 years.

Do you see the blue lines? They are just slightly shy of doubling. They basically double over the next 10 years. That is mandatory spending. That is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and now ObamaCare, things that are built in by formula. And they grow and grow and grow and grow, and they consume everything in their path.

That is what is going on here.

When I do meetings back home in Arizona, in the district, you often get this question: Why do you all fight with each other? Why do you all fuss with each other? And my answer is: It is about the money. And you get this look.

You must understand, we come to this floor and we are fighting over, fussing over, in many ways, a shrinking pot of resources, even though today we have actually the highest revenues this Federal Government has ever received.

So where is the money going? It is going to that mandatory spending. We need to deal with the reality that the mandatory spending—the entitlements—are consuming our future. So that is what this chart is basically saying.

We are going to the next chart. The reason I am going to put this one up is this is from 2013. So we actually know it has happened. It is a closed book.

If you look at the blue areas, that is mandatory spending. You will see Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. You will see other income. You have supplemental programs like food stamps, WIC, and some of those types of programs. You will see veterans' benefits down here. And about 6 percent of our budget last year—our money, our spending—went to interest. Thirty-two percent last year is what we, as Members of Congress, got to come down here and do policy on.

Understand that in 9 budget years—and I am going to show you that pie chart in a moment. That is 32 percent. In 9 budget years, that goes from 32 percent of our spending and collapses down to 22 percent. That 22 percent has your military, the FBI, the education, health research. All those types of things are in that remaining portion of the pie.

This was something that I picked up several months ago, and I was shocked it did not get more discussion here on the floor of the House or around here in Washington. Last September, we had the Chief of Staff of the United States Army in discussion before Congress talking about the future of the Army and what was actually going on. In his quote, he basically says that 46 percent of the Army spending today is personnel costs, like salaries, pensions, health care. By 2023, 9 years from now, it is going to be 80 percent.

So get your head around this: 80 percent of the Army's spending in 9 years will be personnel costs. It will not be equipment. It will not be things that fly fast and go kaboom or make our soldiers safer. It will be personnel costs. In 9 years, 80 percent of that Army's budget will be personnel costs.

You have got to understand the demographic bubble our country is in. The fact of the matter is these costs are consuming us. We can have a debate of, well, it's uncomfortable to talk about, it's not politically correct, when you talk about Medicare and Social Security you can get yourself unelected, but if you care about these programs, if you care about the social contract we as Members of Congress have with our constituents, you need to step up and understand the underlying math so you can save them—because it is math.

Think about if I came to you and told you that 9 years from now, for a branch of our service, 80 percent of their money is not equipment, is not things that keep the soldiers safe, but it is just going to be salaries, health care, and retirement. You need to understand that the very thing we are discussing on our overall Federal budget is now also hitting Federal employees and our military.

I am going to rotate to the next board. Remember, this one shows 32 percent of all of our spending was discretionary.

This is 9 budget years from now, so it is 2024. Nine budget years from now, that discretionary portion falls to 22 percent of our spending. And this is still the military; this is still the FBI; it is still health research; it is still education.

So what is happening here? Well, on the previous pie chart, interest was 6 percent of our budget, 6 percent of our spending. In 9 years, we predict it to be around 14 percent. That is assuming that we stay with historic norms on interest rates. If interest rates spike, if we have 1979, 1980, 1981, or 1982 all over again, our interest exposure consumes huge portions of what is left in the discretionary budget.

You must understand what we have done with the explosion of our deficits in this country. We have actually made this country rather fragile to interest rate exposure, and something you need to understand is we now become more and more subject to the world's interest rate markets and our ability to constantly sell more and more of our debt.

There was something I found sort of amusing, and I didn't bring the actual numbers with me, but 2 days ago this administration was announcing how happy they were with that the deficit numbers and where they were at. The problem was the deficit numbers weren't that different from last year, and they were substantially higher than they were predicting last September, one more time demonstrating here in Washington you can spin almost anything. And if you have a compliant press, complicit press—whatever you want to use—you can make it sound like happy talk.

The numbers are not getting better.

So in 9 budget years, 24 percent of our spending is going to be Social Security.

On occasion, I will have someone on the left who will show up at one of our discussion groups, our working groups, or our town halls and demand a discussion about Social Security, saying Social Security is fully funded. They have all those IOUs in it.

Here is the basic math on Social Security.

Social Security is holding about $2.3 trillion of special Treasury notes from the Treasury Department. Obviously, the Treasury Department, if they were to pay those back—which they will—they have to go borrow the money, because they have already spent the money. That is the asset in Social Security. Understand, Social Security is sitting on about a $24 trillion unfunded liability. So they are holding about $2.3 trillion in special Treasury notes, and they have $24 trillion in unfunded liabilities.

And this is where it ties in. We talked about this a couple of weeks ago.

At the very beginning of the year, George Mason University did a study and put together some data of what would happen if you took the U.S. debt, the U.S. liabilities, and put them on GAAP accounting, just like your business, my business, just like everyone else where you are doing a large public statement and you would have to put them on GAAP accounting—what are your liabilities, what are your assets, and if you offset them.

What would you guess the United States shortfall is? On occasion, I will hear many of my brothers and sisters even here in this body sort of quote the number that you can see at the bottom of the U.S. debt clock on the Web site as it is spinning, and they will say things like: Oh, it's a $120 trillion shortfall.

The study at George Mason University came in at $205 trillion, which is our honest debt, our honest unfunded liabilities, if you actually use GAAP accounting.

Go to the Internet now and take a look at what many predict, estimate, guess is the entire wealth of the world. You are going to find out what we owe, what we are going to owe, what we have promised is greater than the current wealth of the entire world—every asset in the world.

I will make you the argument that even with the chaos we have right now through so many things in this country and so many things I actually hold this administration responsible for, the

President's failure to step up and say, This is the systemic risk to my country, to your country, to our country, not dealing with the explosion of the future entitlements consumes our future. And it is in front of us.

We knew baby boomers were going to turn 65 for how long? I remember sitting in a statistics class in 1981 where the professor was putting things up on the board and talking about how much money we would have to have set aside in assets as we started to move into the baby boom retirements.

We are now into year three, and my understanding is a typical baby boomer will have put in around $100,000, $120,000 into Medicare in their lifetime, and they are going to take out $330,000. So they will put in about $110,000 and take out about $330,000. Now, multiply that shortfall times 76 million brothers and sisters. And we are into year three of it now.

We have known this was coming. We have known this was coming for 65 years, but it was politically dangerous to talk about. It was uncomfortable. It is easier, as you watch the debates here on the floor, to talk about today's chaos, today's spending.

Being able to cover these promises, these social entitlements, these social contracts into our future, if you love your kids, if you love your grandkids, if you love your great-grandkids that may not even be here yet, this is the question I beg of you to ask candidates who are running around this country: What are your plans to deal with the crushing future debt, the crushing future promises that we have made that there is no money for?

There is this almost pathologic attitude around here of: We will get to it one day when we have a Senate that is willing to step up and do work. We will get to it one day when we have a President that is willing to be honest about the math. We will get to it one day.

The problem is that every single day that ticks away, the math gets worse. A good example of that is 2 days ago, the Congressional Budget Office came out with their annual data.

Remember, you have heard over and over on the media that things are getting better, the job situation is better, our numbers are getting better. Well, if they are getting better, how did the fiscal scenarios get worse?

Go pull the Congressional Budget Office's numbers that they just put out. Our Congressional Budget Office does two scenarios. One is the standard and one is called an alternative.

□ 1715

The standard is basically based on the concept of: this is the law as it is today. Here are the numbers that it projects. Of course, you have got to understand that the law as it is today has things in it like the common vernacular ''doc fix.'' We refer to it as the SGR. It is this concept that, in a dozen or so years, doctors are going to take 73 percent less money—73 percent less compensation—to see a Medicare patient. It is implausible. It is not going to happen. Yet here is how the scam works here in Washington.

It is the current law that doctors are going to be compensated this much less over the next dozen years, so we are going to calculate that as savings all up and down our future budget projections, our future debt projections. We have things that are woven into those numbers that are fantasy. Go read the last three pages of the Medicare-Social Security actuarial report. The head actuary, whom I have never met but who I hear is just a standup person, basically says, ''Oh, by the way, these numbers are implausible,'' but they are based on current law. You will hear debates here on the floor, saying, ''No, the number is this. The number is this.'' The number often, if they are using the standard projections, is a fraud.

Then there is the alternative scenario, which may overshoot a number on the negative side because it basically makes a projection of: What if GDP isn't what we hope it to be? which, as it has turned out over the last couple of years, is true. We will be blessed if we can break through that 2 percent this year because of what happened in the first quarter.

The alternative scenario is that we hit 100 percent of debt to GDP in 14 years. How many of you remember what you were doing 14 years ago? To help you put it in sort of a perspective, when you get ready to take out that 30-year mortgage, understand that less than halfway through it your government, your country, is going to be at 100 percent debt to GDP. Theoretically, that is when your sovereign debt becomes much more risky, and this net interest figure potentially starts to explode on you because getting sovereign nations, getting individuals and getting investors from around the world to buy our sovereign debt becomes harder and harder because we start to look riskier and riskier. If you say, ''David, I don't want you to use the alternative number. I want you to use the standard number,'' okay. Add 8 years. Add 8 years so that, in 2036, we hit 100 percent of debt to GDP.

We can fix this, and we can fix it in a way that is not terrifying. It will be a little uncomfortable, but you will save the future. If you are a person of the left and if there are programs you care so deeply about, those programs are on the discretionary side of this budget. If you are a person of the right or a person who cares a lot about the military, that is in this discretionary budget. Every time you talk about those programs, you need to stand behind that microphone and talk about mandatory spending—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and now ObamaCare—because they are all on autopilot, and they are consuming everything in their path.

That is, hopefully, a little more detail of some of the numbers I put up a couple of weeks ago. We traditionally will put these slides up on our Facebook page and on our Web site so that you can analyze them. If you want all of this data and a lot more—I mean, a presentation could go on for hours—it is on the Congressional Budget Office's data sets. This is the issue of our time. It is that we have made as a government, as a people, lots and lots of promises, and we haven't built the mechanisms to pay for them.

With that, I want to move on to one other little thing. Let's take these boards down.

Now, as we get ready to talk about the ''Secret Science'' piece of legislation, I show you all of these debt projections and unfunded liability numbers, and I am actually more optimistic today than I have been at any time in my 3 years here in Congress. Why? If I had gone to anyone out there 10, 12 years ago and had said, ''Hey, in 2015, the United States is going to become a natural gas exporting country,'' you would have laughed at me. Ten or 12 years ago, you couldn't pick up the newspaper—you couldn't pick up The Wall Street Journal, Barron's, financial news—and not hear discussions here on the floor about this thing called ''peak oil.'' The world was running out of energy, do you remember? It wasn't that long ago. The world is running out of energy. Tomorrow, the next incremental barrel of oil and the next incremental unit of fossil fuels that we extract will be less than the day before. You all know the problem with that. It was absolutely wrong. As of today, we have more known fossil fuel supplies than any time in human history, and if we use this the right way, that is one of the legs on the stool that is going to support us as we stand up and start to meet these obligations that we have made.

The second thing is much more ethereal, a little more difficult to talk about, and that is what is happening all around us. There is this hyperefficient economy that is breaking out. How many of you have ever ridden Uber? How many of you have ever done SideCar? How many of you have ever used that handheld computer you call a phone to buy something, to sell something, and to use it in a fashion to do something that is so hyperefficient that you couldn't have done it a couple of years ago? Please understand. The incumbents, as they are often referred to—and it is not competitive businesses. It is competitive businesses and incumbent tax systems. If you have a Web site that allows you to rent someone's townhouse

for the week, that becomes a great transaction for you and for that person who owns the townhouse, but the municipality and the hotel are not happy. The municipality is not getting its bed tax, and the hotel with its capital expenditures is not happy, but the fact of the matter is that this is an economic transaction that is efficient.

Over the next couple of years, I believe, in State legislatures, city councils, county councils, and here in Congress, we are going to see the fight over: Do we regulate the new alternatives you have as a citizen to engage in this hyperefficient economy? Do we regulate them out of existence? Do we create some concept of, well, we need them to have additional tort liability shields or we need to have them engage in this part of the tax scheme? A bit of economic chaos is normal. That is how you renew yourself. That is how you create the next generation of economic growth. We need to embrace it because, if we cannot reach escape velocity in the energy renaissance and in the economic renaissance, I do not know, mathematically, how we keep our promises to so many people in this country.

A few months ago, I introduced a piece of legislation, and it has been through the Science Committee. We gave it the title of ''Secret Science.'' I am not sure if I am thrilled with the title, but it is a very, very simple concept. The concept underlying it is: Do you make public policy and not make the underlying public data available? It is a simple concept—public data for public policy. Should your government be keeping the data—the underlying data—secret and then create a bunch of rules and regulations on top of you?

It is almost absurd to think we have to create a piece of legislation to get the EPA to take its data sets and make them public. There is this intense arrogance out there in the world right now, particularly at our agencies, of saying, ''David, you have got to understand. Only real scientists, researchers who we deem qualified should ever see this data. Well, you don't want the unwashed masses to have an opportunity to see how we are developing our science and our regulations.'' It is absurd. It almost borders on Orwellian as to what is going on in our bureaucracies today. They are going to create rule sets that cost hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars and that are going to affect how we live in future decades. Yet there is the arrogance of saying the young man who is a statistics major, the left-wing group, the right-wing research group, the industry group, the activist group—just someone who is nutty enough to have a great stats package on his home computer, who wants to take the data sets and play with them and model them and see what is out in the tails and maybe match them up to other data sets that someone hadn't thought about—is not worthy. They are not worthy?

Now, it is a personal fixation, but I actually believe that transparency is the ultimate regulator in our society. Could you imagine if we had gone into 2008 and if we had had transparency on that MBS, the mortgage-secured bonds, and had known what the impairment was and had known what was actually going on? Would you have had an implosion on a single day, or would you have had a couple of years of, hey, these are having trouble, these are having trouble; we need to mark down the prices? Transparency is the ultimate regulator, the ultimate vetter, but it is also the ultimate exposure to bad acts.

This hit my desk last week. It is a TIME magazine. On the cover it says, ''Eat Butter. Scientists Labeled Fat the New Enemy. Why They Were Wrong.''

Now, how many times have you heard the people at your gym, your wife, or others saying, ''David, you need to be eating less saturated fats. You can't eat that butter. We need to go buy some of that artificial stuff''? Now I am looking at TIME magazine's saying, ''Hey, we screwed up on the data.'' How many times in our lives do we come here and say, ''We knew it except for the small problem that we got it wrong''? Remember, we all knew the world was running out of energy. ''Well, we got that wrong.'' We all knew eating butter was bad for you until we knew the data was different. There are dozens and dozens and dozens of examples like this around us, but we were so arrogant that we thought we understood the data. We thought we understood the methodology. We were so brilliant except for the fact that we weren't. We got it wrong over and over and over.

The fact of the matter is—and go back to my energy example of a dozen years ago and beyond that—our military policy, our foreign policy, our environmental policy, our tax policy was all based on this concept that the world was running out of energy, except we weren't. How much of our health policy is based on things like this: ''David, you can't eat butter''?

I saw a presentation a few years ago that the government was spending this astronomical amount of money to try to keep people from using salt. The researcher was presenting salt as only a problem for you if you have hypertension, but that is different than the folklore out there. How many things have we developed in our folklore that we make policy?

That is why H.R. 4012—it is called the ''Secret Science'' bill—is, I believe, so needed. When the EPA takes data, whether it be from industry, whether it be from a research group, an activist group, a right, a left, an internal—any group—and when they use that data to make a policy, to make a rule, that underlying data belongs to all of us. It is public policy by public data, and we all as Americans deserve the right, if you are so inclined, if you so choose, to sit there, see it, touch it, calculate it, crunch it, compare it, understand it. Who knows? You may be the researcher who comes out, looks at the data, matches it up against other things, and tells me I can eat butter.

I promise that in a couple of weeks, maybe a month, I am going to come back to this microphone, because I have collected an entire binder of example after example of what we were absolutely positive about—what we absolutely knew—and we got wrong, and how so many of those things we made public policy on, and we got it wrong.

My good friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) has a couple of other things in sort of that same vein that he wants to share, and he may be the best person I have ever seen behind these microphones.

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

□ 1730

A HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the remainder of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for that outstanding transition that he made here. I actually came down to chide him just a little bit.

I was listening very closely to what he had to say, and it was very valuable, the comments on energy that we need and the direction this economy needs to go. I am going to restrain the chiding because of his outstanding transition that he made and, let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I came down here to address you and to talk with you a little bit about the things that are ahead for us in this Congress, the things that are ahead for us in this country.

When our Founding Fathers shaped this country and wrote our declaration and filed our Constitution and got it ratified, it was an extraordinarily accomplishment, and those documents will live for the duration of civilization, and they will be in our memory, they will be in our heads, they will be in our hearts for the full duration of the time of civilization, whether it is succeeding civilizations thousands of years from now, they will look back on what happened here.

When our Founding Fathers put together this republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in article IV, section 4 of the Constitution, it also guaranteed protection from invasion.

They set up the House of Representatives to have elections every 2 years, so

that we could be the quick-reaction shock force. When the public could see that this country was going in the wrong direction, they wanted to make sure that the House could be restored and filled with people that came from all across the country—the Thirteen Original Colonies or the 50 States that we are now and the territories that send representatives here—and that we could reverse an erroneous course that could be taken by a Congress going in the wrong direction.

That is the reason for 2 years—elections every 2 years. The Senate was set up with elections every 6 years, so they didn't have to worry about reelection for a longer period of time, and they could take the longer view.

Now, that was the theory or a philosophy that was generally untested, at least within the culture and the civilization of the time, and it has proven to be a fairly effective approach.

We saw what happened here in 2010, when I will say an overexuberant, very liberal Democrat majority in the House and in the Senate, essentially a veto-proof majority in the Senate, by hook, crook, and legislative shenanigans, crammed ObamaCare down the throats of the American people.

I remember those dramatic times. Tens of thousands of Americans came to Washington, D.C., from every single State, including Hawaii and Alaska, to protest what was happening to our God-given liberty and our right, our God-given right to manage our health, our skin, and everything inside it.

Well, it was still crammed down the throats of the American people, that policy called ObamaCare. The real name for it is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I know. If I would say that about six times and you are having trouble going to sleep, Mr. Speaker, that would put you to sleep. It is a substitute for Ambien, to say Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Democrats finally recognized that, and they changed the name and their verbiage that they use. They said, oh, it is offensive to say ObamaCare; and then they realized that the President is the one that coined the term ''ObamaCare.''

He did so on February 25 of 2009 at the Blair House, in that big square seating when they had a conference on health care, and he acted like a professor and interrupted Republicans 72 times that day, but he used the phrase ''ObamaCare.''

Now, when we use it, they said that is pejorative. Don't use that because it identifies what it really is, it is a health care system that is socialized medicine. It is a government takeover of our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it; yet when the President used ObamaCare, then some of the Democrats decided: we will embrace the word ''ObamaCare.''

They did for a while, and they realized that they were adding fuel to the fire of the rejection of ObamaCare, and they decided, well, let's find another way we can name this thing.

So then they insisted that you weren't nice and you weren't polite and it was inappropriate if we didn't use its official name, which they would liked to have changed to the Affordable Care Act, not the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, but the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I get to this because I am thinking about our Founding Fathers and George Washington, who could not tell a lie. So I asked myself the question—this policy that is going to cost over $1 trillion extra for ObamaCare that was promised it was going to cut our premiums, per household, by $2,500 a year, and if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor, if you like your policy, you get to keep your policy, those promises weren't true.

The big promises of ObamaCare weren't true, and many things that were not advertised as highly as that didn't come true either.

So now they want to say Affordable Care Act. George Washington could not utter those words, Mr. Speaker, because George Washington could not tell a lie. That is why he confessed to chopping down the cherry tree.

I am not certain that the stump exists out there at Mount Vernon yet, but I am convinced that George Washington couldn't say the term ''affordable care act'' in reference to ObamaCare because it is not an accurate term. It is a dishonest term. It is not affordable, and it is less care.

Maybe it is an act, Mr. Speaker, so that is my commentary on going down that path with our Founding Fathers.

They also had this vision and they hoped that—and they had a long-term vision. It was a wonderful long-term vision of what kind of a country you could build if you just laid down God-given liberties, timeless principles, and laid out the pillars of American exceptionalism, articulate them, sell them to the American people, get them to support your Declaration of Independence, get them committed to doing what they knew they had to do, fight a war against King George.

They had to go through the winter at Valley Forge, and they had to a march up and down the coastline and in the interior part of the United States, at least the Thirteen Colonies, and take on the redcoats wherever they where. They won that Revolutionary War, learned some lessons from that about how you field the Continental Army.

You have to have a Commander in Chief, and you have to have a centralized government if you are going to defend yourself against the global powers of the world. They set up a Constitution to do that.

They envisioned and anticipated a lot of things in this Constitution, one of them was a means to amend it, and they believed that the President of the United States would be a man of honor who would give his oath of office, and they wrote his oath of office into the Constitution, to ensure that the nobility, the integrity, the statesmanship, the character that was part of the culture at the time would flow forth forever, or as long as the United States might exist, through our Presidents.

I noted the 210th anniversary of the duel that took place between three-time Vice President Aaron Burr and the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. It was just last week—about a week ago.

They met on an island, and they shot it out. They fought to the death. It turned out to be the death of Alexander Hamilton because Hamilton had insulted the integrity of Aaron Burr.

Aaron Burr would defend his integrity, and Alexander Hamilton would not retract his allegations, so the two of them met in a duel. Think of that, that their word was so important, their integrity was so important that the two of them faced each other with dueling pistols, knowing that one of them was likely to die in that duel, all over their word.

They had already by then written into the Constitution for the oath of the President of the United States and ratified. I do solemnly swear to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United, States—later on added—and to protect against all enemies foreign and domestic—and later on added—so help me God.

In the Constitution is—they call it the Take Care Clause in the Constitution, and the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. It is not actually the oath, but it is a component of the oath.

I don't want to say the word ''implied.'' It is specific in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, Mr. Speaker.

So we had men of honor, statesmen, men of dignity, men of an attitude, that their word and their integrity was more important to them than their very life itself.

When they wrote the oath for the President to take into the Constitution and when they wrote in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, they never imagined that we would have a President who didn't have that same sense, didn't have that same sense of nobility, that sense of integrity, that sense of statesmanship.

They never imagined that we would have a President that didn't think his word was worth more than his life itself.

We come to this place in time and history, Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton went to his grave over a principle like that, and Aaron Burr lost his political career because he sent Alexander Hamilton to his grave over that

principle of your word is your bond, and when you get to a challenge like that, your word is more important than your life itself.

Now, we are at a place where a President gives his oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and, instead, simply executes the law itself, wipes it out, ignores it, immigration law, in particular, Mr. Speaker, where the President, with his Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, the DACA program—DACA, which really stands for deferred action for criminal aliens, that policy and a number of other policies where the President has announced that he is going to ignore the law—and he constantly hides behind this phrase: prosecutorial discretion.

He says he has prosecutorial discretion to decide not to enforce the law against people that are breaking it.

Now, he has a prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker, but it is on an individual basis only, and his lawyers knew that. That is why when they wrote the DACA memos—well, we call them the Morton Memos—when they were written, and we had Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, testifying before the Judiciary Committee, and I announced to her, if you go forward with this, you will be in court, and you will be sued because the President of the United States' job is to stick with his article II authority, and that is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and he is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This is a limited government, but all legislative powers belong here in this Congress. That is article I, all legislative powers.

The President doesn't get to write the laws. He is compelled to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is his constitutional obligation.

Instead, the President has said, well, I don't like these immigration laws. If a law requires our immigration authorities, ICE—Immigration and Customs Enforcement—when they encounter someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they place them into removal proceedings. That is the law.

The President has issued an order that says to ICE, thou shalt break that law and never apply the law to remove people from the United States who are here unlawfully, unless they have committed a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors that are vaguely identified.

I don't know that they actually have ever executed that particular provision, although I would say it is likely that they have, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness.

So the President has created four different classes of people with his Morton Memos and his DACA language, and by grouping people into classes of people, he has got a number of those who he has exempted from the law, some number approaching 600,000 people who came into the United States or were in the United States illegally, who are exempted from the very application of the law that requires our law enforcement officers, particularly ICE, to place them into removal proceedings. That is what the President has done.

So he sent the message out, as far as back as 3 years ago, in midsummer—actually, June—sent the message out to everybody in the world, if you can get into America, and you don't commit a felony—and that is a little bit of a shorthand for the technicalities—then you get to stay.

He has acted upon that. He has executed that all right. He has executed his executive edict, but he hasn't taken care that the law itself be faithfully executed. He has defied the law, and his oath is to uphold the law, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Now, I have to put into the list the pillars of American exceptionalism, so we are thinking about it, Mr. Speaker. What makes America the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, and it is the composition of the pillars of American exceptionalism, and you find most of them in the Bill of Rights, freedom of speech, religion and assembly, and the right to keep and bear arms, and no double jeopardy, the property rights in the Fifth Amendment. You get to face a jury of your peers, quick and speedy trial.

The Ninth and 10th Amendments devolve the powers not granted specifically in the enumeration in the Constitution to the Federal Government devolve to the States or, respectively, to the people.

Those are many of the pillars of American exceptionalism, but there are others. We have a free enterprise economy, the ability to invest capital and sweat equity, and buy, sell, trade, make gain and get rich if you can, and we like to cheer you when you do because it helps all of us when that happens.

Free enterprise economy is another pillar of American exceptionalism, along with the root of this culture and civilization being in Judeo-Christianity, the work ethic that came from it, the values system that allowed that work to be prosperous and profitable and trustworthy, so that we could do business with people in a way that we didn't have to always be checking up on them because we knew that God is looking over our shoulder.

That is shorthand for one of the reasons why this is such a great country.

□ 1745

Another one would be when the Statue of Liberty went up. The image and the inspiration of that statue said to the world that if you can come here, to America legally, you can achieve all that you are capable of achieving. All of the things that you might imagine that you are capable of achieving anywhere in the world, you can achieve in America because you have all of these other rights. And these rights aren't rights that the government confers upon you.

As in every other country in the world, the government confers any rights you might have. These are God-given rights, and God has given them to us. And our Founding Fathers articulated that and put that down on the parchment, and we have fought and defended it all of our years.

So if our rights came from government, government could take them away. The reason that they can't take them away is because they are God-given. And the inspiration comes from all of these pillars of American exceptionalism, which send that message and beam it across the world in National Geographic magazines that show up everywhere around the world or in encyclopedias or through cyberspace today—that picture of the Statue of Liberty, of the Washington Monument, of the Lincoln Memorial, of the United States Capitol, the White House itself. American success across the world and all of the places where it has been, this record of achievement, this record of sacrifice of Americans to expand the nobility of the human race everywhere around the world has inspired people in every country.

And the people that came here, Mr. Speaker, were inspired by that image and those ideas and those ideals. So we didn't just get a random selection of people that came to America legally. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet.

If there were 10 siblings in a family and only one of them had enough inspiration to find a way to come legally to the United States of America, we got the superachiever. We got the can-do. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet from every donor nation on the planet to come to America because they were attracted to the God-given liberty that was established here. They came here, they achieved, and they embraced those principles. And America embraced them.

And in each generation from that, we taught our children the same thing. So it has descended down through the generations, and it has brought in more, and America has gotten stronger.

But we are not a stronger nation if we erode those pillars of American exceptionalism. We are not a stronger nation if we lose faith with those things that have been the core of the success of this country. And we can't be sacrificing the pillars of American exceptionalism for the sake of having our hearts overrule our heads.

Our Founding Fathers didn't let that happen. The principles that came through from the work that they did, the God-given rights and liberties that are there, they are timeless. And they index into human nature, all of human nature, but they are embodied here.

And, by the way, one of the other things I left out of that, another reason for American exceptionalism is that all of that settlement arrived here. And a lot of it, it arrived here on a continent with—at the time, at least, unlimited natural resources. And at the dawn of the industrial revolution, we settled this continent from sea to shining sea.

And here we are today, Mr. Speaker, with a President who wouldn't agree with what I have just said. I mean, if he had the time or took the time, he would seek to rebut the principles that I have laid out. And he would say, instead, well, let's see. We really don't need to have borders in America. We don't have to have that. There is no reason for America to be as successful as we are. We are using a disproportionate share of the planet's resources. We are pumping CO_2 into our atmosphere. That is turning the Earth's thermostat up, even though for 17 years there is not any evidence of that happening.

And we have watched as he has diminished America. He has diminished it in foreign policy. He has diminished it economically. He has diminished it socially and culturally. And today we are watching as he has established this policy of amnesty. He is pushing hard for the Senate Gang of Eight bill.

The Senate Gang of Eight bill is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker. It is instantaneous amnesty for the people that are here illegally, whether they overstayed their visas 40 percent or whether they came across the border illegally 60 percent. Or it is instantaneous amnesty for them.

For anyone that would come into America in the future, it is silent, which means it is an unspoken promise that if you can get here—we haven't demonstrated the will to enforce the law if you came here. So if you come here, why would anybody think that we enforce a law on anybody that would come here after a Senate Gang of Eight bill might potentially become law?

And, to add insult to injury, they sent an invitation out to the people that have been sent back to their home country. It is what I call the ''well, we really didn't mean it'' clause. And that means that anybody that has been deported in the past is sent an invitation saying reapply; we really didn't mean it. That is how bad this is.

And this gaping hole that we have in our border in the McAllen sector of the Texas border, where we now have 57,000 unaccompanied children who have come into the United States—many of them hustled across 2,500 miles or more from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala through Mexico, and there is a significant number yet from Mexico coming into the United States—these unaccompanied minors are hauled up here by coyotes who may live in those communities and recruit these kids.

All of this is going on. And we have a President who says: I need $3.7 billion to expand the bureaucracy to maybe buy a hotel to put them in and move them across the country and infuse them into our communities.

People that are unlawfully present in the United States simply say: I am an unaccompanied minor, and I have been promised that if I can get into America, I get to stay in America. 57,000 of them, Mr. Speaker. And what percentage of the unaccompanied minors have been sent back to their home country? 0.1 percent. One-tenth of 1 percent.

They sent JOE BIDEN down to Guatemala. He landed in Panama and then went to Guatemala. He said that he went down there to send a message which is that we are going to send your kids back. Don't send them here. Well, if there is no record of that, then they know it is not happening.

So think of the difference. If we would take a military airplane and put a couple hundred unaccompanied Guatemalan minors on it, for example, send that plane down the runway and up into the air, if the President picked up the phone and called the President of Guatemala and said: Be on the tarmac in 2 hours; you are going to have 200 of your kids that are going to arrive there, and you should greet them—that is what a leader does, sends them back. If you do that and do that and do that, eventually they will stop coming because they will know they are actually coming back, and they will know that their money is wasted. It is not happening.

But this President is not going to secure this border, Mr. Speaker. He has demonstrated that. We have got 2½ more years of this President. And whatever we do in this Congress, we can't make him secure the border. We can't make him do it. The Congress doesn't have the authority to do that. There are only two constitutional provisions that can force the President to do anything, and we have tried them both within the last 15 years or so, and neither one of them have proven to be effective.

Public opinion might push back hard enough. Well, they kind of are. But we cannot allow our border—especially right now, the Texas border—to be under invasion in the fashion that it is by the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are, by the way, only 20 percent of the illegals coming in in that sector. And they are maybe stopping, at best, 25 percent of those that are trying to come across. So we have got a number that is up there over 1 million people that are attempting to cross into the United States, and 57,000 of those that we pick up on that are unaccompanied minor kids.

The President will not secure the border. We should come to that conclusion. We have got 2½ years of open borders. Or we find a way to secure it, maybe even against the will of the President of the United States, because I don't know if he has got the will to block it if we do this.

But who has the authority? I look around the whole country, and the people who have the authority to do so are the Governors of the border States.

I have a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to introduce into the RECORD that says so. It calls upon the border Governors to call out their National Guard to secure the border, and it says that this House of Representatives will support the funding to do so. I call for that, Mr. Speaker. I urge us to pick this up and sign it. I am going to introduce it tomorrow. I would like to take it up real soon and send that resolution to the world, and I would appreciate your indulgence in doing so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

H. RES. _____

Whereas, the crisis on the Southwest border is of such significance that it demands national attention and urgent action.

Whereas, the President, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Administration have enacted unconstitutional policies, such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and the Morton Memos, that have contributed significantly to a massive increase in illegal immigration.

Whereas, the President has not secured the border.

Whereas, the President has failed to fulfill his Constitutional obligation to protect each state against invasion according to Article IV, Section 4.

Whereas, states have specific authorities under Article I, Section 10 when ''actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.''

Whereas, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection between October 1, 2013 and June 15, 2014, 52,193 unaccompanied children have been apprehended on the Southwest border.

Whereas, according to a June 3, 2014 Homeland Security Intelligence report, only 0.1% of illegal alien, unaccompanied minor children from non-contiguous countries were removed in FY 2013.

Whereas, the Secretary of Homeland Security expects 90,000 unaccompanied alien children to be interdicted by the U.S. government while crossing the border in Fiscal Year 2014.

Whereas, according to the Department of Homeland Security, only twenty percent of those interdicted are and will be children.

Whereas, border security officials estimate the interdiction ratio is twenty-five percent of those attempting to cross the border.

Whereas, according to border security official's testimony before Congress, the likely number of illegal crossing attempts is four times the number of those interdicted.

Whereas, our Southern border is not secure, and this fact represents an immediate danger to every citizen of the United States of America.

Whereas, the Governor of a state is the commander in chief of the National Guard of that state.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes, supports and defends the Constitutional authority of any Governor to deploy his or her state's National Guard division to secure the border;

(2) commits to appropriating the necessary monies to effectively support any such deployment of National Guard troops; and

(3) calls upon the Governors of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to deploy the National Guard forces under their command to immediately gain effective control of our southern border, to turn back anyone without legal immigration status, and to ensure for the people of their states and the United States a safe and free future.

AMERICA, THE ATTRACTIVE NUISANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my dear friend from Iowa (Mr. KING).

I know we have a good friend here on the other side of the aisle who was recently quoted as saying something along the lines that Mr. KING and I have never met an immigrant that we didn't think was a criminal, something of that sort, and I like the gentleman from Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ. I think he is a good guy. I think he has a big heart. But the truth is escaping him on such grandiose claims. He doesn't know my heart. I know he is a good guy. He has a big heart. But he doesn't understand the role of government.

When I looked at one of the most beautiful little girls I had ever seen. It was a Saturday night in the wee hours. She had been drug clear across Mexico. She was asked about home. Well, were you anxious to leave home? She starts crying. She didn't want to leave home, she said. She misses her family. But some adult decided that because the administration's policies are luring people here with the promise that they will most likely be able to stay, then people are coming and the children are not afraid of violence in their home country. Some adults may be. But they are adults making decisions to subject a beautiful child like that and so many of the others that our border patrolmen are processing, our border patrolmen and -women are processing out there, especially in the McAllen sector, which is a rough area.

It was interesting seeing my first tarantula in the wild. I have seen plenty of rattlesnakes before in that area of Texas, but I haven't seen any in the last month that I have been down there. I know they are there. The border patrolmen tell me they are there. But I had never seen a tarantula in the wild like that. It was interesting.

But parents are choosing to send their children, bring their children, in some cases put their children in the hands of drug cartel human traffickers hoping that the tremendous money they pay will get them to the United States rather than make them sex slaves. Some make it, some don't. Some die on the way. Some are raped. Some are abused. And it is all because there is what, under the civil law, might be called an attractive nuisance.

We learned in law school that if you have a swimming pool and you have no fence and a child comes over and drowns in your pool because you didn't have a fence, then you would be liable for civil damages for having an attractive nuisance that lured a child to his or her death. Well, this administration has created an attractive nuisance under civil law.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know the United States is not a nuisance. It has been a force for good because it has applied the laws of the Judeo-Christian heritage. That is why George Washington, in the resignation he sent to the 13 Governors, as the first and only general commander to have led the military in revolution, won the revolution, and then resigned and went home, asking nothing further.

But at the end of his resignation that he sent out to the Governors, he had a prayer for the Nation, praying that he hoped we would never forget those who have served in the field. And I am grateful that both sides of the aisle repeatedly are grateful to our military for their service.

I have, in past years, heard someone say, you know, no liberal ever spit at anybody in uniform. Well, they just don't know; because I served 4 years in the Army after Vietnam, and it was not a good time to be in the Army as far as accolades for your service. I have been spit at.

And when I went through basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, there was a standing order from our commander going through training that we were not to ever wear our uniform off post because—though Kansas is one of the greatest States there is, with wonderful people—there were people who didn't like the military. And if they found you as one or two together, then you would likely get beat up.

□ 1800

They had had instances, and we were ordered—that is what we were told—we were ordered not to ever wear uniforms off post or in basic. Every now and then, even at Fort Benning, Georgia, there would be indications, orders, don't be wearing your uniform off post this weekend. So it was not a good time. And I thank God that people have realized the importance and value of our United States military men and women who take an oath and are willing to lay down their lives for their friends and for their fellow Americans.

But government has a different position from individuals. And that is why some Christians get confused and say, well, I am a Christian. I am supposed to turn the other cheek. I am supposed to love my fellow man. I am supposed to reach out and help sojourners. All of that is true. The beatitudes that Jesus gave are the kinds of things we need to be doing for anyone who is a Christian, and I would humbly submit for anybody who is an atheist, Buddhist. Buddhists practice many of the beatitudes and are very noble in doing so. But for a government, it is different.

The government's role, even when it is composed of Christians, is to make sure that the law is enforced fairly and impartially. Romans talks about the government being an agent for good, for encouraging good, but if you do evil, be afraid because the government is not given the sword in vain. If you do evil, the government is not supposed to turn the other cheek. It is supposed to apply the law fairly across the board.

So when an adult child of one of the wealthier families in all of east Texas who was before my court—and my predecessor had repeatedly given her probation—I couldn't give her probation because I knew I would not do that to anyone else in her situation. So I sent her to prison because I had to be fair and impartial despite knowing the parents, the family, and knowing that that family brought most of my contributors, the biggest contributors I had, into my courtroom the day of sentencing.

Well, it would be nice to do special favors for friends, and I realized that day there may be nobody in this courtroom that ever supports me for office again, and if that is the way it is, so be it. But I had faith in my friends that they would understand. Some didn't, most did. But it is the job of the government to apply the law fairly across the board, whether it is a very wealthy person, as the girl I sentenced, or whether it is someone of no means whatsoever, the law is supposed to be applied impartially.

In that case, it was some years later, I heard that she had served her time and been released and that she got involved in her father's business, but he had passed away while she was in prison. I knew her parents hated my guts and would probably never speak to me again, but I had heard she got off drugs, cleaned up her act, got involved in the family business after she got out, and was doing well.

When I was walking the neighborhood, I walked by the parents' house. And I thought, well, they may still hate me, but I want to let them know how proud I am of their daughter that has gotten out of prison, has gotten drugs under control and was clean and sober. I knocked on the door. It took a while for her mom to come to the door. Eventually she did. I didn't realize her sight had gotten so bad. She asked who it was. I said, it is LOUIE GOHMERT, and

she immediately opened the door and said, please, please come in and sit down.

We sat down there in the foyer of their beautiful home. She said, I feel a bit guilty. And I said, I don't know why you would feel guilty. She said, because I owed you an apology and a thank you. And I said, you don't owe me anything. I just stopped by to tell—I was hoping your daughter would be here to let her know how proud I am that she was able to overcome her addiction. I know it is a daily fight, but that she is doing so well. I just wanted to encourage. I was hoping you didn't still hate me like I knew you once did. And she said, no, my husband and I were visiting our daughter. In one of our trips to see her in prison, we realized you gave us our daughter back. You saved her life.

I didn't do anything special. I just stood up to those who wanted me to act partially and give special favor to very wealthy friends. I couldn't do that as a judge because I had the role of government. I had to treat people impartially and fairly across the board, and that is what I did.

Someone once raised the issue that perhaps judges—and I know they had gotten it at a seminar—raised the issue that maybe your judge—since judges, even though they don't select the grand jurors, they select the grand jury foreman, the one that leads the grand jury—raised the issue, especially in death penalty cases, that judges have been unfair racially and that there would be racial disparity in their appointments.

So I got a subpoena to appear to talk about my appointments. But then the criminal defense lawyer got my grand jury records and found that there was a great racial disparity in my appointments of grand jury foremen, men and women both, that I had appointed, and the great racial disparity was that I had appointed significantly more African Americans to be grand jury foremen, men and women, given the racial components of our district. And so I was notified I was no longer needed and was not wanted to testify.

Well, I didn't pick grand jury foremen because of their skin color. I could have cared less. I looked at all of those people, the 12 that were on the grand jury each time—and I knew so many of them—and I picked people I knew were upright, good, and smart leaders. And each time I selected grand jury foremen, I would ultimately have people come to me that were on the grand jury individually and say, you really made a good choice of your grand jury foreman.

Well, it was because I did so fairly and impartially without any regard for their status in the community. They were good people, they were leaders, and I knew they would do a good job leading the grand jury without regard to their race, creed, color, national origin, or gender. It didn't matter. It was who would be the best. That is what government is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, it breaks down a government's effectiveness when the leaders of a government use partiality to make decisions. It may have been humorous, but, as it is often said, humor usually has a little element of truth, but I sarcastically and cynically sent out a tweet yesterday that since basically we knew the President—according to the United States CIS, they said that the President had given amnesty to 553,000 or so people who were here illegally, and that there had recently been another surge, we were told by sources like The New York Times, of another 300,000, and then we hear yesterday that 38 people were being deported. And so my cynical tweet was, in essence, that the Obama administration had dramatically lowered the chances of anyone coming in illegally being able to stay from 100 percent to 99.9955 percent, and that should scare people.

Dana Loesch responded that the administration must have found 38 Republicans, which is rather funny and amusing. But the little element of truth is that this administration has been partial, and they have been unfair.

This administration, through its Internal Revenue Service, has gone after conservatives and Republicans even to the point of demanding to know the contents of their prayers and demanding to know information they had no business knowing. Actually, they were violating the law and committing crimes by turning over information to other entities. That was a violation of the law, and they did so knowingly. Crimes have been committed, and it is important we have a special prosecutor because this Attorney General has made clear his Justice Department is about ''just us.'' It is more a Department of Injustice.

So it is time to make a change.

Through all of this, the story yesterday from The Hill, by Alexander Bolton:

> Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Democrat from Nevada, on Tuesday asserted the southern border is secure despite the massive surge of illegal minors from Central America that has overwhelmed federal agencies. ''The border is secure,'' he told reporters after the Senate Democrats' weekly policy lunch. Senator Martin Heinrich, Democrat from New Mexico, talked to the caucus today. He is a border State Senator. He said he can say without any equivocation the border is secure.

Well, it is not. And anybody who will be fair and impartial and with the least semblance of objectivity who has eyes to see and ears to hear will go to the border, as I have a number of times now, and find the border is not secure. That is how you have 550,000 people that this President gives amnesty to.

Then this article from NetRight Daily by Robert Romano:

> Last September, the National Council of La Raza issued comments in favor of a Department of Housing and Urban Development regulation. Under the regulation, in October the Obama administration will be empowered to condition eligibility for community development block grants on redrawing zoning maps to create evenly distributed neighborhoods based on racial composition and income.

Mr. Speaker, this article is exactly what I am talking about. The Bible warns against, and wise people throughout time have warned against, if you want to have peace in a nation, you must have a leader or a government that is fair and impartial across the board, that you do not look at people's race, you don't look at their income, you do as I had to do to that very rich lady when I sent her to prison. Why? She was white, and she was rich. But I knew anybody else in her circumstance I would have sent to prison, so I sent her. That is why perhaps she was able to turn her life around.

□ 1815

One of the saddest things I ever heard during a sentencing was during her sentencing. They put on quite a dog and pony show, some impressive evidence about the family and the upbringing and she never really had discipline growing up, never had to make up her bed, study for school, and all kinds of things.

At the end of the hearing her lawyer basically said: Is there anything left you want to tell the judge?

She looked up at me with tears in her eyes because she knew what I was going to do because I was going to do what I would do to anybody in her situation with the priors she had, the chances she had already had, she looked up at me with tears in her eyes and said: I just wish someone had told me no before today and meant it.

It was tragic. Nobody had told her no before today. She was raised so wealthy. She said I was the first one who ever told her no because I was being fair and impartial and treating her like any other defendant.

Well, this government, this administration, wants to look and be unfair and partial and make decisions based on the color of people's skin, rather than on the content of the character, and in fact, this administration is taking us away from the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr.

He is the one who said those fantastic words. He had a dream, and part of the dream was that people would be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

We have made so much progress in America, and the President that went abroad and criticized America for being divisive, he has divided this country

more than any President in my lifetime—along gender lines, along racial lines—by playing partial politics.

It looks, from this article, as if it is going to happen again:

In 2012, HUD dispersed about $3.8 billion of these grants to almost 1,200 municipalities.

According to La Raza's comment in favor of the regulation, Hispanic families often do not know their housing rights and have cited fear of deportation as reason for not reporting rights violations.

This is telling. By La Raza's own analysis, then, HUD implementation of the racial rezoning rule will benefit those who have cited fear of deportation—that is, low-skilled, low-income illegal immigrants, either those who are outright illegal the moment they set foot in the United States or who have simply overstayed their visas. After all, who else would fear deportation?

Therefore, one of the sure effects of HUD's regime will be to flood unwilling communities with a significant percentage of illegal immigrants.

While the current relocation of thousands, including children, from detention centers on the U.S.-Mexico border has garnered national headlines and the ire of elected Republicans, including Senator Mark Kirk, Republican of Illinois, and Governor Dave Heineman, Republican of Nebraska, the HUD regulation has largely flown under the radar.

But it is every bit as important. It is not enough to arbitrarily implement amnesty, whether through refusal to enforce existing law or congressional action. The Federal Government wants to draw the maps of where the new residents will live, forcing local communities to make room whether they like it or not.

It is no secret that Republicans, with their low tax message, tend to do better among the middle and upper middle classes, while Democrats with their social welfare regime tend to do better among the poor. The political effect of the HUD rule will invariably be to gerrymander Republican districts at the local level.

Take a Republican State like Texas as a prime example of how this might work. Houston, currently controlled by Democrats, has accepted $38.5 million of these community development block grants. Harris County has accepted another $10.3 million. Dallas, another Democratic stronghold, has accepted $16.6 million, and Dallas County took $2.1 million. Austin, too controlled by Democrats, took $7.5 million of the grants.

Republicans at the State level cannot block these grants going to these municipalities, and now, thanks to the HUD rule, by virtue of accepting these grants, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., will get to redraw zoning maps along racial and income boundaries to include more affordable ''units and combat discrimination.''

It has all the hallmarks of a master plan. Too conspiratorial? It does not take a cynic to see who the winners and losers will be in implement the racial housing quotas.

In the case of La Raza and illegal immigration amnesty proponents, the likely beneficiaries of the HUD rezoning rule will be Democrat parties across the country. Both U.S. and immigrant-born Hispanics favor Democrats by nearly 2 to 1, according to Gallup.

What emerges is a plan to resettle as many as 20 million illegal immigrants in specific communities as a pretext to tilt the political scales on the national and local political scenes to favor Democrats.

Fortunately, the House of Representatives has already acted, passing an amendment to the Transportation and HUD Appropriations bill by Representative Paul Gosar, Republican of Arizona, in a close 219 to 207 vote to defund implementation of the regulation.

Anyway, I keep coming back to true peace in a country can come from a government that treats everyone impartially, and the great genius of America has been free enterprise, the ability of somebody like DARRELL ISSA that is a captain in the United States Army, who comes up with a brilliant idea of a door lock that would go up and down automatically, which idea was apparently stolen, as I recall, and then he figures, well, I can spend 20 years in litigation or so, or if I can come up with something smart then—I can come up with something else smart, and he comes up with the idea of the automatic car alarm, and my friend DARRELL has done quite well with that.

This is America. It is the genius of American free enterprise. Let people profit when they have good ideas, when they work hard and do well. America is a stronger place to be.

But the results of failing to enforce the law fairly and impartially as it is written, also brought about this headline today from Breitbart, ''Released Alien from Border Crisis Arrested for Alleged Murder, Kidnapping in Texas.''

An illegal immigrant who was released by U.S. authorities with a notice to appear has been arrested for the alleged murder of a woman and kidnapping of children on U.S. soil. The alleged crimes occurred after the man was released.

It goes on in the article and talks about the AP actually reported this, but they neglected to say the man was an illegal alien. It is time for the AP, for the media, for this administration, to start following and enforcing the law, and this country will be a better place in which to live.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor now because of a serious concern, a deadly concern even, that the people of my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois, the citizens of the great city of Chicago, and indeed those from around our country, that they are experiencing and that they are witnessing, and that is the preponderance of violence, killings, young people killing each other, and innocent bystanders shot down on the streets of my city.

They leave victims of gun violence perpetrated by young men, older citizens, retirees, victims of gun violence in my city.

One will get the notion that the name attributed to my city is apropos, that it is a worthy name, Chiraq, a nickname that has been associated with my city.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to say that this great city that I love, these people—worthy people of the First Congressional District, these hardworking Americans who have contributed greatly to the greatness of this Nation, they don't live in a place called Chiraq. Chiraq is not apropos.

We wholeheartedly and determinedly resist and repudiate any references to our city with the inappropriate—grossly inappropriate name of Chiraq. We don't embrace Chiraq and none of its implications.

Yes, there is a focus on the violence that occurs in our city, but, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this functionality in Chicago and in other places across the country is a direct result of decades-long failed governmental policies, failed public policies, policies that have emanated out of this very institution, this Federal Government, policies that have emanated out of State capitals all across this Nation and city halls, village halls, all across this Nation, decades-long.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about just the vestiges of slavery and that dark period of American history. We are not just speaking about segregation and all of the abuses and all of the trauma that segregation has caused upon African Americans.

□ 1830

We are not just talking about Jim Crow laws that were a result of public policies. Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about all of the policies that emanated out of this institution, the housing policies in my very city that until the seventies denied African Americans in my city to actually acquire a mortgage which was and still is the foundation of a middle class lifestyle, a foundation for the American Dream. Without the ability to get a mortgage, to own a home, the American Dream becomes an American nightmare.

That is what we have experienced over these last decades—structural inequities, structural discrimination. Mr. Speaker, I am here to say this evening that there are three d's that define the structural inequities, structural problems in my city and other cities across this Nation.

At the foundation of the violence that we are witnessing today—and I would just plead with anyone in this Chamber, anyone who is viewing this today in any capacity, on any platform throughout the Nation, please do not mistake anything that I say or feel as being an attempt to coddle criminals, to somehow give a sense of relief to those who are killing innocent people in our communities. They are just as

wrong as they could ever be, and I am not in any way trying to give them cover.

But if we want to get some real answers, then we are going to have to ask some real questions. Know ye the truth, the Bible says, and it shall set you free.

The truth of the matter is that this violence can be summed up for the most part in terms of its causes by these three d's.

Discrimination. Years and years, decades and decades of discrimination. Discrimination that has denied hard-working Americans access to the best that this Nation can provide. Discrimination not of the southern type, more subtle, more insidious, even in some ways more deadly than anything that the Ku Klux Klan could ever devise. This subtle institutional discrimination that has been a part of the culture in my city for too long and that takes on different characteristics is able to mask itself. Even with the good intentions of some of our friends, some people who will recall at the assault, that they might have mistakenly involved themselves at some point in time in being a part of the problem rather than a part of the solution.

Discrimination is alive and well in my city, even today. The hopelessness that young people find themselves facing and embracing here in the year 2014 in this Nation, the hopelessness just completely engulfs their very existence. Every waking hour, they are confronted every day of the week, every week of the month, every month of the year. Year by year by year by year they are faced with total despair and utter hopelessness that erupts and stands tall in this institutional framework that is built upon discrimination. Discrimination rises up and causes all types of dysfunction in those who are discriminated against. Discrimination, the first d.

Discrimination leads very quickly to disinvestment, the second d. You can discriminate against a community, against a people, and thereby you can disinvest in those communities—on the south side and the west side and the north side of the city, particularly on the south and the west side. My friend Congressman DAVIS is here and he can speak very, very appropriately and eloquently to the discrimination of people on the west side of the city.

But the disinvestment, the stark disinvestment can't be denied. These patterns of disinvestment in our schools, in our business districts, in our housing, in our recreational opportunities, in our parks, on our streets, this rampant disinvestment decades long has led to a sense of frustrated rage. When there is no way out for families, for neighbors, for neighborhoods, for communities, then psychologists will tell you that violence is a byproduct of that failure to believe and to hope and to be assured that you have a future, that you have a stake. Life loses its meaning when there is no significant and righteous investment in the future of any of our citizens, particularly those who are young and those who have easy access to guns.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the National Rifle Association on this one matter: guns don't kill people; people kill people. But I disagree with them, and I want to take it a little further, because that is only one side of the coin. We are not just talking about people. We are talking about a hopeless people. People without hope for the future. Anybody, regardless of race, creed, color, sex, or nationality, anybody when you are caught, caged into a corner with no hope of getting out, you are going to turn violent. That is a part of the human makeup. Your violence is going to be directed to somebody. So the NRA, if it is going to be truthful, then it just cannot deal with any kind of people. It has got to deal more pointedly at people who have no hope.

This disinvestment has led to staggering intergenerational unemployment. The bottom didn't fall out of the economy on the west side and the south side of the city of Chicago in '07, '08, and '09. The bottom fell out 25 years ago, 50 years ago, and it never has been repaired. There is no safety net in my city. It is like a bottomless pit. Generations yet to be born are still facing those desperate conditions, still will face that despair, still will face this gross disinvestment.

Why aren't there jobs in my city for my community, for my district, no light manufacturing?

□ 1845

Why is it that in my city we have to fight the labor unions in order to get employment or labor jobs? Why don't we have summer jobs for young people?

Government policies have created this nightmare, and this nightmare that we find ourselves in keeps getting darker and darker and darker and darker and deadlier and deadlier and deadlier.

Discrimination, disinvestment.

When the mayor of my city stands proudly and takes credit for closing 54 public schools—mostly on the south and west side of the city of Chicago—that is nothing but a continuation of the decades-long disinvestment in good quality schools.

If you look back at the history of my city, some of my most ferocious battles with the powers that be centered around the inequities in the public school system. Dropouts are produced at an alarming rate in my city because of the disinvestment in public education.

Discrimination is the first d, and disinvestment is the second d.

And then, Mr. Speaker, in recent times, we have seen rampant, gross depopulation of my city. Poor people have been almost run out of my city. Public housing is a failed public policy in my city.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what happened.

Yes, there were mammoth public housing developments in my city. Some we pejoratively called ''projects.'' Yes, there were a lot of social ills associated with public housing or projects, and some of those public housing buildings needed to be restructured, demolished, or redesigned. But unlike New York City, which took its public housing developments and invested money in those developments, my city didn't.

What you had, Mr. Speaker, are former residents of public housing pushed into struggling lower, middle class communities; and that is when the disruption of those heretofore struggling middle class communities could not sustain themselves against this avalanche of former public housing residents into those areas, and those communities started experiencing extreme dysfunctionality.

There is one beat in my city, beat 624. This is the most violent beat in the city of Chicago. In recent years, two police officers were killed in that beat. Day-to-day violence occurs in that beat. Six weeks ago, a brilliant special education teacher who worked part-time as a real estate agent stopped by temporarily to drop some forms off in her office on West 79th Street and lost her life. She was shot in the head by a stray bullet fired in beat 624.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. Beat 624 is in the heart of a community known as Chatham. When I was a young man growing up, Chatham was the model of middle class lifestyle for the African American community. It was exalted in many ways. Everybody thought that living in Chatham was the place to be. When you lived in Chatham, you lived in nice homes with manicured lawns, clean streets, garages, homes, good schools, a good business district, safe communities, and stable communities.

This was the Chatham of my youth. But that Chatham is a long-ago memory now because of the disinvestment and because of the failed public housing policies that emanated out of this Federal Government.

Discrimination, disinvestment, and lastly, depopulation.

I grew up in an area called Cabrini-Green. It no longer exists. Gentrification has conquered the community of Cabrini-Green, and it is well on its way to conquering other communities.

The public dollars over these last 20 or 30 years—maybe even longer than that—have been away from the communities and toward The Loop and the businesses around The Loop.

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

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to yield to Mr. RUSH.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank my friend, Congressman DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in the central business district of Chicago, or The Loop as it is known far and wide, there is a close-in circle around The Loop. They have created three communities. One is called the Near North Side, where public dollars and enormous investments have occurred. This is the area that used to house Cabrini-Green, the Near North Side.

In recent times, we have had gentrification occur in the Near West Side. When I was a young man growing up in Chicago, there was never such a community, never such a time, never such an identity called the Near West Side.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is now something called the Near South Side.

All of these are gems of gentrification. But if you go further west, further south, you see a stark difference in Englewood and Garfield Park. You see a stark difference in capital investments in these communities, where hopelessness and despair dominate the lives and the thoughts and the culture.

That is where the violence emanates from. Unless we deal with these issues, we will never, ever be able to deal with the violence and the increasing murders that are everyday news in the city that I love, the city of Chicago.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank you, Mr. RUSH, for calling this Special Order this evening to put a different kind of light on the whole question and the whole issue of violence in Chicago, which is really the center point of America.

Those of us who live in Chicago say that: So goes Chicago, so goes America.

When I came to Chicago, it was known as the jobs capital of America. Everyplace that you looked, there were help wanted signs. You could find a job. As a matter of fact, the word was that if you couldn't find a job in Chicago, there were basically no jobs for you.

And so I agree with you, Representative RUSH, that the absence of hope is a part of the formula for violence. And if you never ask the right questions, of course, you never get the right answers.

□ 1900

There are those who talk about law enforcement, more police officers. I have even heard people talk about bringing in the National Guard and bringing in paramilitary outfits. Those are not really the solutions. The solutions are to provide people with hope because, if they have hope, then they don't find or feel the necessity for certain kinds of action.

There used to be so many businesses in the district that I represent. Over the last 50 or more years, we have lost more than 100,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs. When Representative RUSH talks about disinvestment, when business and industry decided to leave—Sears, Roebuck; Hotpoint, Motorola, General Electric—what is now Navistar—International Harvester, Allied Radio, Spiegel, Montgomery Ward—all of those entities were in the neighborhood where I lived and worked. I could just walk down the streets and see them. Western Electric was not far from where I lived. You could see hundreds of people going to and from work every morning when you woke up. Of course, things split off, and all of that changed.

Chicago used to just beckon people and jobs to come to Chicago. As a matter of fact, blues singers would have songs of going to Chicago. ''Sorry, but I can't take you.'' They were like the pied piper—people were coming. Then, as so many people came and as communities and neighborhoods began to change and as some people began to leave and others would come, there were levels of deterioration. I remember the riots that occurred after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. Many of those areas that suffered the aftermath of the riots have never been rebuilt. They are the same today as they were in the 1960s when the riots occurred. Nobody has been willing to invest in the redevelopment of those communities. Not only did housing deteriorate, but the social service structure that existed also left.

When BOBBY talked about disinvestment, there was every kind that one could imagine. In some of those communities, it is hard to find a Boy Scout troop. It is difficult to find the resources for a Girl Scout program or for activities that individuals can be engaged in after school. Yes, there is a level of violence, but there is an even deeper level of hopelessness. Without hope, it is like people being pressed up against the wall—pressed up against nowhere—trying to figure out how they get out.

I can tell you that, wherever darkness exists, there is light that comes, so I think that there are, indeed, solutions. What are the solutions? Job creation. Job creation. Job creation.

If we look at history, when times were difficult during the 1930s, there was the utilization of the Federal Government as a resource to create work opportunities, with the understanding that, if people are working, they are reinvesting because they are paying taxes, they are spending money, they are exchanging services and goods with each other. That also gives a boost to the economy. I never take the position that wherever we are that that is where we have to be.

Gun control legislation. Let me tell you that the people shooting don't necessarily make the guns. People who are shooting don't necessarily sell the guns. The people who are shooting actually acquire the guns from someplace and somebody else. If we could take away some of the opportunities for the guns to exist—I remember a song I used to listen to about a place called Black Mountain, and part of the lyrics said: ''I am going to Black Mountain with my razor and my gun. I am going to find that man of mine, shoot him if he stands still and cut him if he runs.'' If you have got to run after somebody, that is a little more difficult than being able to have an Uzi with which you drive by and mow him down. I don't know when we are going to get really serious in this country about diminishing the number of guns that people have access to.

I was disappointed when the Supreme Court said that people could actually carry weapons. That is one thing in some communities, in some places, but I can tell you that is another thing in other communities and other places. I would hate to go into a situation where I felt that everybody there who wanted to was carrying a weapon because he had the right to carry a concealed weapon.

I used to be on the Chicago City Council, and many of the people there were former police officers. Plus, you could carry a gun anyway because you were considered law enforcement. Sometimes, when you would go to lunch, you would see a number of people who might take their jackets off, and you would see a number of guns and weapons. You almost might be too afraid to eat. It would kind of take away lunch because all of these weapons were around.

I would urge our country to be willing to make the kind of investments that you must make. They are not spending. There is a difference between spending and investing. If you just spend, you don't necessarily get a return, but when you invest wisely, you expect a return. We need to invest in education. We need to invest in more social development activity, and we need to reinvest in urban communities like those on the southwest side and near-north sides and suburban areas of Chicago.

Congressman RUSH, I thank you again and commend you for calling for this Special Order, but I have got a feeling that, where there is life, there is hope, and I have a feeling that we will arrest the violence problem, not only in Chicago, but in other places throughout America. I am pleased to join with you this evening and share a few moments in talking about the issue.

Mr. RUSH. Thank you so much, Congressman DAVIS.

I know that you have a response to what I am going to say because I am sure you share the same feeling.

I talked about discrimination earlier, and there is one aspect of discrimination that is probably of little notice. You have these youngsters in your community and in my community—in your district and in my district—and they are shepherded, to a great extent, to these prisons across the State. Most of these prisons are located in small towns, and these prisons are the economic engines for these small towns.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. They are part of the economy.

Mr. RUSH. So young people inside the city of Chicago, in your district and in my district, are actually the raw material of a lifestyle—a middle class lifestyle—for these small towns that surround these prisons because they are in the prisons, and their families and parents are working for the prisons. Their college educations are paid for by their salaries from the prisons, as are their homes, their mortgages. So they are creating an economic boon for these small towns, but we are suffering all of the issues.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. There is no doubt about it. I took 31 children to see their fathers in prison on the Saturday before Father's Day, and I can tell you that it was one of the most emotional gatherings that I have ever participated in.

We have got to put a stop to it, and we have got to start counting individuals not in the places they are imprisoned but in the communities that they come from so that the resources go back to those communities and not to the places where they are imprisoned.

Again, I thank you for shedding light this evening and for my being able to join you. We will just have to keep working on the issue, and I think we will get to the bottom of it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of giving me the opportunity to acquire time that had not been acquired before, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of the Stay family in Houston, Texas.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6439. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6440. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Howard B. Brombreg, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6441. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral William H. McRaven, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6442. A letter from the Secretary, Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of mobilizations of select Reserve units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6443. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Inventory of Contracts for Services for the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6444. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Acting, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Benona, Township et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8339] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6445. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility Massachusetts: Acton, Town of Middlesex County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8335] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6446. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Transnet SOC Limited (Transnet) of Johannesburg, South Africa; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6447. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Capital Planning and Stress Testing (RIN: 3133-AE27) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6448. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Limitations on Guaranteed Benefits; Shutdown and Similar Benefits (RIN: 1212-AB18) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6449. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, ''High-Performance Green Building Initiative Activities''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6450. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6451. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2013 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6452. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6453. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6454. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for the Northern Mexican Gartersnake and Narrow-headed Gartersnake [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0071] (RIN: 1018-AY23) received June, 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6455. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2014 Summer Flounder Specifications; 2015 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Specifications [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD094) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6456. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2013 Wiretap Report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AD52) received May 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6458. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1021] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6459. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1031; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-17854; AD 2014-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6460. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopter [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0697; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-009-AD; Amendment 39-17862; AD 2014-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6461. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Redmond, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0171; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-6] received July 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6462. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bois Blanc Island, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0986; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-25] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6463. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crandon, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0022; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-31] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6464. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newnan, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0097; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-4] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6465. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Conway, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0178; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWS-23] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6466. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0914; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-29] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6467. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30959; Amdt. No. 3591] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6468. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30962; Amdt. No. 3594] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6469. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30960; Amdt. No. 3596] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6470. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30961; Amdt. No. 3593] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6471. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by Agusta Westland S.p.A) (Agusta) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0336; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-063-AD; Amendment 39-17857; AD 2014-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6472. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Longevity Annuity Contracts [TD 9673] (RIN: 1545-BK23) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, ''Response to Findings and Recommendations of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC) during Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

6474. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

6475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4871. A bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5119. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C-130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5120. A bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5121. A bill to prohibit the indefinite detention of United States citizens and lawful resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to clarify the eligibility requirements with respect to railroad Hours of Service employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5123. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to implement country-of-origin disclosure requirements with respect to motor vehicle fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5124. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5125. A bill to promote unlicensed spectrum use in the 5 GHz band, to maximize the use of the band for shared purposes in order to bolster innovation and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5126. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of any Federal agency for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the agency for the previous fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5127. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5128. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 671. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 672. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

263. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 62 urging the Congress to enact the bills currently introduced to address sexual harassment and assault in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

264. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 382 urging the Congress to approve the President's budget proposal to provide $35 million to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

265. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 declaring if a state opts out of a federal program, the state should not have to contribute state dollars to the federal program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 5120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the forgoing powers.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12;

''The Congress shall have the power to ... raise and support armies...

Congress has the power to set the rules for the actions of US military forces, including their ability to detain individuals.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13;

''To provide and maintain a navy''

Congress has the power to set the rules for the actions of US military forces, including their ability to detain individuals.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18;

''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

Congress has the power to make laws to carry out the powers in Clause 12 and Clause 13 of Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power... ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 5128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 279: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 543: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 594: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 676: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 713: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 792: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 958: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 962: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1015: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1024: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1070: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1201: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1278: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1339: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1563: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1695: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1696: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1761: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1771: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1795: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1827: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1893: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2028: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VELA, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2144: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2398: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2453: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2529: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2536: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2607: Mr. HOLT and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2646: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2656: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2673: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2780: Mr. JOLLY and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2847: Mr. POLIS and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2901: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2902: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3136: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3367: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3654: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3833: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 3857: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3867: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3992: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CHU, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4143: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R 4156: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4325: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4399: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 4411: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 4421: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4449: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4450: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4511: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 4567: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 4574: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4577: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4578: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 4589: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 4594: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 4613: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 4614: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4623: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 4630: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 4651: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4682: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. REED, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 4698: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4706: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4709: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4716: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4782: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 4851: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4854: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4878: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 4885: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4906: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 4930: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4936: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4960: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4966: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4970: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4971: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4993: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4999: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 5000: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5014: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 5051: Mr. KIND and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 5052: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 5069: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 5077: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 5078: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 5081: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5084: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5089: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 5095: Ms. HAHN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ENYART.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 411: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 440: Mr. HOYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 456: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 508: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 596: Mr. KLINE, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 601: Mr. MCALLISTER and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 623: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 640: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 650: Mrs. LUMMIS.

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 16, 2014*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we worship You, for Your loving-kindness, truth, and faithfulness sustain us. Though You are high, You respect the lowly. So today infuse our Senators with the spirit of lowliness and humility. Give them the wisdom to know that You give grace to the humble but oppose the proud. May their humility bring them that reverential awe that leads to honor and life. Lord, help them to remember that America's greatness comes not from the swagger of might but from the lowliness of that righteousness which exalts any nation. Guide our lawmakers with Your wisdom and uphold them with Your might.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2609 AND H.R. 5021

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2609) to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings regarding these bills at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Ronnie L. White to be a United States district judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. The debate will be until 10:15 a.m. Senators GRASSLEY, CORNYN, and SHAHEEN will control 10 minutes each of that time and Senator MCCASKILL will control any remaining time.

We have moved the time up, and I appreciate very much the cooperation of the Republicans because this is so one of our Senators can attend the funeral of one of his best friends. But we are not going to extend the time past 10:15 a.m. In light of that I am not going to give any statement today. If cloture is invoked, we will have a 12:20 p.m. vote.

Upon disposition of the White nomination, the Senate will resume legislative session and proceed to the motion to proceed to S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act. The time until 2:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with each side controlling 5 minutes of the final 10 minutes. At 2:10 p.m. the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between 3:30 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. be under Republican control and the time between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be an all-Senators briefing at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon, and it is all related to the emergency supplemental request to address the child and adult migration from Central America to the Southwest border.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

PROTECTING EVERYONE'S RIGHTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Members of Congress do not always see eye-to-eye on everything. It is fairly obvious. There are often strong and principled disagreements about taxes, the size and scope of government, ObamaCare, foreign policy—you name it. But let's be clear: When it comes to decisions about contraception, both parties believe a woman should be able to make her own decisions.

Now, some on the other side would like to pretend otherwise. They think they can score political points and create divisions where there are not any by distorting the facts. And that is why their increasingly outlandish claims—claims one nonpartisan fact-checker described as ''simply wrong''—just keep getting debunked. Even worse, our friends on the other side are now on record as saying we should protect the freedoms of some while stripping away the freedoms of others.

Republicans continue to insist that we can and should be in the business of protecting everyone's rights. We think that, instead of restricting Americans' religious freedoms, Congress should instead work to preserve a woman's ability to make contraception decisions for herself. And the legislation Senator AYOTTE, FISCHER, and I filed yesterday would do just that.

The Preserving Religious Freedom and a Woman's Access to Contraception Act would clarify that an employer cannot block an employee from legal access to her FDA-approved contraceptives. It is a commonsense proposal. It reaffirms that we can both

preserve America's long tradition of tolerance and respect for people of faith while at the same time preserving a woman's ability to make her own decisions about contraception.

Our bill would also ask the FDA to study whether contraceptives could be made available to adults safely without a prescription. And it would allow women to set aside more money in their flexible spending accounts so they can cover out-of-pocket medical expenses, many of which are skyrocketing under ObamaCare.

So if Democrats are serious about doing right by women—if they are not just interested in stoking divisions in an election year—then they should get on board with our legislation. That is a start. And then they can work with us to undo the damage their policies—like ObamaCare—have already caused to millions—millions—of middle-class women.

Research shows that American women make about 80 percent of the health care decisions for their families. Yet, thanks to ObamaCare, millions of women lost the health insurance plans they had and they liked—causing enormous disruptions in their lives and in the lives of their families.

When women first spoke out about the betrayal they felt when they lost their plans, Washington Democrats said their plans were ''junk'' or worse, that they were lying, because Democratic politicians thought they knew better than all of these people we were hearing from. It was insulting to many, including one constituent who wrote to me from Woodford County. She described herself as a ''lifelong self-employed professional'' who ''shopped hard'' for a policy that she liked and wanted to keep. Here is what she said after Washington Democratic policies overruled her own personal choice of a plan:

> The President has referred to my type of policy as ''substandard.'' In fact, it is a good product for people in my situation. It appears that the President does not understand personal finance, and does not trust Americans to choose products that are good for them. He also does not appreciate people like me who are willing to accept personal responsibility for a large part of my own routine medical expenses.

She is not the only one who feels this way, and she is not the only one who has been hurt by ObamaCare.

As a result of ObamaCare, too many women now have fewer choices of doctors and hospitals.

As a result of ObamaCare, millions of Americans—nearly two-thirds of them women—are now at risk of having their hours and their wages reduced.

As a result of ObamaCare, married women can face penalty taxes just for working.

As a result of ObamaCare and other changes by the Obama administration, a woman on Medicare Advantage could see her average benefits reduced by more than $1,500 a year.

And thanks to ObamaCare, millions of women have had their flexible spending accounts limited and can no longer use tax-preferred medical savings to purchase all the medications they use—a wrongheaded policy that the bill we introduced yesterday seeks to address.

But that is just a start. Washington Democrats need to work with us to pass real health reform—actual, patient-centered reform that will not hurt women the way ObamaCare does. Because we have seen the letters from our constituents—letters such as the one I received from a woman in Mount Sterling who says ObamaCare did more than just cause her premiums to nearly double—it might make her medications unaffordable as well: ''I am on three medications, [and] two years ago the copay was $60 for each one,'' she said. ''Now, my medications are costing me a little over $700 a month.''

That is not fair. It is not right. And this is just the kind of challenge both parties should be working together to address.

So let's do away with the false choices. Let's focus on actually helping women instead. Let's work together to boost jobs, wages, and opportunity at a time when women are experiencing so much hardship as a result of this administration's policies.

Republicans have been asking Washington Democrats to do all of this for years now. It is about time they started showing they really care.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RONNIE L. WHITE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:15 a.m. will be controlled as follows: 10 minutes for the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY; 10 minutes for the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN; 10 minutes for the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN; and any remaining time under the control of the Senator from Missouri, Mrs. MCCASKILL.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Senate will vote today to try to end the unjustified filibuster against Judge Ronnie White, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. Many Senators will remember Judge White from 15 years ago, when the Senate denied his confirmation by a partyline vote after an ugly campaign by Republican Senators to caricature him as a jurist who was soft on crime. Today, the Senate has an opportunity to reject that unjust characterization and confirm a well-qualified and principled man who has demonstrated his ability to be a fair judge and who is faithful to the law.

Throughout his exceptional career, Judge White has been a trail blazer in the legal community. In 1995, he became the first African American to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court and later became the first African American to serve as its Chief Justice. He previously served for 2 years as a judge on the Missouri Court of Appeals. Outside of his distinguished judicial service, Judge White has broad experience in the law, working in private practice as a partner in Missouri-based law firms both before and after his time on the bench, serving as City Counselor and Public Defender for St. Louis, MO and serving as a State representative in the Missouri General Assembly. He has been honored for his achievements and commitment to public service by organizations such as the Federal Defense Bar of the Eastern District of Missouri and the St. Louis branch of the NAACP.

I supported Judge White when he was first nominated to the U.S. District Court and I support him now. In 1999, by the time the Senate voted on his nomination, Judge White had upheld the implementation of the death penalty 41 times as a state Supreme Court justice. Yet, then-Senator Ashcroft of Missouri claimed Judge White was ''soft on crime'' and was ''the most anti-death penalty judge on the Missouri Supreme Court.'' These claims should have been easily dismissed years ago, and should be easily dismissed today.

Judge White's nomination is supported by law enforcement, legal professionals, and the civil rights community. The elected President of the Missouri Fraternal Order of Police, Kevin Ahlbrand, wrote on behalf of his organization's 5,400 members: ''As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial. . . . We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.'' I ask consent that this letter, and others, be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Unfortunately, rather than admit that they made a mistake in voting against Judge White's nomination before, some Senators are now saying

they may oppose his nomination because in 2003 he joined the Missouri Supreme Court's majority opinion in Simmons v. Roper holding that the Eight Amendment prohibits the execution of individuals who commit a capital crime when they are under 18 years of age. In 2005, in Roper v. Simmons, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed. The criticism, I gather, is that Judge White's decision to join the majority opinion was contrary to then-existing U.S. Supreme Court precedent. While I have heard some Members of the Senate criticize a nominee for having asserted a position that is ultimately rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court, this may be the first time I have heard a nominee criticized for actually getting it right.

At his confirmation hearing earlier this year, Senator MCCASKILL introduced Judge White as someone who ''continues to be a shining star to thousands of Missourians because of his career, which has really been emblematic of hard work, courage, dedication and service to public before self. . . . I can think of no one in the State of Missouri who is more deserving of this appointment to the Federal bench than my friend, Ronnie White.'' I thank Senator MCCASKILL for her leadership in recommending that President Obama nominate Judge White for this position.

Today Senators have an opportunity to right a wrong. This chance is long overdue. I am confident Judge White will serve on the Federal bench with distinction, and with fidelity to our Constitution. I thank the Majority Leader for bringing this nomination up for a vote, and I urge my fellow Senators to vote to defeat this filibuster and to confirm this well qualified nominee without further delay.

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

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
MISSOURI STATE LODGE,
Jefferson City, MO, May 13, 2014.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY, As the elected representative of over 5,400 law enforcement officers across the State of Missouri, I am urging your committee to vote out the nomination of Ronnie White for the open judicial seat in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

We would then be hopeful that the Senate confirms his nomination.

We do not take such stances lightly. As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial.

As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court.

We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

Sincerely,

KEVIN AHLBRAND,
President, Missouri Fraternal Order of Police.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, we write to express our strong support for the nomination of Ronnie L. White to be a U.S. District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. As one of Missouri's leading legal minds, Mr. White has devoted his life to serving the citizens of Missouri. Throughout his career, he has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to enforcing the rule of law with objectivity, thoughtfulness and impartiality, and he would be an outstanding addition to the federal bench. We urge you to vote yes on cloture and yes on his nomination.

Mr. White is eminently qualified, as evidenced by the ''Unanimously Qualified'' rating he received from the American Bar Association and by his long career in service to the public. After graduating from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Law School in 1983, Mr. White worked as a public defender in St. Louis and served three terms in the Missouri House of Representatives. In 1993, he was appointed as City Counselor for the City of St. Louis; the following year, Governor Mel Carnahan appointed him as a judge for the Eastern District of the Missouri Court of Appeals. In 1995, Mr. White became the first African American to sit on the Supreme Court of Missouri, and he served as chief justice from July 2003 to June 2005. He retired from the bench in 2007.

As a judge, Mr. White served with distinction on the Missouri Court of Appeals and the state Supreme Court, gaining a reputation as a fair, intelligent jurist who commanded the respect of his fellow judges. When President Clinton nominated him in 1997 to a seat on the U.S. District Court for Missouri, Mr. White received support from his colleagues on the Supreme Court and many in law enforcement. However, his nomination was defeated in October 1999 in a disappointing party-line vote engineered by then-Senator John Ashcroft.

Mr. Ashcroft led a vigorous smear campaign against Mr. White based on spurious claims about his record as a judge on death penalty cases. For instance, the senator claimed that White voted against the death penalty more than any other judge on the Missouri Supreme Court. But the facts proved otherwise. Of Mr. Ashcroft's seven appointees to the court, four voted to reverse death penalty decisions more often than Mr. White. In fact, Mr. White upheld the majority of death penalty convictions that came before him as a judge, and in the rare case in which he did vote to reverse, the majority were unanimous decisions.

Further, Mr. Ashcroft used false data and misleading interpretations to solicit opposition from law enforcement and to bolster his assertion that Mr. White was ''soft on crime.'' Even so, two major law enforcement groups—the Missouri State Fraternal Order of Police and the Missouri Police Chiefs Association—endorsed White wholeheartedly and refuted the ''soft on crime'' allegation. Carl Wolf, then president of the Missouri Police Chiefs Association, revealed that Mr. Ashcroft had actively solicited opposition from law enforcement groups and that any such opposition was not spontaneous. It is worth pointing out that Mr. White's current nomination has again garnered the endorsement of the Missouri State Fraternal Order of Police.

In the aftermath of the 1999 vote against Mr. White's confirmation, many saw the vilification of him as unfair and the charges against him unfounded. In ''The Smearing of a Moderate Judge,'' Stuart Taylor of The Legal Times wrote: ''In short, the record shows that Judge White takes seriously his duty both to enforce the death penalty and to ensure that defendants get fair trials. It suggests neither that he's 'pro-criminal' nor that he's a liberal activist. What it does suggest is courage. And while White may be more sensitive to civil liberties than his Ashcroft-appointed colleagues are, his opinions also exude a spirit of moderation, care, and candor.'' Ultimately, many in the media viewed the fight as one of political expediency rather than of judging a candidate on the merits. As the Washington Post wrote, ''This vote was politics of the rawest sort. It was the politics of an upcoming Missouri Senate race, in which Sen. Ashcroft apparently intends to use the death penalty as a campaign issue.''

It is apparent that the opposition to Mr. White's previous nomination was baseless and that he fell victim to political posturing. The Leadership Conference believes Mr. White's record makes him an exceptionally qualified nominee with the ability to make objective decisions on the multifaceted and prominent cases that will surely come before the court. His impeccable credentials and the support he has garnered from people across the political spectrum make him an excellent choice for a federal judgeship on the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Missouri. This malicious and unwarranted attack on a unanimously qualified nominee must not happen again.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote in favor of cloture and in favor of his nomination. Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President, at *Zirkin@civilrights.org* or Sakira Cook, Counsel, at *cook@civilrights.org*.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
President and CEO,
NANCY ZIRKIN,
Executive Vice President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here today to express my concerns with the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Hobby Lobby case and the steps we are taking—hopefully, this week—to protect a woman's right to make her own health care decisions. I want to thank Senators MURRAY and UDALL for their leadership on this issue and for introducing the Not My Boss's Business Act.

I appreciate hearing from the Republican leader about their interest in supporting women's access to contraceptive care, and I hope that is something

we can all agree on. But the issue here is not just access to that care, it is the cost of that care. When you charge women more for contraceptive coverage, then you are denying them access to that care.

The legislation that has been introduced by Senators MURRAY and UDALL, and of which I am a cosponsor, will prevent employers from being involved in an employee's health care decisions and it will reverse the Supreme Court's decision.

Throughout my career in office, I have fought to ensure that women have access to important contraceptive services and that women are able to make their own decisions about their health care with their doctors and with their families.

In 1999, when I was Governor of New Hampshire, I signed into law a bipartisan bill that required insurance companies to cover prescription contraceptives—the issue we are debating right now. I signed that law with strong bipartisan support because both Republicans and Democrats knew it was the right thing to do. In fact, that legislation passed in the New Hampshire House with 121 Democratic votes and 120 Republican votes and 2 Independents.

That law, passed in 1999, has now provided thousands of New Hampshire women with the ability to access the medications they and their doctors decide are right for them because they have that insurance coverage to pay for those medications. The Affordable Care Act also established that women would have access to prescription contraceptive services with no copays, just as New Hampshire did in 1999.

Do you know what is interesting? We are having this debate about religious objections. Back in 1999 the legislature appointed a committee to look at whether there were any religious concerns about what we had done. They came back and reported that this was not an issue.

A recent analysis by the Department of Health and Human Services reports that because of the Affordable Care Act, more than 30 million women are now eligible to receive preventive health services, including contraception, with no copays. In fact, since 2013 women have saved nearly $500 million in out-of-pocket costs because of the ACA's requirement to cover contraceptive care.

The Supreme Court's decision has a real financial bearing on women and their families throughout the country because this ruling will have a profound impact on the health and economic security of women throughout this Nation. As noted by Justice Ginsburg in her dissent in the Hobby Lobby case, when high cost is a factor, women are more likely to decide not to pursue certain forms of health care treatments that involve contraceptive care.

There are many reasons why a doctor may decide to prescribe contraceptives for a woman's health care needs. Contraceptives can be used to treat a broad range of medical issues—hair loss, endometriosis, acne, irregular menstrual cycles. Contraceptives have also been shown to reduce the risk of certain cancers. But just a few weeks ago the Supreme Court jeopardized that access to affordable preventive health care for too many women. As a result of the Hobby Lobby case, some employers now have the ability to claim religious objections as a justification for not providing contraceptive health care with no copay.

I understand the host of issues employers face on a daily basis. I appreciate the complexity they face when they decide to offer health insurance coverage to their employees. For example, take Jane Valliere, who owns Hermanos Mexican restaurant in Concord, NH. I recently had the opportunity to sit down with Jane and to discuss the Hobby Lobby case. Jane made it clear that while she has many choices and decisions to make on a daily basis to keep her business running, she never expected to be put in a position where she could be responsible for making a health care decision for her employees at the restaurant.

Like Jane, I do not think it makes sense for employers to make those personal, private health care decisions for their employees. Critical health decisions are simply not an employer's business. Where a woman works should not determine whether she gets insurance coverage that has been guaranteed to her under Federal law.

While we do not yet know the full extent of the impact from this ruling, we do know the Supreme Court's decision turns back progress women across the country have fought for years to achieve.

We must ensure that women have access to the health care services and medications they need. That means making them affordable, that they are able to make their own decisions about their care with their doctors and their families.

Thankfully, we have an opportunity this week to correct the Supreme Court's shortsighted decision. This week the Senate can stand for women and pass the Not My Boss's Business Act. A woman's health care decision should be made with her doctor, with her family, with her faith, not by her employer and with her employer's faith. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, later we will be voting on a judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. I come to the Senate floor today to explain why, regrettably, I am unable to support the nominee.

As my colleagues know, Justice Ronnie White was originally nominated by President Clinton during the 105th Congress. This body voted on and rejected his nomination in 1999. After careful consideration of his record, I voted against Justice White's nomination at that time. Since 1999, Justice White completed a term as chief justice of the Missouri Supreme Court and has returned to private practice. So today I would like to revisit a few aspects of Justice White's legal and judicial career that first led me to vote against his nomination. I will also discuss developments since 1999. Unfortunately, his record since that time has only reinforced my concerns.

First, I begin with some troubling aspects of Justice White's record during his days on the Missouri Supreme Court in the 1990s. I only need to point to a few cases to illustrate my concerns.

In the 1998 Johnson case, Justice White was the sole dissenter on the State's high court. It was a capital appeal case involving a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. The case was heartbreaking. The defendant shot four people to death—three Missouri sheriffs and one of the sheriffs' wives. The facts were stark and very clear-cut. This was not a close case.

The defendant was convicted based upon the overwhelming evidence of his guilt. Justice White conceded there was more than sufficient evidence to sustain the conviction on appeal, but he went out of his way to create a standard that was not based on Missouri law when he evaluated the conduct of the defense attorney. Unsurprisingly, not a single member of the State court agreed with Justice White's dissenting opinion. That is because it was obvious there was no reasonable probability that anything the defense attorney did would have changed the outcome of the trial. That is the applicable legal standard. It is straightforward—very straightforward. In that case, every member of the State supreme court applied it correctly, except Justice White.

Unfortunately, Justice White's dissent in that case was not an isolated example. On a number of other occasions throughout his judicial career, Justice White misapplied standards of review or considered issues that were not germane to the law when he was deciding cases. Justice White has even admitted as much. Discussing his judicial philosophy, he said in 2005 that he thinks it is appropriate for judges to let their opinions be ''shaped by their own life experiences.'' I think the personal characteristics of any judge—what this nominee calls his ''own life experiences''—should play absolutely no role whatsoever in the process of judicial decisionmaking. I know my colleagues on our Judiciary Committee share that view as well.

Let me get back to the nominee's judicial track record. Justice White was the sole dissenter in another case that the Missouri Supreme Court decided in 1997. That case raised the question of whether the defendant was entitled to an additional evidentiary hearing. In his dissent, joined by none of his colleagues, Justice White again ignored a straightforward standard of review and wrote that the defendant should have the hearing because Justice White thought it would cause ''little harm.'' Here again we see Justice White's personal preferences creeping into what should be objective, law-based decisionmaking—something pretty elementary to being a judge at any level, Federal or State, in our system of jurisprudence.

Those are just two examples of what led me, after consideration of the nominee's record as a whole, to vote against his nomination in 1999.

Unfortunately, my concerns about Justice White's first nomination have only been reaffirmed by his subsequent record. For instance, I am troubled by Justice White's concurrence in the Eighth Amendment case of Roper v. Simmons. That case was first heard by the Missouri Supreme Court, was appealed to the Supreme Court, and was eventually affirmed. But the affirmance is not what my colleagues should focus on. What should concern my colleagues is the opinion that Justice White concurred in, which ignored binding Supreme Court precedent. That precedent was the Stanford v. Kentucky case. I will explain.

In 2003, when Justice White's court decided Roper, binding Supreme Court precedent at that time permitted applying the death penalty to individuals if they committed their crimes when they were under 18. Nonetheless, Justice White concurred in the State court opinion that simply ignored that precedent. Justice White concurred even though the Supreme Court had reaffirmed the Stanford principle twice in 2002, the year before Justice White's state court decision.

Moreover, in 2003 the Supreme Court rejected an appeal raising legal arguments that were identical to the ones Justice White endorsed. That is the very same year Justice White's court ruled in Roper and ignored Stanford outright.

My colleagues on our Judiciary Committee often ask nominees about their commitment to Supreme Court precedent and their faithfulness to the doctrine of stare decisis. Nominees who appear before us routinely repeat the mantra that they will unfailingly apply precedent and nothing else—in other words, leave out personal views. Justice White did as much at his hearing as well. But—and this is what I find so troubling—when I asked him about the Stanford case, he admitted that Stanford was, in fact, binding on his state court at the time he concurred in Roper. What he did not explain—what he could not explain—was why he ignored that binding precedent as a State supreme court justice. He could not explain why he thought it was appropriate for him to concur in a State court opinion that, in effect, overruled U.S. Supreme Court precedent.

I do not doubt that Justice White has always done what he thought was right and that he ruled the way he thought best to achieve justice for the litigants before him. But in my view that is not an appropriate role for a Federal district judge. Judicial decisionmaking requires a disinterested and objective approach that never takes into account the judge's life experiences or policy preferences. From the careful look I have taken at Justice White's 13-year track record as a judge, I have too many questions about his ability to keep his personal considerations separate from his judicial opinions.

Finally, it is worth noting that there continues to be opposition to this nominee from law enforcement.

Specifically, both the National Sheriffs' Association and the Missouri Sheriffs' Association oppose this nominee.

I always try to give judicial nominees the benefit of doubt when I have questions about their records, but in this nominee's case, I simply can't ignore so many indications that the nominee isn't the right person to occupy a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench.

I sincerely hope I am wrong about Justice White, and I reluctantly vote no on the nominee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Missouri Sheriffs' Association Training Academy and National Sheriffs' Association.

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

[From the Missouri Sheriffs' Association and Training Academy, May 10, 2014]

MISSOURI SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION OPPOSES CONFIRMATION OF RONNIE L. WHITE TO THE FEDERAL BENCH

On behalf of the 115 Sheriffs in the State of Missouri, the Missouri Sheriffs' Association vehemently opposes the confirmation of Ronnie L. White to the federal bench.

Victims of crime, families of victims and law enforcement deserve a better federal judge than Ronnie L. White. As we explained to Senators Blunt and McCaskill last year, Ronnie L. White proved himself an activist judge who sought protection for criminals from punishment given to them by a jury even in cases where criminals performed unforgiveable acts of violence against our fellow citizens and law enforcement.

Ronnie L. White's actions and beliefs doomed his confirmation in 1999. In 1999, fifty four Senators knew Ronnie L. White was not the right person for the job based on the merits of his decisions on the bench. Nothing has changed since 1999 warranting Ronnie L. White's confirmation this year.

Senators who want to protect our citizenry from activist judges like Ronnie L. White should vote against confirmation just as was done in 1999.

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, April 2, 2014.

Hon. CLAIRE MCCASKILL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROY BLUNT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCASKILL AND SENATOR BLUNT: I write on behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) and the more than 3,000 elected Sheriffs nationwide to express our support for the efforts of the Missouri Sheriffs' Association to prevent the nomination of Ronnie L. White to a federal judgeship in St. Louis. The Missouri Sheriffs' Association was outspoken in its opposition to Judge White's previous nomination by President Bill Clinton and continues to be outspoken against any further consideration to the federal courts. I respectfully request that, as you examine candidates for the federal judgeship in St. Louis, you carefully consider the concerns presented by the Missouri Sheriffs' Association regarding any judicial nomination of Ronnie L. White.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL LEIDHOLT,
Sheriff NSA President.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the past several weeks, I have spoken about the ongoing crisis on our southern border—the President has acknowledged as a humanitarian crisis—with tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors making a perilous journey from Central America and ending on our doorstep, most often in my State, the State of Texas.

In this year, the numbers are skyrocketing again. Starting in 2011 we saw the numbers, roughly, about 6,000 unaccompanied minors. They doubled from 2011 to 2012, they doubled again from 2012 to 2013, and they look as though they are going to double again from 2013 to 2014. We can only wonder at what might happen thereafter unless we come up with a solution to the problem.

A majority of these children, as I indicated, come from Central America—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. Under current law when these children are detained by the Border Patrol, they are processed by the Border Patrol and then given a notice to appear at a future court hearing and turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services for safekeeping.

Health and Human Services tries to identify a guardian to pick up the child and, not surprisingly, most of them are never heard from again. Certainly they don't show up for this court hearing in response to the notice to appear. Thus, the transnational criminal organizations, the cartels—the people who make money from transporting these children and other migrants across Mexico and the United States—have

discovered an effective business model. In other words, they are able to deliver these children to their families—at least the ones who survive—from Central America through Mexico and into Texas.

The majority of them will make it, because they will be placed with a family member or some other relative, and never appear at the court hearing for which they have been notified to appear.

For children detained from bordering nations such as Mexico or Canada, the process is different than it is from noncontiguous countries such as Central America. Border Patrol, under the current law, can determine whether the children are eligible to stay in the United States or give these children the choice to be safely transferred to officials from their home countries.

Our country simply does not have the current capacity to deal with 50,000, much less 90,000 or 100,000, unaccompanied minors appearing on our Nation's doorstep.

As a result, these children are being kept at Border Patrol facilities, such as I witnessed in McAllen, TX, that have capacity for a few hundred people, but they are currently holding well over double, many times triple and beyond, their current capacity.

I and other Members of Congress, unlike the President, have seen these facilities firsthand and talked to some of the children. The conditions they are kept in are unacceptable by any standard: babies in diapers sleeping on cement floors and dozens of children crammed into one cell with a single toilet.

In addition to these overcrowded detention facilities, there is an overburdened judicial system. Minors in custody of the Department of Health and Human Services are released to family members or guardians or sponsors in the United States, but they are given a notice to appear before an immigration judge if they wish to make a claim for relief under our immigration laws.

Those who show up will not see a judge, on average, for more than 1 year—leaving, as I said, plenty of incentive to simply disappear and never return for a court date. As the law is currently written, in 2008, there are few other options available.

For that reason I have, along with my friend and colleague from Texas, HENRY CUELLAR from the House of Representatives, introduced a clear, commonsense change to the 2008 law to address the immediate crisis.

This is, I hasten to add, not a complete fix to our broken immigration system, but it does target this particular crisis and offers a commonsense solution.

We call this the Helping Unaccompanied Minors and Alleviating National Emergency Act, or the HUMANE Act. It would amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. That law had good intentions, because it was focused on the victims of human trafficking, and we preserve those protections for the victims of human trafficking, but it needs to be improved so that thousands of children who now make this perilous journey in the hands of these criminal organizations up these smuggling corridors from Central America to the United States—we must make sure they are deterred from making this life-threatening journey.

Our changes to the law maintain all of the safeguards built into the 2008 law, and so there should be no objection on that basis. But what we would go further to do is the HUMANE Act would treat all unaccompanied minors the same and ensure an orderly legal process.

A majority of these children would be reunited with their parents in their home countries. Those who choose to appear in front of an immigration judge will have every opportunity to do so on an expedited basis. In those cases where they qualify for removal under our current laws, they would be placed in safekeeping with federally screened sponsors while additional hearings are scheduled.

This expedited process would alleviate overburdened Border Patrol and HHS facilities, as well as the local officials who have been disproportionately affected—although I would add that I read newspaper stories about officials in places such as Massachusetts, Arizona, California, and others expressing concern about these large numbers of unaccompanied children who are being warehoused in their States.

Most importantly, this legislation would send a message to people in Central America that the dangerous journey to the United States in the hands of ruthless smugglers and cartel operatives is simply not worth it.

Central American families would hear loudly and clearly that not only will the journey place their children at risk of sexual assault and even death, they will by and large not be permitted to stay in the United States once they arrive under current law.

Some will. If you are a victim of human trafficking, you may be eligible for a T-visa. If you have a colorable claim to asylum, you can make that claim to an immigration judge under our legislation. But if you don't have a claim to relief under our current immigration laws, you will be returned safely to your home country.

Tackling this crisis is a significant challenge that requires Presidential leadership. But, in the meantime, these children are sleeping in overcrowded cells, Texas communities are reeling from the impact, and we need action. With this legislation we try to target a commonsense solution that will take immediate steps to help stem the tide of the growing crisis.

I hope my colleagues will join us in cosponsoring this legislation. It sounds as if the House of Representatives is probably going to be moving next week. I know there is a lot of controversy anytime we talk about circumstances such as this. Some people think it should be tougher, others think it is too tough to enforce current law. But the fact is, the drug cartels, the transnational criminal organizations, have created a business model based on a loophole they found in the 2008 law.

Our bipartisan, bicameral legislation seeks to fix that and to give these children the benefit of the law if they qualify under the law as currently written. But to continue to leave the law as it exists now with this loophole in it, and continue to see it exploited by the Zetas and other cartels that traffic in human beings, is simply an invitation to continue to see these numbers double year after year and our capacity to deal with these children on a humane basis further diminished.

We need to have immigration laws that protect these children and all of us, and it does not mean that anybody and everybody under every circumstance can qualify to come to the United States and stay. That is simply an invitation to chaos.

We can treat these children humanely, we can give them the benefit that the law allows as written, but if they don't qualify, we need to return them home.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, it is not often the Senate has a chance to go back and fix a grievous error that occurred in our history, and that error occurred in 1999 when a good and qualified man was defeated in the Senate for a position on the eastern district court of the Federal bench in Missouri.

At that time there was an attack on Ronnie White for being soft on crime. The record, as it stands today, flies in the face of that assertion.

At the time of his defeat, he had voted to uphold the death penalty almost 70 percent of the time. In fact, in his career on the Missouri Supreme Court, being the first African American appointed to the Supreme Court, he voted with the majority on death penalty cases 90 percent of the time.

This is a mainstream jurist. This is not someone who is outside of the mainstream. That is why the Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed his nomination. That is why he is considered in the State of Missouri as an iconic leader in the legal community. He went back to Missouri, was the chief justice in the Supreme Court after he was defeated on the floor of the Senate, retired from the Supreme Court, and has gone on to be an established and respected lawyer in the St. Louis community—frankly, part of many big cases, especially the appellate work, because he served on both the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

I think Ronnie White handled what happened to him with as much character as could possibly be required of any individual. I look forward to finally righting the wrong and allowing Ronnie White his well-deserved place on the Federal bench.

I ask all my colleagues to support the confirmation of Ronnie White.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Claire McCaskill, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Christopher Murphy, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Mikulski	Rockefeller	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yes are 54, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, the time until 12:20 p.m. will be divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak on an issue of vital importance to all who value true liberty in the United States.

Last month the Supreme Court issued its decision in the Hobby Lobby case. In 2010, in the Citizens United case, the Court said corporations have a First Amendment right to participate in elections. In the Hobby Lobby ruling, the Court took it a step further and said that since a corporation can be a person, it can also have religious views and because a corporation is a person, it can impose its religious beliefs on an employee and deny a woman insurance that protects her health by providing contraception. So the folly of the Supreme Court has come full circle, where an actual person will be denied their rights because the views of a corporation have been given priority under the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by this Supreme Court.

Instead of ''we the people,'' it is now ''I the CEO of a corporation'' who has the right to exercise their constitutional privileges as interpreted by this Supreme Court that truncates the right of individual women in America to exercise theirs.

The Supreme Court majorities have continued to extend our basic constitutional rights—the inalienable rights held by individuals—to corporations. Corporations are not people.

Supporters of the Hobby Lobby ruling have accused Democrats of hyperbole. They say we are making the Hobby Lobby case seem more dire than it truly is. The corporate personhood supporters say the ruling doesn't mean women can't use the contraception of their choice, just that the insurance provided by their employer doesn't have to cover it or they say the ruling doesn't mean a boss is imposing his or her religious views on their employees. That is just wrong. It says that the boss doesn't have to subsidize health care that violates the boss's religious views.

What happens when the religious views of a CEO are imposed on the real life of a working woman?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. MARKEY. In real life working women earn their insurance coverage. It is part of their pay, and they depend on insurance to pay for their health care—including contraception—for themselves and their families. If that employer's choice of insurance doesn't pay for a particular type of contraception, a woman will be forced to give up her right to use it.

If one form of contraception is—just as Ginsburg explained in her dissent—$1,000, and insurance won't cover even a penny, a working woman is going to be forced to make medical decisions based on the religion her employer practices, not on what she and her doctor determine is best for her from a medical perspective. The religion of the employer trumps the recommendation of a physician to a woman, and this is just a step that changes the whole relationship between an individual and their country.

If a corporation's insurance doesn't cover any contraception because all contraceptives violate the employer's religious beliefs, then their employee's religious views are especially burdened, and she will have to pay for contraception out of her own pocket. Keep in mind that the average woman makes 77 cents on the dollar to a man, but if you are an African-American woman, then it is 66 cents on the dollar, and Latina women earn 59 cents on the dollar compared to what a white man makes in the United States of America.

In the Hobby Lobby case, the Supreme Court transformed religion from a personal choice into a corporate decision, and the corporate world—in real life—can impose its religious views on its employees. That is why I am an original cosponsor of S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act, or as supporters call it the Not My Boss's Business Act.

Let's be clear. Corporations are not people, period. For-profit corporations

do not have religious views. For-profit corporations should not be able to deny their employees critical health care or force American taxpayers to pay for it because of the owner's personal religious views.

The Not My Boss's Business Act will fix the Hobby Lobby decision by making it illegal for corporations to deny their employees health care benefits—including contraception—that are required to be covered by Federal law. It will protect employees from having their health care restricted by bosses who want to impose their religious belief on others.

I urge my colleagues to vote to restore true liberty by voting to pass S. 2578. I thank all of my colleagues.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, last month, as my friend from Massachusetts just mentioned, the Supreme Court ruled that the Obama administration's Health and Human Services mandate infringes on the First Amendment guarantee of religious freedom. This is a guarantee that Americans have enjoyed for the entire history of our country. It is the first freedom in the First Amendment to the Constitution. The first sentence has the words ''freedom of religion.''

In the very recent past, the Congress of the United States voted for a bill that protected freedom of religion unless there was some extraordinary reason not to have freedom of religion in our country. It is important to try to maintain some sense of good humor and be willing to work with people on other issues. As it is, people come to the floor and just say the same things over and over that are not true.

Everybody is entitled to their own opinion on religious freedom. Everybody is entitled to their own opinion on the President's health care bill. Everybody is not entitled to their own facts. If we were dealing with the facts as they truly exist right now, this would be a much different debate.

In fact, just a couple of days ago the Washington Post Fact Checker said that what the Senate Democrats are saying in their rhetoric is just wrong. He said: They are simply wrong. He said the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives. The court ruling does not prevent women from seeking birth control. The court ruling does not take away a person's religious freedom. In fact, all the court ruling does is say that although many people are exempted from this law, we are going to find a way to have people's religious rights upheld.

In America you should not be forced to choose between giving up your business for your faith or giving up your faith for your business. Under the Constitution and under the political heritage of this country and the foundation this country was built on, the government has no right to ask people to make that choice. There are plenty of protections in the Religious Restoration Freedom Act that passed just a few years ago that don't allow this to be taken to some unacceptable extreme.

Religious freedom has historically been a bipartisan issue. In fact, the law the Court based their decision on was introduced in the House by then-Congressman CHUCK SCHUMER—now Senator SCHUMER who sits right over there—and the late Senator Ted Kennedy. They were the people who proposed this legislation. President Clinton signed the bill into law. The Vice President of the United States, JOE BIDEN, voted for the bill. The minority leader of the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, was a cosponsor of the bill, and this was just considered something that was easily done.

It was unanimously passed in the House. It got three no votes—the vote was 97 to 3 in the Senate. This was in 1993, not 1893. This was a dozen years ago when the understanding was clear that there was a principle in our country that if you are going to violate that principle, you better have taken every step possible not to violate the principle of religious freedom. People on the other side would say it was only a handful of years ago when the bill passed and they didn't know that was what it meant.

Of course they knew that was what it meant. One of the reasons they know that is what it meant is because they knew at the time that this principle was a principle the government would adhere to.

In fact, the specific language in the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act that I introduced in the 112th Congress plus the specific language that Senator Kennedy put in the Health Insurance Consumer's Bill of Rights Act in 1997 exempted the protected religious faith. It says that based on the religious or moral convictions of the issuer, the issuer didn't have to do things they thought were wrong.

In the 103rd Congress Senator Moynihan introduced the Clinton health care package—sometimes called Hillary care—which said that nothing in this title should be construed to prevent any employer from contributing to the purchase of a standard benefits package which excludes coverage for abortion or other services if the employer objects to such services on the basis of a religious belief or moral conviction. It can't get much clearer than that.

According to Senator SCHUMER—when the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was introduced it said the government shall not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability unless it demonstrates such a burden is, one, in the furtherance of a compelling governmental interest or, two, is the least restrictive means of furthering that governmental interest.

This is not a law—the Affordable Care Act—that people are not exempted from. In fact, every woman and man in America who works for an employer that has fewer than 50 people employed is exempted from this act. There are entire religious faith groups exempted from this act if they don't believe in government health care. There are waivers the President has issued over and over that exempt people from this act—many of whom were employees of fast-food restaurants and other places that had minimal packages. The President said we are going to exempt them for a while.

People who work for employers with under 50 employees are exempted forever until the law changes. There are millions more people who work for employers with under 50 employees than work for employers that will have a sincere faith-based interest in not doing the wrong thing.

The majority of people who worship in this country in a given week go to worship in a church where they say this practice is wrong. It doesn't mean it is illegal. It doesn't mean anybody who hears them or appreciates them can't do whatever they want to do. But it does mean you can easily go to church and be told this is the wrong thing to be a part of.

The companies involved in the court case have a great tradition of following their faith. When you get a full-time job at Hobby Lobby, your starting wage is $14 an hour—almost twice the minimum wage. You have to work a couple of hours to have the extra $10 a month that some of these particular medicines, procedures, and birth control pills would cost. They are closed on Sunday. They close earlier at night than their competitors so people who work there can have a family life. In fact, the government conceded these were companies that were clear in their belief.

Now, if you have millions of people who are not covered by the law, why can't you find a way to exempt people from providing a small portion of health coverage that they feel is the wrong thing to do? What did the government say? The government said: Well, you have a way out; you don't have to provide insurance at all. So if you are an employer of faith and you want to do everything you can to provide the best benefit—probably in excess of the government-required benefits in almost all areas you want to provide—your choice is to not provide insurance at all.

In fact, the suggestion was made that they would save money by not providing insurance at all because it

would cost $2,000 per employee not to provide insurance at all. That was the penalty in the law, and the government suggested that was probably a lot less than these companies were paying for insurance.

They said: Why not just pay the penalty? You don't have to violate your faith. You can just violate your belief to take special responsibility for your employees. You can pay the $2,000 penalty and save money.

While I'm on the $2,000 penalty, I will say that one of the egregious overreaches of what the government was trying to do here is to say if you don't provide insurance at all, your penalty is $2,000. If you don't provide the exact insurance the government says you have to provide—whether it is based on your faith or otherwise—your penalty is $36,500 per employee.

You can provide better insurance in every other area than what the government says, you can provide insurance in areas that the government didn't even require you to provide insurance, you can do anything you want to do beyond what the government says to do, but if you don't do everything the government says, you have to pay $36,500 per employee per year. And that was in the regulation.

That is the law that Members of the House and Senate voted for. I was not one of them. I was against this law. But the law said you have to pay $2,000 if you don't do anything at all. But the Obama administration said you have to pay $36,500 if you didn't do exactly what they said you have to do. It is the wrong application of religious freedom. The idea that people could not have access to any FDA-approved product is just wrong. Somehow if your employer can keep you from having access to anything you want to have access to that has been approved by the FDA is wrong as the millions of women and men who work for companies who aren't covered under the law prove every day. They prove it every day. If we listen to our friends on the other side, one would think we would be driven backward—we are talking about on behalf of religious freedom, being driven back into the dark ages of December 2013—when everybody who could buy a product in December of 2013 can buy that same FDA-approved product today.

This is about religious freedom. It is not about money. In fact, this bill proposed in the last Congress—I had a provision in that bill that a few Democrats voted for—more Democrats voted for the bill than Republicans voted against it. There was bipartisan support for the bill. I offered an amendment that said if the Department of Health and Human Services wants to, they can promulgate a rule that requires an employer to add a benefit of equal value for any benefit the government requires that they don't want to offer. That is an easy way to say there is no economic motive at all. Maybe the government doesn't require mental health coverage, and if an employer can offer that mental health coverage of equal value to a benefit the employer's faith prohibits being a part of—the bill that most Democrats in the Senate voted against had that provision in there.

This is not about our pocketbooks. This is not about what something costs. This is about whether the government has done everything possible to accommodate people's deeply held religious beliefs. The first freedom in the first sentence in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution mattered when it was put in there, it mattered when 16 or so of the current Members of the Senate voted for the Religious Freedom Act, it mattered when Ted Kennedy and Senator Moynihan put this exact same ability in the health care laws they proposed less than 20 years ago, and it matters today.

I hope we move on to solving problems based on the real facts rather than continuing to talk about facts as my friends would like them to be rather than facts as they really are.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the Protect Women's Health Care from Corporate Interference Act.

I thank my colleague Senator MURRAY from Washington and my colleague Senator UDALL from Colorado for introducing this bill and Senator MURRAY for her long championed efforts on women's health. I am very proud to support this bill.

I guess I would say to my colleague, who I know feels passionately about these issues, that the issue is really how important prescription benefits are to women's health and particularly how important contraception is to women and the fact that it is not an add-on to our health care but, rather, an essential part of our health care. So I hope it doesn't really take us getting a majority of women on the Supreme Court to convince people how central this issue is to the health care of women and why we don't want to deal with a boss who decides to say: I don't want to cover that in employee benefit packages.

I hope I and my colleagues will get a chance to vote on this legislation because I think the Supreme Court's ruling in this case 2 weeks ago really set us on a slippery slope. In a 5-to-4 decision they held that corporations can deny contraceptive coverage for women who are their employees if the owner—if the owner—professes a religious objection.

I know my colleagues think, why don't we just make this product more available so that women can pay an out-of-pocket amount for it?

It is an essential part of women's health and should be part of an employee's package and should not have to be a component she has to add on later.

This precedent by the Court is a troubling precedent. The decision threatens access to critical preventive health services for women, and it opens the door for employers to deny other health care services just because of the owner's religious beliefs.

Many of my colleagues have come to the floor and articulated how this is not about the religious exemption part of the Affordable Care Act that can be sought by churches and religious organizations; this is about employers who are corporations. So those exemptions for people who do have religious beliefs and don't want to offer these health care services are still preserved. But what is not preserved is a woman's ability to say to her employer: Why are you discriminating against me and my health care insurance that you are going to provide when you are not providing the full range of benefits for women?

So, as I said, it really is a slippery slope, and the question is, How many other things are going to be thrown into this same area?

I am getting a lot of letters. I have heard from several people from the Northwest. In fact, this one individual wrote to me saying, ''I am terrified that affordable access''—affordable access, not an add-on. Just because I am a woman and I work for an employer, now I have an add-on because you are discriminating against what my health care services are. She said, ''I am terrified that affordable access to my medically indicated preferred method of birth control may be in jeopardy due to the recent Supreme Court decision.''

So, yes, we are hearing from a lot of people that the decision imperils the ability of women to access evidence-based, clinically effective contraceptive methods in their health care plans. These are health care plans they pay for through their hard-earned wages as part of their benefit package when they sign on to work for a company.

We know this is a vital component of health care, and it helps women with everything from family planning to reducing risks of ovarian cancer and other medical conditions. So we want to make sure these recommendations, such as the recommendations of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, which says to include reproductive health care methods as preventive services—we want those services to be offered. As a result of those recommendations, about 675,000 women in Washington State now have robust access to a set of 20 FDA-approved contraceptive methods as part of a preventive services package. These services

are covered free of coinsurance, free of copays, and free of deductibles.

Now we are basically saying that because a person is a woman and even though this is an essential part of health care, all of a sudden, because of the Supreme Court decision, a woman might work for an employer who is going to ask her to pay for that instead out of her own pocket.

I think this decision threatens real progress for our health care delivery system. We know this well because in Washington State employers denying women basic health coverage is not a new issue. In fact, women in my State have been fighting for decades.

In 1999 Jennifer Erickson was supervising as a pharmacist at Bartell Drugs in Bellevue, WA. Upon starting her job, she learned that her company didn't cover one prescription that she needed—birth control pills—so she appealed to the company asking them to cover that benefit. She was denied. She went on to file a class action lawsuit on behalf of the company's nonunionized employees. In a landmark ruling, the Federal district court—Judge Robert Lasnik—held that Ms. Erickson had the legal right to access birth control under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. What is more, the decision was based on a Supreme Court precedent.

Unlike the district court, though, the Supreme Court has gotten this wrong, and the ruling is a dangerous precedent to allow employers to deny other health care benefits just because the owner wants to proclaim that his religious beliefs don't want him to offer those coverages.

As Justice Ginsburg said, would the exemption the Court holds that has been used on contraceptives based on religious grounds—would there be other examples, such as blood transfusions because they are a Jehovah's Witness or antidepressants because they are a Scientologist or medications derived from pigs, including anesthesia and other things, because certain other ethnic groups—Muslims, Jews, or Hindus—said they didn't want to provide those services?

Does it set us up for a lot of medical necessities not being covered by corporations simply because the CEO or many owners of that company decide it is in their religious beliefs not to offer those important services?

It is very important that we vote to make sure we speak on behalf of these women who are writing to us now, that we give them the kind of coverage for health care they deserve and that ensures every employer who sponsors a health care plan has these same benefits included in the package.

The good news is that 60 percent of working women in Washington State get their coverage through their employers. But we need to make sure the employers—just because the CEO all of a sudden has now become the judge of whether they want to cover important health care services, we have to make sure we pass this legislation to protect those employees.

I hope my colleagues will support this legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor. I ask that the time during the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to set the record straight. Since the Supreme Court ruled on the Hobby Lobby case, a flood of misinformation has spread, distorting the true meaning of the Court's decision. We have seen a misrepresentation of the case, I think to divide the American people, and I find these scare tactics very disappointing.

It is time to move away from the overheated rhetoric and it is time for us to discuss the facts. The Washington Post Fact Checker has systematically rebutted a series of misleading claims from my friends on the other side of the aisle. The Fact Checker concluded that, ''Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.''

In other words, under this ruling, no boss has the right to tell an employee that they cannot use birth control. Nothing in the decision, nothing takes away women's access to birth control. All women continue to hold the constitutional right that was first articulated in Griswold v. Connecticut to use contraceptives. The Court's Hobby Lobby opinion reaffirms Griswold and unequivocally states, ''under our cases, women (and men) have a constitutional right to obtain contraceptives.'' Discrimination based on gender continues to be illegal. Employers may not punish, retaliate, or discriminate against women who choose to use contraception.

Moreover, current privacy laws prevent employers from even asking if an employee uses birth control.

The Court went on to state that its decision ''provides no such shield'' against discrimination in hiring. An employer cannot prohibit a woman from purchasing any form of contraception. Moreover, women can continue to have broad access to safe, affordable birth control.

Even before the Affordable Care Act was passed, 28 States already had laws or regulations on the books to provide for contraceptive coverage. Over 85 percent of large businesses provide contraceptive coverage for their employees. For women without such coverage, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services administers five separate programs to ensure affordable access to contraception, including Medicaid.

The bottom line: All women continue to have the ability to purchase or use a wide variety of contraceptives. It is both possible to stand tall for the principle of religious freedom and also to support safe access to birth control. The two are not mutually exclusive. The issue in Hobby Lobby is not whether women can purchase birth control, it is who pays for what. Those of us who believe that life begins at conception have moral objections to devices or procedures that destroy fertilized embryos.

The Green family, the owners of Hobby Lobby, have similar objections. They do not want to use their money to violate their religious beliefs. I think most Americans would believe that is reasonable. In fact, the Greens offered health coverage that pays for 16 out of 20 forms of contraception, including birth control pills.

The Court narrowly ruled that the Green family's decision was protected by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, a bill led by Democrats and passed with overwhelming support by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The bill requires the government to show a high level of proof before it can interfere with the free exercise of religion. The Court ruled that in this case the government failed to meet that burden. Accordingly, it could not abridge the Green family's legitimate religious views.

While not all Americans share these particular views, I do believe all Americans understand the importance of preserving religious liberty. Indeed, our Nation was largely founded by men and women seeking that religious freedom. The Court's decision was a narrow one, applying only to closely held, mostly family-owned companies. Some have suggested the ruling could open the door to objections over blood transfusions or vaccines. We heard similar fears when the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was passed over 20 years ago. None of those fears have been realized.

Finally, I would like to state my strong support for the legislation I introduced with Senator KELLY AYOTTE and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL that reaffirms the dual principles of religious freedom and safe access to contraception for all women.

Rather than seeking to divide Americans, our legislation brings people together around ideas that we all can support. I would especially like to commend Senator AYOTTE for her strong

leadership on this issue. I have enjoyed working with her to push back against those misleading claims about the Hobby Lobby ruling and ensuring that women across America know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the assault on women's health that has come from a majority of our Supreme Court in recent weeks. It is unfortunate and frankly shocking that in the year 2014 we are still debating the issue of access to birth control. But here we are. Millions of Americans are looking to the Senate today and counting on us to stand for women's rights. They are counting on us to put health care back between a woman and her doctor. They are counting on us to stand for millions of Americans' access to affordable, preventive health care of every kind. They are counting on us to say that birth control is not your boss's business.

In short, they are counting on us to right this huge wrong from the Supreme Court. We have that ability to right this wrong. We have that ability here in this room. The Court, in its decision, lays out a structure in which Congress does have the power to overturn this misguided decision. The Court based its decision on an act of Congress, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Now Congress can respond. Congress can pass a new law that says: That is not what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was meant to mean. The Court got it wrong. We are going to make it right. We should all remember that the act was set up to protect the religious choices of employees. The Supreme Court has stood that on its head.

But for us to right the wrong we have to be willing to debate. We have to be willing to go to the bill. We have to be willing to consider each other's viewpoints, listen to each other. We have to be willing to vote. But we cannot get to the bill if the majority is thwarted by a minority which uses its filibuster power in a way never envisioned in the past, never utilized until recent history, which has prevented Congress from actually debating bills.

So let's all join together and say: Wherever you stand on this issue, this issue is important enough to debate. Women's health care is important enough to debate. Access to contraceptive care is important enough to have that issue before this body. So let's all say yes to debate this bill. The bill is formally titled The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act or, as it is commonly known, the Not My Boss's Business Act.

I hope we will all join collectively in saying this is an important issue, because it really is about women's access to fundamental health care. Whether contraceptives are used for family planning or for painful medical conditions such as endometriosis, birth control is essential health care for millions of Americans. While some are trying to say this case has nothing to do with access to birth control, that is simply not true. For most working families, affordability is access. Without insurance, birth control can cost tens of thousands of dollars over a lifetime. One-third of women in America say they have struggled with the cost of birth control at some point in their lives. For working families, getting by month to month, often paycheck to paycheck, these costs, though they might be dismissed by Washington pundits and even politicians here across the aisle, add up. They can put contraception out of reach.

A loss of insurance coverage can certainly make certain types of contraception totally unaffordable. As Justice Ginsburg noted in her dissent, the upfront cost of an IUD is equivalent to nearly a month's wages for a minimum wage worker. In the blue-collar community I live in, in working America, a month's wage is a very big deal.

Not having insurance coverage equals not having access. Although our Republican colleagues would have you believe otherwise, this dangerous precedent could apply to all sorts of basic, essential health care. What is to stop a boss from claiming a religious objection to vaccinations under the theory espoused in this decision or from access to a blood transfusion or to surgery or to HIV and AIDS, because all of those fit the same pattern in that various religions have a strong religious objection to those health care benefits.

I am not sure what is more troubling, the path charted by five Justices that allows a boss to trump essential personal, preventive health care choices or the Court's notion that it is okay to single out women's health care in this decision.

The bottom line is this: The bill before us that we would go to on the vote this afternoon, the Murray-Udall bill, is about putting women back in charge of their own health care. Women do not want politicians interfering in their health care. They certainly do not want their bosses and CEOs interfering in their health care. Bosses belong in the boardroom. They do not belong in employees' bedrooms or their exam rooms. Let's send a message to all Americans who are watching this body, this great deliberative body today, that the Senate is listening, that we hear the concerns of millions of women across this land and that we are ready to put women back in charge of their own health care and get the bosses out of the exam rooms.

I urge my colleagues to join in voting yes to open debate on this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, whenever any Americans' religious liberty is infringed, every American should be concerned. Religious liberty is a part of the American character. Before our Constitution was adopted, religious freedom was a part of the American character. It was the reason the first Europeans settled on our shores. It was a great source of the American Revolution.

My Scotch-Irish Presbyterian ancestors came here to escape religious persecution from two churches, and when they came here they objected to paying taxes to support another church.

So our very foundation as a country has in it the guarantees of religious freedom.

That is why after the States created our Constitution, the people came back and said: Wait a minute. You forgot something. You forgot the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights begins with guarantees of religious liberty. They are emblazoned on the wall at the Newseum at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th, the guarantees of liberty. They were spoken by President Roosevelt when he talked about World War II and why we were fighting that great war.

So whenever any American's religious liberty is trampled upon, every American should be concerned.

That is why I am so disappointed that Senate Democrats are proposing to carve a giant hole out of America's religious freedom.

This is very different than what has consistently been the attitude in this body. Twenty-one years ago Congress voted to pass the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, an act which reflects the American character as well as any other act that Congress has passed. It created a very high hurdle for government to burden a person's religious beliefs.

That legislation says that if the government is going to take an action that creates a burden on a person's faith, the government must prove there is a compelling national interest and that burden must be as light as possible.

That bill passed nearly unanimously. It became law nearly unanimously, with support from many in the Senate today, many on the other side of the aisle who are supporting this carve-out for religious freedom.

When he signed the bill into law, President Bill Clinton was eloquent and said:

> We all have a shared desire here to protect perhaps the most precious of all American liberties, religious freedom.

President Clinton continues:

Usually the signing of legislation by a President is a ministerial act, often a quiet ending to a turbulent legislative process. Today this event assumes a more majestic quality because of our ability together to affirm the historic role that people of faith have played in the history of this country and the constitutional protections those who profess and express their faith have always demanded and cherished.

But here we are debating a Democratic proposal to gut the law President Clinton was describing and require Americans who own businesses to provide insurance coverage for any health care item or service that is required by Federal law or regulation, whether or not it violates the employer's sincere religious beliefs.

So what has changed?

On June 30, the Supreme Court of the United States found that the law meant what Congress and the President said it did when it was enacted.

They held that the Federal Government could not order the owners of a closely held corporation to violate the basic tenets of their faith. The company in question in this case, Hobby Lobby—and having been a law student, I know that over time this will be known in law schools across the country as the great case of Hobby Lobby because of its importance and because of its name—is owned by the Green family, who make their faith central to their business. They close their stores on Sunday. They refuse to engage in profitable transactions that facilitate or promote alcohol use. They contribute profits to Christian missionaries and ministries.

No one doubts those are sincerely held religious beliefs. The Green family offers health insurance which covers 16 of 20 forms of contraception. It does not cover four forms of contraception that prevent implantation of the embryo but employees are free to purchase those four forms themselves.

The company in no way interferes with its employees' lives. It does not tell them what to do with their bodies. It does not tell them how to live their lives. It simply does not offer in the company's insurance plan, coverage for the four forms of contraception that violate the faith of the owners of the business.

Obamacare regulations tried to mandate 20 forms of contraception, but recognizing this violated the beliefs of those who believe in life at conception, they created a carve-out for several organizations, Catholic hospitals for example. They could have created a similar carve-out for closely held companies, but they did not.

Instead, the Green family and others were forced to defend their freedoms in court, which fortunately ruled that the family was entitled to protection from the government's mandates under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. This ought to have been a victory for everyone if it is true in our country that when any American's religious freedom is upheld, all of us benefit.

In 1993, the passage of the legislation was hailed as a momentous achievement of religious freedom. The New York Times editorialized in support of it. My friend Senator REID from Nevada—now the majority leader—said:

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. I congratulate the authors and the committee for creating a fine bill.

The distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER—then a Member of the House and the lead Democratic sponsor—said: ''This is a good moment for those of us who believe in the flower of religious freedom that so adorns America. . . . ''

But here we are debating a bill that would fundamentally undermine that very act spoken of so eloquently by the Democratic leaders of Congress and by the Democratic President of the United States.

What has changed? If they are successful, an American who opens a business in this country will know that he or she will forfeit their right to religious freedom. That is not consistent with the American character. That is not the American way.

Why would Democrats who felt so strongly about this in 1993 feel so differently today? Why would they be willing to do such damage to the cause of religious freedom they so ardently proclaim? Because the Democrats ''believe they have a powerful campaign weapon'' in this issue, according to a report in Politico.

The Democrats charge that under the Supreme Court decision, an employer's personal views can interfere with women's access to essential health care services.

They say that under this decision corporations can limit their employees' health care options and restrict their freedoms. That is not true. It is patently false. It is absurd. It is wrong.

In the words of the Washington Post's nonpartisan Fact Checker Glenn Kessler:

Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives . . .

Second, the Fact Checker says:

Democrats need to be more careful in their language about the ruling. All too often, lawmakers leap to conclusions that are not warranted by the facts at hand. Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.

Today, women have the same rights they did before Obamacare—at least in terms of religious freedom. The Supreme Court decision did nothing to change or alter a woman's ability to access birth control or other contraceptive care.

Hobby Lobby's insurance today already covers 16 of 20 forms of contraception for the company's employees. A Hobby Lobby employee who wishes to use a drug or device not covered by the company's insurance is in no way prohibited from purchasing it. Nothing in the Hobby Lobby decision prevents a woman from making her own decisions about contraception. The only effect of the decision is that certain employers cannot be forced to include it in their insurance coverage against their religious objections.

The Supreme Court decision covered certain closely held, for-profit companies—meaning they are controlled by five or fewer individuals—where the owners have sincere religious beliefs. The Court's decision does not mean all Americans of faith who own businesses and ask for religious exemption from a general law will receive that exemption.

The Court's decision does not mean employers will be able to use the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as a reason to refuse to cover critical health services, such as vaccines, blood transfusions, and HIV treatment. In fact, such fears were raised by opponents of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act before it became law in 1993. The Democrats didn't believe those objections then, and they shouldn't believe them now because 21 years later these doomsday predictions have not come true. Courts are well-equipped to dispel spurious or frivolous claims.

I think the Democrats know all of this. I think they are just trying to win an election.

This Supreme Court decision was about individual freedoms that do not disappear if you decide to open a business. It was not about contraceptive rights.

What is really happening is my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to change the subject. They want to talk about health care, but they don't want to talk about Obamacare and what it is doing to the women of this country. Let me tell a story that gives an example of what it is that really concerns me.

First, what concerns me is the destruction of anyone's religious freedom.

While we are talking about women and health care, let me talk about Emilie of Lawrenceburg, TN. She is 39 years old. She came to see me. She has lupus. Under Tennessee's laws, she had an insurance policy granted by something called CoverTN. It was created by our then-Democratic Governor and Blue Cross. It gave her the policy she needed at a cost of about $50 a month. When Obamacare arrived, it canceled Emilie's policy. She went on the exchange to try to replace it, according to Washington's wisdom.

This is Emilie. This is a real woman in Tennessee who is really hurt by the Obamacare law. We should be talking

about her. This is what she wrote to me:

I cannot keep my current plan because it doesn't meet the standards of coverage. This alone is a travesty. CoverTN has been a lifeline [for me]. . . . With the discontinuation of CoverTN, I am being forced to purchase a plan through the Exchange. . . . My insurance premiums alone will increase a staggering 410 percent. My out-of-pocket expenses will increase by more than $6,000 a year—that includes subsidies. Please help me understand how this is ''affordable.''

Here is an American woman who has been hurt by ObamaCare. She lost her policy—a policy that she could afford, that fit her health care needs and her budget—but all of the wise people in Washington said: This is the policy you need. So she got the policy Obamacare says she should have, and her insurance premiums went up to approximately $400 a month, and she got an insurance policy that does not fit her budget and does not fit her health care needs. She is the one who has been hurt.

Unfortunately, Emilie is not the only one experiencing rate shock. Millions of Americans are losing their insurance plans. They are being forced to buy new plans, many of them with higher premiums, many with higher deductibles, many of them with coinsurance.

Let me talk about a Tennessee woman whose name is Carol, a single mom with a son starting at Austin Peay University in the fall. She is an office administrator in an office that used to have CoverTN insurance that cost less than $100 a month in premiums and covered all of her health care needs. Carol said:

Now, thanks to Obamacare, I must pay over $300 per month [compared to $100 a month] in insurance premiums for a policy that has a $2,500 deductible and a $4,000 out of pocket limit.

If we want to talk about a war on women, let's talk about the war on Emilie and Carol in Tennessee and millions of other women who are hurt by ObamaCare. Carol earns too much to qualify for a subsidy, so now she puts a big chunk of her income toward her premiums—such a big chunk that now she can't afford to help pay for her son's education.

These are the kinds of stories all of us hear from people who are being harmed by Obamacare. These are the kinds of stories our friends on the other side don't want repeated, so they even go so far as to bring up carving big chunks out of America's character by trampling on religious freedom—the freedom that is talked about in the First Amendment.

We have proposals to help Americans like Carol and Americans like Emilie. We have offered them on the Senate floor repeatedly since 2010 when the ObamaCare law was passed. They would move our country in a different direction toward health care as rapidly and as responsibly as we could go—a direction toward more freedom, more choices, and lower costs for Emilie and Carol and for millions of women and millions of men and millions of younger people across this country.

Our bills would allow Americans to keep more of their insurance plans, as the President promised.

Our bills would allow people to buy insurance in another State if it fits their budget and fits their needs. Let's say Emilie, who has lupus, finds a policy regulated in Kentucky that fits her budget and fits her needs. We would allow Emilie to buy that.

We would allow small business employers to combine purchasing power with other employers and offer their employees lower cost insurance. More freedom, more choices, lower costs.

We would allow Americans to buy a major medical plan to insure themselves against a catastrophe—today, some Americans can, but under Obamacare all Americans cannot—buy a major medical plan to insure against catastrophe—that is what a lot Americans would like to do—and then open a health savings account that is expanded to pay for everyday health expenses. More freedom, more choices, lower costs.

We would like to repair the damage Obamacare has done. We would like to prevent future damage. Republicans want to move in a different direction that provides more freedom, more choices, lower costs. We trust Americans to make decisions for themselves. That is the American way. That is what we believe in. Religious freedom and health care freedom—that is the American way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Post by the Fact Checker.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial today in the Wall Street Journal, an op-ed by two of my colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Nebraska, Senators AYOTTE and FISCHER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

[From The Washington Post—Fact Checker, July 14, 2014]

DEMOCRATS ON HOBBY LOBBY: ''MISSPEAKS'' ''OPINION'' AND OVERHEATED RHETORIC

(By Glenn Kessler)

''Really, we should be afraid of this court. The five guys who start determining what contraceptions are legal. Let's not even go there.''—Houe Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.), at her weekly news conference, on July 10.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 ruling that, as a closely held company, Hobby Lobby was not required to pay for all of the birth-control procedures mandated by the Affordable Care Act, Democrats have rushed to condemn the court. But in some cases the rhetoric has gotten way ahead of the facts.

Here's a round-up of some of the more noteworthy claims. In some cases, lawmakers concede that they make a mistake; in others, they are argue that they are offering what amounts to opinion, even though the assertion was stated as fact.

Statements on Supreme Court cases are notoriously difficult to fact check because rulings are open to interpretation—and the full impact is often difficult to judge until lower courts begin to react to the ruling. Both Democrats and Republicans use adverse Supreme Court rulings to rally their respective bases, but lawmakers have a responsibility not to succumb to overheated and inaccurate rhetoric.

Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives, but that salient fact is often lost as lawmakers jump to conclusions that the cost will be prohibitive. That may or may not be the case depending on circumstances. Moreover, it is worth remembering that when the Affordable Care Act was passed, 28 states already had laws or regulations that promote insurance coverage for contraception. The law sought to extend that across the country—and even with this ruling, that will remain the case for the vast majority of workers.

''Really, we should be afraid of this court. The five guys who start determining what contraceptions are legal. Let's not even go there.''—Pelosi

This is a very odd statement from the House Democratic leader, given that the majority opinion flatly states that ''under our cases, women (and men) have a constitutional right to obtain contraceptives,'' citing the 1965 ruling in Griswold v. Connecticut, which under the right to privacy nullified a law prohibiting the use of contraceptives.

Drew Hammill, Pelosi's spokesman, acknowledged that she ''misspoke.'' ''Obviously the impact of the court's decision is not to make these four contraceptive methods illegal—i.e. no longer allowed to be sold'', he said. ''But the overriding point here is that the decision does in fact limit access, which is the key point Pelosi made.''

Hammill cited Justice Ruth Ginsburg's dissent that women have a compelling interest in being able to plan their pregnancies and that they need reliable birth control.

Later, in the same news conference, Pelosi decried that ''five men could get down to specifics of whether a woman should use a diaphragm and she should pay for it herself or her boss.''

Hobby Lobby involved the owners' objection to four types of birth control but not diaphragms, but here Pelosi adhered closer to the essence of the case (and a related temporary injunction the court awarded to Wheaton College): the question of who

should pay for contraceptives. (The court also vacated a decision by an appeals court that had ruled against a Michigan company that objected to providing any contraceptives under its employee health plan, so that would include diaphragms.)

Ginsburg's dissent pointed out that it costs $1,000 for the office visit and insertion procedure for intrauterine devices (IUDs)—''nearly the equivalent to a month's full-time pay for workers earning the minimum wage.''

Our colleagues at PolitiFact gave Pelosi a rating of ''false'' for her comments, and we certainly agree, though we generally do not award Pinocchios when politicians fess up to a mistake.

Still, we note that despite her office's admission of a mistake, the transcript of the news conference had not yet been corrected three days later. ''It will be,'' Hammill said. ''We're migrating to a new site in the next two weeks, so everything is a little slow.''

''The one thing we are going to do during this work period, sooner rather than later, is to ensure that women's lives are not determined by virtue of five white men. This Hobby Lobby decision is outrageous, and we are going to do something about it.''—Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D–Nev.), remarks to reporters, on July 8

The Hobby Lobby decision was written by Justice Samuel Alito, joined by Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Antonin Scalia, Anthony Kennedy and Clarence Thomas. That's certainly five men, but Thomas is African American.

''That was a mistake, and he knew it right away,'' spokesman Adam Jentleson said. He noted that on other occasions Reid has simply said ''five men.'' (The four dissenters included three women.)

''This is deeply troubling because you have organized religions that oppose health care, period. So if you have an employer who is a member of an organized religion and they decide, you know, I wouldn't provide health care to my own family because I object religiously, I'm not going to allow any kind of health-care treatment.''—Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (Fla.), Democratic National Committee chair, appearing on MSNBC, June 30

While there are some religions that object to certain medical procedures, Wasserman Schultz goes to quite an extreme to suggest that employers could block an employee from seeking any kind of health-care treatment. (Again, the issue was who would pay for contraceptives, not whether someone was barred from getting contraceptives.)

''The Chair was referring to the Justice's ruling which puts employers' religious beliefs ahead of the medical needs of employees,'' spokesman Michael Czin said. ''We fundamentally disagree with the logic behind that ruling.''

''[In Griswold v. Connecticut,] the Supreme Court said that the right of privacy of individuals and families trumped any state right to ban contraceptives. It was a breakthrough. They found privacy, at least the inference of privacy, in the Constitution. I asked that question repeatedly of Justice Roberts and Justice Alito to make sure that they would honor that same tradition of privacy. The Hobby Lobby decision violates that fundamental premise. [While both justices were careful in their answers before confirmation,] they both said they stood by the Griswold decision.''—Sen. Dick Durbin (D–Ill.), quoted in ABC's ''The Note,'' July 10

Durbin serves on the Judiciary Committee and is the second-ranking Democrat on the Senate. Here, he appears to come close to saying what Pelosi asserted—that the ruling signaled a possible ban on contraceptives. He specifically mentions the Griswold decision, which as we noted was cited by Alito in the majority opinion as settled law.

But a Durbin spokeswoman said he was not trying to say the court was on a path to overturn Griswold. ''He was saying Hobby Lobby was out of line with the general 'tradition of privacy' that permitted women to make their own choices about birth control,'' she said, asking not to be identified. ''He was critiquing this ruling and its impact on women's access to contraceptive coverage, not making a prediction about future cases.''

''The U.S. Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision opened the door to unprecedented corporate intrusion into our private lives. Coloradans understand that women should never have to ask their bosses for a permission slip to access common forms of birth control.''—Sen. Mark Udall (D–Colo.), in a news release, July 9

Udall's remarks were contained in a news release he issued with Sen. Patty Murray (D–Wash.) about a bill that seeks to overturn the Hobby Lobby decision. There is a bit of an irony here: Udall voted for the Affordable Care Act, which built upon the employer-based health-care system in the United States and thus led to a ruling by the Supreme Court in the first place. So it's a chicken-or-egg question about how the door was opened in the first place.

Again, the issue is not whether women will have access to birth control, but whether the health plan will cover the cost. Spokesman Mike Saccone argues that this is, in effect, ''a permission slip.''

''Following the court's decision, women will need to effectively ask their employers if they will continue to cover contraception,'' Saccone said. ''They will need to determine if their boss will give permission for their insurance plans to cover birth control.''

He added: ''Without insurance coverage, IUDs (what Hobby Lobby objects to covering) cost up to $1,000, which poses a huge barrier for women, especially if she is making the minimum wage. Without her boss's permission to get coverage for that service in her health plan, it becomes much more—potentially prohibitively—expensive for that woman.''

''Before the Hobby Lobby decision, the fight against corporate influence was mainly about making sure real people and their ideas were in charge of elections. But now it is no longer just about a democracy; it is about keeping corporations out of our private lives, out of our bedrooms, and out of our religious decisions.''—Sen. Jon Tester (D–Mont.), statement in the Congressional Record, July 10

Here again, a lawmaker mixes up the question of paying for contraceptives with a broader prohibition against all contraceptives.

''If an employer doesn't cover contraceptive care, for many women access to birth control is effectively blocked because it becomes cost-prohibitive,'' argued spokesman Dan Malessa. ''If an employer refuses to cover contraceptives based on its religious views, then its religious views trump the religious views of its employees.''

''You know, what I am objecting to is that these bosses should not be able to tell their employees that they cannot use birth control. Motherhood is not a hobby. That is what I am objecting to.''—Rep. Gwen Moore (D–Wisc.), speaking on MSNBC, July 1

Moore also falls into the trap of claiming that corporate bosses can now dictate whether women can have access to birth control. No boss under this ruling has the right to tell an employee that they cannot use birth control. That's simply wrong, but Moore's spokeswoman argued this is open to interpretation.

''Congresswoman Moore was referring to the Supreme Court decision that now allows certain employers to deny contraceptive coverage to their employees through employer-sponsored health care plans. By denying this coverage to their employees, many workers may not have the financial means to access this health care necessity,'' spokeswoman Staci Moore said. ''To your point on the Hobby Lobby decision concerning only certain forms of contraceptive coverage, the congresswoman would argue that the ruling opens the door for employers to challenge other vital health-care coverage, not limited to the four contraceptives you mentioned.''

''What they've done, Chris, is taken away the religious freedom of their employees. They have to comply with the religious freedom of their employers.''—Rep. Louise Slaughter (D–N.Y.), interview on MSNBC, June 30

Is Slaughter really saying that the court has taken away an employee's religious freedom because some contraceptives may not be covered by insurance? Eric Walker, her spokesman, says this is a matter of opinion.

''By forcing an employee to live with the religious choices imposed on them by their employer, the employee's own religious freedom is infringed upon,'' Walker said. ''I think it's fair to say that 'freedom from religion' goes hand in hand with 'religious freedom.' The first amendment protects Americans from having religion thrust upon them by others—a standard the court failed to uphold, in the congresswoman's opinion.''

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

The Fact Checker generally does not award Pinocchios for ''misspeaking'' or for statements of opinion. And we obviously take no position on the Supreme Court opinion. But this collection of rhetoric suggests that Democrats need to be more careful in their language about the ruling. All too often, lawmakers leap to conclusions that are not warranted by the facts at hand. Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.

Certainly, a case can be made that perhaps this is a slippery slope (as Ginsburg argues in dissent) or that the cost of some contraceptives may be prohibitively high for some women who need them. But the rhetoric needs to be firmly rooted in these objections—and in many cases the Democratic response has been untethered from those basis facts.

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

[From The Wall Street Journal, July 16, 2014]

THE HOBBY LOBBY DECISION AND ITS DISTORTIONS

NOTHING IN THE SUPREME COURT'S RECENT RULING DENIES WOMEN ACCESS TO BIRTH CONTROL.

(By Kelly Ayotte and Deb Fischer)

In the days since the Supreme Court's June 30 Burwell v. Hobby Lobby decision, we have been troubled by those who seem eager to misrepresent both the facts of the case and the impact of its ruling on women—all

to divide Americans and score political points in a tough election year.

The biggest distortion: the #NotMyBossBusiness campaign on which falsely suggests that under the ruling employers can deny their employees access to birth control.

That's flat-out false. Nothing in the Hobby Lobby ruling stops a woman from getting or filling a prescription for any form of contraception. Those who distort the court's decision insist that one cannot support religious liberty and also support access to safe, affordable birth control. But these are principles that we, and millions of others, support. Americans believe strongly that we should be able to practice our religion without undue interference from the government. It's a fundamental conviction that goes to the very core of our character—and dates back to the founding of our nation. The Supreme Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case, which protects rights of conscience, reaffirmed our centuries-old tradition of religious liberty.

Contrary to the misleading rhetoric, the Hobby Lobby ruling does not take away women's access to birth control. No employee is prohibited from purchasing any Food and Drug Administration approved drug or device, and contraception remains readily available and accessible for all women nationwide. According to a Kaiser Family Foundation poll, prior to ObamaCare over 85% of large businesses already offered contraceptive coverage to their employees. And the ObamaCare mandate under review in the case doesn't even apply to businesses with fewer than 50 employees. For lower-income women, there are five programs at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that help ensure access to contraception for women, including Medicaid.

The court's decision applies to businesses whose owners have genuine religious convictions. In the Hobby Lobby case, the company's owners—the Green family—offered health-care plans that provide coverage for 16 of the 20 FDA-approved contraceptive drugs and devices, including birth-control pills, required under the Affordable Care Act.

The Greens only had moral objections to the remaining four methods, which they consider to be abortifacients. The family felt strongly that paying for insurance that includes these methods would compromise their deeply held religious belief that life begins at conception.

In its narrow ruling, the court agreed, basing its decision on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, which was introduced in the Senate by the late Sen. Edward Kennedy (D–Mass.) and in the House by then-Congressman Charles Schumer (D–N.Y.), and supported by over a dozen current Democratic senators, Vice President Joe Biden, and Secretary of State John Kerry.

Kennedy and Mr. Schumer sponsored this bipartisan law in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in Employment Division v. Smith, which held that ''generally applicable laws'' that have nothing to do with religion could effectively prevent Americans from fully exercising their religious rights.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed the Democratic-controlled House by voice vote and was approved by the Democratic-controlled Senate in an overwhelming vote of 97 to 3.

When President Clinton signed the bill, he said: ''What this law basically says is that the government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion.''

In the Hobby Lobby decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the government failed to make that case.

With misinformation now swirling, it's important to understand what the court's decision doesn't mean.

The court's majority opinion explicitly states that the ruling does not ''provide a shield for employers who might cloak illegal discrimination as a religious practice.'' Additionally, the court said that ''our decision should not be understood to hold that an insurance-coverage mandate must necessarily fall if it conflicts with an employer's religious beliefs''—meaning, you must show a legitimate religious objection.

While some Americans may disagree with the Green family's views, nearly all Americans believe that religious freedom is a fundamental right that must not be abridged. When President Clinton signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, he said: ''Our laws and institutions should not impede or hinder, but rather should protect and preserve fundamental religious liberties.''

Congressional Democrats used to share that view. What's changed? We can preserve access to contraceptives without trampling on Americans' religious freedom.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Ronnie White to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. I was proud to chair Justice White's nomination hearing before the Judiciary Committee in May.

Justice White has the experience, the integrity, and the qualifications to be an outstanding district court judge.

He came from humble beginnings. He was born in St. Louis to teenage parents and grew up poor in a segregated neighborhood. He has worked since age 11 to help make ends meet and to put himself through college at St. Louis University and law school at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Justice White went on to accomplish great things in his legal career—most notably, becoming the first African-American Supreme Court Justice and Chief Justice in Missouri's history. It was a powerful moment when Justice White was sworn in to the Missouri Supreme Court. The ceremony took place at a courthouse where slaves were once sold on the steps.

I am pleased that the Senate is voting today on Justice White's nomination to the Federal bench.

It is not often that the Senate gets the chance to correct a historic mistake, But by confirming Ronnie White to the Federal bench, we will be able to do so.

Justice White's previous nomination to the district court was defeated on the Senate floor in 1999 on a partyline vote. At the time, the claim was made that Justice White was ''pro-criminal.'' This was a grossly inaccurate claim, both then and now.

Over his long career as an attorney and a judge, Justice White has been widely recognized as fair, unbiased, and committed to the rule of law. Just read the letter from the Missouri State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police in support of Justice White's nomination. The Missouri FOP said:

As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial. As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court. We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

This is a compelling endorsement from the Missouri FOP.

In 2001 I had the opportunity to ask Justice White in a hearing before the Judiciary Committee about the allegation that he was somehow hostile to law enforcement. Here was his response. He said:

That is not true that I was opposed to law enforcement. Senator Durbin, I have a brother-in-law who is a police officer in St. Louis. I have a cousin who is a police officer in St. Louis. I have served on boards and commissions with police officers in the St. Louis community, and I also, when I was city counselor for the city of St. Louis, was the lawyer for the St. Louis City Police Department and we defended police officers. As a judge, all I have tried to do is to apply the law as best I could and the way I saw it.

Overall, Justice White's track record shows that his judicial decisions were well within the legal mainstream and were supported by precedent and legal authority. His decisions showed respect for the rule of law, even in hard cases that involved difficult or emotional facts.

The bottom line is that Justice White is a man with integrity, a wealth of judicial experience, and a real respect for the law. He is going to be an outstanding Federal judge.

I urge my colleagues to support this nomination and to put this good man on the Federal bench.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Ronnie White to serve as a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

In the Senate, as in life, there rarely is a chance for a do-over—to get something right that went wrong a long time ago.

For me, Ronnie White's nomination is a chance to do that. This year should have been his fifteenth as a district court judge—he would be close to senior status today had his nomination by President Clinton been confirmed in 1999.

I was very pleased this year to see him appear once again before the Judiciary Committee, and I believe he will distinguish himself as a Federal district judge.

Let me simply quote from a letter from the Missouri State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police, which wrote a letter on May 13, 2014 in support of Judge White's nomination:

As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court. We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

Ronnie White's confirmation is long past due, and I really am pleased it is likely to come to pass. I just wanted to say that, and to urge my colleagues to support him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Cardin	Mikulski	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time? Does any Senator yield time?

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the most extraordinary feature of the bill before us today is the incongruity between the bill's title and its content. The title, the ''Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act,'' is clear and straightforward. It suggests the bill is aimed at the important and worthy goal of protecting women's health. But the text of the bill plainly demonstrates that the bill's true objective is to circumscribe Americans' religious freedoms—the religious liberties of individual Americans—within the narrow confines of the Democratic Party's partisan agenda and the whims of politicians and bureaucrats.

While maintaining the appearance of preserving all of the current legal protections of religious freedom in America today, this proposal quietly adds to them a subtle yet deeply problematic and inappropriate qualification. The Federal Government will not prohibit the free exercise of religion until the Federal Government decides that it wants to do so. Under this bill, your religious liberties stop at the doorstep of the Democratic National Committee.

So I rise today in opposition to this bill because it doesn't do anything to protect women's health and it does much to undermine the bulwarks of religious liberty enshrined in our Constitution that have made America the most religiously diverse and tolerant Nation in human history.

Although this proposal is only the latest maneuver attempted by my Democratic colleagues to assert their power and restrict religious freedom in America, it also represents the culmination, at least for now, of their opposition to the Supreme Court's recent ruling in Burwell v. Hobby Lobby.

On June 30 of this year, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Government may not force closely held businesses to violate their sincerely held religious beliefs in order to comply with the contraceptive mandate issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This decision has received a great deal of attention, but it has received this attention for all the wrong reasons.

Contrary to what many critics have suggested, the Hobby Lobby decision did not promulgate national health care policy nor did it render any opinion on the virtues of contraception and religious faith. No, the issue in Hobby Lobby involved not a dispute of competing rights but a straightforward application of plainly written law.

As the Constitution states in Article III, Section 2, the role of the Supreme Court is to adjudicate legal disputes by hearing ''cases and controversies'' that arise when two laws or two parties come into conflict.

In Hobby Lobby, the two laws in dispute were the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Congress and signed into law by President Clinton in 1993, and a Federal mandate issued by the Department of Health and Human Services, acting under the powers delegated to it by the Affordable Care Act.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA as it is sometimes called, reaffirmed Americans' commitment to the fundamental religious liberty already protected by our Constitution.

With RFRA, a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, in cooperation with Republican minorities in both Houses, declared that when the Federal Government seeks to infringe on Americans' religious liberty, it must clear two thresholds. First, it must show that the law in question serves a compelling State interest. Secondly, if it does, the law must do so by the least restrictive means possible.

Given that the government openly acknowledged that there was a significant number of far less intrusive means to ensure affordable access to the drugs at issue, the Supreme Court rightly ruled that the contraception mandate violated RFRA.

However unwarranted, the overheated response to the Hobby Lobby decision among some ideological extremists on the left has led some of my colleagues to introduce a bill that would not simply overturn that modest and narrow decision but fundamentally rewrite America's social contract as it pertains to matters of personal conscience.

Whereas, the Court's ruling was limited to ''closely held'' for-profit companies such as Hobby Lobby, this bill would empower the Federal Government to coerce employers of all faiths and of no faith into violating their deepest personal convictions. It would deny any employer—devout or secular, individual or corporate, for-profit or nonprofit—conscience protection under RFRA against all present and future government mandates.

Perhaps most troubling is the warped theory of rights underlying the text of

this bill. This theory holds that the American people possess constitutional and legal rights only when acting alone but not when acting in a group. These rights, along with any duties one may hold as a person of faith, must be forfeited whenever acting in association with others, on penalty of fines to be paid to the Federal Government.

This view of religious liberty might be summarized as an amendment to Matthew, chapter 18, verse 20: For where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there is the IRS in the midst of them.

This view is extreme. It is out of touch with the Constitution, with commonsense, and with America's heroic history of religious tolerance.

From our earliest days as a country, one of the sources of our strength as a people and one of the reasons for our success as a nation has been our robust understanding of religious liberty. The breadth and depth of that conception has allowed and encouraged people of all faiths and all traditions to live here in friendship and in cooperation with one another.

As two members of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom put it:

> . . . respect for the flourishing of people requires respect for their freedom—as individuals and together with others in community—to address the deepest questions of human existence and meaning. This allows them to lead lives of authenticity and integrity by fulfilling what they conscientiously believe to be their religious and moral duties. . . . It also includes the right to witness to one's beliefs in public as well as private, and to act—while respecting the equal right of others to do the same—on one's religiously inspired convictions in carrying out the duties of citizenship.

Expanding as wide as possible the space in which all people can witness their faith alongside one another has for two centuries elevated, enriched, and united American society. This robust conception of religious liberty was so essential to American unity that not only did the Founding generation reinforce its protection in a Bill of Rights—which many Framers actually thought was redundant—but it was the first freedom articulated in the First Amendment.

They understood, as most Americans still do, that the proper role of government is not to define people's happiness but to protect all individuals' equal rights, to pursue happiness according to their own hopes and values and conscience.

Yet for all its legal and constitutional protections, America's exceptional tradition of religious toleration rests ultimately on the uniquely American principle of equal dignity and respect for all women and all men, not simply as ''fellow passengers en route to the grave'' but as fellow pilgrims in search of their own promised land.

The authors of this bill know all of this. They know the American people reject their intolerance of diversity and indifference to the First Amendment. We know their bill cannot become law. Indeed, we know this for a fact because if the regulations they support were actually written in the law, ObamaCare itself would never have passed. It was slipped in after the fact by bureaucrats who are not subject to public accountability and never stand for election.

This legislation is more than an insult to the people it would target; it is an embarrassment to the party leadership that has embraced it.

I still hold fast to that principle and to the freedom it preserves and thus strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we are entering into a new era in which five men in the Supreme Court are going to get to make the decisions about what kind of health care you get as a matter of right, living under the protection of the laws of the United States, and what kind of health care you get as an employee, at the whim of the decisions made by your boss.

These are the kinds of decisions that your boss should be making: decisions about the direction of your company, decisions about the level of your salary, about new products that your business is going to offer.

This should not be your boss's decision. It should not be up to your boss as to whether you as a female employee get access to prescription contraceptives. But that is the world we live in today after the Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, has given the power to particular employers to deny women access to prescription birth control.

Prescription birth control, contraception, is used by 99 percent of women in this country at one point over their life. A big portion of those prescriptions are actually for purposes related to complicated medical treatments such as cancer therapy. No matter how the Supreme Court tries to explain this, there is no way to effectively differentiate what the Supreme Court has done on birth control with a whole other range of potential discrimination.

As Justice Ginsburg said in her dissent, this exemption the Supreme Court has given for employers' religious beliefs would extend logically with religiously grounded objections to blood transfusions held by Jehovah's Witnesses; to religious objections to antidepressants held by Scientologists; medications derived from pigs, including anesthesia, intravenous fluids, and pills coated with gelatin held by certain religions; and even vaccinations, a belief held by Christian Scientists, amongst others.

The idea that the Supreme Court is now going to get into the business of micromanaging which particular religious beliefs they are going to protect and which ones they are not going to protect is unacceptable to the majority of people I represent, so that is why I am here today to support the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act. Pretty simple. All we are saying here is that employers should not be allowed to refuse health coverage that is guaranteed to their employees and their dependents under Federal law.

When we decide to pass a law with the majority of the House and the Senate agreeing to it, signed by the President, those protections should be available to all employees. It is not easy to pass a law and get it signed by the President. The Senate has already set up a lot of pretty significant barriers to the passage of any law, never mind a law that guarantees a certain level of health care coverage.

Until the Hobby Lobby decision, the Supreme Court has stayed out of that decision, said that if the Congress decides a minimum level of coverage should be available to employees, then employers should not be able to get in the way. That precedent is now blown up. There is no going back, as Justice Ginsburg has said. I hope we pass it this week.

The reality is it is more important now than ever to protect this coverage, because as a result of the Affordable Care Act, there are millions more women, millions more families all across the country who have access to prescription contraception. Twenty-four million more prescriptions for oral contraceptives were filled without a copay in 2013 than in 2012. That is by virtue of the protections in the Affordable Care Act.

On this particular type of prescription alone, the Affordable Care Act has saved $483 million in out-of-pocket costs for oral contraceptives. That saved a lot of families money, but that has also given access to this important medication for millions of women.

It is just another example, just another piece of evidence amidst a mounting pile, that tells us the Affordable Care Act is working today. I want to spend a few additional minutes going over the latest litany of good news when it comes to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Republicans have kind of gone quiet, silent even, in many parts of the Nation, when it comes to their critique of the Affordable Care Act. That is in large

part because on both sides of the aisle, there is a quiet acceptance that the Affordable Care Act is working. It has vanished from most campaigns as a political issue this summer and this fall because it is increasingly impossible, aside from anecdotal evidence, to make the case on an empirical data-driven basis that the Affordable Care Act is not working.

Senator REID did a little bit of this earlier this week, but I want to share again some of the new numbers we have. Here is maybe the most stunning number: The uninsured rate in the United States fell 2.2 percentage points in the second quarter of 2014. We now have the lowest quarterly rate of uninsured in this country since Gallup began tracking this percentage in 2008. There are approximately 20 to 25 percent less people and families in this country without insurance than 6 months ago. That is absolutely stunning, that in 6 months of implementation of this act, we have taken one-quarter off the rolls of the uninsured in this country. Even the biggest optimists about how the implementation of the Affordable Care Act was going to go could not have guessed we were going to take that big a chunk out of the rolls of the uninsured.

But here is more evidence that this is working. Fifty-seven percent of the individuals who purchased coverage through the exchanges were uninsured when they were enrolled. So a lot of Republicans said: Well, you know, the big numbers you are seeing, 8 million people insured through the private health care exchanges, that may be people shifting from one kind of insurance to another.

Well, a Kaiser study says that, in fact, 6 out of 10 of the people who got insurance in the exchanges, through Medicaid, through staying on their parents' insurance, had no insurance beforehand. Frankly, to my mind, it does not necessarily matter, because to the extent they went on these plans coming off of another plan, it was for a reason: They were saving money, by and large. That is a good thing in and of itself.

But you have 4 out of 10 people going onto the new plans to save them money, 6 out of 10 people coming onto the new plans because they had no insurance at all. They are getting care as well. A new Commonwealth Fund survey says that 60 percent of the adults with this new coverage through the marketplace or Medicaid reported that they had visited a hospital or a doctor or filled a prescription. Sixty-two percent of those people said they could not have had access or afforded this care previously.

That was the theory. All of these people who were waiting to get so sick that they had to go to the emergency room, costing us all sorts of money in the long run, now can get preventive care. Of the 60 percent of the people who went out and saw a doctor because of the new coverage they had by virtue of the Affordable Care Act, 60 percent of them said they would have never gotten that care had they not had that coverage. That is millions of people, millions of people all across the country who are going to have an injury or an illness, who were going to sit at home and live with it until it got so bad they had to show up at the emergency room—they are now getting care.

What about the premiums? People said: Well, you know, these presume are going to be unaffordable and people are going to start paying them and then stop paying them. HHS did a survey of the premiums and found, on average, that the monthly premium people are paying is $82 per month, after a tax credit is factored in.

Listen, $82 a month is not pocket change. There are a lot of families out there who have trouble coming up with $82 a month. But for somebody like Susie Clayton, a breast cancer survivor from North Canaan, CT, that is a big deal. She is paying right about that number, $90 per month. But prior to the Affordable Care Act, because she had a preexisting condition, Susie Clayton was spending $1,600 per month. There are hundreds of thousands of Susie Claytons out there. Premiums are pretty affordable.

The critics said: All right, we will concede that more people are getting covered. We will concede they are using the care. We will concede premiums are affordable, in part because you are spending all of this money on premium assistance. But you are going to just start spiraling health care costs. Well, that did not come true either. With April's updated CBO projections, spending on major Federal health care programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and the ACA subsidies—has now been revised downward by $900 billion. That is a half a percent of GDP since the 2011 projections. So in 3 years, CBO has pushed down its projections of 10-year spending by $900 billion.

Here is an even more stunning way to think about this. If you look at what CBO said we were going to spend on a per-Medicare recipient basis in 2010 versus what they now say we are going to spend on that recipient today over the next 10 years, that per-Medicare recipient spending level has been decreased by $1,000. We are spending $1,000 less per Medicare recipient.

That does not have anything to do with the private exchanges. That has to do with all of the other provisions in the bill that start to shift health care spending away from a system that rewards volume: How much medicine you practice to a system that rewards outcomes: How good is the medicine you are practicing. Are you keeping your patients healthy?

The reality is that spending is remarkably low, historically low on health care. Listen, admittedly, some of that is because of an economy that has been slow to recover over the course of the last 6 years. But a lot of that is because of the Affordable Care Act, so much so that I saw an article in the Wall Street Journal the other day that said the President was to blame for the slow economy because he had been so successful in pushing down the rate of health care spending that now it was an economic catastrophe that we were spending so much less than we had initially projected on health care. There is no way for the President to win. If health care expenses spiral and premiums spiral, it is his fault. But if he does something to control health care premiums and health care costs, than it is a drag on the economy.

In the long run, the truth is if we get health care spending down, really just a transfer payment within our economy, then we have room to spend more money on much more necessary investments, in our infrastructure, in our scientific edge over other countries.

I am here today to support the underlying bill, because I think it is the right thing to do for women in this country, but also because it is part of a growing success story of the Affordable Care Act: $500 million saved on prescription contraception alone. But add that to all of the other evidence, and we are living in a world in which it is increasingly hard to argue that the Affordable Care Act is not working: millions more people covered, huge chunks out of the uninsured rolls being eliminated, costs for overall health care expenses decreasing. I will not even get into it this afternoon, but quality is improving as well. That is people having hospital-acquired infections, having to be readmitted to the hospital.

The stories just keep on coming in. I certainly understand that on an anecdotal basis you can find people who have had negative experiences with the health care system under the Affordable Care Act. I could find millions of other people before the Affordable Care Act was passed as well. But there are many more people like Sean and Emilie Hannon, who are two freelancers from Weston, CT, who were looking for coverage previous to the Affordable Care Act being passed. The best they could do was $1,500 per month from Golden Rule. When they heard about the Affordable Care Act, they called the Connecticut exchange and they found a plan through ConnectiCare that was going to cost them $309 a month. This is a fairly young couple, a savings of nearly 80 percent compared to what they used to pay. That is a story that can be replicated millions of times all across this country.

We would be wise this week to restore this protection to women across

this country so they have access to affordable prescription birth control. That is just one part of a growing, overwhelming array of both success stories and positive data about the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, proving that the ACA works.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to respond to some of the comments by the Senator from Connecticut and specifically with regard to the health care law. I come with an interest because I did part of my medical training in that State, still have many friends who practice medicine in Connecticut, and feel from the comments I hear from them that they see a very different side of the picture than what we hear from the Senator from Connecticut.

For some time now Republicans have been talking about the terrible side effects of the President's health care law. The Senator from Connecticut made some references to a family who certainly may have been helped by the health care law, but there are clearly people in that State who are being harmed by the health care law.

In the past I have spoken on this floor about a story in the Washington Post about how the health care law is hurting families all across Connecticut. The article said that two insurance carriers in the Senator's home State of Connecticut have proposed increasing their health insurance premiums by an average of about 12 percent. I didn't hear the Senator from Connecticut make reference to that today. So some people will have smaller increases than the average, but many people in Connecticut are going to pay much more. That is an expensive side effect families are going to have to deal with because of the President's health care law for which the Democrats in the Senate have voted.

There was another article a week or so ago in The Hill newspaper with the headline ''Personal data on ObamaCare enrollees may be compromised.'' It says:

> Connecticut's health insurance exchange acknowledged Friday that the personal information of some enrollees may have been compromised.

Someone found a backpack on a street in Hartford, CT, containing personal information of about 400 people, and it looks as if some of the information is connected to the exchange.

It is interesting. There was a story in the Danbury, CT, newspaper. The headline is ''Affordable Care Act could cost schools big bucks.'' So it is not just health care; the Affordable Care Act itself could cost the schools big bucks. I haven't heard the Senator from Connecticut make reference to that. This could cost school districts hundreds of thousands of dollars they didn't expect to pay.

The Senator from New York is here, and I don't know if the Senator has time locked in. If not, I wanted to speak for a few more moments because this continues to be a major impact.

The law includes a special tax on what are called the Cadillac plans. These are generous health insurance plans that some people—such as union workers, police, and school employees—get in some places.

Another big thing is the way the law defines full-time workers, and this is a problem we are seeing in a lot of places. Employees are considered full time under the health care law if they work 30 hours a week. So schools—schools that are being impacted—are having to provide insurance for those people or cut back their hours.

It is hurting a lot of folks in the Senator's home State and specifically in the school districts in Connecticut. What they are finding is that they are having to pay more money to buy insurance for the people whom they can't cut back. So the school superintendent in Danbury, CT, wrote to the congressional delegation from Connecticut asking for help. According to a newspaper story from Danbury, he wrote:

> Unless there is some reasonable modification to the ACA [the President's health care law] there will be a tremendous drain on our limited resources.

So when I see the Senator from Connecticut with a sign that says the health care law works, I would say: Not for many people, and it is harming people, including students in our schools. The law is a drain on resources of schools, towns, and counties across the country—a very costly side effect of the health care law at the local level.

I hear the same from my constituents in Wyoming who are seeing similar decisions having to be made, tough choices. I know the Senator from Connecticut is hearing it from his constituents, such as the superintendent of schools in Danbury.

Middle-class families are getting smaller paychecks because of the law. School districts are getting stretched thin by the health care law. Families are having to pay higher premiums because of the health care law, and on top of that they are being exposed to potential fraud and identity theft in the exchanges created by the health care law, as evidenced by a backpack found on a street in Hartford, CT, containing names, Social Security numbers, home addresses, and birth dates of people who signed up for the exchange.

Republicans are going to keep talking about these devastating, dangerous side effects of the Democrats' health care law. We are going to keep pushing for real health care reform that gives people the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act of 2014, introduced by my friends and colleagues Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

We are at a critical moment when it comes to women's health care rights. We just witnessed a Supreme Court decision that curtailed important access to health care for employees across the country. The Hobby Lobby case has now opened the door for the vast majority of companies and bosses to start denying their employees contraceptive coverage if the owners have a religious objection. We must slam the door shut. To do that this body must set the record straight about the law the Supreme Court used to make their decision, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

As one of the original authors of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, I was the lead sponsor in the House of Representatives. Senator Kennedy was the lead sponsor in the Senate.

I can say with absolute certainty that the law has been unwisely stretched by the Supreme Court to extend religious protections to corporations Congress never intended to be covered under the bill. I am compelled to do so because several of my colleagues on the other side have come to the floor to defend the Hobby Lobby decision using my words. These were arguments I made in 1993 when we first passed the RFRA and we were dealing with the protection of individual—underlining individual—liberties. The quotation they used dealt broadly with the importance of religious freedom of expression in our country. I said the RFRA would help restore the American tradition of allowing maximum religious freedom. That is as true today as it was then. I believe as strongly in RFRA as it was written then as I do now, but it was misinterpreted and wrongly expanded by the Supreme Court.

When my colleagues used this quotation as a point of argument, they completely missed the point of the debate. The debate is not about the conflict between freedom of religious expression and government-mandated health coverage. That is a false choice. The debate is really whether the Supreme Court appropriately interpreted the RFRA in applying it to profit-making corporations.

As the author of the bill, I can say again with absolute certainty that the

Supreme Court got the Hobby Lobby case dead wrong.

When we wrote RFRA back in 1993, we did so to protect that which individuals with strong religious beliefs had always enjoyed—the presumption that they should be able to exercise their religious beliefs without interference from the government. But the Court took that protection and misapplied it to for-profit companies that exist for the purpose of benefiting from the open market.

The Hobby Lobby decision marks a sharp departure both from the intent of RFRA and from prior judicial interpretations of RFRA. The Supreme Court got it wrong. That is why this bill, authored by my colleagues from Washington and Colorado, is of paramount importance—to clarify the law and to restore protections for employees that were stripped away by this wrongheaded Supreme Court decision.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to assert that this is just another assault by Democrats on free exercise of religion or peddle other falsehoods. So I would like to clearly explain what this bill will and won't do.

This bill will ensure that companies cannot deny their workers any health benefits, including birth control, as required to be covered by Federal law.

This bill will make it clear that bosses cannot discriminate against their female workers, ensuring equal treatment under the law for tens of thousands of workers whose coverage hangs in the balance.

This bill is not only about birth control. The Hobby Lobby decision has implications for other health services, and now this bill will ensure that all covered employees have access to all necessary health care—not only contraceptives but also blood transfusions, antidepressants, and vaccines.

The bill does not require churches or nonprofit organizations to provide contraceptive coverage even when they object on religious grounds. The Affordable Care Act exemption process for nonprofit organizations with a religious mission is unchanged by this bill.

This bill will not allow new laws that can target specific religious groups.

The bill only applies to health care.

Most importantly, this bill does not restrict the Constitution's First Amendment right to free exercise of religion. The bill only clarifies the relative weight the Court should give when two Federal statutes—such as the Affordable Care Act and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—come into conflict.

As I continue to say, RFRA was intended to give individuals who profess strong religious beliefs what they had always enjoyed—the strong presumption that they should be able to exercise their religious beliefs without government interference. RFRA was not intended to extend the same protection to for-profit corporations the very purpose of which is to profit from the open market.

The Supreme Court's cavalier decision to grant religious rights to closely held corporations could curtail the health care freedom of women at as many as 90 percent of American businesses. By putting health care decisions in the hands of a woman's boss instead of a woman and her doctor, the decision creates a slippery slope that could affect tens of millions of Americans—our daughters, our wives—in the future.

We need this bill to clarify the law and firmly protect a woman's right to access essential health care.

I thank my colleagues Senator UDALL and Senator MURRAY for offering this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to protect women's health care and religious freedom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about one of the saddest developments in the Senate—namely, the all-out assault on the First Amendment being led by Senate Democrats.

It is important to clarify what the issue before this body is not about. The issue before this body is not about access to contraceptives, despite a whole lot of politicking by Senate Democrats who suggest to the contrary.

In this body the number of people who would do anything to restrict access to contraceptives to anybody is zero. Let me repeat that. There is no one in this body, there is no one I am aware of across the country who is advocating restricting anyone's access to contraceptives.

My wife and I are blessed with two little girls. I am very glad we don't have 17.

Nobody, nobody, nobody is talking about restricting access to contraceptives.

What are we talking about? What we are talking about is the Federal Government using brute force to force people to pay for the abortion-inducing drugs of others against their religious faith. That is extraordinary. It is remarkable and it is dismaying.

I am sorry to show what the current First Amendment looks like in the wake of the Democrats' assault on the First Amendment.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee we have been debating on amendments some 47 Democrats have supported that would repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment. Sadly, every Senate Democrat in the Judiciary Committee supported it.

Today, this body is considering another provision that would effectively cross out the free exercise rights.

Where have we entered when the Bill of Rights has become a partisan matter? What kind of world is it? It used to be the case that we would find bipartisan agreement that the First Amendment is part of our civil compact—that we will stand together with one voice in support of the free speech rights of individual citizens, in support of the religious liberty rights of individual citizens.

The proposal we are going to vote on in just a few minutes would go directly after the religious liberty rights of Americans.

Let me talk a little bit about one group of people who will be affected by this bill if this bill were to pass. Let me talk about the Little Sisters of the Poor, a group of Catholic nuns.

The Little Sisters of the Poor are an international congregation of Roman Catholic women founded in 1839 by St. Jeanne Jugan. Their mission is to:

> . . . offer the neediest elderly of every race and religion a home where they will be welcomed as Christ, cared for as family and accompanied with dignity until God calls them to himself.

The bill that is being voted on on this floor would shut these nuns down. The bill that is being voted on on this floor, if it were adopted, would fine the Little Sisters of the Poor millions of dollars, unless these Catholic nuns are willing to pay for abortion-producing drugs for others.

When did the Democratic Party declare war on the Catholic Church? And let me note, this is not hypothetical. I am not suggesting in theory this might be applied to the Little Sisters of the Poor. Right now—today—the Obama administration is litigating against the Little Sisters of the Poor, trying to force them to pay for abortion-producing drugs and threatening to shut the Little Sisters of the Poor down.

How far have we come from the basic bipartisan agreement in favor of religious liberty? Faith fines should have no place in American society.

The Little Sisters of Denver, which provides approximately 67 full-time jobs, has said it will incur penalties of roughly $6,700 per day—nearly $2.5 million per year—if it chooses to stay true to its religious beliefs; that is, $2.5 million a year in faith fines—fines to Catholic nuns who are devoting their time to caring and providing health care for the elderly. That is more than one-third of their $6 million budget each year.

What has become of the Democratic Party? When did they become so extreme that they would actually propose fining nuns millions of dollars if they are unwilling to pay for the abortion-producing drugs of others? That is not a mainstream position. That is a radical, extreme position.

I would encourage every one of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to ask themselves: How are they going to answer their constituents when they say: Senator, why did

you vote in favor of a law that would fine Catholic nuns millions of dollars if they refuse to pay for the abortion-producing drugs of others?

Let me make a basic suggestion. If you are litigating against nuns, you have probably done something wrong. And the Obama administration is doing so right now.

Mr. President, drop your faith fines.

Mr. Majority Leader, drop your faith fines.

To all of my Democratic colleagues, drop your faith fines. Get back to the shared values that stitch all of us together as Americans.

I call upon my Democratic colleagues to stop playing election-year politics. I recognize scaring women by suggesting someone is coming at their birth control may be good politics. It is false. Even the Washington Post has said it is false and a lie.

But election-year politics should not trump religious liberty. Senate Democrats should not wage war on the Catholic Church.

It is not just the nuns who are dismayed. The Catholic bishops have said the proposed bill ''does not befit a nation committed to religious liberty'' and would allow the government to ''override religious freedom rights of Americans regarding health coverage.''

So it is not just the nuns. It is to the Catholic bishops that the Democratic party has said: Your free exercise of religious rights has no place in a Democratic Senate.

The Catholic bishops went on to say:

If, in the future, the executive branch chose to add the abortion pill RU486, or even elective surgical abortion, including late-term abortion, to the list of ''preventative services,'' those who object to providing or purchasing such coverage would appear to have no recourse.

Think about that for a second. The Catholic bishops just said the bill this body is getting ready to vote on, if passed, would enable the Federal Government to try to force Catholic nuns to pay for and carry out partial-birth abortion. That is staggering.

If we want to talk about mainstream positions, there are mainstream positions, there are far-left positions, and then there is extreme radical fringe, which is the Federal Government forcing Catholic nuns to pay for partial-birth abortions. And that is where virtually every Senate Democrat is today.

Under the legislation before this body, the Catholic University Ave Maria would be forced to make the same choice: Authorize abortion-inducing drugs right now or pay millions of dollars in fines to the U.S. Government.

As Ave Maria President Jim Towey has said:

Ave Maria University pays 95 percent of the cost of the health plan we offer our employees. Under the federal mandate Ave Maria University would be paying for these drugs if we complied with the law. So we will not.

Every Senate Democrat who votes yes in a few minutes will be voting to fine Ave Maria Catholic University millions of dollars simply for standing true to their faith. That is a vote that should embarrass any Member of this body.

Mr. Towey went on to say:

We are prepared to discontinue our health plan and pay the $2,000 per employee, per year fine rather than comply with an unjust, immoral mandate in violation of our rights of conscience.

Belmont Abbey College is another proud religious school—founded by Benedictine monks—that the Democrats have put in the same predicament. The Democrats' legislation would force Belmont Abbey College to pay $20,000 a day in faith fines. Faith fines have no place in our democracy.

Let me ask again: Why are Democrats so hostile to the Catholic Church? Why are Democrats trying to use the Federal Government to fine Catholic institutions for holding true to their religious beliefs? It all comes down to a hard-line, extreme, out-of-touch position on abortion.

Just yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee about legislation so broad that it would set aside State laws providing parental notification for abortion, prohibiting late-term abortions, mandating taxpayer-funded abortions. These are extreme radical views held by a tiny percentage of the American people but yet held by a large percentage of Democratic activists.

This position would also rip apart the bipartisan legislation that President Clinton signed into law in 1993. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed the Senate 97 to 3. When President Clinton signed that Act, he said:

What [RFRA] basically says is that the Government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion. This judgment is shared by the people of the United States as well as by the Congress. We believe strongly that we can never, we can never be too vigilant in this work.

We should listen to the words of Bill Clinton in 1993, and the Senate should back away from this assault on religious liberty.

I will finally note two simple things.

In 1997, when the Senate considered another assault on the free speech protections of the First Amendment, then-Senator Ted Kennedy, liberal lion of the Senate, stood and said:

We haven't changed the Bill of Rights in over 200 years and now is no time to start.

Senator Ted Kennedy was right in 1997.

Likewise, President John F. Kennedy, in a historic speech to the Nation, said:

I would not look with favor upon a president working to subvert the First Amendment's guarantees of religious liberty.

Where are the Kennedys today? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the First Amendment today? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the constitutional rights of practicing Catholics? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the Little Sisters of the Poor? Does any Democrat have the courage to listen to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and speak for religious liberty?

It saddens me that there are not 100 Senators here unified, regardless of our faith, standing together, protecting the religious liberty rights of everyone.

Faith fines have no business in our democracy. I urge every Member of this body to vote no on this assault on basic religious liberty of every American.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I have come to the floor every day this week to talk about my commonsense bill to keep corporate interference out of women's private health decisions.

On Monday when I was on the floor, I shared the concerns of a Denver-based OB/GYN who said that in light of the Supreme Court's split decision in the Hobby Lobby case, physicians might now have to consider an employer's religious beliefs when making a medical recommendation to ensure their patients are covered for very basic contraceptive treatments.

Yesterday I spoke about a Colorado mother whose college-aged daughter depended on contraception—prescribed by her doctor—to help her manage a debilitating health condition that often kept her from attending class. She told me that without that contraceptive coverage through her family's health plan, her daughter would not have had the coverage for a medically necessary treatment.

Women are sharing these stories with me every day. And Coloradans agree—they should not have to ask for a permission slip to be covered by the method of contraception that is best for them.

Women should be in charge of their health care, not their boss, and certainly not a corporation.

This week my colleague from Washington State and I called on our colleagues to join us in supporting our bill—the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act—or the ''Not My Boss's Business Act.'' Our bill is straightforward. It is common sense. It ensures that no boss can come between a woman and her access to affordable health care.

I thank my colleagues who have come to the Senate floor this week to highlight the importance of passing this bill. In just a few moments, we will be casting our votes as to whether we should bring this bill to the floor. So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can at least agree this

is a debate worth having. It is a discussion I know women and men in every State are encouraging their representatives to have.

After bringing this legislation to the floor for a proper debate, if my colleagues then believe that this simple bill to keep a boss's religious beliefs from impacting access to essential health care for millions of American women is misguided, then they can vote against it.

Bosses have no business interfering in women's private health decisions. Women have asked us to act. Let's act.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last month five conservative justices on the Supreme Court decided that a corporation's rights can trump a female employee's right to make her own health care decisions. This is just the latest of several rulings from a thin majority of justices that diminish the rights of hardworking Americans and have a direct effect on their economic security. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act, which the Senate is considering today. It is needed to overturn the Court's most recent expansion of corporate rights.

For far too long, women were priced out of health care simply because of their gender. The very fact of being a woman, in effect, was brandished against women as a pre-existing condition. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, much of the discrimination women faced in the health insurance market was eliminated. It is unthinkable that as recently as last year, a woman's health care premiums could cost 45 to 140 percent more than a man's. No wonder over half of women identified cost as a barrier to health coverage and why so many women went without insurance. Women could be denied coverage for something as simple as having had a C-section, or for being a victim of domestic violence. It is a travesty that in a country as great as ours this inequity survived as long as it did.

Unfortunately, in the Hobby Lobby decision, which this legislation would address, the Supreme Court set back these advances in equality in health coverage by sanctioning the very discrimination in health care access and services that the Affordable Care Act remedied. By ruling that the owners of corporations may impose their religious beliefs on their employees, women are no longer guaranteed the right to make their own health care decisions. Additionally, this ruling could have far reaching consequences beyond access to contraception. Unless Congress acts, we could see employers restricting the right to other health care services, including vaccines or blood transfusions.

This ruling comes on the heels of another decision that also threatens women's access to health care. In McCullen v. Coakley, the Court ruled that a 35-foot buffer zone protecting women from harassment when entering women's health clinics was not justified and was therefore unconstitutional. This was yet another decision where the Roberts Court allowed other's rights—whether an employer or a stranger on the street who holds a different view point—to trump that of a woman seeking health care.

In addition to the Supreme Court narrowing the rights of American women, we have seen many legislative efforts across the country to cut away at the progress we have made in women's health over the last few years. We have seen Federal bills and amendments introduced that would take decisions out of the hands of patients and doctors, and place them with businesses and insurance companies. States have followed suit by passing laws limiting women's access to health care services. I believe our focus should be on improving access to quality and affordable health care for all Americans, not arbitrarily restricting the important treatments needed by millions of women.

The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act would restore Congress' intent by preventing any company from denying their workers specific health coverage, including birth control, as required to be covered by Federal law. Without this legislation, for-profit corporations that otherwise offer preventative health benefits can choose to deny their employers contraception coverage based on their bosses' religious beliefs. The bill before the Senate would once again prohibit bosses from discriminating against their employees based on their gender and would ensure that women's health care decisions are put back in the hands of those women and their doctors, where they belong.

At the core of the Affordable Care Act is the principle that all Americans, regardless of health history or gender, have the right to access health care services and make their own decisions about their health care. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee—and as a husband, a father, a grandfather, and as a Vermonter—this is a principle I take seriously. I will continue to fight against efforts to roll back protections for women, minorities, or any group that has faced discrimination.

I hope that instead of focusing on ways to limit health care options for women, we can join together to promote the interests of women across America by supporting this bill. Nothing less than the economic security of our families is at stake.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to allow us to begin debate on the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act of 2014, of which I am a cosponsor.

One of this Nation's founding principles is respect for religious faith. Most all of us agree that one American should not be able to impose his or her religious convictions upon another. Yet the outcome of the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Hobby Lobby case is that thousands of Americans may lose the ability to make the most personal choices about what health care meets their religious or ethical standards and hand those decisions over to an employer.

The Court's reasoning in the Hobby Lobby decision was deeply flawed. As I and several colleagues argued in a brief to the Court, applying the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as the Court did seriously misconstrues the language of the statute and ignores the intent of Congress in passing it. Giving for-profit corporations the power to impose the religious beliefs of managers or owners upon employees is what violates basic religious freedom.

It is a central feature of our health care system that millions of Americans receive health insurance through employer-sponsored plans and those employers are most often, as was the case with Hobby Lobby, corporations. Business owners choose to incorporate because forming a corporation means access to limited liability and other government-conferred privileges.

But corporations don't have faiths. People do. That includes the women who have now lost their ability to make the most important and personal decisions about their health care.

If we are to say we truly value the freedom to practice any religion or no religion, as we see fit, surely that includes the freedom for American women to make choices about their own health care without the imposition of their employer's religious convictions. The Supreme Court's decision has elevated the religious faith of a business's owners above the values of that business's employees. That is not what the law envisions, and it is not what Americans believe.

I strongly support this legislation to repair the damage the Supreme Court has done. We should proceed to this bill, debate it, vote on it, and hopefully pass it. America's women and their families deserve nothing less.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Protect Women From Corporate Interference Act, and I praise Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL (of Colorado) for their work on this bill.

Let me first discuss the Supreme Court's 5–4 decision in Hobby Lobby v. Burwell—a decision that in my view is deeply disappointing. In the Hobby Lobby case, the Supreme Court found that large, closely-held, for-profit corporations have religious-freedom rights

under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Major corporations can now assert a religious objection to generally applicable federal law.

It is possible such corporations will not get most exemptions they seek. This will be examined on a case-by-case basis. But the point is the Court has opened the door to granting these sorts of exemptions to large, for-profit corporations.

This is a far-reaching result that Congress never intended when it enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

As 18 other senators and I made clear to the Court in an amicus brief in the Hobby Lobby case, Congress's purpose in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993 was simple. Congress wanted to strengthen individuals' free-exercise protections, after a Supreme Court decision in Employment Division v. Smith (1990) limited those rights. But Congress never intended to grant new free-exercise protections to artificial, for-profit business corporations.

The Court's decision in Hobby Lobby went far beyond what Congress intended in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The Federal law limited by Hobby Lobby was the Affordable Care Act's requirement that preventive health services including contraceptives are covered without cost-sharing in both individual and employer-provided health plans. Preventive health services include contraception because it is basic health care for women. This is an important benefit secured by federal law for all American women, 99 percent of whom have used contraception at some point in their lives. The medical community has almost unanimously recognized contraception as basic and essential health care. As the Guttmacher Institute explained in 2011: Contraceptive use ''help[s] women avoid short intervals between births, thereby reducing the risk of poor birth outcomes.'' ''[S]hort birth intervals have been linked with numerous negative perinatal outcomes,'' including ''low birth weight, pre-term birth and small size for gestational age.'' Contraceptives can also be used to treat common medical conditions including ''menstrual-related migraines, the treatment of pelvic pain that accompanies endometriosis, and of bleeding due to uterine fibroids.''

The Institute of Medicine also recognized the importance of these benefits when it recommended that all FDA-approved contraceptives should be covered without cost-sharing, pursuant to the Women's Health Amendment to the health care law, which I strongly supported.

Yet the Court's decision in Hobby Lobby means a woman's employer can for religious reasons ignore the federal requirement to include this important health benefit in its health plan.

To me, that is wrong. A woman's employer-provided health plan should include basic preventive services required by law, without the owners of the corporation she works for imposing their own personal religious views upon her health care decisions.

I understand some have argued that this decision doesn't impact women's access to contraception because it doesn't allow a corporation to bar a woman from buying contraception. That's ridiculous. Of course health insurance coverage impacts access to care. That is the whole point of insurance. No one would argue that if an employer decided not to cover antibiotics that patients would still have the same access to needed medication on their own. When insurance coverage is limited, access is limited as well, particularly for those of lower financial means.

According to a 2009 study from the Guttmacher Institute, 23 percent of women surveyed reported having a harder time paying for birth control during the economic downturn, and this number rose to one out of three among those who were financially worse off compared to the year before. In fact, my Republican colleagues felt that prescription drug coverage was so important to ensuring patient access to medication that they led the creation of Medicare Part D, which was signed into law by President Bush. I supported that legislation and still believe that health insurance coverage is critical to ensuring patient access.

It is also important to note that contraception is not the only issue here. The Hobby Lobby decision means that other Federal health laws—including other benefits required by law, or even coverage itself—could be the subject of a religious objection by a corporate employer.

In the United States more than half of all individuals get insurance through their employer, and estimates suggest that more than half of Americans work for a closely-held corporation.

In the Affordable Care Act Congress recognized the importance of preventive care. We included coverage without a copay for effective prevention services as determined by independent medical experts. I will just name some: Blood pressure and cholesterol screening, colonoscopies, immunizations, HIV tests, mammograms and cervical cancer screening, diabetes screening, autism screening for children, hearing tests for newborns and screening for sickle-cell anemia.

The point is certain essential, preventive services for adults and children must be part of employer-provided health care under the law. But the Hobby Lobby decision grants for-profit corporations the ability to seek a religious exemption from providing them. Those exemptions may or may not be granted, but the Supreme Court has now opened the door to those claims.

In my view this is at odds with the fundamental principle that health care decisions should be made by patients in consultation with their doctors.

This bill is simple: it would protect elements of employer-provided health care plans that are already required by law against challenge on the basis of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It would not infringe any individual's constitutional right to the free exercise of religion, nor would it alter existing exemptions and accommodations for religious organizations and nonprofits.

I urge my colleagues to defend the critical health protections that we have created and join me in supporting this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reserve the last 3 minutes of debate for my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, in a few minutes we are going to vote to proceed to debate on the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act—or, as we call it, the Not My Boss's Business Act—straightforward, simple legislation that would ensure that no CEO or corporation can come between you and your guaranteed access to health care, period.

Women across the country are watching. Affordability of care equals access to care, and we know that millions of Americans lacked health insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act because they couldn't afford it, not because it wasn't available to them to purchase. Contraceptives should be a part of the options in women's health care because it is an essential part. We don't single out other benefits for employees. Why should we single out benefits that are so important to women in this country?

Now is the time for our colleagues to answer a few basic questions. Who should be in charge of a woman's health care decision? Should it be the woman making those decisions with her partner and her doctor and her faith or should it be her boss making those decisions for her based on his

own religious beliefs? To me and to the vast majority of people across the country, the answer to that question is obvious: Women should call the shots when it comes to their health care decisions, not their boss, not the government, not anyone else, period.

But we are here today because five men on the Supreme Court disagreed. Five men on the Supreme Court rolled back the clock on women across America. We are here today because we simply cannot allow that to stand.

In the aftermath of that decision, women across America turned up here in Congress and demanded we fix it. That is why I worked with my partner, the senior Senator from Colorado, to introduce this bill, and we have 46 cosponsors in the Senate and over 120 organizations that have voiced their support now. So I sincerely hope our Republican colleagues will join us in allowing us to proceed to debate on this important bill.

I wish to remind them that women across the country are watching. In fact, we have a number of them here in the Nation's Capitol today, and I believe they will be very interested in seeing who is on their side.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Mark Udall, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Carl Levin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Jon Tester, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Maria Cantwell, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Harkin	Murphy
Begich	Heinrich	Murray
Bennet	Heitkamp	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Pryor
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reid
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 56 and the nays are 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Vermont.

IMMIGRATION CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, over the years I have frequently spoken on the Senate floor about refugees. I have asked my fellow Senators to support our humanitarian refugee efforts in farflung corners of the world. In doing so, I cite America's role as a human rights leader and our long history of providing refuge to those fleeing persecution and violence. I also remind people of a time in the past, around World War II, when this country unwisely closed its borders to people who were fleeing the Holocaust in Germany. They came here, they were turned back, sent back, many of them to certain death in the death camps. That was a sorry part of our history. Usually our history reflects what we see in the Statue of Liberty: a beckoning torch to refuge. But now the refugee crisis has come back again and to our own border.

It is a complicated problem. I hope we will stop trying to react to whatever was in the latest news cycle 12½ seconds ago so we can get to the next sound bite 12½ seconds from now and resist the urge to let politics shape our response. Critics are arguing that the increase in unaccompanied children arriving at the southwest border is driven by recent changes in our immigration policy. This is a sound bite. The facts, of course, are a lot different. They tell a different and more complicated story.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has found over 50 percent of the children ages 12 to 17 arriving from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras have been forcibly displaced and have claims to international protection because of the violence they have encountered. If changes in immigration policy were the primary factor, we would expect to see an across-the-board increase in children arriving from Mexico and Central America.

What Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras have in common is widespread corruption and weak governments that have failed to implement effective social and economic programs or to protect their most vulnerable citizens from record levels of violence. This reality, more than any change in U.S. policy, is responsible for the massive increase in unaccompanied minors arriving on our southwest border.

It is true that many of these children do not have claims to immigration relief and they are going to be returned. For them, the dangers of this trip are not worth it, and we must discourage them from making the arduous journey alone. But others are fleeing murder or being forced into gangs or girls in their early teens are being raped and impregnated. This is what they are escaping.

There is no doubt that simply maintaining the status quo is not an option. We should take up and pass the administration's emergency supplemental request without delay. But instead of supporting the supplemental, Republicans are trying to use the crisis to promote fear and their enforcement-only agenda. It has not worked in the past. It will not work now. These children coming across the border are not trying to flee from enforcement. If they see somebody in uniform, they run to them, thinking that finally they are escaping the gangs and the murderers and the rapists, and now they suddenly feel safe because they see an American in uniform. As we know from the experience of other countries facing far greater refugee crises, increased detention and other messages of deterrence do not persuade desperate people from taking dangerous journeys.

Some Members of Congress are proposing that the way to solve this problem is by amending the Trafficking

Victims Protection Act to make it easier to deport these children by rushing them through a superficial hearing—and it would be superficial—without access to counsel or child welfare specialists, in a country strange to them and in a language different than theirs. That is unacceptable. We are talking about young children—6 and 7 and 8 years old—who have experienced horrific violence and now are in a country where they don't even speak the language. It is unconscionable to push them through our complicated legal system terrified and alone, without a lawyer, and with the ultimate idea that they will be summarily deported back to the very danger they fled. I will vote against anything that would allow such a travesty.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act is not a windfall for these children. It hasn't been from the time President George W. Bush signed it into law until today. It simply provides commonsense protections such as requiring the children who arrive alone to be interviewed by a child welfare specialist and have a meaningful opportunity to tell their story to a judge. That is how we identify victims of trafficking or sexual violence or persecution. If improving the efficiency of the process is the goal, the administration already has the discretion to do that. The funding for immigration judges and legal assistance in the supplemental will further help. We can address this humanitarian crisis without watering down our law. We don't have to turn our backs on our own basic values as Americans—the basic values that brought my grandparents to Italy from Vermont and my great-great grandparents from Ireland to Vermont. It is our humanitarian values. Let's not turn our backs on them.

The problem, in fact, we are facing now could be alleviated in part if the Republican-controlled House of Representatives would allow a vote on the Senate's comprehensive immigration reform bill, S. 744. We had hundreds of hours of hearings, of markups, of debate, sometimes going late into the evening, and then days of debate on the floor, and we passed it by a strong bipartisan majority. We passed this bill 1 year ago, and the Republican leadership in the House will not even allow it to come to a vote, even though it would probably pass in the same form as we did. They will not let it come to a vote because whether people vote for or against it, there are some people who will disagree with the vote, so it is easier to vote maybe. No matter what the humanitarian crisis we have, vote maybe. Don't vote yes, don't vote no; vote maybe by not voting, but then blame it on the President, blame it on everybody else.

The Senate stepped up and we passed a bill the President said he would sign. The Senate-passed bill calls for nearly 20,000 new Border Patrol agents, 3,500 additional Customs and Border Protection officers, and 700 miles of fencing. We have heard people stand and say—as though they suddenly found this out—we need tougher laws to fight back against coyotes and cartels that want an opportunity to exploit these vulnerable children. I have heard some of the same people refuse to vote on a bill and say we need this protection. Read the bill. S. 744 does that too. It has tougher provisions to fight against human smuggling and enhanced penalties in situations that result in serious bodily injury, death, bribery or corruption.

We have done it. We have done it in the Senate. Why isn't there a hue and cry? I understand it is very easy, if you are going to do a sound bite for the evening news or something, to stand up and say: Why haven't Obama and the Democrats acted? It takes a little bit more time to say: Why haven't you voted for a bill that does everything you say is needed? Why won't the Republican leadership even allow the House Members—Republicans and Democrats—to vote on a bill that does everything they say they need?

I want to thank Senators HARKIN and FEINSTEIN and DURBIN for their comments at the last week's Appropriations Committee hearing. It is clear to me that they, too, understand our Nation is at a crossroads with this crisis. The world is watching how we are going to respond. How is the greatest Nation on Earth going to respond?

I know one person who spoke out: Pope Francis. He has urged us to protect these children. Well, I think the Pope is right.

We have a choice. We can either make good on the promises we have already written into our law and Republicans and Democrats have voted for, or we can decide: Gosh, we didn't mean it. We voted for it, we gave great press conferences, but we did not mean it. Now, gee whiz, it is complicated—as though life is always easy—so let's just rewrite the law. If we do that, just send these children back. Send these children back to the murderers, the rapists, the gangs. Doesn't that turn our back on the very principles on which this Nation was founded—the principles that brought my grandparents here from Italy, my great-grandparents here from Ireland?

Where are those principles? We forgot them at the beginning of the Holocaust. We look at the people who died, the number of Jews who went to the ovens because we had forgotten our principles.

Well, President George W. Bush was right in signing the bill. The Republicans and Democrats who voted for it were right. Let's not turn our backs. If we want to do something beyond the sound bites, something realistic, pass the supplemental for the people we need to do it for and allow the House of Representatives to vote up or down on the bill that Republicans and Democrats voted for here in the Senate a whole year ago. But do not let the supplemental request be a political football. It should be passed clean, without delay. Do not try to remove all the protections for victims of human trafficking.

Pass the supplemental, and then have the courage to stand up and vote yes or no on S. 744. We did here in the Senate. Republicans and Democrats came together. A large majority of us passed it in the Senate. Why can't the House of Representatives do the same thing? I will tell you why. They are afraid whichever way they vote, it might be unpopular. Well, that is what you expect. I have cast more votes than all but a half dozen Senators in the history of this country. Can anybody go back through all those thousands upon thousands of votes and find some they could attack me on? Of course. I could give them a list myself. Can I find some that I probably on second thought wish I had cast differently? Of course I can. But I had the courage to vote yes or no. I was criticized when I became the first Vermonter—in fact, the only Vermonter—to ever vote against the war in Vietnam. The authorization was cut off by one vote. Today it would be hard to find anybody who supported that war.

My point is not whether as a Senator from Vermont I vote right or wrong or any one of us as a Senator from our State votes right or wrong—but at least vote. That is what we said we would do when we were elected: vote. So I am talking about what is wrong with immigration law when you are afraid to even vote one way or the other. But let's not turn our back on the principles this country stands for. Let's not say to 7- or 8- or 9-year-old children—trying to escape a fate that my children or my grandchildren would never face—sorry, we are too great and big and busy a country to worry about you. Go back and face your fate, whatever it might be, because we don't care. That is not the America I serve. That is not the America I love. That is not the place where the Senate should be if we are going to be the conscience of the Nation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I want to spend a few minutes discussing the effect and the premise of the legislation on which we just decided not to move forward.

I have spent 25 years of my life caring for women. There is not a complication of pregnancy I have not handled. I have seen every aspect of it. I have delivered babies the size of my little finger and watched them move their little arms, not yet far enough along to survive. I have cared for women in the midst of lost pregnancies and the tragedy and trauma and the heartbreak. I have cared for women who have had abortions and the complications that has completed and exacerbated in their own lives from psychological to real physical problems. I have actually performed abortions to save women's lives who had severe congenital heart defects and would have died had their pregnancy continued.

But the premise under which this bill was brought forward is an absolute false premise. You see, I come from Oklahoma. David Green and his family come from Oklahoma. They are the owners of Hobby Lobby. They are one of the finest groups of people I have ever met in my life. They are responsible corporate citizens. But everything they have done in their life is guided by their faith and their ethics. Therefore, they are not open on Sunday because they feel their employees have a right to a restful weekend. They pay a very livable wage. They have always had health insurance.

The Supreme Court decision was about religious freedom and whether I, as a private businessperson, am still entitled to that as I carry on commerce in this country.

What has been described—maybe not specifically but negatively—is that Hobby Lobby and the Green family do not appreciate women or their contributions or their rights or their freedoms. Nothing could be further from the truth. They had a very personal objection to four abortifacients—not birth control pills—four medicines, devices that actually kill a living human being. See, what we do not think about very often—and I think about all the time—is that when an egg and a sperm unite, there is created something that has never been created before: a unique human being. The genetic material will be no different at conception than it is when you are 85 years old. It is unique. It has never before been here; it will never again be here.

So based on these deeply held beliefs and ethics—and what I would say is morals—they chose to supply their entire employee network with 16 different methods of birth control. But the four that actually kill a baby that has been formed—they thought it was their religious right to be able to say they should not have to take money out of their pocket to pay for something that goes against their strongly held moral, ethical, and faith beliefs.

So we have had a reaction. It is political in nature. It does not have much to do with the facts. It has a lot to do with darkness, of saying something is so that is not true, and saying it often enough so we can tell people that here are those terrible Republicans and they want to hurt women.

I dedicated 25 years of my life to helping women in every type of tragedy, every type of disease, whether it is cancer or diabetes or hypertension or pregnancy or miscarriages or just the common cold. Before the Senate forced me to stop delivering babies, I was delivering babies that I delivered; in other words, it was the third generation. That is how crazy the Senate ethics rules are.

So the very undercurrent of what we heard could not be further from the truth. What we heard—the implications were that the Green family is somehow this negative corporate monster who wants to take women's rights away—is absolutely untrue.

The other falsehood we hear is that if you do not have health care, you do not have available birth control. We spend $400 million a year on title 19, most of which is in birth control pills that are given out to women who do not have access. It costs $7 a month to buy birth control pills, and most physicians, like myself, who had women who could not either access title 19 or who did not have $7 a month, gave the pills themselves out of their stocks, their samples.

So there is a reality other than what has been painted in the Senate, and I could not sit by and let this hang out, this terrible untruth. I do not know of a family business, I do not know of a business in America that cares more about its employees than Hobby Lobby, and it is manifested through the employee loyalty and also the success of their brand because they really have a team. And you do not have a team if you do not feel as if you are being cared for—that you are not one of the group.

There are a lot of problems in front of this country. But the one described in this last piece of legislation is not one of them. The Green family does not keep anybody from buying abortifacients if they want them. They are not all that expensive. The morning-after pill is over the counter. But to force a person of faith to pay for an action against what they believe is morally wrong. It is far away from the religious liberties our Constitution guarantees.

I know we can get hyped up on emotion, but the emotion we ought to get hyped on is preserving the rights our Founders guaranteed when they started this country. They were based on the same set of beliefs the Green family inculcates into everything they do with Hobby Lobby. It is pretty ironic to me that we have become so postmodern, so smart, so ''for'' what the government can do and mandate that we are willing to destroy the very freedoms that created this country in the first place.

This bill was a cynical attack on truth. I am glad it is not proceeding. It is time to quit wasting the Senate's time on political games and start addressing the very real problems this country has, such as the fact that Social Security disability will run out of money next month; the fact that one-third of those on disability who are not truly disabled are threatening the livelihood of those who truly are; the fact that Medicare, 17 years from now or 16 years from now, will be out of money; the fact that Social Security will be out of money in 18 years; the fact that we are having corporations leave this country in a mass flood because we have a Tax Code that is not competitive with the rest of the world; the fact that we are wasting $250 billion a year on duplicative programs that do not accomplish the goals which the Congress set out for them. Yet we have no leadership that says we are going to address the very real problems in front of the country. It is not a great record to be proud of.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask to be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SECOND LIEUTENANT NOAH HARRIS

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I wish to share an experience I had a couple of weeks ago while riding the mountains of North Georgia to my home. I was in the pickup truck alone, driving my red Silverado from a place in the mountains. I spent a lot of time thinking—which I try to do when I get a few moments to myself—about all the difficult positions we are now in as a country. I thought about our border with Mexico and all the Central American children who are coming through, huddled on the border, and the crisis there. I thought about Syria and the tragedy of that civil war. I thought about the fact that the Israelis and Hamas are firing rockets back and forth from Gaza and into the mainland of Israel. I thought about the fact that we are now negotiating with Iran, our archenemy. I thought about the fact that Vladimir Putin decided to take advantage of the vacuum that has been created in world leadership and moved into Crimea, threatening Kiev and threatening Ukraine. I thought about all the crises we have along the way.

Then I came to Ellijay, GA, a little town known for its apples and its population of 2,000 great Georgia citizens.

I came to Poole's Bar-B-Q, which is a landmark along the highway in Ellijay, GA. I stopped, and all of a sudden all those thoughts I had of the wars going on, the conflicts going on, the strife and the trouble going on all culminated in Gilmer County, because in Gilmer County in 2005 I attended the funeral of Noah Harris. Noah Harris was killed in Iraq in 2005.

I thought about his story, and I thought about our position now, and I thought about some message I want to send to my country and to this body of the Senate.

Let me talk about Noah Harris. Noah Harris was a cheerleader at the University of Georgia. On the Saturday before 9/11 in 2001, he was in Sanford Stadium with 92,000 fans of the Georgia Bulldogs cheering on the team.

Then, like the rest of the world, he saw the terrible attack of 9/11 in 2001—in New York City, in Shanksville, PA, and in Washington, DC.

On the morning of the 12th, he got out of bed in the dormitory and he went straight to the Army ROTC building in Athens, GA, and told them he wanted to sign up for an ROTC commission because he wanted to go fight whoever it was who killed those 3,000 citizens of the world tragically in New York City.

They said: Noah, you can't get a commission in just a year. You only have a year left.

He said: I can double up and do it. I want to go for my country. I want to go for what is right. I want to go fight for America.

He became a second lieutenant in the 3rd Infantry Division, and, sure enough, 3 years after that, he was in Iraq. He became known as the Beanie Baby soldier because he had his pockets stuffed with Beanie Babies. And as he would go through Ghazaliya, where he was stationed near Baghdad, he would hand out Beanie Babies to the Iraqi children. He was like a pied piper. Unfortunately, in the 11th month of his tour, a rocket-propelled grenade his hit humvee and he and two of his buddies were killed instantly in Iraq.

I didn't know Noah Harris, but I went to the funeral that day because, as a Senator from Georgia, I wanted to pay my respects to a soldier who paid the ultimate sacrifice in the war on terror.

So as I was riding through Gilmer County a couple weeks ago, thinking about the crises we have today around the world and then thinking about Noah Harris, I thought to myself, there is a message all of us need to remember: Those soldiers should never have died in vain, and we have to make sure they did not.

In Iraq 4,486 American soldiers were killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. In Afghanistan, to date, 2,319—a total of 6,805—most of them Americans, some of them immigrants seeking their citizenship in America and fighting for America in our Armed Forces—fought for the rights and freedoms that all our Founding Fathers stood for, fought for all the reasons we serve in this body today, fought for all the reasons that America is the great and noble country it is around the world.

But right now there is an absence of leadership in the world, and because of it we are seeing one crisis come up after another. I worry that Noah Harris, who died in Iraq in 2005, might—and I underscore the word ''might''—have died in vain if we don't recognize our responsibilities and see to it that we try and prevent what has been happening lately from continuing to happen.

There is a decision point coming to the United States of America—it is coming next year. It is one I want to encourage the President to think about deeply and for all of us to think about deeply.

We have lost Iraq to ISIS. ISIS is a renegade group of terrorists who have basically taken over that country and partnered with some of the terrorists in Syria to control Iraq.

One of the reasons they did that is we left a huge vacuum in Iraq when we pulled out. We pulled every American soldier out. I know it was our goal to leave after the surge worked—and that was the right thing to do. But it wasn't the right thing to pull out every single soldier, because we abandoned all the infrastructure that we had built. We abandoned the image of American strength and power. We abandoned the ability for us to be agile in a dangerous part of the world.

In Afghanistan, we are supposed to pull our troops out at the beginning of next year. Some of them should come home but not all of them. We have invested billions of dollars in American hardware and American money to see to it we had the best support in the world for our soldiers in Afghanistan. If we abandon Bagram, if we abandon Kabul—if we abandon Afghanistan, the same thing will happen in Afghanistan as happened in Iraq. And those soldiers, the 2,319 who died in Afghanistan, will have in part died in vain because we abandoned what they built. We abandoned what they protected. We abandoned the investment they made.

We need also to remember what happened on 9/11 of 2001, when we decided to go into Iraq and then later into Afghanistan. We didn't have enough infrastructure in that part of the world to make an invasion. We had to rent the Kyrgyzstan airport near Russia to be able to fly our troops in to begin positioning outside of the Tora Bora area in Afghanistan.

We have built tremendous infrastructure, we have built tremendous bases, and we have tremendous assets for which the taxpayers of the United States have paid. We should maintain a presence there so we are agile; so our SEALs teams, if needed, can be positioned; so that the rest of the world knows that while the war may be over and America has come home, it hasn't left. It hasn't abandoned us. An American presence will remain—just as we have in Germany, just as we have in Japan, just as we have in South Korea. Our best friends today were our enemies 40, 50, and 60 years ago, because America didn't leave when the fight was over. We need to make sure that relationship happens in Afghanistan so we can begin to build our presence in that part of the world and be that somebody who prohibits and inhibits terrorism and people like ISIS from taking over countries.

Make no mistake about it. Vladimir Putin has been encouraged by an absence of leadership, and ISIS took advantage of an absence of leadership. What is going on between Hamas and Israel in the Gaza Strip is an absence of leadership, in part on our part. We can't sit around and be bystanders. We have to recommit ourselves to the effort in that part of the world because in the end the peace and security of America from terrorism and from those who would bring us down is not our looking the other way and not living up to our responsibility to the Noah Harrises of the world who gave the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq in 2005—all because he watched what we all watched that morning of 9/11 in 2001, and said: This shall not stand. I want to volunteer to fight for my country. And he joined our Army and did so.

God bless Noah Harris. God bless his parents, Rick and Lucy. God bless the United States of America. May we remember our responsibility not to leave what we have built and remain a beacon of peace, liberty, and democracy around the world.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to inform the Members about an important hearing that was held this morning in the Senate Veterans' Committee. I also wish to thank the Members of the Senate who, in the midst of a very partisan environment last month, voted with 93 votes—overwhelming support—to pass a very significant piece of legislation to help the men and women who put their lives on the line to defend our country—legislation that was written by Senator

MCCAIN and myself, and I thank him very much for his help in this effort.

One of the important provisions in that legislation was an understanding that the needs of our veterans are a cost of war. They are a cost of war just as much as guns and tanks and planes and missiles are a cost of war. It seems to me to be fairly obvious that if we spend trillions of dollars fighting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is absolutely appropriate to make sure we have money available on an emergency basis to take care of the men and women who use those guns and tanks and missiles and who put their lives on the line and, in some cases, never come home.

So the first point I wish to make is that if we send people to war, we should always understand that a cost of that war is taking care of our veterans.

I recall—and I see the chairperson of the Appropriations Committee and she will recall this as well—that when this country went to war in Iraq and after in Afghanistan—and let me be clear, I voted against the war in Iraq—but when we went to war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, the understanding was that this is emergency funding; that our troops, no matter how one voted on the war, needed the equipment to take care of themselves, to protect themselves, and to win the mission. That is exactly where we are today. We want to win this mission. The mission we are involved in now is making sure the men and women who served this country in the military get quality care in a timely manner. That is the mission we have to win now, and that, in my view, is a cost of war.

I think there is not widespread awareness of what the cost of war is, and I hope, A, we never get into more wars in the future, but that if we ever do, people understand that any budget for war must include the needs of veterans—not 2 years after the war but 70 years after the war. When some veteran is sitting in some room in an apartment without legs, without arms, without eyesight, that is a cost of war and we don't desert those people—not tomorrow, not 50 years from now, not 70 years from now. Our moral commitment is to make certain we provide for those who defend us.

I think there is not sufficient understanding about what the cost of war truly is. I wish to mention just a few facts people should understand. Over 2 million men and women served this country in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Studies are very clear that 20 to 30 percent of those men and women have come home with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury. That is between 400,000 to 500,000 men and women who are coming home with PTSD or TBI. What that translates into is men and women who are struggling every single day. It translates into outrageously high rates of suicide for younger veterans, substance abuse, inability to hold on to a job and earn a living; many of these folks have a difficult time being around people. It translates into divorce. It translates into emotional problems for kids and for other family members.

Since fiscal year 2006, the number of veterans receiving specialized mental health treatment has risen from over 927,000 to more than 1.4 million in fiscal year 2013. Today, and every day, approximately 49,000 veterans are receiving outpatient mental health appointments. Let me repeat that. Today, some 49,000 veterans in 50 States in this country are receiving mental health appointments. That is a staggering number. During the last 4 years, VA outpatient mental health visits have increased from $14 million a year to more than $18 million a year. This is just one of the problems facing the veterans community. How do we provide the psychiatrists, the social workers, the psychologists, the counselors we need? It is a huge issue because PTSD and TBI are very tough illnesses.

In addition, what we are looking at now—and every Member of the Senate is familiar with this—is outrageously high waiting periods for veterans to get into the VA. Time and time again I hear from veterans in Vermont and I hear from veterans all over the country; I hear from veterans organizations and I read independent surveys which tell me that when veterans get into the VA, the quality of the care they get is good. I just met 2 hours ago with a veterans organization—same thing: Once people get into the system, the quality of care is generally good; the problem is accessing the care. The problem is appointments.

I will not read to my colleagues all of the statistics, but trust me the waiting lines all over this country are much too high in many parts of America. There are other people who never even made it to the waiting lines. This has to do with a whole lot of issues that we have discussed.

The bottom line is we must address the waiting time issue and make sure that in the very near future, every veteran who is in need of health care gets that health care in a timely manner.

Sloan Gibson, who is the Acting Secretary of the VA——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is informed that the time is under Republican control, if the Senator would suspend.

Mr. SANDERS. Could I ask my colleague just for 3 more minutes?

Mr. RISCH. The Senator may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Senator SANDERS is speaking. Senator RISCH, I believe, is going to speak. The time now is on unaccompanied children; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement was that the Republicans control the time until 4:30.

Ms. MIKULSKI. OK.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. I ask unanimous consent that——

Ms. MIKULSKI. I haven't yielded the floor. I reserved my right to object. I am just clarifying. So Senator SANDERS wishes to speak, and as I understand it, I have time—this is not in any way to interfere with the Senator from Idaho, but at 4:30 I am supposed to have the time under the time controlled by the Democrats; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We already agreed to the unanimous consent request that the Republicans control the time until 4:30.

Ms. MIKULSKI. How much time is—all I am trying to do is know when I am going to be able to speak.

If I could turn to the Senator from Idaho, how long does he intend to speak?

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I intend to speak for about 4½ minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I withdraw my objection. I think we deserve to hear Senator SANDERS, and I will wait patiently for my turn.

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank very much the Senator from Idaho.

Let me wrap it up by making the point that Acting Secretary Gibson made this morning which was a very simple but important one. What he said is we must address the immediate crisis of ending these outrageously long waiting periods that veterans are now experiencing in order to get into the VA. Right now—and I am proud of what he is doing—they are moving very aggressively to get veterans all over this country into private health care when necessary and any other form of health care, to make sure those waiting periods go down. I think they are doing a pretty good job. They have to continue to do that, but we should be mindful that this is going to be a very expensive process.

The other point he made, which is equally important, is that long term, if the goal is to end these unacceptable waiting periods, we have to give the VA the staffing and the space and the facilities and the infrastructure they need.

He came forward with what I recognize is a very big pricetag. His pricetag was $17.6 billion, so we can get the 10,000 more staff we need, the doctors, the psychiatrists, the primary health care physicians, the mental health

counselors we need, get the space we need, because in many facilities around the country the staff can't operate because they don't have adequate space.

So what I would say to my colleagues, if we are serious about addressing this very important problem, we will go forward in two ways. No. 1, immediate crisis, let's end those waiting lists. Let's contract out when necessary to private physicians.

Long term, it is absolutely imperative that the VA have the infrastructure it needs so we don't have this crisis again 2 years from today.

The last point, I reiterate. If we send people off to war—if we make that enormously difficult, painful decision—I hope every Member in this body understands that taking care of veterans is a cost of that war and that we have a moral responsibility to do everything we can with them and for them and their families.

Before I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum submitted by Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson at our committee hearing earlier today.

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

Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN SANDERS

From: Sloan D. Gibson, Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Regarding: Testimony at July 16, 2014 Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs Hearing.

Per your request, attached for your information is a summary of additional resource needs through FY2017 that I outlined in my testimony today before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In developing the resource requirements, the overarching goals were to:

Support the work of the Senate-House conference committee to improve Veterans' access to medical care and services.

Ensure that VA has the resources necessary to deliver timely, high quality care and benefits to Veterans enrolled in the VA system.

Schedule all Veteran appointments within standards of acceptable care.

Enhance and reform infrastructure that enables VA medical care (i.e. facilities construction/IT improvements) to modernize VA's operations and provide access to care when and where Veterans want it.

Further, the resource requirements were shaped by principles that the Administration believes should be key to any discussion of VA resource needs. These principles include:

Leverage contract care where necessary, but focus efforts on incentivizing improvements in the VA system itself—Consider referrals to non-VA care to address burgeoning workload as a temporary stop-gap to immediately address the current problem, but concurrently look to strengthen the VA system by including incentives and resources for VA to deliver care in-house.

Require cost-effective, coordinated care—Make efficient use of taxpayer dollars by ensuring quality care is delivered in a cost-effective way. Require VA to actively coordinate a Veteran's care across all care environments.

Modernize VA infrastructure and processes—Ensure that VA facilities and IT infrastructure are modernized and equipped to meet increasing demand for services; reform VA IT delivery and procurement to make it more effective in delivering services to Veterans.

Support VA system without undercutting other national priorities—Given that VA is required to provide quality care to Veterans—and faces serious resources needs not contemplated when budget caps were negotiated—funding to support the ramp-up of VA medical care contemplated below must be provided outside of current base discretionary resources.

If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

VA RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS FACT SHEET

Investments to Address VA Access to Care and Modernize Infrastructure and Processes

Resource	Cost ($Billions)	Summary of Use of Funds
Increasing Veterans' System-wide Access to Care.	$10.0	• Access: $8.2B for approximately 10,000 primary care and specialty care physicians, and other clinical/medical staff including physicians, nurses, social workers, mental health professionals, and others—and funds other associated expenses such as equipment, supplies, and other overhead costs • Hepatitis-C Drugs: $1.3B for critical new therapies over the next 2 years for higher than expected costs for two new Hepatitis C drug therapies that are significantly more effective and carry fewer side effects • Caregivers Program: $186M is estimated to support higher-than-expected demand for the Caregivers program (over approximately 22,000 Caregivers in total)
IT Enhancements	$1.2	• IT Infrastructure: Additional funding is needed to provide IT support in new space generated by major and minor construction and Non-Recurring Maintenance (NRM). • Project Development: Additional funding is needed for the development of OIT programs. These include Interoperable Purchased Care, Mobile App Scheduling, and additional Veterans Benefits Management System & VBA IT development. • Other IT Support: Additional funding for IT staff to support operational requirements and for hardware, bandwidth, security, etc.
Improve and Invest in VA Physical Infrastructure.	$6.0	Funding for approximately: • 700 Minor and NRM projects to include safer inpatient care to eradicate legionella and other threats • 8 major construction projects that address safety or access issues
Veterans Benefits Administration	$0.4	• Funding for approximately 1,700 staff to speed appeals, non-rating benefits workload, and other benefits programs
Total	$17.6	

• These resources are needed to ensure that VA is able to deliver high quality, timely health care to Veterans enrolled in the VA.

With that, I yield the floor, and again I wish to thank my friend Senator RISCH for the courtesy of giving me some extra time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

(The remarks of Mr. RISCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2616 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time between now and 5:30 p.m. will be controlled by the majority party.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, for the next hour a number of us from the Democratic Caucus will be talking about the Central American refugee crisis. We are lucky to be joined by Senator MIKULSKI, the chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to get us started today. So I look forward very much to hearing what she has to say and you will be hearing from me in a little bit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an urgent crisis at our border in which over 250 children a week are coming from Central America, fleeing horrific gang violence—horrific gang violence—to seek refuge and asylum in the United States of America.

This is being called a crisis at the border. Well, it is a border crisis, but the crisis actually begins in Central America, where brutal, violent gangs, based on organized crime, are either trying to recruit the boys into organized crime, drug smuggling, human trafficking, or to recruit the girls into human trafficking in other just dangerous and repugnant circumstances.

But when you go to the border the way I have, you will see that the situation is dire. It is dire because, as these children come to the border, crossing the Rio Grande—probably within really almost a 50-mile stretch of the Grande; it is not over the 1,900 miles of the Grande—they come and, actually, they do not try to sneak in, they come right up to where the border control is and they have pieces of paper with their name on it. They are then taken into custody by border control. They are placed into holding cells that are designed for adult males. They were designed to hold drug smugglers, narcotraffickers, and now they hold as many as 20 or 30 or 40 children, while under the law they are to be placed in the hands of the Health and Human Services Agency while their legal and asylum status is being verified.

Well, I am telling you, the entire infrastructure for dealing with these children—from the way the border control is trying to take care of them, the overrunning of the capacity of these

holding cells, to the backlog on processing their legal and asylum determination, to really trying to place them in facilities under the care of Health and Human Services—the situation is dire.

The President of the United States has asked for emergency funding to deal with it. I hope we consider this emergency funding. The amount of money the President is seeking is $3.7 billion. This is to care for the humanitarian needs of the children, the enforcement at the border, the identifying of their legal status under a law passed under the administration of President Bush to deal with the trafficking of children, both boys and girls, and also for robust deterrence in the home countries where these children are coming from. But the deterrence comes from breaking down and prosecuting organized crime syndicates of the smugglers and the traffickers.

We are also asking for money to conduct a massive educational campaign advising Central American families against the dangers and false hopes of this journey. The journey is, indeed, dangerous. They come on foot. They come by car. They ride the tops of a train that is referred to as The Beast. There was one little girl who I spoke to with Secretary Johnson. She had stayed awake for 2 days on the rooftop of a train, terrified that she would fall off and be mutilated, just to be able to make it into the United States of America. And why did she make such a perilous, dangerous journey? It was because they were trying to recruit her into these violent and vile ways.

We need to make sure Central America, with our help, goes after the seven organized crime units that we know are sparking this, that are trying to recruit these kids; giving them false promises too, that if they come to this country, they will be able to get a free pass somehow for getting into this country. We need to be able to stop this and be able to deal with it in the most effective way.

The President's program actually does outline the money to be able to do that. When the children do come, as I said, while they are awaiting their legal status to be determined, they are placed in the hands of HHS. Now, HHS does not run group homes. HHS does not run foster care. HHS funds it, and they need to be able to turn to local communities to be able to have these children be able to stay.

I saw fantastic work being done while the children were being placed at Lackland Air Force Base and the social services were being run by—under contract of a faith-based organization—the Baptist church. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer knows a lot about human services. I myself am a social worker, and I will tell you that faith-based organization is really running a good program for these kids.

But we are running out of money. We need money for food and shelter for the children. We need money for the border agents. We need money for transportation to shelters and also transportation, when we can, returning these children home. We need money for immigration judges and legal services for the children to determine their asylum status, and, as I said, we need the muscular deterrence in the home country breaking up the organized gangs that then create the violence that then sets these children on this journey.

The best way to make sure the surge of children is stopped is not by harsher immigration laws. It is by making it hard on the drug dealers and the human traffickers, the smugglers, the coyotes. Because they are the ones who are the reason they are coming.

Looking at the data—looking at data—we see that these children are coming not only where there is high poverty, but that children are coming where there is a high level of crime, particularly homicide, murder, and other recruitment of children. These children are almost being recruited by child soldiers in their own country to engage in violent criminal activity.

So we need to be able to look at this emergency supplemental and be able to meet the human needs while the children are here, make sure we fund the judges, the immigration judges and the legal services, to determine their asylum status, and be able to take care of them.

Already, 60,000 unaccompanied children have come into our country during this last year. In the 2 weeks I toured the border, I saw young children as young as 5 with one instruction: Cross the border, turn yourself in, and try to get as safe as you can. Border agents find these children often dehydrated, malnourished, and usually a victim of some type of trauma. Also, they have heard false promises from the smugglers about what it will be when they come here.

These smugglers—as part of these dangerous gangs and cartels—see women and children as a commodity to be bought, sold, transported, as if they were cargo. Children leave these homes based on lies. They think they are coming to an area where they will never have to go home or that they will be safe. I hope we then pass this appropriations. I hope in passing the appropriations we will be able to protect the safety of the children, we determine their legal and asylum status, and we have this muscular deterrent strategy in the home country.

There are those who want to have a new immigration policy or want to repeal the George Bush law. I would caution that because, remember, our problem is not the children; our problem is what causes the children to come. We have to go after what causes the children to come; and that is the drug dealers, the smugglers, the coyotes, those who are engaging in such violent crime.

The host countries, along with Mexico, need to help deal with this, and we need to marshal our law enforcement resources to be able to help them do this. Now they say: Let's bring in the National Guard at the border. What is our National Guard going to do? When these little kids cross the Rio Grande, they are going to go right up to that soldier, put their arms around his or her leg, and say: I need to be safe. Can you help me? What is the National Guard going to do? It is not a border enforcement problem; it is a criminal gang problem in Central America.

So we need to be able to be sure we are targeting the right areas in order to solve this problem. The children are not the threats. They are coming here because they are threatened themselves. We need to meet these urgent humanitarian needs, and we need to focus on our hemisphere to break up the gangs and crime.

Later on today we are going to have a briefing for every single Senator so they can ask the questions about this situation. Who are the children? Why are they coming? What are their legal rights under the law? But how can we effectively deal with this children's march, where the children are in danger in their host country and on the long journey to this one?

We are also asking that this $3.7 billion be designated as an emergency.

There are those who will want to take from other domestic programs. I would caution that. In fact, I would object to the very idea. The President has said this is an emergency because under the Budget Control Act of 2011 it meets the criteria that it is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and temporary, deals with the loss of life, property, or our national security interests. I think it meets that test. I do not want to take offsets from existing programs to do this. It is unexpected. It is significant. We can deal with it, but let's not do it at the expense of other programs designed to help the American family and the American middle class.

I know there are others who want to speak on this issue. I will have more to say later, but for now let's examine the urgent supplemental and let's really solve the problem at the border and what causes it to be a problem for us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, let me start by thanking my colleague from Maryland for her leadership on the Appropriations Committee and her leadership on this difficult issue. She said something in caucus the other day that really struck me. She said: Every Senator has an opinion on this, but not every Senator has the facts. Facts matter. They make for good policy.

Last week I had the opportunity, along with Secretary Johnson, to visit a temporary facility for refugee mothers and their children that is in my home State of New Mexico. The holding area at this facility in Artesia, NM, is one of several ways that DHS is increasing its capacity to process the increasing number of families with children from Central America who are crossing our southwest border.

On Monday, 40 individuals were repatriated back to Honduras. It is reported that more mothers and their children will be sent back to their countries of origin.

While I was at this facility, I saw firsthand the remarkable interagency effort that it took to take a Federal law enforcement training center, a campus, and turn it into a safe and humane place for families to stay while their cases are being processed.

But that is not all I saw while I was there. I watched a young boy play soccer with his little brother, both of them clearly happy to be in the kind of secure environment where they could just be kids. I saw a lot of mothers. I saw mothers whose faces were worried, who reflected the clear concern about what the future would be for them and for their children. What I did not see at that facility—I did not see cartel mules. I did not see drug runners. I did not see criminals or gang members. Those were mothers and little kids. Most of those families come from one of the most violent regions in the world today.

This current crisis is of grave concern to all of us. I know I have heard from a number of my constituents who wanted to know what they can do to help. I have to give great credit to our local chamber of commerce in Artesia, NM, as they worked hard as they received hundreds of donations from compassionate New Mexicans across the State hoping to make a difference in these people's lives. They understand that this is first a humanitarian crisis. They also understand that we are a nation of laws, that our immigration system has been broken for a long time and needs to be fixed.

The Senate worked for months to address this, but the Republican-led House of Representatives refuses to even debate immigration reform, much less allow a vote on it. Instead, Republicans claim that the President's immigration policies, including deferred action for childhood arrivals—or DACA, as it is known—caused a crisis at the border. That could not be further from the truth. The increase in unaccompanied children started before President Obama created the DACA program 2 years ago. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees has documented an increased number of asylum seekers from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala since 2009—a full 5 years ago. What is more, children crossing the border would not be eligible for DACA. In fact, they would not be eligible for the Senate version of immigration reform.

These asylum seekers are not only fleeing to the United States but also to the other neighboring countries in the region. They are fleeing to Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize. In fact, those countries saw a 712-percent spike in asylum cases from El Salvador, from Honduras, and Guatemala from 2008 to 2013, further demonstrating that children are not coming to the United States to apply for DACA. They are coming because their lives are at risk back home.

In interviews with over 400 children, the United Nations High Commission on Refugees found that no less than 58 percent of them were forcibly displaced because they suffered or faced harm that indicated a potential or actual need for international protection—an increase of more than 400 percent from 2006.

Less than 1 percent of these kids spoke of immigration reform or some new program or policy as the basis for coming to the United States. In fact, out of the 404 children who were interviewed, there were only 4—4 children who expressed a reason for coming that related to some part of the U.S. immigration system.

The reality is, as we heard from Senator MIKULSKI, what is driving children to our borders is unimaginable violence, corruption, extreme poverty, and instability in their home countries.

This picture was taken in Tegucigalpa in Honduras. This is frankly an all-too-common sight in Honduras today. Not only is the poverty unimaginable, but the violence we have seen is like nothing in recent history. Honduras has now the world's highest murder rate, with over 90 murders per 100,000 persons annually. Last year approximately 1,000 young people under the age of 23 in Honduras were murdered—murdered in a nation of only 8 million, 1,000 young people.

In a report published by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, they found that 93 percent of crimes perpetrated against youth in Honduras go unpunished—completely unpunished.

The National Observatory of Violence reported that violent deaths of women increased by 246 percent between 2005 and 2012.

This is all the more unsettling to me because I know firsthand that Honduras did not always look this way. In the 1990s I traveled to Honduras with my wife Julie. We were on our honeymoon. We flew into San Pedro Sula. The only time I felt any fear was trying to drive in a city that moves a lot faster than I do when I try to drive on country roads in New Mexico. But we never had any fear for violence when we were in Honduras. We traveled around the country. We went to many places off the beaten path.

That is very different today. Today San Pedro Sula is a city synonymous with murder.

To understand just how bad it is, you can look at pictures like this one of literally body bags getting ready to go to mass graves from murders happening in these neighborhoods in San Pedro Sula. You can read a recent article in the New York Times by Frances Robles that tells the chilling story of Cristian, an 11-year-old sixth grader from Honduras who lost his father in March after he was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. It is kind of hard to imagine needing a security guard to protect a pastry truck. Three people he knows were murdered this year alone, and four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of 2 weeks at the beginning of the year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of the sum of $5. She was clubbed over the head, dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat and stuffed her underwear in it and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

Then there is Anthony, a 13-year-old from Honduras, who disappeared from his gang-ridden neighborhood. His younger brother Kenneth hopped on his green bike to search for him, starting his hunt at a notorious gang hangout in the neighborhood. They were found within days of each other, both dead. Anthony, 13, and a friend had been shot in the head.

Kenneth, age 7, had been tortured and beaten with sticks and rocks. They were among seven children murdered in the La Pradera neighborhood of San Pedro Sula in April alone—in 1 month.

El Salvador and Guatemala are the world's fourth and fifth highest in murders. The Center for Gender and Refugee Studies found that in 2011, El Salvador had the highest rate of gender-motivated killings of women in the entire world. In Guatemala, the Department of State reports widespread human rights problems, including institutional corruption, particularly in the police, in judicial sectors, kidnapping, drug trafficking, execution, and often lethal violence against women.

We have a human crisis at our southern border that requires an immediate but compassionate response. Yet instead of supporting the supplemental which seeks to address the root causes of the crisis and protect these vulnerable children, Republicans are trying to use the crisis to promote fear and their border-enforcement-only agenda.

Recently, a Republican Governor suggested that the President send the National Guard to ''secure the border once and for all'' and that ''the border between the U.S. and Mexico is less secure today than at any time in the recent past.'' As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, facts are stubborn. This is simply not the case. In

fact, the notion that lax border policies are somehow responsible for this latest crisis is not just a myth; it is a, well, full misrepresentation driven by politicians who would rather create a political issue than to solve a very real problem.

The border today is more secure than it has ever been. There are more Border Patrol agents on the ground. There are more resources. There is more technology deployed on the border than at any time in our Nation's history—at any time. In fiscal year 2012, the Federal Government spent almost $18 billion—$17.9 billion—on immigration enforcement. That is $3.5 billion more than the budgets of all the other Federal law enforcement agencies combined—$3.5 billion more than the FBI's budget, plus the DEA's budget, the ATF budget, plus the Secret Service, plus the U.S. Marshals Service. These resources have made a difference. From fiscal year 2009 to 2012, the Department of Homeland Security seized 71 percent more currency, 39 percent more narcotics, 189 percent more weapons along the southwest border as compared to the last 4 years of the Bush administration.

It is important to remember that this crisis from refugees in Central America is not about children and families sneaking across our border like criminals. As we heard from the Senator from Maryland, many of these refugees seek out the first Border Patrol agent they can find in order to turn themselves in. Many of these children have walked across the border or across the Rio Grande with identification literally safety-pinned to their shirts. But that image does not serve the political interests of those who prefer a border crisis to a refugee crisis.

Let's step back and remember that the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill more than a year ago now—a bill that included incredibly important provisions to further strengthen our border but that would also protect refugee children and crack down on the smugglers and the transnational criminal organizations that are at the root of the current crisis.

Notably, this bill was widely supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate Chamber.

Public support and good economics have not been enough to convince the House leaders to hold a vote on immigration reform, but they cannot turn a blind eye to the current humanitarian crisis along our Nation's southern border.

Instead of attacking the President, Senate Republicans should work with them to address the issue, and they should demand that their colleagues in the House act to fix our broken immigration system.

Additionally, passing the $3.7 billion supplemental sends a clear signal that we are aggressively stemming the flow of children and families from Central America while continuing to treat these refugee children humanely and as required under the law. This situation is an emergency and we need emergency funding.

Our immigrant communities have helped to write the economic, social, and cultural history of America. I know this firsthand. My own father is an immigrant who came to this country as a boy from Nazi Germany in the 1930s.

As a nation we value the twin promises of both freedom and opportunity. Those ideals are important no matter where you are born.

The fact is, our immigration system is broken. Those of us who represent border communities understand the challenge we face, but there are solutions—solutions before us that are pragmatic, bipartisan, and uphold our American values.

I am familiar with the promise America represents for families. I know how hard immigrants work, how much they believe in this country, and how much they are willing to give back to this country.

A small group of faith leaders from New Mexico penned an op-ed in the Albuquerque Journal over the weekend. In sharing their thoughts on this humanitarian crisis they wrote:

> While the current situation raises the issues in powerful ways, expressing hatred toward, fear of, or anger with women and children serves nothing to resolve national debate. Rather, it engenders a destructive spirit of mistrust. Let us seek to understand the immigrant's reasons for coming and to work collaboratively for just and reasonable immigration reform.

I could not agree more with these faith leaders.

It is time to fix our broken immigration system once and for all. Our short-term solution is to approve the President's emergency supplemental request now, and as part of our long-term solution we need House Republicans to put the Senate's immigration reform bill on the floor for a vote.

Our Nation will be the better for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. I rise today to speak about the ongoing humanitarian crisis on our southern border. I thank my colleagues, Senator HEINRICH and Senator MIKULSKI, for their eloquent words in speaking to this issue.

As a woman and as an immigrant, my heart breaks for these children. My mother fled Japan, where I was born. She fled out of desperation to escape a terrible marriage. I came with her to this country as a young girl, and I remember how uncertain I was about what was in store for me.

Although we came by boat in steerage, at least we traveled safely and together. We did not face the kind of danger as did these children who are risking everything to be here. Their journeys to our border are lined with smugglers and traffickers. Children are arriving injured and malnourished. Yet they continue to come, not only to the United States but to other nearby countries, fleeing their countries out of desperation.

These children don't care about the DREAM Act or the Senate immigration reform bill. They are terrified of the violence, abuse, and death in their home countries. Young girls, who represent about 40 percent of the children who arrived this year, often face sexual assault and rape.

Let me share some recent stories from young girls who are fleeing. One girl fled an area of El Salvador controlled by gangs. Her brother was killed for refusing to join a gang that tried to forcibly recruit him. She was raped by two men and became pregnant as a result. She fled El Salvador and was attacked on her journey to the United States.

Another girl was kidnapped by a gang in Honduras that attempted to traffic her into prostitution. She escaped and reported the kidnapping to the police. The gang then abducted her again, raped her, and burned her with cigarettes. She fled to the United States and is seeking asylum.

Yet another girl fled El Salvador when she was 8 years old. Gang members had kidnapped her two older sisters. The girl's mother did not want her 8-year-old daughter to suffer the same fate, so she arranged for her daughter to be brought to the United States.

These are horrific stories. It is clear that something needs to be done.

I have worked with my colleague Senator MENENDEZ to introduce a comprehensive plan to address this issue. The plan aims to curtail trafficking and smuggling, contain the violence and discord in Central America, and ensure that these children have access to legal assistance and are in safe and humane conditions when they arrive.

This Friday I will also take some of my colleagues to McAllen and San Antonio, TX, to view facilities housing these children during the processing and removal process. We will see for ourselves the conditions that these children are in and meet with officials and leaders on the ground.

This crisis clearly demonstrates that inaction is not an option with regard to these children.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental funding needed for our country to meet their humanitarian needs. We have a responsibility to ensure that those in our custody are treated according to our values as a nation, and the President's request will allow our government to keep these commitments.

I would also urge my colleagues to reject the idea that the solution is to

speed up the deportation of these children back to the dangerous conditions they fled. Stripping away basic legal protections for children in these terrible situations will not solve this problem. As Senator HEINRICH so eloquently showed us, the conditions in their home countries are truly horrific.

To really address this situation, we need to do more work with our partners in the region to reduce violence and improve opportunities in their home countries. We must provide resources so that we can safely, fairly, and timely process these children, including asylum determination, as provided by law.

We should all look to our conscience in seeking a path forward. Surely we can do better than sending these children back to the horrific conditions that they are escaping. Out of sight is not out of mind. That is not what our country stands for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's supplemental request, and I urge my colleagues to work together toward resolving the underlying process of this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am very honored to follow my colleague from Hawaii and her eloquent and powerful remarks, as well as the Presiding Officer from New Mexico, who knows much firsthand about this issue and has really been a leader in this body for me and others. I thank the Presiding Officer for that leadership.

My view of this issue concerning the tens of thousands of young children making the difficult and dangerous journey to the United States from lands where they face violence and oppression is shaped by my meeting with some of them in my home State of Connecticut.

I had the opportunity to do so recently on a number of occasions, and it has deeply affected my own approach because what I have seen in them really inspires me. It inspires me because I understand better the reasons they have come here. The reasons they have come relate to the violence, the threat of torture, and the oppression they see in the lands they are leaving. They are coming here, many of them, for family reunification.

What struck me in speaking with these young children is they are coming here to reunify with relatives: their moms and dads, their aunts and uncles. They have come to be with members of their family and, of course, to seek education. They desperately want to go to school, and they want the opportunity simply for the freedom they see this country as epitomizing and embodying, the beacon of opportunity that drew so many of our forebears to this country, the lamp that is lit above the harbor of New York symbolically for all Americans, and the ideals this country embodies for the world. That is the reason people come and why our relatives, our own families came—one generation ago for me and perhaps more generations ago for others here.

So what we face is, in fact, a humanitarian crisis. It is a refugee crisis of children seeking asylum, family reunification, and escape from oppression, torture, and death in intolerable conditions in their home countries.

There is gang warfare that is a result of drug trading, pushed from Colombia to Central America to service better their customers in the United States. Their markets are here. This country provides the demand that fuels the trade—not only this country, of course, but all around the world.

But these children are the innocent victims of the warfare—gang warfare, market warfare that is fueled by a drug trade they have nothing to do with inciting or spurring. They are truly innocent victims.

The values this country embodies that drew them and drew our ancestors and our forebears to come are the values we must now remain true to serving. Among them is the ideal of due process and fairness to justice.

To say simply that we will deport all of them en masse, ask no questions, and put them on a bus really is a disservice to those values and ideals that this Nation embodies for the world—a source of our power in dealing with the world. Our power is not the result only of our air superiority, our great naval fleet, our brave warriors on the ground. It is truly the ideal that our military service and our military might serves to safeguard around the world.

Speaking of security, safety, and safeguarding our Nation, our border is secure, more secure than ever before—perhaps not perfectly secure—and more has to be done for border security, which immigration reform would help to accomplish.

The President has utilized an unprecedented level of resources in terms of both boots on the ground and advanced technology. There is no evidence to indicate any breakdown in border security.

What we have on our border is not a situation involving huge numbers of immigrants slipping into this country surreptitiously; they are coming here openly, surrendering themselves to authorities or being immediately apprehended by law enforcement.

This situation is entirely consistent with a fully effective border security apparatus.

If the current situation were caused by lack of policies in the United States, we would expect to see a large number of immigrant children only in this country. After all, the United States' policies apply only to the United States' borders but, in fact, that is not what we see. There are children seeking asylum and refugee status in many other Western Hemisphere countries—including some of the poorest in the world—a documented 712 percent increase in asylum seekers from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala since 2009.

We have seen no increase in illegal immigration from Mexico, which also would be happening if it were simply lax border security. Any way you look at the situation, the facts simply do not support the theory that America's border is in crisis. It is Central America that is in crisis—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras are the sources of this humanitarian crisis.

Rolling back the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act will not solve a border problem and it will not uphold the values and ideals of this Nation. The protections of this law in fact are central to ensuring the United States of America does not send innocent children into situations where they would be harmed and killed.

So I would oppose a wholesale rollback of this law. We have to make sure that we do what is right and get this situation right, because the stakes are so very high. No one in this Chamber wants to be responsible for sending one child to their death because we failed to consider the complexity and provide the humanity this situation demands.

Not only would rolling back the Trafficking Victim Protection Reauthorization Act do harm—and we must first do no harm—but it would also hurt law enforcement. This act helps enforcement and our law enforcement authorities to gain crucial actionable intelligence about trafficking. This law reflects the fact that I learned during my law enforcement career, one of the keys to putting criminals behind bars is working closely with victims. In fact, victims are essential, their cooperation is vital to making the law enforceable and making sure it is enforced.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act encourages victims of trafficking to turn themselves in and cooperate with Border Patrol agents, and provide U.S. law enforcement with the information they need. They are not interested in arresting children. They want to arrest the traffickers, the drug lords, the top of the chain. That is so very important for our colleagues to understand.

The surge in drug trafficking and drug-related violence that has turned so many communities into war zones is driven by those gangs in Central America that are in turn driving also the flood of young children to this country. We have this crisis in common with them. It is a humanitarian crisis and a law enforcement challenge. Let us move toward immigration reform which will help to address that crisis

by increasing border security, by enabling millions of people now in the shadows to have a path to earned citizenship, to make sure our values and ideals are upheld by the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

I thank all my colleagues who spoke today, and most especially thank Senator LEAHY and Senator FEINSTEIN for their decades of committed work on this issue. I look forward to working with them, the Presiding Officer, and the majority leader, who has led this Chamber and this Nation so well on this issue.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2244

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 2014, the Senate proceed to consideration of S. 2244, as provided under the previous order; that the debate time with respect to the bill and consideration of amendments in order to the bill be modified as follows: Coburn No. 3549, 30 minutes equally divided; Vitter No. 3550, 20 minutes equally divided; Flake No. 3551, 10 minutes equally divided; and Tester No. 3552, 30 minutes equally divided; further, that any remaining time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at noon the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the amendments as provided under the previous order; that upon disposition of the Tester amendment, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; further, that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote and all after the first vote be 10 minutes, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed now to executive session to consider Calendar No. 849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ANDRE BIROTTE, JR. TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 851.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROBIN L. ROSENBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 854.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask the Chair to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSUMER CHOICE AND WIRELESS COMPETITION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed commonsense legislation to help promote consumer choice and competition in the wireless phone marketplace. This legislation was a bipartisan effort to restore consumers' rights to unlock their cell phones so they can take their phones to the wireless network of their choice. Last year, over 110,000 consumers signed a petition calling for cell phone unlocking to be permitted. Their call was heard. I am pleased that the Senate has acted to pass this commonsense, bipartisan legislation that I authored with Senator GRASSLEY to promote consumer choice.

Once every 3 years, the Library of Congress undertakes a rulemaking under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, DMCA, to establish exemptions to the DMCA's prohibition on circumventing technological measures that control access to copyrighted works. From 2006 to 2012, the Library granted an exemption for cell phone unlocking that allowed users to change wireless providers after complying with their contracts. In its 2012 rulemaking, the Library did not recognize an exemption for new cell phones purchased after January 26, 2013. This act reinstates the Librarian's prior determination, ensuring that consumers will be able to use their phones on the network of their choice after satisfying their contracts without running afoul of our copyright laws.

The act takes two further steps to benefit consumers. First, it ensures that consumers who lack the technological savvy to unlock their phones themselves can authorize others to do the unlocking for them, in order for the owner or their family member to connect to a chosen wireless network. Second, in recognition of the growing importance to consumers of other wireless devices, such as tablets, the act directs the Librarian of Congress to determine whether such devices should also be eligible for unlocking. That determination will be part of the Librarian's next triennial rulemaking under the DMCA, which is set to begin later this year.

This legislation addresses the specific question of permitting consumers to unlock their cell phones to use on their chosen network consistent with the terms of their contract. The legislation creates no new obligations for cell phone manufacturers or wireless carriers, such as how a carrier may choose to process unlocking requests or provide unlocking codes. While there are larger ongoing debates about the DMCA, as well as other aspects of phone unlocking, those issues are not addressed by the bill. The bill takes a narrow, targeted approach to protect consumer choice and promote competition in the wireless industry.

I thank the Judiciary Committee ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY, and our other bipartisan cosponsors for working with me on this bill. I also thank the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House Judiciary Committee, who are continuing to work with us on this effort. I look forward to prompt consideration of the bill by the House and to the President signing it into law.

COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on June 15, 2014, President Juan Manuel Santos was elected to a second term as Colombia's President. This is not only a tribute to President Santos, who had staked his presidency on a courageous and risky peace initiative with the FARC who have waged a 30-year guerrilla war against the government, but also to the Colombian people.

There was every reason to believe that if President Santos' opponent, Óscar Iván Zuluaga, had won the election the peace negotiations would have been abandoned. Mr. Zuluaga had the strong backing of former President Uribe, whose aggressive leadership style and emphasis on security contributed to significant battlefield advances against the FARC, but his administration was plagued by scandal and human rights abuses. He has been a vociferous critic of President Santos and the peace negotiations. Instead, the Colombian people wisely recognized that the path to a more prosperous, secure country is through a peace process that addresses the underlying causes of the armed conflict, not an open-ended civil war fueled by cocaine that has already claimed countless innocent lives, uprooted millions of people, and impeded foreign investment.

I know from my own conversations with Members of Congress that President Santos has the support of people here of both parties. Since 2000, the Congress has supported billions of dollars in aid for social and economic development, counternarcotics, military, and humanitarian programs in Colombia. While there have been disagreements in some areas, particularly the slow pace of Colombia's justice system in holding accountable members of the security forces and paramilitaries who have been implicated in massacres of civilians and other human rights crimes, our support for Colombia has remained strong.

Colombia's greatest resource is its remarkable people. It is no wonder that Colombia, despite its many challenges, has remained a vibrant democracy while the governments of neighboring Venezuela and Ecuador have been dominated by messianic leaders who

have systematically dismantled the institutions of democracy and a free press.

But another of Colombia's unique features is its biological and cultural diversity. The country is not only home to more species of flora and fauna than practically any other country in the world, it is also inhabited by a multitude of indigenous groups who speak many languages and live in various stages of isolation.

Many of us have visited Cartagena and Bogota, but I suspect few people here are aware that Colombia boasts one of the hemisphere's most extensive systems of national parks. They range from Caribbean islands and coral reefs, to glacier-covered mountain peaks, semi-arid desert, and tropical rainforest with dramatic rock outcroppings and cascading waterfalls. The variety of Colombia's species of birds alone dwarfs that of most countries.

I mention this to pay tribute to President Santos who has been a strong supporter of Colombia's national parks and indigenous reserves, and Julia Miranda who has ably led the National Park Service with tireless energy and unwavering commitment for a decade.

I also want to commend President Santos for his decision last week to protect the Estrella Fluvial de Infrida under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. This is one of the most important reserves of fresh water in the world, covering an area larger than Florida's Everglades. It is home to 415 of Colombia's bird species and 470 fish species, so this designation will play a crucial role in protecting Colombia's biodiversity for future generations.

Coupled with last year's doubling in size of the extraordinary Chiribiquete National Park, these steps to protect Colombia's natural environment will be even more important if a peace agreement is signed that ushers in a period of greater security. While Colombia's oil and coal reserves are finite and their extraction can cause lasting social and environmental harm, Colombia's national parks offer limitless ecotourism potential that over the long term can bring far greater benefits to the country.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE CENTENNIAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is no shortage of questions facing Congress today, and when Members and their staffs need additional information or detailed research on these complex topics, we often turn to the dedicated analysts at the Congressional Research Service, CRS. Today marks the 100th anniversary of CRS, and in the last century it has grown to become one of the most valued resources on Capitol Hill.

Informed decisions are better decisions for the American people and for the Nation. The Congressional Research Service provides research materials, historical snapshots, and confidential memoranda that help Members of Congress and their staffs prepare for debates on vital—and sometimes historic—issues. The office also provides often insightful briefings for Members of Congress and their staffs. Publicly, the office provides summaries of proposed legislation, available through the useful Thomas.gov website. In certain instances, the CRS provides useful research tools which Members are able to make available to the public.

One such example was a report that the Congressional Research Service produced earlier this year at my request. Vermont is wrestling with how to effectively combat opiate abuse in our very rural State. Our State has taken a community-based approach to the issue, involving not only law enforcement and health providers, but also faith leaders, local officials, business owners, and nonprofit advocacy groups. In March, I was pleased to take the Senate Judiciary Committee to Vermont to hear firsthand how these approaches are having an impact in addressing addiction in the State. But equally important to Vermont is knowing how other States are dealing with heroin and opioid abuse. The Congressional Research Service prepared a useful document, ''Prevention and Treatment of Heroin and Other Opioid Abuse in the States,'' which helped illustrate how other States are dealing with addiction.

Analysts for CRS include subject matter experts in such issue areas as American law; domestic social policy; foreign affairs; defense and trade; government and finance and resources; and science and industry. I have in the past supported efforts to make many of the reports produced by the CRS available to the public. It is an effort I continue to support. I believe students, researchers, and our constituents would benefit from access to this useful information.

In the 100 years since Congress established the Legislative Reference Service, the small office has evolved into the Congressional Research Service of today, which encompasses a staff of 600 analysts, lawyers, information professionals, and management and infrastructure support staff. On the occasion of its 100th anniversary, I thank the dedicated staff of the Congressional Research Service—both past and present—for their public service and commitment to fulfilling the office's core value of providing objective and nonpartisan evaluations of policy matters to Congress.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the Congressional Research Service, CRS. The CRS is celebrating its centennial this week.

Established as the Legislative Reference Service in 1914, the CRS has been assisting Members of Congress in their legislative work by providing reference information and nonpartisan policy analysis for 100 years.

I wish to thank the diligent and professional staff of the CRS that provide an invaluable service to Congress.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, allow the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels for a number of deficit-neutral reserve funds. These reserve funds were incorporated into the Bipartisan Budget Act by reference to S. Con. Res. 8, the Senate-passed budget resolution for 2014. Among these sections is a reference to section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance. The authority to adjust enforceable levels in the Senate for terrorism risk insurance is contingent on that legislation not increasing the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2019 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2024.

I find that S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, as reported on June 23, 2014, fulfills the conditions of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance. Therefore, pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of H.J. Res. 59, I am adjusting the budgetary aggregates, as well as the allocation to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the revisions be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

$s in millions	2015	2015–19	2015–24
Current Budgetary Aggregates:*			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,940,093	n/a	n/a
Outlays	3,004,206	n/a	n/a

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974—Continued

$s in millions	2015	2015–19	2015–24
Revenue	2,533,388	13,882,333	31,202,135
Adjustments Made Pursuant to Sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act:**			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	120	n/a	n/a
Outlays	120	n/a	n/a
Revenue	0	1,770	4,000
Revised Budgetary Aggregates:			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,940,213	n/a	n/a
Outlays	3,004,326	n/a	n/a
Revenue	2,533,388	13,884,103	31,206,135

n/a = Not applicable. Appropriations for fiscal years 2016–2024 will be determined by future sessions of Congress and enforced through future Congressional budget resolutions.
*The levels for ''Current Budgetary Aggregates'' include a disaster cap adjustment made on 6/16/2014 for the Committee on Appropriations.
**Adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

$s in millions	Committee on Banking. Housing, and Urban Affairs		
	Current Allocation	Adjustments*	Revised Allocation
Fiscal Year 2015:			
Budget Authority	24,537	120	24,657
Outlays	5,071	120	5,191
Fiscal Years 2015–2019:			
Budget Authority	114,495	1,690	116,185
Outlays	−4,264	1,690	−2,574
Fiscal Years 2015–2024:			
Budget Authority	206,853	3,540	210,393
Outlays	−56,229	3,540	−52,689

*Adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SECOND LIEUTENANT JERED W. EWY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army 2LT Jered W. Ewy. Along with one other soldier, Jered died July 29, 2011, of injuries he sustained when his unit was attacked with improvised explosive devices in the town of Janak Kheyl, Paktia Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

After graduating from Putnam City North High School, Jered enlisted in the Army Rangers in 1998 and was one of the first on the ground in Afghanistan after the tragic events of September 11, 2001. He served three tours of duty and then joined the Oklahoma National Guard in 2003 and served as an instructor.

While serving in the National Guard, Jered attended the University of Central Oklahoma pursuing a bachelor's degree in criminal justice. ''What I wanted him to do was take the degree and get into law enforcement with the Department of Justice,'' his father, John Ewy said. ''He turned it down because he missed the camaraderie.''

While attending school he taught gymnastics in Edmond, OK. Although he was very involved in the community and truly enjoyed coaching the kids, ''Gym was just kind of a side job while he could finish up school,'' added Dena Edwards. ''I think the military was pretty much where his heart lies.''

In January 2011 he graduated from Officer Candidate School and was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard. He deployed to Afghanistan in June 2011.

''This loss of life has shaken every member of the Oklahoma National Guard to their core,'' said MG Myles L. Deering, Adjutant General for Oklahoma. ''We have lost two very brave men who once raised their hands and took an oath to defend our nation. They courageously gave everything they had to ensure our freedom and safety and their sacrifice will not be forgotten.''

''Jered was a man of integrity, discipline and honor who put everyone else first,'' family members wrote in his obituary. ''He cared deeply about the men he served with but his true passion in his life was his wife Megan and infant daughter Kyla.''

On August 11, 2011, the family held church services at Henderson Hills Baptist Church in Edmond, OK.

He is survived by his wife Megan of Edmond, daughter Kyla, mother Martha Nelson of Edmond, father and stepmother John and Ann Ewy of Moore, grandmother Harriet Ewy, siblings, Penny Clark and her husband Rob of Moore, Michelle Davis and her children Hayden, Colton and Cody, and Chad Nelson of Edmond, and many uncles and cousins.

Today we remember Army 2LT Jered W. Ewy, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT ANTHONY DEL MAR PETERSON

Mr. President, it is my honor to also honor the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Anthony Del Mar Peterson, of Chelsea, OK who died on August 4, 2011, serving our nation in Paktya province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Peterson was assigned to B Company, 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry, 45th Brigade Combat Team, OK Army National Guard.

Sergeant Peterson died of wounds suffered during a dismounted patrol when a group of insurgents attacked his unit with small arms fire in the Zurmat district of Paktya province, Afghanistan. Anthony had previously been deployed to Afghanistan in 2006–2007.

My heartfelt prayers go out to Dakota Justice Peterson, the young son Sergeant Peterson left behind. I remain confident he will grow to learn of his father's heroism; and pray the honor of his father may be carried with pride and cultivate in him, the character of his father.

Upon hearing of Sergeant Peterson's death, MG Myles Deering, the Adjutant General for Oklahoma stated, ''Oklahoma has lost another brave son. Sergeant Peterson was an exceptional Soldier who worked tirelessly to protect the values that we as Americans hold close to our hearts.''

Sergeant Peterson has also been described as an excellent non-commissioned officer and a committed soldier. Another friend has said that he will remember his zest for life, and his passion to lead others to Christ.

Born December 8, 1986 in Sacramento, CA, Anthony graduated from Chelsea High School in 2005 and Rogers State University in Claremore, OK in 2008. He was active in Campus Crusade for Christ, Baptist Collegiate, Rescue (Outreach Program), and Stop Child Trafficking, OATH.

He enjoyed hiking, camping, canoeing, hunting, and spending time with his family and friends. The most important things in his life were: God, family, and his country. Anthony's favorite quote was, ''Come home with your shield—or on it.''

Anthony is survived by his son, Dakota Justice Peterson of Owasso, parents, Garth and Terra Peterson of Owasso, siblings: Robert Edward Peterson, and Brittany Nicole Louise Peterson both of Owasso, grandparents: Ed and Gail Peterson of Chelsea, Paula and Richard Jones of Post Falls, ID, Les Marubashi of Chelsea, and Toni and Frank Trejo of Coquille, OR, nephew, Carter Myles Thomas of Owasso, and numerous extended family members who loved him.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Anthony's family. He lived a life of love for his son, family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

ARMY SERGEANT MYCAL L. PRINCE

Mr. President, I am also honored to remember Army SGT Mycal L. Prince. Sergeant Prince was tragically killed in action on September 15, 2011, in Saygal Valley, Laghman Province, Afghanistan when enemy forces attacked his unit with rocket-propelled grenades and small arms fire.

Mycal was born July 16, 1983, in Chickasha, OK, to Harold and Arnetta-Schoolfield-Prince. After graduating from Ninnekah High School in 2001, he completed cleet training and served as a police officer in Rush Springs for 3 years. On October 25, 2001, he married Surana Smith in Chickasha, and they later moved to Minco in May 2009 where he served as a police officer with the K–9 Unit for 2 years.

Minco Police Chief Phil Blevins said, ''He was one of the most professional and squared away young men I've ever met. He had things together in his family life, in his professional life. It's unbelievable for a man who is 28 how mature he was in all areas of his life.''

Mycal was a member of Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry, Oklahoma National Guard. He deployed to Afghanistan for his third tour on July 29, 2011.

''Sgt. Prince served his nation and this great state for more than a decade with honor and distinction,'' MG Myles L. Deering, Oklahoma's Adjutant General, said in a statement. ''He joined the Guard five days after his 17th birthday. I think that says a lot about the kind of man Sgt. Prince was. He deployed to help the people of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and went to Iraq in 2008. He could have gotten out of the service, but he chose to stay and serve his country.''

Mycal was preceded in death by his father, Harold Prince, one child, and his paternal and maternal grandparents. He is survived by his wife Surana of Minco, two daughters, Raelynn and Mycaela of Minco, mother, Arnetta Prince of Stonewall, sister, Leslie Dickenson and husband Wade of Stonewall, sister, Kathy Prince of Stonewall, and Cody Prince as well as many nieces, nephews, relatives, and friends.

Funeral services with full military honors were held on September 26, 2011, at Bridge Assembly of God Church in Mustang, OK. Mycal was laid to rest in Bradley Cemetery in Bradley, OK.

Today we remember Army SGT Mycal L. Prince, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

RECOGNIZING THE WAYNE FAMILY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished Wayne family legacy in Louisiana. On April 29, 2014, Guinness World Records officially recognized the Wayne family as having the most family members to graduate from Grambling State University.

Beginning in the 1940s, a total of 86 descendants of the Wayne family have attended Grambling State University. More than five generations of this Marion, LA family have studied at this storied institution and pursued lasting careers as military administrators and officers, doctors, lawyers, professors, professional athletes, and more. Through their years of service, this family has created enduring changes in a wide breadth of research and direction to impact and improve the lives of all those within their communities.

The Wayne family sets the Guinness World Record for ''Most family members to graduate from the same university'' with 40 approved relatives from the Wayne record. This outstanding accomplishment is a testament to the family's unparalleled devotion to education and to one of Louisiana's Historically Black College and Universities, Grambling State University. The continued commitment of this proud Louisiana family sets a new standard of both professional and educational aspiration and leaves a lasting legacy of achievement for generations to come.

Among this family's graduates of Grambling State University are: Alma McElroy Andrews, descendent of Matilda Wayne McElroy; Gloria Marie Brown, descendent of Ida Wayne Rivers; Claudine Williams, Dossie Roger Williams Jr., Shelia E. Williams, Verjanis Andrews Peoples, Stevie Andrews, Tjuana T. Williams, and Marcus D. Andrews, descendants of King Wayne; Rose Wayne, Ronald Wayne, Patricia Wayne Williams, and Stephanie Williams, descendants of John Wayne Sr; Ellis D. Wayne, LaJeane Holley and Mary Will Johnikin, descendants of Moses Wayne; Shirley Wayne, Ralph Wayne, and Larry Wayne, descendants of William Thomas Wayne, Sr.; Hattie Wayne, Donald Wayne Tatum, Saundra Tatum, Rashia Tatum, Jr., Renee Tatum, Michael Tatum, Christopher Tatum, Dawn Michelle Tatum, Nicholas Tatum, Kevin Parks, Cathy Denise Wasson Conwright, and Veronica Lee, descendants of Sandy Wayne, Sr.; John Earl Ellis, Willie Raymond Ellis, and Marcia N. Ellis, descendants of Sam Wayne; and Leola Wayne Taylor, Willie B. Wayne, Albert Jackson, Debra Jackson Gilliard, Margaret Jackson Riley, and DaRandall D. Riley, descendants of Willie Wayne. This family has promoted a continued dedication to education and accomplishment for all those who are a part of the communities that their exceptional careers have impacted.

This family has been and continues to be an inspiration to all those who have benefitted from the contributions the Wayne descendants have made. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the incredible legacy of the Wayne family at Grambling State University, as well as their lasting impact throughout the State of Louisiana and the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FAYETTE COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I wish to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Fayette County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Fayette County worth over $4.7 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $9 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the implementation of a downtown geothermal project through Main Street Iowa dollars, as well as funding to rehabilitate the Bus Barn building in West Union.

Among the highlights: Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This is not just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like West Union to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Fayette County has earned $150,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Fayette County has received $2,145,041 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Fayette County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $216,050.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Fayette County has received more than $3.2 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to Statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Fayette County's fire departments have received over $1.5 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Fayette County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Fayette County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Fayette County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

JACKSON COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Jackson County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Jackson County worth over $5.5 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $16 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include allocating more than $4.9 million to rehabilitate Lock and Dam 12 on the Mississippi River at Bellevue. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, each lock and dam produces $1 billion per year in transportation cost savings to ship goods and raw materials, keeping the economy in Iowa moving.

Among the highlights: School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Jackson County has received $642,107 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Jackson County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $82,500.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped

through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Jackson County has received over $11 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Jackson County has received more than $1.4 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Jackson County's fire departments have received over $1 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Jackson County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Jackson County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Jackson County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 306. An act for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic.

H.R. 3086. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 306. An act for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2609. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6440. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Flynn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6441. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty-nine (29) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6442. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General William L. Shelton, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6443. A communication from the Chief Information Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Defense Next Generation Host-Based CyberSecurity System''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6444. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6445. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessment of Fees'' (RIN1557–AD82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6446. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA): Changes to the Section 8 Tenant-Based Voucher and Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Programs'' (RIN2577–AC83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6447. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6448. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2013 and 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6449. A communication from the Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the U.S. Breeding Population of the Wood Stork From Endangered to Threatened'' (RIN1018–AX60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6450. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Policy on Interpretation of the Phrase 'Significant Portion of Its Range' in the Endangered Species Act's Definitions of 'Endangered Species' and 'Threatened Species''' (RIN1018–AX49; 0648–BA78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6451. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yellow-Billed Parrot With Special Rule, and Correcting the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo Special Rule'' (RIN1018–AY28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6452. A communication from the Chief of the Permits and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Permits; Extension of Expiration Dates for Double-Crested Cormorant Depredation Orders'' (RIN1018–AX82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6453. A communication from the Regulations Specialist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2014–2015 and 2015–2016 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations'' (RIN1018–AY85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6454. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Northern Distinct Population Segment of the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog, and Threatened Species Status for Yosemite Toad'' (RIN1018–AZ21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6455. A communication from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6456. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge'' (RIN0960–AH67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6457. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines for the Streamlined Process of Applying for Recognition of Section 501(c) (3) Status'' ((RIN1545–BM07) (TD 9674)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6458. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Mid-Session Review Budget of the U.S. Government Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC–6459. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6460. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133E–4.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6461. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133B–8.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6462. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at Nuclear Metals, Inc. in West Concord, Massachusetts, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6463. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6464. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6465. A communication from the National Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled ''2013 Annual Report of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps'' and ''2013 Financial Statement of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6466. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by Agusta Westland S.p.A) (Agusta)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0336)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6467. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0984)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6468. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airplanes Originally Manufactured by Lockheed for the Military as Model P–3A and P3A Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1073)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6469. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0368)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6470. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0697)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6471. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1031)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6472. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0938)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6473. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives;

Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6474. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam srl Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6475. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1056)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6476. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0281)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6477. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0141)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6478. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–1088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6479. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0882)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6480. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0340)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6481. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0574)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6482. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiebiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa 'PZL–Bielsko' Model SZD–50–3 'Puchacz' Sailplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6483. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A (Agusta) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0379)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6484. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0378)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6485. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (BHTI) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0415)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6486. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Redmond, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0171)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6487. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Newnan, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6488. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Elkin, NC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0046)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6489. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0914)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6490. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Conway, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0178)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6491. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crandon, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6492. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bois Blanc Island, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0986)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6493. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class W Airspace; Taylor, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6494. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments No. (514)'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6495. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (49); Amdt. No. 3593'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6496. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (126); Amdt. No. 3592'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6497. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums

and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (195); Amdt. No. 3594'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6498. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (38); Amdt. No. 3591'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6499. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 14–54)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6500. A communication from the Associate Managing Director-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proposed Amendments to the Service Rules Governing Public Safety Narrowband Operations in the 769–775/799–805 MHz Bands'' ((FCC 13–40) (WT Docket No. 96–86)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS–2014–0907); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–303. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California calling upon the Congress and the President of the United States to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund by developing a long-term plan to promote adequate federal Highway Trust Fund revenues; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24

Whereas, A safe, efficient, and reliable surface transportation network is vital to California's future economic growth, quality of life, and security; and

Whereas, Inadequate investment in California's highway and bridge infrastructure system is having a dramatic impact on the citizens of California, causing them to spend too much time idling on increasingly congested roads and bridges rather than with their families; and

Whereas, The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), that authorized the federal highway and public transportation programs, will expire September 30, 2014; and

Whereas, The federal Highway Trust Fund and its user fee-based revenue stream supports all federal investment in highway and bridge improvements and the vast majority of the federal public transportation program; and

Whereas, The federal Highway Trust Fund experienced revenue shortfalls in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2012 that created uncertainty about federal surface transportation investment commitments; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Transportation will begin slowing reimbursements to states for already approved federal-aid projects as early as July of this year to preserve a positive balance in the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, The Congressional Budget Office reports the federal Highway Trust Fund will be unable to support any new highway or public transportation spending in the 2015 fiscal year absent congressional action to increase trust fund revenues; and

Whereas, Eliminating federal highway and public transportation investment in one year would threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide and severely disrupt California's long-term transportation improvement plans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges timely action by the President and the Congress of the United States to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund by developing a long-term plan to promote adequate federal Highway Trust Fund revenues that achieves all of the following:

(a) Continues an appropriate role for the federal government in sustaining a viable national transportation system.

(b) Contributes to deficit reductions and economic growth.

(c) Ensures the integrity of the surface transportation program and resists funding diversions that have been harmful to public support.

(d) Allows the Congress to pass a reauthorization of the federal highway and public transportation programs before MAP–21 expires; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM–304. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses so that they can survive as a free-roaming wild herd for future generations to enjoy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1257

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses living along the Outer Banks of Currituck County, North Carolina, are descendants of horses brought to the Americas by Spanish explorers and colonists beginning in the 16th century; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses are known as Colonial Spanish Mustangs; and

Whereas, these Colonial Spanish Mustangs have played a significant role in the history and culture of North Carolina's coastal area for hundreds of years; and

Whereas, in 2009, the General Assembly adopted these Colonial Spanish Mustangs as the official horse of the State of North Carolina; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses freely roam 7,500 acres of public and private land in Currituck County; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses have been managed through a public-private partnership that includes representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the State of North Carolina, Currituck County, and the Corolla Wild Horse Fund; and

Whereas, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is insisting that no more than 60 horses be allowed in the herd; and

Whereas, world-renowned genetic scientists have determined that a herd of at least 110 horses, with a target population of 120 to 130 horses is necessary to maintain the genetic viability of the Corolla herd; and

Whereas, 110 to 130 horses is well within the carrying capacity of the land the Corolla wild horses roam; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses are a critical component of the heritage and economy of Currituck County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

Section 1. This body urges Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses so that they can survive as a free-roaming wild herd for future generations to enjoy.

Section 2. The Principal Clerk shall transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and the members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation.

Section 3. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

POM–305. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts expressing its support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by certain individuals, and calling for the immediate and safe return of the girls; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, as many as 234 female students, the majority of whom are between 16 to 18 years of age, were kidnapped by armed men from the government girls secondary school in the Federal Republic of Nigeria on April 14, 2014 and efforts by the United States to aid in their rescue are underway;

Whereas, Militants burned down several buildings, then shot at soldiers and police who were guarding the school; and

Whereas, Public secondary schools in Nigeria have been subjected to many attacks in 2014, resulting in hundreds of students being killed; and

Whereas, the militant group known as Boko Haram has taken responsibility for this mass kidnapping; and

Whereas, United Nations has declared that girls' education is a major challenge in Nigeria and, according to the world economic forum's global gender gap index, Nigeria is ranked 106 out of 136 countries based on women's economic participation, educational attainment and political empowerment; and

Whereas, the United States Senate has affirmed that women and girls must be allowed to go to school without fear of violence and unjust treatment so that they can take their rightful place as equal citizens of and contributors to the world; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts Senate has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety, welfare and education of women and girls and to pursuing policies that guarantee the rights of women and girls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby expresses its strong support for the

people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram and calls for the immediate and safe return of the girls; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

POM–306. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to invoke the participation of the International Joint Commission under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 151

Whereas, Ontario Power Generation is proposing to construct an underground, long-term burial facility for low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station. This site is less than a mile inland from the shore of Lake Huron; and

Whereas, Placing a permanent nuclear waste burial facility so close to the Great Lakes shoreline is a matter of serious concern for the inhabitants of the Great Lakes states and provinces. A leak or breach of radioactivity from this waste facility could damage the ecology of the lakes. Tens of millions of United States and Canadian citizens depend on the lakes for drinking water, fisheries, tourism, recreation, and other industrial and economic uses; and

Whereas, Michigan recognizes the duty of the legislative branch of government to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens and the state's natural resources. Article IV, Section 50 of the Michigan Constitution authorizes the Legislature to regulate atomic energy in view of the safety and general welfare of the people. Article IV, Section 51 declares that the public health and general welfare of the people of the state are matters of primary public concern, while Article IV, Section 52 requires the Legislature to provide for the protection of the air, water, and other natural resources of the state from pollution, impairment, and destruction; and

Whereas, The Michigan Legislature has recognized the inherent dangers of siting a radioactive waste storage facility near the shores of the Great Lakes. Under Public Act No. 204 of 1987, the final siting criteria for a radioactive waste facility containing the same types of waste as would be stored at the proposed Ontario repository includes a prohibition on siting it within 10 miles of one of the Great Lakes, the Saint Mary's River, Detroit River, St. Clair River, or Lake St. Clair; and

Whereas, The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) is a binational agreement to address critical environmental health issues in the Great Lakes region, with the overall purpose of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes. Article 6 of the GLWQA acknowledges the importance of anticipating, preventing, and responding to threats to the Great Lakes and recognizes that a nuclear waste facility sited close to the Greg Lakes shoreline could lead to a pollution incident or could have a significant cumulative impact on the waters of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, The 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty recognizes the immense importance of the Great Lakes as a shared resource between the United States and Canada. The wisdom of the Treaty drafters is reflected in the creation of the International Joint Commission (IJC), composed of three members from the United States and three members from Canada, to act as impartial watchdogs over the boundary waters between the countries. Under Article IX of the Treaty, questions or matters of difference between the countries involving their rights, obligations, or interests along their common frontier may be referred to the IJC for examination and report, upon the request of either country. Under Article X, the IJC may be asked to make a binding decision on an issue of difference between the two countries, upon the consent and referral by both the United States and Canada; and

Whereas, The IJC has frequently been asked to weigh in on major topics of concern to the Great Lakes region. In 1912, a few years after the Treaty's ratification, the IJC was asked to examine and report on the extent, causes, and location of pollution in the boundary waters and to recommend remedies and pollution prevention strategies. In 1999, the IJC was asked to study the international export of bulk supplies of Great Lakes water. The IJC provides an objective and international forum to study Great Lakes issues that affect both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to invoke the participation of the International Joint Commission under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the other Great Lakes states and Canadian provinces to adopt appropriate regulations to protect the Great Lakes region from radioactive waste and to petition their respective federal governments to engage the IJC under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Prime Minister of Canada and the Canadian Parliament to suspend the Joint Review Panel process convened by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to decide whether to grant Ontario Power Generation a license to construct the underground nuclear waste repository so that it can receive input from the IJC, the Great Lakes Commission, and the state of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Canada, the United States Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the Speaker of the Canadian Senate, the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, and the governors or premiers and the legislative majority leaders in Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Ontario, and Quebec.

POM–307. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that will lead to the recognition of World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners as veterans of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1256

Whereas, during World War II, United States Merchant Mariners who served along the coastline of the United States, and were known as Coastwise Merchant Mariners, helped to transport materials, including food, clothing, and weapons, to members of the United States Armed Forces serving on three continents; and

Whereas, the Coastwise Merchant Mariners bravely performed their duties even as they were in danger of attack from German U-boats operating along our nation's coastal waters; and

Whereas, many of the Coastwise Merchant Mariners were elderly, handicapped, women, and underage children who stepped forward in the time of a national crisis to ensure that the members of the United States Armed Forces were sufficiently supplied as they fought enemy forces; and

Whereas, because of administrative rules and decisions made by the United States Navy, many Coastwise Merchant Mariners who served during World War II were not recognized as veterans and thus were not eligible for the veterans benefits they had earned; and

Whereas, in the years following World II, as a result of some changes in federal law and federal rules and regulations, some of the Coastwise Merchant Mariners previously denied veterans benefits were finally recognized as veterans and therefore entitled to the same benefits as other veterans of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas, despite the past recognition of some Coastwise Merchant Mariners as veterans, as many as 30,000 Coastwise Merchant Mariners may never get that recognition due to the documentation required to prove their service during World War II; and

Whereas, through no fault of these courageous individuals, much of the documentation proving they served their country during World War II as Coastwise Merchant Mariners has been lost or destroyed or was never recorded; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

SECTION 1. The House of Representatives honors the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II.

SECTION 2. The House of Representatives urges Congress to do the following:

(1) Conduct congressional inquiries into (i) the lack of recognition given to the World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners who were lost in action without having been recognized by our nation as veterans and (ii) the reason World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners records that are known to exist have not been moved to the National Records Center for use by families and researchers in accordance with agreements between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Department of Defense.

(2) Enact legislation that expands the types of acceptable documentation that Coastwise Merchant Mariners may use to prove their service during World War II, and to thereafter require that those who can provide the documentation be finally recognized as veterans entitled to the accompanying benefits.

SECTION 3. The Principal Clerk shall transmit a certified copy of this resolution

to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation, and the news media of North Carolina.

SECTION 4. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

POM–308. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania expressing support for the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine, and calling on the United States and the European Union to continue to work together to support a peaceful resolution to the crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 284

Whereas, A democratic, prosperous and independent Ukraine is in the national interest of the United States; and

Whereas, Closer relations with the European Union (EU) through the signing of an Association Agreement will promote democratic values, good governance and economic opportunity in Ukraine; and

Whereas, Millions of Ukrainian citizens support closer relations with Europe and the signing of an Association Agreement; and

Whereas, The Government of Ukraine has declared integration with Europe a national priority and has made significant progress toward meeting the requirements for the Association Agreement; and

Whereas, Ukraine has the sovereign right to enter into voluntary partnerships of its choosing, in keeping with its interests; and

Whereas, Ukraine's closer relations with the EU do not threaten any other country and will benefit both Ukraine and its neighbors; and

Whereas, On November 21, 2013, following several months of intense outside pressure, Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych abruptly suspended negotiations on the Association Agreement one week before it was due to be signed at the EU's Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania; and

Whereas, This reversal of stated government policy precipitated demonstrations by hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian citizens in Kyiv as well as in cities throughout the country; and

Whereas, The demonstrators were overwhelmingly peaceful and have sought to exercise their constitutional rights to freely assemble and express their oppositions to President Yanukovych's decision, as well as their support for greater government accountability and closer relations with Europe; and

Whereas, On November 30, 2013, police violently dispersed peaceful demonstrators in Kyiv's Independence Square, resulting in many injuries and the arrest of several dozen individuals; and

Whereas, On December 9, 2013, police raided three opposition media outlets and the headquarters of an opposition party; and

Whereas, On December 11, 2013, despite President Yanukovych's statement the previous day that he would engage in talks with the opposition, police attempted to forcibly evict peaceful protesters from central locations in Kyiv; and

Whereas, United States, European and other leaders, as well as three former presidents of Ukraine, urged restraint, warned against the use of violence against peaceful protesters and called for dialogue with the opposition to resolve the current political and economic crisis; and

Whereas, On January 16, 2014, the Ukrainian parliament passed, and President Yanukovych signed, legislation which severely limited the right of peaceful protest, constrained freedom of speech and the independent media and unduly restricted civil society organizations; and

Whereas, The passage of these undemocratic measures and President Yanukovych's refusal to engage in substantive dialogue with opposition leaders precipitated several days of violence and resulted in several deaths and hundreds of injuries, as well as numerous allegations of police brutality; and

Whereas, In the face of spreading demonstrations, Ukrainian Government representatives and opposition leaders entered into negotiations which on January 28, 2014, resulted in the resignation of the Prime Minister and his cabinet and the repeal of most of the antidemocratic laws from January 16, 2014; and

Whereas, On February 20, 2014, Ukrainian security forces, including heavily armed snipers, fired on demonstrators in Kyiv, leaving dozens dead and the people of Ukraine reeling from the most lethal day of violence since the Soviet era, and many of President Yanukovych's political allies, including the major of Kyiv, resigned from his governing Party of Regions to protest the bloodshed; and

Whereas, On February 22, 2014, the Ukrainian parliament found President Yanukovych unable to fulfill his duties, exercised its constitutional powers to remove him from office and set an election for May 25, 2014, to select his replacement; and

Whereas, On March 2, 2014, Russian troops invaded the Ukrainian territory of Crimea, seizing control of the peninsula, border crossings, government and administrative buildings, key infrastructure and surrounding Ukrainian military bases; and

Whereas, The military intervention by the Russian Federation in Crimea is a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity; and

Whereas, On March 16, 2014, Crimea held a referendum on seceding from Ukraine and acceding to the Russian Federation, which violated the Ukrainian constitution, occurred under duress of Russian military intervention and was not recognized by the international community; and

Whereas, On March 20, 2014, the Russian parliament noted to annex Crimea and Russian President Putin signed the treaty of accession annexing Crimea to the Russian Federation; and

Whereas, On April 7, 2014, protesters occupied government buildings in Ukraine's eastern cities of Donetsk, Luhansk and Kharkiv; and

Whereas, On April 18, 2014, the United States, Russia, Ukraine and the European Union agreed at talks in Geneva on steps to de-escalate the crisis in eastern Ukraine; and

Whereas, On April 22, 2014, Ukraine's acting president ordered the relaunch of military operations against pro-Russian militants in the east after two men were found tortured to death in the Donetsk region; and

Whereas, On May 25, 2014, Ukraine held a presidential election, but most polling stations in the east remained closed; and

Whereas, Pedro Poroshenko was elected President and vowed to bring ''peace to a united and free Ukraine''; and

Whereas, The Senate greatly values the warm and close relationship the United States has established with Ukraine since that country regained its independence in 1991: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania express support for the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate call on the United States and the European Union to continue to work together to support a peaceful resolution to the crisis and to continue to support the desire of millions of Ukrainian citizens for closer relations with Europe through finalizing the signing of an Association Agreement, as well as for a democratic future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate condemn the unprovoked and illegal Russian military seizure and annexation of the Ukrainian Crimea; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate urge the Government of Ukraine, Ukrainian opposition parties and all protesters to exercise the utmost restraint and avoid confrontation and call on the Government of the Ukraine to live up to its international obligations and respect and uphold the democratic rights of its citizens, including the freedom of assembly and expression, as well as the freedom of the press; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate urge all parties to engage in constructive, sustained dialogue in order to find a peaceful solution to Ukraine's current political and economic crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM–309. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the Congress of the United States to approve the Presidents budget proposal to provide 35 million dollars to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 382

Whereas, Sexual violence continues to plague our nation and destroy lives. Women and girls are the vast majority of victims, and nearly one in five women, or about 22 million, have been raped during their lifetimes. Men and boys are also at risk and one in 71 men, or about 1.6 million, have been raped during their lifetimes. Nearly one-half of all female rape survivors were raped before 18 years of age, and over one-quarter of male rape survivors were raped before 10 years of age; and

Whereas, Effective collection of forensic evidence is of paramount importance to successfully prosecuting sex offenders, as is performing sexual assault forensic exams in a sensitive, dignified, and victim-centered manner. Sexual assault forensic examinations are intrusive, lengthy, and complex medical examinations that take an average of three to four hours. A victim who agrees to a sexual assault forensic exam reasonably expects evidence collected from that exam, also referred to as a rape kit, to be analyzed; and

Whereas, The federal government has estimated that hundreds of thousands of rape kits sit untested in police and crime storage facilities across the country in what is known as the rape kit backlog. Crime labs have struggled over the past decade to meet the demand for DNA testing for all types of crimes. With demand continuing to outpace capacity—the Joyful Heart Foundation estimates that every two minutes someone is

sexually assaulted in the U.S.—the backlog in testing evidence collected from sexual assault forensic exams will likely continue to grow; and

Whereas, Untested sexual assault kits mean lost opportunities to develop DNA profiles, search for matches, link cold cases, and bring justice and resolution to the victim. DNA can help identify unknown offenders and when the offender is known, it can result in ''cold hits'' connecting the known suspect to other crimes. Failure to test evidence collected from a sexual assault kit in a timely manner can be tragic, from expired statutes of limitation that preclude prosecution even if a suspect is later identified, to additional rape and murder victims of serial rapists; and

Whereas, Local jurisdictions that have attempted to alleviate the rape kit backlog have impressive results to show for their efforts. With federal funding, the Wayne County Prosecuting Attorney's Office along with the Detroit Police Department, has begun to address a backlog of more than 10,000 rape kits. Among those first 1,600 kits tested, there were 455 matches in the DNA database, including matches linking to crimes committed in 22 other states and the District of Columbia. The Prosecutor's Office identified 127 potential serial rapists and obtained 14 convictions of potential serial rapists who are tied to rapes reported in 12 other states and the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, Testing sexual assault kits provides essential evidence. But, equally essential is the investigation and prosecution of identified perpetrators, without which survivors are denied justice, rapists remain free to assault with impunity, and our communities continue to suffer emotionally and economically; and

Whereas, Reducing the rape kit backlog is a national concern requiring a national response. Federal funding is crucial to help communities in Michigan and other states to test and follow up on untested sexual assault kits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge Congress of the United States to approve President Obama's budget proposal to provide $35 million to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–310. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado designating the month of October as ''Safe Schools Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14–031

Whereas, Colorado is committed to ensuring safe schools for all students, from early learning to higher education; and

Whereas, Safe schools provide an environment where effective teaching and learning can take place so that all education goals can be achieved; and

Whereas, Safe schools interface with the larger community by providing safe havens and distribution centers in the event of greater community crisis; and

Whereas, Each school day, Colorado school personnel are accountable for the safety of over 875,000 students, or about one-sixth of the total population of the state; and

Whereas, Educators and school personnel are the first responders in the schools, on the routes to and from school, on field trips, and at school-related events; and

Whereas, Schools face a broad range of safety-related threats, including human-caused hazards, technological hazards, and natural hazards; and

Whereas, Schools must adopt guiding principles of readiness and all-hazards emergency management, including prevention, mitigation, protection, preparedness, response, and recovery, in addressing these threats; and

Whereas, Educators and school personnel must communicate, coordinate, and collaborate with professional responders and other community partners in applying these guiding principles; and

Whereas, Schools must keep pace with improvements and changes in safe schools design, crime prevention through environmental design, security systems, communications, information management, training programs, and other resources related to school safety; and

Whereas, Schools must continually evaluate and update policies, standard operating procedures, memoranda of understanding, best practices, lessons learned, and fundraising activities related to school safety; and

Whereas, Schools can improve safety by making sure that climates are welcoming and that responses to misbehavior are fair, non-discriminatory and effective through training staff, engaging families and community partners, and deploying resources to help students develop the social, emotional, and conflict resolution skills needed to avoid and de-escalate problems; and

Whereas, The mission of the Colorado School Safety Resource Center is to assist educators, emergency responders, community organizations, school mental health professionals, parents, and students in creating safe, positive, and successful school environments for Colorado students in all K–12 and higher education schools; and

Whereas, In 2013, the Colorado School Safety Resource Center published nearly 800 announcements in its monthly newsletters on school safety-related topics such as training, grant information, prevention and protection resources, current research and statistical resources, and youth-specific information; and

Whereas, The members of the General Assembly believe that a yearly commemorative month devoted to school safety and a safe school climate can encourage activities that provide awareness about school safety topics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That we, the members of the Colorado General Assembly:

(1) Believe that establishing a commemorative month devoted to school safety and school climate can foster awareness about these important topics affecting our state's children and educators;

(2) Designate October as ''Safe Schools Month'' in Colorado; and

(3) Encourage all educators, community partners, first responders, subject matter experts, members of the private sector, the media, and other stakeholders to coordinate their activities with the Colorado School Safety Resource Center and to help promote a culture of school safety and positive school climate, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States; Vice President Joe Biden; United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan; United States Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson; United States Attorney General Eric Holder; the office of the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services; United States Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel; United States Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack; United States Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx; Gina McCarthy, Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency; the Honorable John Hickenlooper, Governor of Colorado; Executive Director, Colorado Department of Higher Education, Lt. Gov. Joseph A. Garcia; Kristin D. Russell, Colorado Secretary of Technology and State Chief Information Officer, Governor's Office of Information Technology; Robert Hammond, Commissioner of Education, Colorado Department of Education; Scott Newell, Director, Division of Capital Construction, Colorado Department of Education; Sarah Mathew, Director, Office of Health and Wellness, Colorado Department of Education; Richard Kaufman, Chair, Colorado Commission on Higher Education; Nancy McCallin, President, Colorado Community College System; John W. Suthers, Attorney General, Colorado Department of Law; Susan Payne, Director, Safe2Tell; Kathy E. Sasak, Interim Executive Director, Colorado Department of Public Safety; Paul Cooke, Director, Colorado Division of Fire Prevention and Control; Kevin R. Klein, Director, Division of Homeland Security Emergency Management; Colonel Scott Hernandez, Chief, Colorado State Patrol; Christine R. Harms, Director, Colorado School Safety Resource Center; Reggie Bicha, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Human Services; Dr. Larry Wolk, Executive Director and Chief Medical Officer, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment; John Salazar, Commissioner of Agriculture, Colorado Department of Agriculture; Donald E. Hunt, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Transportation; and to each member of Colorado's Congressional delegation.

POM–311. A joint memorial adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado urging the United States Congress to provide statutory relief to grant Colorado research institutions the authority to conduct controlled clinical and objective medical research trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 14–006

Whereas, Colorado is in a unique situation regarding marijuana use in this country; and

Whereas, Colorado's constitution authorizes the legal use of marijuana for both medical and private adult use, but the use of marijuana is still illegal under federal law; and

Whereas, Because marijuana use has been illegal under federal law since 1937, there is limited modern, scientific-based research regarding the medical use of marijuana; and

Whereas, Without medical research, most information regarding marijuana's medical efficacy is limited in clinical or scientific evidence and is anecdotal or observational; and

Whereas, Several marijuana extracts seem to demonstrate significant benefits for pain control, treatment of childhood epileptic seizures, and other beneficial effects, often with fewer side effects than prescription drugs, and without use dependence; and

Whereas, Colorado has an unprecedented opportunity to provide the United States

with scientific-based, peer-reviewed clinical medical research that could lead to a medical consensus regarding marijuana's medical efficacy to treat a number of chronic and debilitating medical conditions; and

Whereas, Colorado is proposing to spend up to $10 million studying marijuana's medical efficacy in Senate Bill 14–155; and

Whereas, Federal law currently significantly restricts state research institutions that receive federal funding from conducting controlled clinical trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That the United States Congress is hereby memorialized to provide statutory relief to grant Colorado research institutions the authority to conduct controlled clinical and objective medical research trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Memorial be sent to each member of the Colorado Congressional delegation, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the president of the United States Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 498. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. Res. 500. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Alfonso E. Lenhardt, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

*Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

*Leslie Ann Bassett, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay. The Financial Report of Contributions of Leslie Ann Bassett was printed on page 12327 in the July 17, 2014, Congressional Record.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2612. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide strong protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2613. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2614. A bill to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2615. A bill to establish criminal penalties for failing to inform and warn of serious dangers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2616. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 2617. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 503. A resolution designating September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' to promote awareness of charities benefitting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 504. A resolution to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State (S. Ct.); considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the perfiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1733

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 1758

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1758, a bill to amend title XVIII of

the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 2092

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2092, a bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, supra.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, supra.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2578

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

S. 2599

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2599, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 2605

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2605, a bill to preserve religious freedom and a woman's access to contraception.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 498, supra.

S. RES. 500

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2616. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of Senator CRAPO and myself to introduce the Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act.

Idahoans deeply value their Second Amendment rights, and recreational use of firearms for hunting and shooting sports is common. The use of firearms in Idaho is a tradition often passed through the generations, and many use it as an opportunity to teach safe and responsible practices to their children.

We have been working on this matter and on this particular issue since 2010 as it relates to this particular parcel of ground.

Idaho County needs adequate resources to provide this not only for its citizens but also for its law enforcement agencies. The Idaho County Sheriff's Office cannot effectively train their staff in firearms use because they simply do not have the facilities.

Should the Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act be enacted, a 31-acre parcel of land in Idaho will be transferred from the U.S. Government to Idaho County for use as a gun range which will be maintained by the county.

It is enthusiastically supported by both the Idaho County Sheriff's Office, the county commissioners, and the citizens of Idaho County.

Passing this legislation will fill the void in Idaho County for firearm training, practice, and shooting sports for citizens and law enforcement by providing quality facilities that will ensure safe and responsible use for years to come.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to pass this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS ''NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH'' TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF CHARITIES BENEFITTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND RECOGNIZING EFFORTS MADE BY THOSE CHARITIES AND ORGANIZATIONS ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH AS CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 503

Whereas millions of children and youth in the United States represent the hopes and future of the United States;

Whereas numerous individuals, charities benefitting children, and youth-serving organizations that work with children and youth collaborate to provide invaluable services to enrich and better the lives of children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas raising awareness of, and increasing support for, organizations that provide access to healthcare, social services, education, the arts, sports, and other services will result in the development of character and the future success of the children and youth of the United States;

Whereas the month of September, as the school year begins, is a time when parents, families, teachers, school administrators, and communities increase their focus on children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas the month of September is a time for the people of the United States to highlight and be mindful of the needs of children and youth;

Whereas private corporations and businesses have joined with hundreds of national and local charitable organizations throughout the United States in support of a month-long focus on children and youth; and

Whereas designating September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' would recognize that a long-term commitment to children and youth is in the public interest, and will encourage widespread support for charities and organizations that seek to provide a better future for the children and youth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month''—

(1) to promote awareness of charities benefitting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States; and

(2) to recognize efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—TO DIRECT THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE IN THE NAME OF THE SENATE IN MENACHEM BINYAMIN ZIVOTOFSKY, BY HIS PARENTS AND GUARDIANS, ARI Z. AND NAOMI SIEGMAN ZIVOTOFSKY V. JOHN KERRY, SECRETARY OF STATE (S. CT.)

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 504

Whereas, in the case of *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State*, No. 13–628, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, the constitutionality of section 214(d) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003, Pub. L. No. 107–228, 116 Stat. 1350, 1366 (2002), has been placed in issue;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(c), 706(a), and 713(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(c), 288e(a), and 288*l*(a), the Senate may direct its counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the Senate in the case of *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State*, to defend the constitutionality of section 214(d) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3558. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3559. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3560. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3561. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3562. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3563. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3558. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

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

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.—'';

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''and congressional staff with'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with''; and

(B) by striking ''or congressional staff shall'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after ''Congress,'' the following: ''of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who—

''(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

''(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character

under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointees for coverage under this paragraph.

''(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

''(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.''.

SA 3559. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ___—PRENATAL NONDISCIMINATION

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (PRENDA) of 2014''.

SEC. __02. FINDINGS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Women are a vital part of American society and culture and possess the same fundamental human rights and civil rights as men.

(2) United States law prohibits the dissimilar treatment of males and females who are similarly situated and prohibits sex discrimination in various contexts, including the provision of employment, education, housing, health insurance coverage, and athletics.

(3) Sex is an immutable characteristic ascertainable at the earliest stages of human development through existing medical technology and procedures commonly in use, including maternal-fetal bloodstream DNA sampling, amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling or ''CVS'', and obstetric ultrasound. In addition to medically assisted sex determination, a growing sex determination niche industry has developed and is marketing low-cost commercial products, widely advertised and available, that aid in the sex determination of an unborn child without the aid of medical professionals. Experts have demonstrated that the sex-selection industry is on the rise and predict that it will continue to be a growing trend in the United States. Sex determination is always a necessary step to the procurement of a sex-selection abortion.

(4) A ''sex-selection abortion'' is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child. Sex-selection abortion is barbaric, and described by scholars and civil rights advocates as an act of sex-based or gender-based violence, predicated on sex discrimination. Sex-selection abortions are typically late-term abortions performed in the 2nd or 3rd trimester of pregnancy, after the unborn child has developed sufficiently to feel pain. Substantial medical evidence proves that an unborn child can experience pain at 20 weeks after conception, and perhaps substantially earlier. By definition, sex-selection abortions do not implicate the health of the mother of the unborn, but instead are elective procedures motivated by sex or gender bias.

(5) The targeted victims of sex-selection abortions performed in the United States and worldwide are overwhelmingly female. The selective abortion of females is female infanticide, the intentional killing of unborn females, due to the preference for male offspring or ''son preference''. Son preference is reinforced by the low value associated, by some segments of the world community, with female offspring. Those segments tend to regard female offspring as financial burdens to a family over their lifetime due to their perceived inability to earn or provide financially for the family unit as can a male. In addition, due to social and legal convention, female offspring are less likely to carry on the family name. ''Son preference'' is one of the most evident manifestations of sex or gender discrimination in any society, undermining female equality, and fueling the elimination of females' right to exist in instances of sex-selection abortion.

(6) Sex-selection abortions are not expressly prohibited by United States law or the laws of 47 States. Sex-selection abortions are performed in the United States. In a March 2008 report published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Columbia University economists Douglas Almond and Lena Edlund examined the sex ratio of United States-born children and found ''evidence of sex selection, most likely at the prenatal stage''. The data revealed obvious ''son preference'' in the form of unnatural sex-ratio imbalances within certain segments of the United States population, primarily those segments tracing their ethnic or cultural origins to countries where sex-selection abortion is prevalent. The evidence strongly suggests that some Americans are exercising sex-selection abortion practices within the United States consistent with discriminatory practices common to their country of origin, or the country to which they trace their ancestry. While sex-selection abortions are more common outside the United States, the evidence reveals that female feticide is also occurring in the United States.

(7) The American public supports a prohibition of sex-selection abortion. In a March 2006 Zogby International poll, 86 percent of Americans agreed that sex-selection abortion should be illegal, yet only 3 States proscribe sex-selection abortion.

(8) Despite the failure of the United States to proscribe sex-selection abortion, the United States Congress has expressed repeatedly, through Congressional resolution, strong condemnation of policies promoting sex-selection abortion in the ''Communist Government of China''. Likewise, at the 2007 United Nation's Annual Meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, 51st Session, the United States delegation spearheaded a resolution calling on countries to condemn sex-selective abortion, a policy directly contradictory to the permissiveness of current United States law, which places no restriction on the practice of sex-selection abortion. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has urged governments of all nations ''to take necessary measures to prevent . . . prenatal sex selection''.

(9) A 1990 report by Harvard University economist Amartya Sen, estimated that more than 100 million women were ''demographically missing'' from the world as early as 1990 due to sexist practices, including sex-selection abortion. Many experts believe sex-selection abortion is the primary cause. Current estimates of women missing from the world range in the hundreds of millions.

(10) Countries with longstanding experience with sex-selection abortion—such as the Republic of India, the United Kingdom, and the People's Republic of China—have enacted restrictions on sex-selection, and have steadily continued to strengthen prohibitions and penalties. The United States, by contrast, has no law in place to restrict sex-selection abortion, establishing the United States as affording less protection from sex-based feticide than the Republic of India or the People's Republic of China, whose recent practices of sex-selection abortion were vehemently and repeatedly condemned by United States congressional resolutions and by the United States Ambassador to the Commission on the Status of Women. Public statements from within the medical community reveal that citizens of other countries come to the United States for sex-selection procedures that would be criminal in their country of origin. Because the United States permits abortion on the basis of sex, the United States may effectively function as a ''safe haven'' for those who seek to have American physicians do what would otherwise be criminal in their home countries—a sex-selection abortion, most likely late-term.

(11) The American medical community opposes sex-selection. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, commonly known as ''ACOG'', stated in its 2007 Ethics Committee Opinion, Number 360, that sex-selection is inappropriate because it ''ultimately supports sexist practices''. The American Society of Reproductive Medicine (commonly known as ''ASRM'') 2004 Ethics Committee Opinion on sex-selection notes that central to the controversy of sex-selection is the potential for ''inherent gender discrimination'', . . . the ''risk of psychological harm to sex-selected offspring (i.e., by placing on them expectations that are too high)'', . . . and ''reinforcement of gender bias in society as a whole''. Embryo sex-selection, ASRM notes, remains ''vulnerable to the judgment that no matter what its basis, [the method] identifies gender as a reason to value one person over another, and it supports socially constructed stereotypes of what gender means''. In doing so, it not only ''reinforces possibilities of unfair discrimination, but may trivialize human reproduction by making it depend on the selection of non-essential features of offspring''. The ASRM ethics opinion continues, ''ongoing problems with the status of women in the United States make it necessary to take account of concerns for the impact of sex-selection on goals of gender equality''. The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization with hundreds of members—many of whom are former abortionists—makes the following declaration:

''Sex selection abortions are more graphic examples of the damage that abortion inflicts on women. In addition to increasing premature labor in subsequent pregnancies, increasing suicide and major depression, and increasing the risk of breast cancer in teens who abort their first pregnancy and delay childbearing, sex selection abortions are often targeted at fetuses simply because the fetus is female. As physicians who care for both the mother and her unborn child, the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists vigorously opposes aborting fetuses because of their gender.''. The President's Council on Bioethics published a Working Paper stating the council's belief that society's respect for reproductive freedom does not prohibit the regulation or prohibition of ''sex control'', defined as the use of various medical technologies to choose the sex of one's child. The publication expresses concern that ''sex control might lead to . . . dehumanization and a new eugenics''.

(12) Sex-selection abortion results in an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance. An unnatural sex-ratio imbalance is undesirable, due to the inability of the numerically predominant sex to find mates. Experts worldwide document that a significant sex-ratio imbalance in which males numerically predominate can be a cause of increased violence and militancy within a society. Likewise, an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance gives rise to the commoditization of humans in the form of human trafficking, and a consequent increase in kidnapping and other violent crime.

(13) Sex-selection abortions have the effect of diminishing the representation of women in the American population, and therefore, the American electorate.

(14) Sex-selection abortion reinforces sex discrimination and has no place in a civilized society.

(15) The history of the United States includes examples of sex discrimination. The people of the United States ultimately responded in the strongest possible legal terms by enacting a constitutional amendment correcting elements of such discrimination. Women, once subjected to sex discrimination that denied them the right to vote, now have suffrage guaranteed by the 19th amendment. The elimination of discriminatory practices has been and is among the highest priorities and greatest achievements of American history.

(16) Implicitly approving the discriminatory practice of sex-selection abortion by choosing not to prohibit them will reinforce these inherently discriminatory practices, and evidence a failure to protect a segment of certain unborn Americans because those unborn are of a sex that is disfavored. Sex-selection abortions trivialize the value of the unborn on the basis of sex, reinforcing sex discrimination, and coarsening society to the humanity of all vulnerable and innocent human life, making it increasingly difficult to protect such life. Thus, Congress has a compelling interest in acting—indeed it must act—to prohibit sex-selection abortion.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—In accordance with the above findings, Congress enacts the following pursuant to Congress' power under—

(1) the Commerce Clause;

(2) section 5 of the 14th amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on Government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(3) section 8 of article I to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

SEC. __03. DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE UNBORN ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly—

''(1) performs an abortion knowing that such abortion is sought based on the sex or gender of the child;

''(2) uses force or the threat of force to intentionally injure or intimidate any person for the purpose of coercing a sex-selection abortion;

''(3) solicits or accepts funds for the performance of a sex-selection abortion; or

''(4) transports a woman into the United States or across a State line for the purpose of obtaining a sex-selection abortion;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY WOMAN ON WHOM ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed pursuant to a violation of subsection (a)(2) may in a civil action against any person who engaged in a violation of subsection (a) obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) CIVIL ACTION BY RELATIVES.—The father of an unborn child who is the subject of an abortion performed or attempted in violation of subsection (a), or a maternal grandparent of the unborn child if the pregnant woman is an unemancipated minor, may in a civil action against any person who engaged in the violation, obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct or the plaintiff consented to the abortion.

''(3) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, including loss of companionship and support, occasioned by the violation of this section; and

''(B) punitive damages.

''(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A qualified plaintiff may in a civil action obtain injunctive relief to prevent an abortion provider from performing or attempting further abortions in violation of this section.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph the term 'qualified plaintiff' means—

''(i) a woman upon whom an abortion is performed or attempted in violation of this section;

''(ii) any person who is the spouse or parent of a woman upon whom an abortion is performed in violation of this section; or

''(iii) the Attorney General.

''(5) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(c) LOSS OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—A violation of subsection (a) shall be deemed for the purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to be discrimination prohibited by section 601 of that Act.

''(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A physician, physician's assistant, nurse, counselor, or other medical or mental health professional shall report known or suspected violations of any of this section to appropriate law enforcement authorities. Whoever violates this requirement shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the United States district courts, United States courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under this section.

''(f) EXCEPTION.—A woman upon whom a sex-selection abortion is performed may not be prosecuted or held civilly liable for any violation of this section, or for a conspiracy to violate this section.

''(g) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent the Constitution or other similarly compelling reason requires, in every civil or criminal action under this section, the court shall make such orders as are necessary to protect the anonymity of any woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted if she does not give her written consent to such disclosure. Such orders may be made upon motion, but shall be made sua sponte if not otherwise sought by a party.

''(2) ORDERS TO PARTIES, WITNESSES, AND COUNSEL.—The court shall issue appropriate orders under paragraph (1) to the parties, witnesses, and counsel and shall direct the sealing of the record and exclusion of individuals from courtrooms or hearing rooms to the extent necessary to safeguard her identity from public disclosure. Each such order shall be accompanied by specific written findings explaining why the anonymity of the woman must be preserved from public disclosure, why the order is essential to that end, how the order is narrowly tailored to serve that interest, and why no reasonable less restrictive alternative exists.

''(3) PSEUDONYM REQUIRED.—In the absence of written consent of the woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted, any party, other than a public official, who brings an action under this section shall do so under a pseudonym.

''(4) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not be construed to conceal the identity of the plaintiff or of witnesses from the defendant or from attorneys for the defendant.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) The term 'abortion' means the act of using or prescribing any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance, device, or means with the intent to terminate the clinically diagnosable pregnancy of a woman, with knowledge that the termination by those means will with reasonable likelihood cause the death of the unborn child, unless the act is done with the intent to—

''(A) save the life or preserve the health of the unborn child;

''(B) remove a dead unborn child caused by spontaneous abortion; or

''(C) remove an ectopic pregnancy.

''(2) The term 'sex-selection abortion' is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 249 the following new item:

''250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex.''.

SEC. __04. SEVERABILITY.

If any portion of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the portions or applications of this title

which can be given effect without the invalid portion or application.

SEC. __05. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to require that a healthcare provider has an affirmative duty to inquire as to the motivation for the abortion, absent the healthcare provider having knowledge or information that the abortion is being sought based on the sex or gender of the child.

SA 3560. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 101, insert the following:

(d) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority granted under subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any remote seller that is not a qualifying remote seller.

(2) QUALIFYING REMOTE SELLER.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''qualifying remote seller'' means—

(i) any remote seller that meets the ownership requirements of subparagraph (B); or

(ii) any remote seller the majority of domestic employees of which are primarily employed at a location in a participating State.

(B) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—A remote seller meets the ownership requirements of this subparagraph if—

(i) in the case of a remote seller that is a publicly traded corporation, more than 50 percent of the covered employees (as defined in section 162(m)(3)) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of such corporation reside in participating States;

(ii) in the case of a remote seller that is a corporation (other than a publicly traded corporation), more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of such corporation is held by individuals residing in participating States;

(iii) in the case of a remote seller that is a partnership, more than 50 percent of the profits interests or capital interests in such partnership is held by individuals residing in participating States; and

(iv) in the case of any other remote seller, more than 50 percent of the beneficial interests in the entity is held by individuals residing in participating States.

(C) ATTRIBUTION RULES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the rules of section 318(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(D) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of this paragraph, all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 of such Code shall be treated as one person.

(3) PARTICIPATING STATE.—The term ''participating State'' means—

(A) a Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement which has exercised authority under subsection (a); or

(B) a State that—

(i) is not a Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement; and

(ii) has met the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) for exercising the authority granted under such subsection.

SA 3561. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102, insert the following:

(i) TRANSFER OF DATA.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring any State to transfer data relating to the audit or collection of sales and use taxes.

SA 3562. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 101, insert the following:

(d) EXCEPTION FOR REMOTE SELLERS INCORPORATED IN STATES THAT DO NOT HAVE SALES TAX.—A State is not authorized to require a remote seller to collect sales and use taxes under this Act if the remote seller is incorporated in a State that does not collect sales and use taxes with respect to products and services sold in such State.

SA 3563. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. RELEASE OF REPORT ON ENERGY AND COST SAVINGS IN NONBUILDING APPLICATIONS.

Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the report on the results of the study of energy and cost savings in nonbuilding applications required under section 518(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 121 Stat. 1660).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''At a Tipping Point: Consumer Choice, Consolidation and the Future Video Marketplace.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Challenges at the Border: Examining and Addressing the Root Causes Behind the Rise in Apprehensions at the Southern Border.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Improving the Trust System: Continuing Oversight of the Department of the Interior's Land Buy-Back Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERAN'S AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veteran's Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The State of VA Health Care.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the

session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''What Makes A Bank Systemically Important?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South Central Asian Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Indispensable Partners—Re-energizing US-India Ties.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a joint hearing with the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Options for Assuring Domestic Space Access.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014 at 3 p.m. in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 1:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Hanging Up on Phone Scams: Progress and Potential Solutions to this Scourge.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that fellows in my office: Annie Dreazen and Lemeneh Tefera be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Haley Wilson, be granted privileges of the floor for today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Lisa Foster, be granted privileges of the floor until the end of September.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Hannah Van Demark, Julia Sferlazzo, and Zachary Nash, interns on the banking committee staff, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 450, H.R. 3212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sean Goldman, a United States citizen and resident of New Jersey, was abducted from the United States in 2004 and separated from his father, David Goldman, who spent nearly 6 years battling for the return of his son from Brazil before Sean was finally returned to Mr. Goldman's custody on December 24, 2009.

(2) The Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, which serves as the Central Authority of the United States for the purposes of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (referred to in this Act as the ''Hague Abduction Convention''), has received thousands of requests since 2007 for assistance in the return to the United States of children who have been wrongfully abducted by a parent or other legal guardian to another country.

(3) For a variety of reasons reflecting the significant obstacles to the recovery of abducted children, as well as the legal and factual complexity involving such cases, not all cases are reported to the Central Authority of the United States.

(4) More than 1,000 outgoing international child abductions are reported every year to the Central Authority of the United States, which depends solely on proactive reporting of abduction cases.

(5) Only about one-half of the children abducted from the United States to countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention are returned to the United States.

(6) The United States and other Convention countries have expressed their desire, through the Hague Abduction Convention, ''to protect children internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention and to establish procedures to ensure their prompt return to the State of their habitual residence, as well as to secure protection for rights of access.''

(7) Compliance by the United States and other Convention countries depends on the actions of their designated central authorities, the performance of their judicial systems as reflected in the legal process and decisions rendered to enforce or effectuate the Hague Abduction Convention, and the ability and willingness of their law enforcement authorities to ensure the swift enforcement of orders rendered pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(8) According to data from the Department of State, approximately 40 percent of abduction cases involve children taken from the United States to countries with which the United States does not have reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or other arrangements relating to the resolution of abduction cases.

(9) According to the Department of State's April 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, ''parental child abduction jeopardizes the child and has substantial long-term consequences for both the child and the left-behind parent.''

(10) Few left-behind parents have the extraordinary financial resources necessary—

(A) to pursue individual civil or criminal remedies in both the United States and a foreign country, even if such remedies are available; or

(B) to engage in repeated foreign travel to attempt to obtain the return of their children through diplomatic or other channels.

(11) Military parents often face additional complications in resolving abduction cases because of the challenges presented by their military obligations.

(12) In addition to using the Hague Abduction Convention to achieve the return of abducted children, the United States has an array of Federal, State, and local law enforcement, criminal justice, and judicial tools at its disposal to prevent international abductions.

(13) Federal agencies tasked with preventing international abductions have indicated that the most effective way to stop international child abductions is while they are in progress, rather than after the child has been removed to a foreign destination.

(14) Parental awareness of abductions in progress, rapid response by relevant law enforcement, and effective coordination among Federal, State, local, and international stakeholders are critical in preventing such abductions.

(15) A more robust application of domestic tools, in cooperation with international law enforcement entities and appropriate application of the Hague Abduction Convention could—

(A) discourage some parents from attempting abductions;

(B) block attempted abductions at ports of exit; and

(C) help achieve the return of more abducted children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should set a strong example for other Convention countries in the timely location and prompt resolution of cases involving children abducted abroad and brought to the United States.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect children whose habitual residence is the United States from wrongful abduction;

(2) to assist left-behind parents in quickly resolving cases and maintaining safe and predictable contact with their child while an abduction case is pending;

(3) to protect the custodial rights of parents, including military parents, by providing the parents, the judicial system, and law enforcement authorities with the information they need to prevent unlawful abduction before it occurs;

(4) to enhance the prompt resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) to detail an appropriate set of actions to be undertaken by the Secretary of State to address persistent problems in the resolution of abduction cases;

(6) to establish a program to prevent wrongful abductions; and

(7) to increase interagency coordination in preventing international child abduction by convening a working group composed of presidentially appointed and Senate confirmed officials from the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Justice.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABDUCTED CHILD.—The term ''abducted child'' means a child who is the victim of international child abduction.

(2) ABDUCTION.—The term ''abduction'' means the alleged wrongful removal of a child from the child's country of habitual residence, or the wrongful retention of a child outside such country, in violation of a left-behind parent's custodial rights, including the rights of a military parent.

(3) ABDUCTION CASE.—The term ''abduction case'' means a case that—

(A) has been reported to the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the resolution of an abduction; and

(B) meets the criteria for an international child abduction under the Hague Abduction Convention, regardless of whether the country at issue is a Convention country.

(4) ACCESS CASE.—The term ''access case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a parent seeking rights of access.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''Annual Report'' means the Annual Report on International Child Abduction required under section 101.

(6) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the application required pursuant to article 8 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the formal document required, pursuant to the provisions of the applicable arrangement, to request the return of an abducted child or to request rights of access, as applicable; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the formal request by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country requesting the return of an abducted child or for rights of contact with an abducted child.

(7) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(8) BILATERAL PROCEDURES.—The term ''bilateral procedures'' means any procedures established by, or pursuant to, a bilateral arrangement, including a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country, to resolve abduction and access cases, including procedures to address interim contact matters.

(9) BILATERAL PROCEDURES COUNTRY.—The term ''bilateral procedures country'' means a country with which the United States has entered into bilateral procedures, including Memoranda of Understanding, with respect to child abductions.

(10) CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Central Authority'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the meaning given such term in article 6 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the official entity designated by the government of the bilateral procedures country within the applicable memorandum of understanding pursuant to section 103(b)(1) to discharge the duties imposed on the entity; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the foreign ministry or other appropriate authority of such country.

(11) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who has not attained 16 years of age.

(12) CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''Convention country'' means a country for which the Hague Abduction Convention has entered into force with respect to the United States.

(13) HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION.—The term ''Hague Abduction Convention'' means the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague October 25, 1980.

(14) INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''interim contact'' means the ability of a left-behind parent to communicate with or visit an abducted child during the pendency of an abduction case.

(15) LEFT-BEHIND PARENT.—The term ''left-behind parent'' means an individual or legal custodian who alleges that an abduction has occurred that is in breach of rights of custody attributed to such individual.

(16) NON-CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''non-Convention country'' means a country in which the Hague Abduction Convention has not entered into force with respect to the United States.

(17) OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''overseas military dependent child'' means a child whose habitual residence is the United States according to United States law even though the child is residing outside the United States with a military parent.

(18) OVERSEAS MILITARY PARENT.—The term ''overseas military parent'' means an individual who—

(A) has custodial rights with respect to a child; and

(B) is serving outside the United States as a member of the United States Armed Forces.

(19) PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''pattern of noncompliance'' means the persistent failure—

(i) of a Convention country to implement and abide by provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(ii) of a non-Convention country to abide by bilateral procedures that have been established between the United States and such country; or

(iii) of a non-Convention country to work with the Central Authority of the United States to resolve abduction cases.

(B) PERSISTENT FAILURE.—Persistent failure under subparagraph (A) may be evidenced in a given country by the presence of 1 or more of the following criteria:

(i) Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases.

(ii) The Central Authority regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to—

(I) the Hague Abduction Convention; or

(II) any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country.

(iii) The judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention country or a bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable.

(iv) Law enforcement authorities regularly fail to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases.

(20) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—The term ''rights of access'' means the establishment of rights of contact between a child and a parent seeking access in Convention countries—

(A) by operation of law;

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(21) RIGHTS OF CUSTODY.—The term ''rights of custody'' means rights of care and custody of a child, including the right to determine the place of residence of a child, under the laws of the country in which the child is a habitual resident—

(A) attributed to an individual or legal custodian; and

(B) arising—

(i) by operation of law; or

(ii) through a judicial or administrative decision; or

(iii) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(22) RIGHTS OF INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''rights of interim contact'' means the rights of contact between a child and a left-behind parent, which has been provided as a provisional measure while an abduction case is pending, under the laws of the country in which the child is located—

(A) by operation of law; or

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(23) UNRESOLVED ABDUCTION CASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''unresolved abduction case'' means an abduction case that remains unresolved for a period that exceeds 12 months after the date on which the completed application for return of the child is submitted for determination to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, in the country in which the child is located.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CASE.—An abduction case shall be considered to be resolved if—

(i) the child is returned to the country of habitual residence, pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or other appropriate bilateral procedures, if applicable;

(ii) the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the government of the country in which the child is located has implemented, and is complying with, the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or other bilateral procedures, as applicable;

(iii) the left-behind parent reaches a voluntary arrangement with the other parent;

(iv) the left-behind parent submits a written withdrawal of the application or the request for assistance to the Department of State;

(v) the left-behind parent cannot be located for 1 year despite the documented efforts of the Department of State to locate the parent; or

(vi) the child or left-behind parent is deceased.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

SEC. 101. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an Annual Report on International Child Abduction. The Secretary shall post the Annual Report to the publicly accessible website of the Department of State.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each Annual Report shall include—

(1) a list of all countries in which there were 1 or more abduction cases, during the preceding calendar year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States, including a description of whether each such country—

(A) is a Convention country;

(B) is a bilateral procedures country;

(C) has other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) adheres to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(2) for each country with respect to which there were 5 or more pending abduction cases, during the preceding year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States—

(A) the number of such new abduction and access cases reported during the preceding year;

(B) for Convention and bilateral procedures countries—

(i) the number of abduction and access cases that the Central Authority of the United States transmitted to the Central Authority of such country; and

(ii) the number of abduction and access cases that were not submitted by the Central Authority to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of such country;

(C) the reason for the delay in submission of each case identified in subparagraph (B)(ii) by the Central Authority of such country to the judicial or administrative authority of that country;

(D) the number of unresolved abduction and access cases, and the length of time each case has been pending;

(E) the number and percentage of unresolved abduction cases in which law enforcement authorities have—

(i) not located the abducted child;

(ii) failed to undertake serious efforts to locate the abducted child; and

(iii) failed to enforce a return order rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of such country;

(F) the total number and the percentage of the total number of abduction and access cases, respectively, resolved during the preceding year;

(G) recommendations to improve the resolution of abduction and access cases; and

(H) the average time it takes to locate a child;

(3) the number of abducted children whose habitual residence is in the United States and who were returned to the United States from—

(A) Convention countries;

(B) bilateral procedures countries;

(C) countries having other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) countries adhering to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(4) a list of Convention countries and bilateral procedures countries that have failed to comply with any of their obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, with respect to the resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) a list of countries demonstrating a pattern of noncompliance and a description of the criteria on which the determination of a pattern of noncompliance for each country is based;

(6) information on efforts by the Secretary of State to encourage non-Convention countries—

(A) to ratify or accede to the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) to enter into or implement other bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, with the United States; and

(C) to address pending abduction and access cases;

(7) the number of cases resolved without abducted children being returned to the United States from Convention countries, bilateral procedures countries, or other non-Convention countries;

(8) a list of countries that became Convention countries with respect to the United States during the preceding year; and

(9) information about efforts to seek resolution of abduction cases of children whose habitual residence is in the United States and whose abduction occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Unless a left-behind parent provides written permission to the Central Authority of the United States to include personally identifiable information about the parent or the child in the Annual Report, the Annual Report may not include any personally identifiable information about any such parent, child, or party to an abduction or access case involving such parent or child.

(d) ADDITIONAL SECTIONS.—Each Annual Report shall also include—

(1) information on the number of unresolved abduction cases affecting military parents;

(2) a description of the assistance offered to such military parents;

(3) information on the use of airlines in abductions, voluntary airline practices to prevent abductions, and recommendations for best airline practices to prevent abductions;

(4) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train domestic judges in the application of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(5) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train United States Armed Forces legal assistance personnel, military chaplains, and military family support center personnel about—

(A) abductions;

(B) the risk of loss of contact with children; and

(C) the legal means available to resolve such cases.

(e) REPEAL OF THE HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 2803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 11611) is repealed.

(f) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON COUNTRIES IN NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall include, in a separate section of the Annual Report, the Secretary's determination, pursuant to the provisions under section 202(b), of whether each country listed in the report has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance in cases of child abduction during the preceding 12 months.

(2) CONTENTS.—The section described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall identify any action or actions described in section 202(d) (or commensurate action as provided in section 202(e)) that have been taken by the Secretary with respect to each country;

(B) shall describe the basis for the Secretary's determination of the pattern of noncompliance by each country;

(C) shall indicate whether noneconomic policy options designed to resolve the pattern of noncompliance have reasonably been exhausted, including the consultations required under section 203.

SEC. 102. STANDARDS AND ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of State shall—

(1) ensure that United States diplomatic and consular missions abroad—

(A) maintain a consistent reporting standard with respect to abduction and access cases;

(B) designate at least 1 senior official in each such mission, at the discretion of the Chief of Mission, to assist left-behind parents from the United States who are visiting such country or otherwise seeking to resolve abduction or access cases; and

(C) monitor developments in abduction and access cases; and

(2) develop and implement written strategic plans for engagement with any Convention or non-Convention country in which there are 5 or more cases of international child abduction.

SEC. 103. BILATERAL PROCEDURES, INCLUDING MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall initiate a process to develop and enter into appropriate bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, as appropriate, with non-Convention countries that are unlikely to become Convention countries in the foreseeable future, or with Convention countries that have unresolved abduction cases that occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States or that country.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall give priority to countries with significant abduction cases and related issues.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The bilateral procedures described in subsection (a) should include provisions relating to—

(1) the identification of—

(A) the Central Authority;

(B) the judicial or administrative authority that will promptly adjudicate abduction and access cases;

(C) the law enforcement agencies; and

(D) the implementation of procedures to ensure the immediate enforcement of an order issued by the authority identified pursuant to subparagraph (B) to return an abducted child to a left-behind parent, including by—

(i) conducting an investigation to ascertain the location of the abducted child;

(ii) providing protection to the abducted child after such child is located; and

(iii) retrieving the abducted child and making the appropriate arrangements for such child to

be returned to the child's country of habitual residence;

(2) the implementation of a protocol to effectuate the return of an abducted child identified in an abduction case not later than 6 weeks after the application with respect to the abduction case has been submitted to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of the country in which the abducted child is located;

(3) the implementation of a protocol for the establishment and protection of the rights of interim contact during pendency of abduction cases; and

(4) the implementation of a protocol to establish periodic visits between a United States embassy or consular official and an abducted child, in order to allow the official to ascertain the child's location and welfare.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall submit written notification to the Member of Congress and Senators, or Resident Commissioner or Delegate, as appropriate, representing the legal residence of a left-behind parent if such parent—

(1) reports an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States; and

(2) consents to such notification.

(b) TIMING.—At the request of any person who is a left-behind parent, including a left-behind parent who previously reported an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, the notification required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as is practicable.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 201. RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote the best interest of children wrongfully abducted from the United States by—

(A) establishing legal rights and procedures for their prompt return; and

(B) ensuring the enforcement of reciprocal international obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or arrangements under bilateral procedures;

(2) to promote the timely resolution of abduction cases through 1 or more of the actions described in section 202; and

(3) to ensure appropriate coordination within the Federal Government and between Federal, State, and local agencies involved in abduction prevention, investigation, and resolution.

(b) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO UNRESOLVED CASES.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—For each abduction or access case relating to a child whose habitual residence is in the United States that remains pending or is otherwise unresolved on the date that is 12 months after the date on which the Central Authority of the United States submits such case to a foreign country, the Secretary of State shall determine whether the government of such foreign country has failed to take appropriate steps to resolve the case. If the Secretary of State determines that such failure occurred, the Secretary should, as expeditiously as practicable—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202; and

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that foreign country to directly address the resolution of the case with senior officials in the foreign government.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State may delay any action described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an additional period of time, not to exceed 1 year, will substantially assist in resolving the case.

(3) REPORT.—If the Secretary of State delays any action pursuant to paragraph (2) or decides not to take an action described in subsection (d) or (e) of section 202 after making the determination described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, not later than 15 days after such delay or decision, shall provide a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details the reasons for delaying action or not taking action, as appropriate.

(4) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.—At the request of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed briefing, including a written report, if requested, on actions taken to resolve a case or the cause for delay.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary of State should—

(A) take 1 or more actions that most appropriately respond to the nature and severity of the governmental failure to resolve the unresolved abduction case; and

(B) seek, to the fullest extent possible—

(i) to initially respond by communicating with the Central Authority of the country; and

(ii) if clause (i) is unsuccessful, to target subsequent actions—

(I) as narrowly as practicable, with respect to the agencies or instrumentalities of the foreign government that are responsible for such failures; and

(II) in ways that respect the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary of the country, as applicable.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—In addition to the guidelines under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, in determining whether to take 1 or more actions under paragraphs (5) through (7) of section 202(d) or section 202(e), shall seek to minimize any adverse impact on—

(A) the population of the country whose government is targeted by the action or actions;

(B) the humanitarian activities of United States and nongovernmental organizations in the country; and

(C) the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) RESPONSE TO A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to oppose institutional or other systemic failures of foreign governments to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, to resolve abduction and access cases;

(2) to promote reciprocity pursuant to, and in compliance with, the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as appropriate; and

(3) to directly engage with senior foreign government officials to most effectively address patterns of noncompliance.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall—

(A) review the status of abduction and access cases in each foreign country in order to determine whether the government of such country has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance during the preceding 12 months; and

(B) report such determination pursuant to section 101(f).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—The Secretary of State shall seek to determine the agencies or instrumentalities of the government of each country determined to have engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under paragraph (1)(A) that are responsible for such pattern of noncompliance—

(A) to appropriately target actions in response to such noncompliance; and

(B) to engage with senior foreign government officials to effectively address such noncompliance.

(c) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO A COUNTRY WITH A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days (or 180 days in case of a delay under paragraph (2)) after a country is determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A), the Secretary of State shall—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsection (d);

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that country to directly address the systemic problems that led to such determination; and

(C) inform senior officials in the foreign government of the potential repercussions related to such designation.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary shall not be required to take action under paragraph (1) until the expiration of a single, additional period of up to 90 days if, on or before the date on which the Secretary of State is required to take such action, the Secretary determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such additional period is necessary—

(A) for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the government of a country described in paragraph (1) in order to bring about a cessation of the pattern of noncompliance by such country;

(B) for a review of corrective action taken by a country after the designation of such country as being engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A); or

(C) in anticipation that corrective action will be taken by such country during such 90-day period.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR ADDITIONAL ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall not be required to take additional action under paragraph (1) with respect to a country determined to have been engaged in a persistent pattern of noncompliance if the Secretary—

(A) has taken action pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (d) with respect to such country in the preceding year and such action continues to be in effect;

(B) exercises the waiver under section 204 and briefs the appropriate congressional committees; or

(C) submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(i) indicates that such country is subject to multiple, broad-based sanctions; and

(ii) describes how such sanctions satisfy the requirements under this subsection.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the Annual Report, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the specific actions taken against countries determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under this section.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COUNTRIES.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the actions by the Secretary of State referred to in this subsection are—

(1) a demarche;

(2) an official public statement detailing unresolved cases;

(3) a public condemnation;

(4) a delay or cancellation of 1 or more bilateral working, official, or state visits;

(5) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States development assistance in accordance with section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n);

(6) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States security assistance in accordance with section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304);

(7) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of assistance to the central government of a country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(8) a formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(e) COMMENSURATE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Secretary of State may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (d) if the Secretary determines that such action—

(A) is commensurate in effect to the action substituted; and

(B) would substantially further the purposes of this Act.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If commensurate action is taken pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) describes such action;

(B) explains the reasons for taking such action; and

(C) specifically describes the basis for the Secretary's determination under paragraph (1) that such action—

(i) is commensurate with the action substituted; and

(ii) substantially furthers the purposes of this Act.

(f) RESOLUTION.—The Secretary of State shall seek to take all appropriate actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncompliance, as applicable.

(g) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

As soon as practicable after the Secretary of State makes a determination under section 201 in response to a failure to resolve unresolved abduction cases or the Secretary takes an action under subsection (d) or (e) of section 202, based on a pattern of noncompliance, the Secretary shall request consultations with the government of such country regarding the situation giving rise to such determination.

SEC. 204. WAIVER BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State may waive the application of any of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202 with respect to a country if the Secretary determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country—

(A) has satisfactorily resolved the abduction cases giving rise to the application of any of such actions; or

(B) has ended such country's pattern of noncompliance; or

(2) the national security interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date on which the Secretary of State exercises the waiver authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

(2) provide such committees with a detailed justification for such waiver, including an explanation of the steps the noncompliant government has taken—

(A) to resolve abductions cases; or

(B) to end its pattern of noncompliance.

(c) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall ensure that each waiver determination under this section—

(1) is published in the Federal Register; or

(2) is posted on the Department of State website.

(d) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State may limit the publication of information under subsection (c) in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the Secretary determines that the publication of such information would be harmful to the national security of the United States and would not further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Any specific action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of State submits a written certification to Congress that the government of such country—

(1) has resolved any unresolved abduction case that gave rise to such specific action; or

(2) has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct such country's persistent pattern of noncompliance that gave rise to such specific action, as applicable.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

SEC. 301. PREVENTING CHILDREN FROM LEAVING THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF A COURT ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 433. PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

''(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—The Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as 'CBP'), in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a program that—

''(1) seeks to prevent a child (as defined in section 1204(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from departing from the territory of the United States if a parent or legal guardian of such child presents a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction prohibiting the removal of such child from the United States to a CBP Officer in sufficient time to prevent such departure for the duration of such court order; and

''(2) leverages other existing authorities and processes to address the wrongful removal and return of a child.

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction. The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

''(A) the Department of State;

''(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official within the Department of Defense—

''(A) to coordinate with the Department of State on international child abduction issues; and

''(B) to oversee activities designed to prevent or resolve international child abduction cases relating to active duty military service members.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 432 the following:

''Sec. 433. Prevention of international child abduction.''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall seek to provide training, directly or through another government agency or nongovernmental organizations, on the effective handling of parental abduction cases to the judicial and administrative authorities in countries—

(1) in which a significant number of unresolved abduction cases are pending; or

(2) that have been designated as having a pattern of noncompliance under section 202(b).

(b) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements under this section.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't believe there is further debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 3212), as amended, was passed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERINARY MEDICINE MOBILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 458, H.R. 1528.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1528) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1528) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 503, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 503) designating September 2014 as ''National Childhood Awareness Month'' to promote awareness of charities benefiting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 504.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, next term the Supreme Court will take up a case presenting the question whether a provision of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, which affects the official identification documents of some American citizens born abroad, is constitutional. In 2002, Congress enacted a law permitting U.S. citizens who are born in Jerusalem to have the Secretary of State specify ''Israel'' as their birthplace on their passports and other consular documents. Under existing State Department policy, passports and other documents of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem may only record ''Jerusalem'' as their place of birth, not ''Israel,'' regardless of the wishes of the child or the parents.

Although the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003 into law, in his signing statement he stated that, if the section of the law that included that provision, section 214, were interpreted as mandatory, it would ''interfere with the President's constitutional authority to formulate the position of the United States, speak for the Nation in international affairs, and determine the terms on which recognition is given to foreign states.'' Emphasizing that ''U.S. policy regarding Jerusalem has not changed,'' the Executive has continued to record solely ''Jerusalem'' as the birthplace on passports of all U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem, regardless of their preference and notwithstanding the statute.

In accordance with the Executive's policy, the State Department declined a request to place ''Israel'' on the official documents of a young Jerusalem-born U.S. citizen despite the statutory directive. The boy's parents then sued the Secretary of State on his behalf and sought an order to have ''Israel'' recorded as their son's place of birth. Their suit has been before the D.C. Circuit three times and is now in the Supreme Court for the second time.

Both the district court and the court of appeals initially ordered the suit dismissed. The D.C. Circuit held that the parents' claim under the statute ''presents a nonjusticiable political question because it trenches upon the President's constitutionally committed recognition power,'' which the court said, includes ''a decision made by the President regarding which government is sovereign over a particular place.'' Siding with the Executive, the court explained, ''[E]very president since 1948 has, as a matter of official policy, purposefully avoided taking a position on the issue whether Israel's sovereignty extends to the city of Jerusalem. . . . The State Department's refusal to record 'Israel' in passports and Consular Reports of Birth of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem implements this longstanding policy of the Executive.''

The parents sought Supreme Court review, and in 2011 the Attorney General advised Congress that the Department of Justice would defend the court of appeals' judgment that the case was nonjusticiable, but that it would also argue that, if the claim was found to be justiciable, section 214(d) of the Act unconstitutionally infringes on the President's exclusive authority to recognize foreign states. A number of Senators and Members of the House appeared as amici curiae, or friends of the court, in support of the statute.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari and vacated the court of appeals' holding that the constitutional issue was a political question. The Court found that the case called for nothing more than performing the ''familiar judicial exercise'' of ''deciding whether the statute impermissibly intrudes upon Presidential powers under the Constitution.''

On remand, Members of both Houses again submitted amicus curiae briefs in defense of section 214(d). One judge on the appellate panel found that the plaintiff's argument was ''powerfully'' buttressed by briefs submitted by Members of Congress, among other amici. However, the panel majority observed, ''While an amicus brief has been submitted on behalf of six senators and fifty-seven representatives, they of course do not speak for the Congress qua the Congress.''

Based on its review of constitutional text and structure, precedent, and history, the D.C. Circuit concluded, this time on the merits, that the President ''exclusively holds the power to determine whether to recognize a foreign sovereign'' and that the statute ''plainly intended to force the State Department to deviate from its decades-long position of neutrality on what nation or government, if any, is sovereign over Jerusalem.'' The court found conclusive the Executive's view that, in so doing, ''section 214(d) would cause adverse foreign policy consequences.'' Accordingly, the court found that the law ''impermissibly intrudes on the President's recognition power and is therefore unconstitutional.''

In April of this year, the Supreme Court again granted review in the case, this time focused on the single question: ''Whether a federal statute that directs the Secretary of State, on request, to record the birthplace of an American citizen born in Jerusalem as born in 'Israel' on a Consular Report of Birth Abroad and on a United States passport is unconstitutional on the

ground that the statute 'impermissibly infringes on the President's exercise of the recognition power reposing exclusively in him.'''

This case, accordingly, now presents the Supreme Court with very important questions about the constitutional allocation of power between the branches over foreign affairs. The issues likely to be addressed include the claims of the Executive that the Constitution gives the President exclusive authority over recognition of foreign governments, that this law implicates such authority, and that the statute infringes impermissibly on the President's recognition power.

Contrary to the Executive's claim and the reasoning of the D.C. Circuit, this statutory provision does not usurp any constitutional power of the President. In particular, it does not infringe on the President's exercise of the power to recognize foreign governments and to voice positions on matters of international sovereignty on behalf of the United States.

In legislating the content of identification documents available to American citizens born abroad, Congress is exercising its plenary powers over immigration and naturalization and its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce. The law does not alter the position of the United States on the status of Jerusalem. Rather, it continues Congress's century-and-a-half-old exercise of legislative authority over the contents and design of identification documents, such as passports, held by U.S. citizens. Congress does so in this case to respect the prerogative of American citizens to identify themselves as American citizens with a birth connection to the State of Israel, should they choose to do so.

Mr. President, Title VII of the Ethics in Government Act authorizes the Senate to appear as an amicus curiae in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of the Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue. Appearance as an amicus curiae in this case would enable the Senate to respond to the Executive's contention that this law infringes on the President's constitutional power to recognize foreign governments and to present to the Court the basis for the Senate's conviction that the law is consistent with the Constitution.

This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in this case in the Senate's name as amicus curiae to support the constitutionality of the statute.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 504) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, July 17; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 438, S. 2244, as provided under the previous order, and I ask that that be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 12 noon tomorrow there will be up to five votes in relation to the TRIA bill. We anticipate three rollcall votes in relation to the Coburn and Flake amendments and then on passage of the bill. There will be two voice votes on the Vitter and Tester amendments. We also expect to lock in an agreement to vote in relation to a circuit judge nomination at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:34 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*LAURA S. WERTHEIMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 16, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

RONNIE L. WHITE, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SHAWNA MARIE SEARCY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After almost eight years of service, Shawna Marie Searcy will be leaving her post in my Kansas City District Office.

Shawna began working in my campaign office, then joined my District office staff in 2006. She has served as a field representative over the years for many counties, including Clay County, the largest county in the Sixth Congressional District.

Shawna could be relied on to listen to my constituents' concerns and represent me at meetings when I was away in Washington. Shawna has also been instrumental in helping students in my district who are seeking nominations to our nation's military academies through that process. When it came to planning events, I knew Shawna would always put together an excellent event, whether a ribbon-cutting for a new bridge, a reception for the Congressional Art Contest honorees, or the Sixth Congressional District Small Business Expo. She was always at ease speaking publicly for me, while her warm smile and happy heart left an impression with my staff and constituents that they will always remember.

I have received many kind words from constituents praising the outstanding service Shawna has provided. Her professionalism and dedication to serving my constituents was a great example of how government should work. While I am losing a valuable member of my team, I am excited for Shawna to begin the next chapter of her career.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Shawna Marie Searcy for her many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Shawna's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking her for her commitment to others and wishing her best of luck in all her endeavors and many years of success to come.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF IRENE WRIGHT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the ninetieth birthday of one of my noted and civically active constituents, Mrs. Irene Dugan Wright of Dallas, Texas.

Irene was born on July 19, 1924, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and was the oldest of three children. Both of her parents were hearing impaired and, many years later, she would come to serve as an interpreter for the deaf at church. After spending most of her childhood in Philadelphia, Irene graduated from Commerce High School in Springfield, Massachusetts. She went on to work as a secretary for Trinity Church in Springfield and met her husband, Bob, through a church event and they married in 1951.

Irene's life in Texas began in 1954 when the family moved to Dallas on a temporary assignment from the Sun Oil Company. It did not take long for Texas to appeal to the Wrights, and they successfully requested that the assignment in the area become permanent.

Since moving to Dallas, Irene has continuously been very active in our community's civic and political life. The first time she ever voted was for Dwight D. Eisenhower after attending a debate between him and Adlai Stevenson. In 1957, the Wrights were having air conditioning installed in their home when they were asked to host a backyard event to gather and identify Republicans in Dallas County. Since then, Irene attended many state conventions in Texas and was an alternate delegate to the Republican National Convention in her birthplace of Philadelphia in 2000. She has worked on numerous campaigns, including those of John Tower, Jim Collins, and SAM JOHNSON.

Irene also maintains active ties with her faith community. She is not only a member of the Golden Corridor Republican Women's Club but also serves as a chaplain. She is a member of Christ Church in Plano, Texas, and has taught women's Bible Study for thirty-five years. Irene and Bob, who passed away in 2003, had three children together—Susan, Lisa, and John—and she has six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the ninetieth birthday of one of my most civically engaged constituents, Mrs. Irene Dugan Wright. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating this milestone in her remarkable life.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALEXANDRIA BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize the congregation of Alexandria Baptist Church, which will be celebrating its 100th anniversary with a celebration on August 3.

The Alexandria Baptist Church was organized the first Sunday in April of 1914. There were 22 members of the original church, and the first pastor was Rev. John W. Stewart. After six years of holding services in the Odd Fellows Hall in Alexandria, plans were made to build a church. Four years later, the present church was built.

Many of the early pastors at Alexandria Baptist Church were students from Howard College. Two passenger trains carried these student pastors back and forth from Birmingham each Sunday.

The people of Alexandria Baptist Church live out the church's mission statement, "To Love God and To Love Others" each and every day.

On August 3, 2014, Alexandria Baptist Church members will gather with former pastors, leaders, members and staff to commemorate their successful 100 years. Please join me in celebrating this milestone and wishing them many more years of success.

HONORING DR. JON NACHISON

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Dr. Jon Nachison, Ph.D., or Dr. Jon, as he is fondly known, co-founder of the National Stand Down for Homelessness. After twenty-seven years of continuous service as director, Dr. Jon is finally "standing down."

Dr. Jon began Stand Down in 1988 when, as Clinical Director of Psychological Services at the Veterans Village of San Diego (then known as Vietnam Veterans of San Diego), he and the Director at VVSD, Robert Van Keuren, convinced the City of San Diego and other community stakeholders to support a new program to address the needs of homeless veterans Through his perseverance, and despite initial community resistance, San Diego embraced what has become an annual event, incorporating as many as 3500 community volunteers who return faithfully year after year. In tribute to his original creativity, over 200 other communities nationwide have adopted the model that Dr. Jon first introduced and perfected.

The term "stand down" refers to a military command to move oneself out of a war zone (the streets, in this case) to a safe place to regroup. By design, Stand Down borrows from a long history of therapeutic communities and recreates a bivouac setting of military tents and military organization. Over a three day weekend, it recreates a sense of prior military identity and begins to restore a sense of self-worth. Showers, clean clothes, basic medical care and social services renew the veterans' faith in change being possible. Dr. Jon wants participants to regain the sense of competence and empowerment they had known

during their years of military service. The isolation and stress of homelessness recedes amongst friends.

Stand Down becomes a transformational experience and Dr. Jon's energy, vision, and unwavering commitment have been the cornerstone of this program. That he has created a program to address two national problems, homelessness and the successful societal reentry of our returning veterans, establishes him as a treasure, not only for San Diego, but for our Nation. I rise to honor Dr. Jon for his many years of creative service.

RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of what we now know as the Congressional Research Service.

Today's Congressional Research Service—CRS—was first established in the Library of Congress in 1914 as the Legislative Reference Service to provide reference information to Members of Congress to assist in their legislative work. Over the past 100 years, the LRS evolved into today's CRS. Today, CRS employs more than 600 experts to assist Congress with research and analysis.

CRS and its employees provide an invaluable service to Members of Congress and their staff. In an era of political gridlock and partisan rhetoric, CRS consistently provides in-depth, authoritative, and consistently nonpartisan work product in order to ensure that we have an informed legislature.

In the 1950s, the press called LRS ''Congress's right arm.'' I believe that description would be just as accurate about today's CRS. CRS has taken that role seriously—it has continued to modernize and evolve, while maintaining its core mission of independent research and policy analysis. It has kept up with modern technology, updating its website to be more user-friendly and providing Members and staff with quick access to timely reports and detailed analysis.

Mr. Speaker, CRS at 100 is a critical tool to an informed Congress, and I look forward to working with CRS as it embarks on its second century of service.

HONORING THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the occasion of its centennial anniversary. For 100 years, the experts at CRS have worked to provide Members and staff with timely information and research to help them serve their constituents, develop legislation and conduct strong oversight.

Since its founding in 1914, CRS has evolved from a small agency providing basic reference services to a group of nearly 600 expert, highly-trained and collaborative professional staff members who are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress.

I can attest from my time in Congress that the objective, nonpartisan work of CRS is essential to the legislative process. When we face difficult policy problems or international crises, we turn to CRS for reliable information and analyses. CRS enables the Congress to make informed decisions for the United States and its citizens.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating CRS for all of its accomplishments over the last century, and I look forward to strongly supporting the institution as it embarks on its next century of service to our nation.

A TRIBUTE TO MOTHER CORENER HINES-HERRING

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great woman of faith, Mother Corener Hines-Herring. She was a pastor's wife, musician, songwriter, mother, and grandmother from the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin. Mother Hines-Herring was born on September 12, 1937 and passed away on July 10, 2014.

Mother Corener Hines-Herring was born in Haynes, Arkansas to Governor and Corener Harris and had 15 siblings. She was married to the late Reverend Willie L. Hines, Sr., and their union produced 10 children. Reverend Hines, Sr. led the congregation at the Greater Westside Church of God In Christ where Mother Hines served as first lady to the church.

Mother Hines-Herring was a Member of Christian Faith Fellowship Church of God in Christ, Inc., where her eldest son, Bishop Darrell L. Hines, Sr. is pastor. Mother Hines-Herring was a prayer warrior and lived to praise God. She loved to dance before the Lord in church and played the piano.

Mother Hines-Herring would always open her home and heart to those in need. Although she gave birth to 10 children and raised them well, she was a mother to thousands. She was never a complainer but rather a doer.

She leaves behind many friends, admirers and family members to mourn her passing including children: Bishop Darrell L. Hines, Sr. (Pamela), former Milwaukee Common Council President Alderman Willie L. Hines Jr. (Janel), daughter songstress, Phebe Hines Holmes, Janet Hines Samolyk, Daven Hines (Tonya), Robin Hines Young (Harold), Bridgette Hines Flowers (Curtis), Sharon Hines Monroe (Mark), Rhoda Hines Turner (Jason), Richard Hines (Liza) and her husband, Mr. Timothy Herring.

I am honored to pay tribute to Mother Corener Hines-Herring. She was a prayer leader extraordinaire, a pillar of the church, the matriarch of her family and my friend and mentor. She has made a positive impact on Milwaukee and will be missed.

Mr. Speaker for these reasons I rise to pay tribute to a woman whose legacy will continue to benefit the Fourth Congressional District.

HONORING MR. ROLAND GLENN

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an honorable World War II veteran in my state whose bravery saved the lives of many during combat on Okinawa.

In 1945, Roland Glenn helped to lead the men of his company to capture key Japanese positions by scaling an escarpment in the face of intense resistance. The unit needed the element of surprise, and for the enemy to believe that they were facing a large group of American soldiers (instead of the 35 that made it up the escarpment). The unit's success in this dangerous situation is due, in large part, to Mr. Glenn's leadership and bravery.

The plan to overtake the enemy position was difficult and had little room for error. Many of these soldiers were young men, afraid and far from home. It was not only Mr. Glenn's ingenious plan of attack that saved many lives; he also encouraged them to keep going, empowering them and boosting their morale. Together, these brave men were able to beat the odds and win the battle.

Since his time in the Army, Mr. Glenn has worked as a peace activist, continuing his service to our country. He was then, and continues to be, a great leader and patriot. I wish Mr. Glenn all the best and thank him wholeheartedly for his service to our nation.

HONORING JOSEPH MEIDL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joseph Meidl. Joseph is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 117, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joseph has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joseph has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joseph has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joseph Meidl for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE LIVING LEGACY TREE PLANTING PROJECT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership's ''Living Legacy Tree Planting Project.''

This project is an ambitious effort to plant one tree for every one of the 740,000 soldiers who died during the Civil War along the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Scenic Byway, which runs from Monticello, Virginia to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. When completed, the byway will become the world's first 180-mile landscaped alley. More importantly, it will serve as a living memorial to those who died during our nation's most difficult trial and a sober reminder of the enormity of its cost.

Each tree planted will be dedicated to an individual Civil War soldier and will be ''geotagged'' to make a number of historical resources, such as the soldier's pictures and personal writings from the war, electronically available to visitors and researchers. The project has drawn enthusiastic volunteers from communities around the country and has recently partnered with Ancestry.com to supplement the quality of the information provided on each soldier.

I submit the following article from the Washington Post and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the important efforts being made by the Journey Through Hallowed Grounds Partnership to honor those who paid the ultimate price for freedom and liberty.

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 2014]

A LIVING TRIBUTE TO CIVIL WAR SOLDIERS

(By Wesley Robinson)

The newest trees along U.S. Route 15 come with stories of Civil War troops.

One freshly planted rising sun redbud in Leesburg, Va., honors Joseph T. Bosworth, a young man from Massachusetts who fought with the 1st Rhode Island Cavalry. He died at the Battle of Antietam.

A young sassafras nearby was dedicated to Daniel M. Barringer, who joined the Confederate Army in Corinth, Miss., fought with the 17th Mississippi Company and is buried in Union Cemetery in Leesburg. He was wounded at the Battle of Fredericksburg and died about a month after he was discharged.

They are among 1,413 trees that have been planted so far to commemorate the Civil War dead through the nonprofit Journey Through Hallowed Ground (JTHG) Living Legacy Tree Planting Project. Though organizers acknowledge that the $74 million plan is ambitious, their aim is to plant a tree for each of an estimated 740,000 troops killed in the War between the States.

Cate Magennis Wyatt, founder and president of the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, said the trees—each funded by a $100 donation—are being planted along a 180-mile stretch from Thomas Jefferson's Albemarle County estate, Monticello, to Gettysburg, Pa.

Visitors can search an interactive online map that shows each tree and includes details about the person it honors.

The tree-planting project came about after then-Gov. Robert F. McDonnell asked communities to plan an unusual way to observe the sesquicentennial of the war, which was fought from 1861 to 1865, Magennis Wyatt said. She said her group, which is dedicated to historic preservation, wanted to do something other than a ''flagpole or another monument,'' eventually arriving at the idea for the tree allée.

''My joke was that God had spoken to her through a burning redwood bush,'' said Peter Hart, an arborist and volunteer with JTHG.

When the project began, Magennis Wyatt noted, the number of Civil War dead was estimated at 620,000. Now historians put it at 740,000. Organizers said they are considering tagging existing trees to advance the goal of recognizing as many troops as possible. At a dedication ceremony last month, at Oatlands Historic Home and Gardens in Leesburg, Magennis Wyatt noted that there was not nearly enough room to plant a tree every 10 feet along the entire 180-mile route.

Many of the trees are redbuds, but the project is also using a variety of maples, eastern red cedars and flowering dogwoods. Hart, who took part in the selection process, said they picked colorful variations but also hearty trees that can flourish next to a well-traveled roadway, where they must withstand heat from the pavement, high winds and road salt.

Christopher Shott of New Bedford, Mass., said he came across the project online and decided to donate a redbud to honor Bosworth.

Shott doesn't have any direct family ties to the Civil War; his relatives came to the United States later. Still, he felt a kinship with Bosworth because they had lived in the same town, Swansea, Mass.

''He made me feel like I have a connection to the Civil War,'' Shott said.

One of the challenges the project faces, organizers said, is collecting information about the slain troops. Magennis Wyatt said about half of the soldiers died anonymously. She said there was no American Red Cross, government-issued dog tags or comprehensive registry. Wartime contributions of Native Americans, African Americans and women went largely unheralded.

The project has joined with Ancestry.com and Fold3.com to provide biographical sketches of the troops. It is uploading biographical information to the Web site and trying to verify information with descendants, historians and others.

At last month's dedication ceremony, for 500 recently planted trees, Jimmy Cunningham, 14, presented his research on Barringer. Jimmy, who lives in Leesburg, has attended a JTHG summer camp for the past three years and will serve as a junior counselor this summer. He was asked to participate in the research project by the JTHG staff and teamed up with his grandmother to investigate Barringer's life.

Jimmy found that Barringer was injured in battle but died after he had been discharged. The death was attributed to ''leprosy'' and ''disease of the head.'' Jimmy also learned that Barringer's father was a wealthy man, which raised questions about why he went to war.

''It stimulated a lot of conversation in our home,'' said MaryKirk Cunningham, Jimmy's mother.

Cunningham said her son's research also helped him become interested in family history. An ancestor on her side, Briscoe Goodhart, was a member of the Loudoun Rangers, a partisan cavalry unit that fought for the Union in the Civil War.

''For us, it's really great. . . . He went beyond our family but stayed connected to his nana through our family,'' Cunningham said.

Michelle Kellogg, director of the JTHG National Heritage area, said the stretch where the trees are being planted, rich with historic sites, is a fitting place for such a tribute. She noted the region's nine presidential homes and high concentration of Civil War battle sites.

''This region is essential in helping Americans and visitors understand our history,'' Kellogg said.

The Hallowed Grounds partnership was created several years back by Magennis Wyatt, a former Virginia secretary of commerce, and others worried about development's effect on the historic area. They were motivated, in part, by Disney's attempt in the 1990s to create a historic theme park in the region and by proposals to build a casino in Gettysburg and condos near Monticello.

''It was apparent that we were taking a lot for granted,'' Magennis Wyatt said, ''not just the bricks and mortar but the people who lived on this land and created this country.''

Ellen Vogel, a landscape architect with the Virginia Department of Transportation, said another challenge of the project is finding enough space for the trees in the corridor, about half of which is in Virginia. She said VDOT worked to provide the necessary guidance and flexibility.

''It's great that Virginia has a scenic byway. There are so few of those across the country,'' Vogel said. ''But we have a lot of history here. I think it's fitting.''

Hart's great-great-uncles Charles and William Davis and Jason Hart were killed in the war. His great-great-grandfather James Hart was wounded twice but survived.

''You combine my love for my family history and my love for trees and this living legacy project has captured me,'' Hart said.

Shott, who flew to Virginia for the ceremony last month, said he visited Bosworth's grave in Sharpsburg, Md., early that Sunday to pay his respects before going to see the rising sun redbud planted in the soldier's honor.

''I just try to understand why they did what they did to the point they'd die for something they believed in,'' Shott said. ''The least we can do is remember them.''

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT ANTON F. JACKS, LEGION d'HONNEUR FOR U.S. VETERANS RECIPIENT

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Anton F. Jacks for receiving the Legion d'Honneur for U.S. Veterans Award for heroic service in connection with military operations in Lorient, France.

Sergeant Jacks committed an exceptionally heroic action on August 31, 1944, while serving in the Army Corps of Engineers, Company ''A'', 25th Armored Engineer Battalion, in the United States Army.

On that day, Sergeant Jacks was assigned to guard a farm house that served as an allied forces outpost in the vicinity of Lorient. While on guard, Sergeant Jacks made the heroic decision to establish a series of booby traps around the perimeter to provide protection for his unit and innocent French civilians in the area. When a unit of German soldiers attempted to attack and overthrow the farm

house, the traps prevented the German soldiers from infiltrating the allied perimeter.

As stated by Captain Richard H. Brooks, ''the outpost was attacked by a numerically superior force of German soldiers. At 0845 the attacking enemy, failing to penetrate the courageous fighting men of the outpost, withdrew.''

Mr. Speaker, without question, Sergeant Jacks is a hero. His personal bravery, and heroic conduct are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the Corps of Engineers, and the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a very grateful nation, please join me in recognizing and thanking Sergeant Anton F. Jacks for his acts of valor.

H.R. 4719, THE AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2014

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, and in particular in support of the provision that would make the current tax deduction for the contribution of conservation easements permanent. As a cosponsor of similar legislation, I am pleased to see this provision included in the bill. In my home state of Idaho, I have repeatedly seen the positive impact of conservation easements. One of my favorite stretches of river in Idaho is the South Fork of the Snake, near Idaho Falls, where I live. It is a great place to fish, watch bald eagles, or enjoy the beauty of nature without interruption, and this is due in large part to the fact that conservation easements protect the land on the river from development and created wonderful areas for recreation.

More importantly, however, conservation easements have a significant benefit to our economy in Idaho. Farming and ranching have long been a way of life in my state, but increasingly what was once vast swaths of ranchland is being broken up into smaller parcels for development. The conservation easement tax incentive gives many farmers and ranchers the option to put some of their land into conservation easements, protecting habitat and scenic landscapes, instead of selling to developers. In addition, easements that allow for continued agricultural use provide certainty for those who want to keep ranching and farming.

I am pleased that this provision was included in the bill, and I look forward to seeing it benefit willing landowners who are working together with land management agencies to preserve the open spaces in Idaho.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of a segment of northern Cyprus. This invasion has since morphed into a prolonged occupation in which an estimated 43,000 Turkish soldiers are deployed in the occupied territory, and tens of thousands of Turkish citizens have migrated to the island since 1974. Turkey's invasion and occupation of northern Cyprus has created yet another long-running international conflict, one that continues to destabilize the eastern Mediterranean region.

I agree with those in the international community who assert that a peaceful, long-term resolution of this conflict must include the establishment of a unified Republic of Cyprus, in which the religious, cultural and political beliefs of all Cypriots can be expressed through a truly democratic political process. I am encouraged by the democratic selection of new leadership in the Republic of Cyprus, and reassured by the willingness of Turkish-Cypriot leaders to continue a dialogue about potential reunification. These are signs that a peaceful resolution is possible, but a key component of any long-term settlement must include the withdrawal of Turkish military forces from the island.

A long-term, peaceful resolution of the Cyprus standoff is not simply in the interest of the island's Greek and Turkish inhabitants. A successful resolution of this conflict would remove a major obstacle to Turkey's integration with the rest of Europe, a development that would enhance the security and economic wellbeing of millions of people in the region. Our government should be working daily to facilitate that outcome, and I will certainly use every opportunity available to me to make that point to Administration officials.

RECOGNIZING THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the amount of information that passes through a Congressional office on a daily basis is astounding. While the morning might see me and my staff meeting with one group of constituents on the perils of climate change, and another on the need for universal advanced care directives, the evening may bring a bill on mining rights or international trade to the floor of the House of Representatives. All of these discussions, decisions, and debates require me and my staff to have access to vast amounts of unbiased information that we can trust. We have no greater resource than the Congressional Research Service.

The experts at CRS work with incredible speed and accuracy to get my office the information we need. Whenever we are drafting legislation or looking for more background as we delve into complicated policy, CRS is always a first call. Over the years, we have come back to certain experts again and again and are always increasingly impressed at the depth of their knowledge of their subject matters.

Congratulations to CRS on its 100th anniversary. I hope that this vital institution remains vibrant as our government strives toward a better and more nuanced understanding of the issues and challenges we face as a country.

IN HONOR OF FRANCIS ''FRANK'' BUDD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the life of Mr. Francis ''Frank'' Budd. Mr. Budd, a New Jersey native, passed away on April 29, 2014 after an accomplished life.

Born on July 20, 1939 in Long Branch, New Jersey, Frank Budd was an outstanding athlete and graduate of Asbury Park High School and Villanova University. He was inducted into the inaugural Villanova Wall of Fame in Villanova Stadium on October 7, 1995 and the Frank Budd Track and Field Meet at Asbury Park High School is held each year in his honor.

After college, Mr. Budd played for the National Football League and the Canadian Football League. Following his football career, Mr. Budd worked for the New Jersey Department of Corrections and the Tropicana Casino in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

At one time distinguished as ''the world's fastest human,'' Frank Budd was a standout track and field runner. He competed for the United States in the 1960 Olympics in Rome, won several individual and team championships while at Villanova, and in 1961 broke the 13-year long record for the 100-yard dash at 9.2 seconds.

Mr. Budd leaves behind a loving family, including his wife of 51 years, Barbara, a son, Frank, Jr., two daughters Kimberly Arzillo and Anitra Speight, siblings, grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Frank Budd for his remarkable athletic achievements, his legacy to Asbury Park, and his service to his community, state and family.

CYPRUS SETTLEMENT TALKS

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today and to have the opportunity to speak about something very important both to me and to many of the constituents I serve

in New York's Fifth District: the Cyprus settlement talks. I'm here to tell you that I am following the negotiations carefully—that I am ready to lend my support in any way I can. And I am here to tell you that America wants these talks to be successful—that America is engaged. Mr. BIDEN's visit in May was the first by an American Vice-President in over 50 years, and that says a lot. Finding a fair and mutually acceptable resolution to the situation in Cyprus is a priority at the very highest levels of our government—and we will not rest until we succeed.

I am also here to tell you that I'm hopeful. I have not forgotten the false-starts of the past, nor am I naïve about the difficulties which lie ahead, but I am hopeful that Cyprus has turned a corner—that things are different this time. I'm optimistic that there's a real chance for progress. Not long after Mr. BIDEN departed Cyprus, in fact, Greek Cypriot President Mr. Anastasiades and his Turkish Cypriot counterpart, Mr. Eroglu, agreed to meet at least twice a month to discuss how they could build trust between the two sides. I commend both leaders for taking this step, and I express my utmost support for continuing an open and honest dialogue.

I am also hopeful because at no other time during the 40 years Cyprus has been divided was reaching a settlement so critical. For millennia Cyprus has been at the crossroads of civilization. It has been a hub of commerce and a strategic waypoint for all who transited the Mediterranean. And it remains so today, but with even greater strategic implications. Located at the nexus of Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa, Cyprus is a vital source of stability and security in one of the world's most volatile regions. And with a robust free-market, services-based economy and newly discovered natural gas reserves, Cyprus stands to benefit greatly from increasing ties with the international community, especially the Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership—a free trade agreement I strongly support.

But Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike are being denied the bright future they deserve. It is time to come to the negotiating table ready to make compromises, ready to make progress. It is time to reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation, as called for by multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions. It is time to turn a page in Cyprus' history and find out what great surprises the next chapter holds in store.

I stand by my friends and colleagues in Cyprus and the Cypriot diaspora—ready to read that next chapter. And America stands by too—determined to deepen the partnership between our two great countries, eager to see just how much we can accomplish when we work together.

HONORING DR. NEYLAND CLARK

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Neyland Clark, who has recently resigned from his post as the superintendent of the South Harrison Community School Corporation after 18 years of exemplary public service. His resignation marks a milestone in a career dedicated to education, including 26 years as a superintendent and more than four decades as an educator.

Over the course of his career, Dr. Clark has been bestowed many accolades and awards that objectify the passion and expertise that he has brought to the field of education. In just the past few years, Dr. Clark has been conferred an honorary degree from Indiana University Southeast, awarded the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) ''Excellence in Educational Leadership Award,'' and honored as the ''District VIII Superintendent of the Year'' by the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents.

Dr. Clark is known in the education world as a capable leader and tireless innovator. Dr. Clark's successes have spanned a wide variety of issues, from combating racism in schools to balancing budgets while also raising teacher salaries. Dr. Clark's district became the first school corporation in the state of Indiana to establish an in-house professional development center in schools. These examples are more evidence of the relentless passion and knowledge Dr. Clark has brought to our education system over the past four decades.

Despite all of the praise, Dr. Clark remains a characteristically humble Hoosier, saying ''There is no magical story for being successful; it is a good, old-fashioned southern Indiana work ethic [that paves the path to success].'' Dr. Clark's work ethic, dedication, and knowledge will be missed as he moves on to new endeavors. Dr. Clark serves as an inspiration for anyone who seeks to make a positive difference in the public sector.

The 9th District of Indiana thanks him for his service.

HONORING BUFFY RENEE SMITH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After more than ten years of service, Buffy Renee Smith will be leaving her post in my Kansas City District Office.

Originally from the Sixth District, Buffy brought an understanding of the people and issues that only someone with her deep roots could bring. Buffy began working in my Washington office in 2004, then later moved back home to Missouri and joined my District office staff. She has served as a staff assistant, field representative, scheduler and Director of Operations for my office over the years.

Buffy could be relied on to keep my office running efficiently and represent me at meetings when I was away in Washington. Buffy managed my schedule both in Washington and in District for many years, helping me represent the people of the Sixth Congressional District. Whether I needed to meet with officials in Platte County during the 2011 floods, manage a bill on the House floor or attend a House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure town hall in Wisconsin, I could count on Buffy to get me there and make sure I had all the information I needed for the event.

I have received many kind words from constituents praising the outstanding service Buffy has provided. Her professionalism and dedication to this office and my constituents was a great example of how government should work. She would often work nights and weekends, while time and again going beyond her job description, all without complaint. While I am losing a valuable member of my team, I am excited for Buffy to begin the next chapter of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Buffy Renee Smith for her many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Buffy's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking her for her commitment to others and wishing her best of luck in all her endeavors and many years of success to come.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,591,980,437,201.71. We've added $6,965,103,388,288.63 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FOR CYPRUS REUNIFICATION

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for ending the separation of Cyprus which has existed since 1974. It is time to finally end the 40 year division of Cyprus and I am hopeful that the Cyprus settlement talks will accomplish that critical goal. The reunification of Cyprus is among the most pressing foreign policy matters that exist in the world today.

A reunited Cyprus would finally end the occupation and injustice that has existed on the island for far too long. Only by solving this crisis can Greek and Turkish Cypriots live side by side in peace, and work together to improve stability and prosperity in the region. It is critical that Congress express its support for a resolution and that our country stand ready to provide assistance in any way it can. A united and unified Cyprus is in America's interest, with many benefits to our economy, bilateral relations and national security.

I urge all parties involved in reunification talks to continue working towards a lasting solution. While there is not yet light at the end

of the tunnel, there are some bright spots peeking through. I look forward to the negotiations moving forward and hope that one day soon, a divided Cyprus will only exist in the history books.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 7, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Wednesday, July 9, 2014: H.R. 4923—Energy and Water Development and related agencies Appropriations Act 2015 Amendments: rollcall No. 371—McAllister Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 372—Hahn Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 373—Gosar Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 374—Wenstrup Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 375—Swalwell Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 376—Byrne Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 377—McClintock Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 378—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendments ''aye.''

Thursday, July 10, 2014: rollcall No. 379—McClintock Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 380—Bonamici Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 381—Speier Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 382—Titus Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 383—Schiff Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 384—Quigley Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 385—Chabot Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 386—Titus Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 387—DeLauro Amendment ''aye''; rollcall No. 388—King Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 389—Lankford Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 390—Cassidy Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 391—Providing for consideration of H.R. 5016 ''aye''; rollcall No. 392—Providing for consideration of H.R. 5016 ''nay''; rollcall No. 393—Burgess Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 394—LaMalfa Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 395—Stockman Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 396—Stockman Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 397—McKinley Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 398—Blackburn Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 399—Gosar Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 400—Hudson Amendment ''nay''; rollcall No. 401—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions ''aye''; rollcall No. 402—On Passage ''nay.''

Friday, July 11, 2014: H.R. 4718—rollcall No. 403—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions ''aye''; rollcall No. 404—On Passage ''nay.''

CONGRATULATING DANSBY SWANSON, 2014 COLLEGE WORLD SERIES' MOST OUTSTANDING PLAYER

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Marietta native, Marietta High School Alumnus, and Vanderbilt second baseman, Dansby Swanson, on his accomplishments in the 2014 NCAA College World Series.

Swanson was awarded the College World Series' Most Outstanding Player Award and was an incredible asset in helping Vanderbilt clinch its first College World Series Championship.

Throughout the 2014 season, Swanson became one of the key players on Vanderbilt's tremendously talented roster and was key in Vandy's 3–2 victory over the University of Virginia in the final to cap off a landmark 50 win season.

Just a sophomore, Swanson batted .323 with five runs scored and two RBI in Omaha—the most impressive performance of any player in the tournament.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I applaud Dansby for his achievement and look forward to his future successes. I extend my enthusiastic congratulations to him on achieving the highest level of recognition possible in the NCAA College World Series.

HONORING MARVIN HAMMOND

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Hammond, a friend of mine for more than 50 years, passed away this past Saturday in Knoxville, Tennessee. Marvin was one of the finest men I have ever known.

Marvin was 71 and had a long and successful career as an executive for the Knoxville Utilities Board and as the top official of the Hallsdale-Powell Utility District.

I first got to know Marvin when he was the manager of Holston High School athletic teams. I played a lot of sports and sold programs, popcorn, and soft drinks at many games for the University of Tennessee and Knoxville professional teams. Marvin was at many of these games.

When I was 15, I got my first hourly-pay job working as a groundskeeper at the Holston-Chilhowee ball park. Marvin was 19 and was my first boss. I made $1.00 an hour, and he always joked that I was overpaid.

After high school he became a trainer in the Cincinnati Reds minor league system. I was batboy for the Knoxville Smokies and would see him when his team would come to town. He was always proud of his association with several players who later made it to the big leagues. He especially treasured his longtime friendship with manager Dave Bristol.

The Knoxville News-Sentinel relates a story about how Marvin helped a Cub Scout troop that I led. He spent a full day and went to great lengths to help me and the Cub Scouts, none of which he knew other than my son, John.

He campaigned for me in my first race for Congress. I will never forget a campaign trip one Saturday to Polk County, Tennessee. Lance Cavett was with us and he kept fussing at Marvin about his ridiculously high KUB bill and how he just couldn't believe it.

Marvin became very concerned and then asked Lance how high this terrible utility bill was. When Lance replied that it was $36, Marvin, who was driving, nearly ran off the road.

I was pleased that on the Monday before he died, I had about a 30-minute visit with Marvin at his Hospice room. He held my hand for almost the entire visit.

He seemed so alert and pleasant that I left thinking and hoping that he would recover. Unfortunately, that was not to be.

That day, we talked over old stories and old friends. He assured me that he was not in any pain and that God had greatly blessed him in many ways.

He told me of what he considered to be a miracle during his final illness. He said he had become addicted to pain pills and told his doctor he wanted to stop taking them.

He said his doctor told him that would not be possible—that no one could stand the pain he would experience. Marvin insisted, saying he was turning it over to the Lord. He said from that moment, he became miraculously pain-free.

Marvin had accepted that his death was near and told me he was thankful that he had been given time to say good-bye to his family and friends. He faced his death in a courageous, loving way, showing great Christian faith, and setting a wonderful example for everyone.

Marvin Hammond was a good and kind man. I was told that over 300 friends visited him in his last days and hundreds more attended his receiving of friends and funeral.

This Nation would be a better place if we had more men like Marvin Hammond. To me, he was a great man.

I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the stories about Marvin Hammond that ran in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on July 14, 2014, and the Shopper News on July 16, 2014.

[From knoxnews.com, July 14, 2014]

FORMER HALLSDALE POWELL CEO MARVIN HAMMOND DIES AT 71

(By Josh Flory)

A prominent former leader of a North Knox County utility district died on Saturday.

Marvin Hammond, 71, was the former president and CEO of the Hallsdale Powell Utility District, and previously a longtime executive with the Knoxville Utilities Board.

Darren Cardwell, Hammond's son-in-law and the current general manager of HPUD, said Monday that Hammond had been in worsening health for several months, and had been receiving hospice care.

Cardwell described Hammond as a mentor, coach and boss, saying that even when they disagreed, they could still ''have a family life, too, and not carry the two together.''

''That taught me a lot over the years in how to grow and be more of not only a husband and father but how to be a leader in the business,'' Cardwell said.

Knoxville attorney John Valliant said that in the last days of his life, many people would ask Hammond how they could help, and he would respond by telling them about other people with needs. ''He was giving people instructions as to how he wanted them to help other people, and he was dying,'' Valliant said.

Hammond's leadership at Hallsdale Powell wasn't without controversy. His tenure coincided with a significant growth phase for the

utility, which also drew sharp criticism from some customers over rising utility rates.

In 2012, Knox County Mayor Tim Burchett criticized a $125-an-hour consulting contract approved for Hammond after he stepped down from the HPUD post. That contract was later terminated.

Valliant said Hammond was a selfless person. ''You know people gave him a lot of grief over the rate increases at Hallsdale Powell, but they didn't realize that the EPA was breathing down his throat,'' he said.

Hammond was well-connected in local political circles, and counted U.S. Rep. John J. Duncan, Jr. among his friends. In a written tribute in 2008, Duncan recalled his first hourly-pay job as a 15-year-old groundskeeper at Holston-Chilhowee Ball Park, saying that Hammond was his 19-year-old boss.

''I remember another time when I was a judge, Marvin found that I was Cubmaster of a Cub Scout troop,'' Duncan wrote. ''He told me he could get several canoes from another church and he knew some people who owned a dairy farm 45 miles away with a big lake on it. He spent his whole day getting the canoes, helping the boys tour the farm, do the canoe rides, cook out, and then load everything back up for the return.''

Receiving of friends will take place on Tuesday, July 15, from 4:30 to 8 p.m., at Salem Baptist Church, with funeral services to follow.

[From the Business Shopper news]

MARVIN HAMMOND PROMOTED YOUNG PEOPLE, COMMUNITY

(By Sandra Clark)

Marvin Hammond was the right leader for Hallsdale Powell Utility District when the board of commissioners hired him as only the second general manager in the district's 50-year history.

Did he move too quickly? Maybe. Did he move HPUD in the right direction? Absolutely.

Under his leadership, HPUD upgraded its wastewater plant, upgraded its Beaver Creek water treatment plant, replaced leaking pipes throughout the district, and built a second water plant on Norris Lake.

Under his leadership, HPUD invested in people—whether it was teaching laborers to read and write or encouraging kids to return to college for advanced degrees.

In the picture on this page, Marvin is congratulating Cody Humphrey who had just received his MBA from Lincoln Memorial University while working full time at Hallsdale Powell. Cody, now older, still works for HPUD. He was at Monday's board meeting.

Board chair Kevin Julian paid tribute to Mr. Hammond at that meeting.

''His vision for Hallsdale Powell was already set when I came on the board:'' Julian said. ''Marvin had big shoulders and he took the criticism for rate increases, but he did what he thought best based on 30 years experience in the utility business.

''When it all plays out, people will appreciate his vision. He will be missed.''

When business leaders in Halls were trying to block commercial development on the land that later became Clayton Park, Hammond was there at County Commission to speak.

Developers said their engineers had said filling the wetland on Norris Freeway was OK.

Hammond pointed out that the Titanic was designed by engineers, while Noah's Ark was not.

Everybody smiled and the developers were sent packing.

When Darren Cardwell was promoted to succeed Hammond, he said he hoped to be a blend of his predecessors: Allan Gill and Marvin Hammond.

When Marvin's kidneys malfunctioned, he refused dialysis, saying he did not want to put his family through the strain. ''I'm ready to go,'' he told everyone who came to visit. He lived at Tennova Hospice for less than two weeks, dying July 12, and held court with a steady flow of visitors and friends.

Sen. Lamar Alexander telephoned Marvin and asked if there was anything he could do.

''Get EPA off our backs,'' Marvin told him, concerned about Hallsdale Powell employees and customers until the end.

''Dad will be remembered as a Godly servant leader, a generous southern gentleman, and one who was always showing genuine Christian love for his fellow man, especially for the less fortunate among us,'' his family wrote.

''Dad was a proud alumnus of ETSU where he was member of the baseball and football programs in the 1960s. He also played minor league baseball for the Macon Peaches. He was a U.S. Air Force veteran and held the coveted Eagle Scout and Silver Beaver awards.

''He squeezed every ounce of life he was given whether he was working, fishing, or hunting. He was proud to be known as a conservative, ''deep water'' Baptist and as an unworthy man saved and blessed by God's grace and love.''

U.S. Rep. Jimmy Duncan remembers Hammond as his first boss at the Holston-Chilhowee Rec Center. Jimmy was 15 and earned $1 per hour. Marvin was 19 and ''told me what to do.''

Survivors include wife Kay Hammond; children: Jeff and Missy Hammond, Lisa and Darren Cardwell; brother James (Jim) Hammond; grandchildren: John and Xan Hammond, Amber and Colby Cardwell, and Megan Pratt; great-granddaughter Lucy Rae Pratt.

Services were Tuesday at Salem Baptist Church, led by the Rev. John Holland with eulogies by Bill Landry, John Hill and John Valliant.

HONORING AUSTEN JAMES KNEPPER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austen James Knepper. Austen is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austen has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Austen has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Austen has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Austen organized and led the construction of a trail at the Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austen James Knepper for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO MS. ALICE COACHMAN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great woman, legendary athlete, and outstanding public servant, Ms. Alice Coachman. Sadly, Alice passed away on Monday, July 14, 2014, at the age of 90 in Albany, Georgia. The memorial service is scheduled for this Friday, July 18.

Alice was born the fifth of ten children on November 9, 1923, to the late Fred and Evelyn Coachman in Albany, Georgia. From an early age, Alice spent much of her time running and was quite inventive, using ropes and sticks for improvised high jumps. Her hard work, dedication, and resourcefulness paid off as Alice qualified for the 1940, 1944, and 1948 Olympic Games, although the first two were cancelled due to World War II. At the 1948 Olympic Games in London however, Alice made history when she soared to a record-breaking height of 5 feet, 6 and 1/8 inches in the high jump finals, becoming the first African American woman to win an Olympic Gold Medal. Although the track and field star's career concluded with the London games, Alice's commitment to serving others never ceased.

Before and after her record-breaking victory, Alice dealt with challenges representative of the Deep South during the Jim Crow era. Because of such segregation, Alice was forbidden from using public training facilities. However, she continued to train to ensure her competiveness on the national and international scenes. Throughout her career, Alice won over 20 national track and field championships, and she was named to five All-American teams. It was her unwavering faith in herself and God that guided her along the way as she blazed the trail for countless other female African-American athletes.

In 1954, Alice once again set another record—this time as the first African American woman to endorse an international product when she agreed to serve as Coca-Cola's spokeswoman. The Olympic Champion was also inducted to the USA Track and Field Hall of Fame in 1975 and the U.S. Olympic Hall of Fame in 2004. She was recognized as one of the top one hundred Olympic athletes of all time at the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta.

Alice's title as an Olympic Champion, however, serves as only a fragment of the powerful legacy she leaves behind for current and future generations. She followed her calling to be a teacher in the classroom after the 1948 games and also actively supported youth participation in track and field. In Alice's later years, she established the Alice Coachman Track and Field Foundation to offer assistance to young athletes and former Olympic competitors.

George Washington Carver once said, ''No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it.'' We are all so blessed that Ms. Alice Coachman passed our way and during her life's journey did so much for so many for so long. She leaves behind a great legacy of service to her beloved family and to all those whose lives she touched. She will truly be missed.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the nearly 700,000 residents in Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Alice Coachman for her numerous outstanding achievements on and off the track. We extend our deepest sympathies to her family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time and we pray that they will be consoled and comforted by, an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), a service unit of the Library of Congress. For Members and staff on Capitol Hill, CRS is known as our own think tank, providing invaluable information. Perhaps most importantly, CRS provides data and analyses free from agendas and free from partisanship. They also provide a range of reports, confidential memoranda, briefings, and programs to Members and staff about policy issues and legislative process. We rely on this information to craft legislation, analyze bills pending before Congress, respond to our constituents, and to ensure the accuracy of communications.

The idea of a legislative reference service for Congress was first championed by Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Sr. (served in the House from 1885–1891, and in the Senate from 1906–1925), and Rep. John M. Nelson (served in the House from 1906–1919, and from 1921–1933). Supporters realized their goal through a Senate floor amendment offered by Sen. LaFollette to the Library's 1915 appropriations bill. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam established the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) in the Library of Congress by administrative order on July 18, 1914. In its early years, LRS provided basic reference services to assist lawmakers in their work.

The research service, in its various iterations, has benefited from the Library's collections for its research, analysis, and dissemination of information and materials to assist the Congress.

By the 1940s and following World War II, demands on LRS had increased significantly. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act (LRA) called for an increase in the size and scope of LRS and directed it to hire expert policy specialists to provide information to Congress in subject fields aligned with a new committee system. In 1970, the Service underwent another transformation, which renamed it the Congressional Research Service.

Emphasizing the fact that the research and informational needs of the Congress required the services of highly-skilled experts, the 1970 Act mandated that CRS provide authoritative and objective research and analysis and close support for Members and committees. The Service evolved into a 21st century organization that utilizes formats and delivery methods (e.g., CRS4Congress Twitter, CRS.gov, Congress.gov) for CRS products and services.

Today, CRS provides comprehensive, objective and non-partisan research and analysis to the entire Congress on all legislative and oversight issues of interest. In the Second Session of this Congress, CRS identified over 150 issues of interest to Congress that CRS could support.

CRS has a workforce of over 600 analysts, attorneys, information professionals and support staff. These expert, highly-trained and collaborative professional staff are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress.

In FY2013, Members and committees received information and analysis from CRS in more than 636,000 responses that took the form of 67,000 requests for custom analysis and research, 9,000 congressional participations in 350 seminars, and over half a million instances of Website services.

I want to congratulate the Congressional Research Service as they celebrate this important milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 2014, I mistakenly voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 411. I intended to vote ''yes.''

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Loring Job Corps Center as it joins 125 other campuses across the nation in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Job Corps.

The Job Corps program was established in 1964 as the central initiative of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. The program was established to administer free-of-charge education and vocational training to youth ages 16 to 24. Providing support specifically for young unemployed men and women, the program was modeled after the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal, which was discontinued after World War II. Since its inception under the Economic Opportunity Act, Job Corps has served more than two million young people, with approximately 60,000 students enrolled annually at centers throughout the country.

The U.S. Department of Labor began developing a Job Corps Center in Limestone, Maine, on the former Strategic Air Command's Loring Air Force Base in 1994. The first students to arrive at Loring in January of 1997 transferred there in order to major in the University of Maine's Outdoor Recreation Associates Degree Program. Since it was first established, Loring has offered an excellent opportunity for students to obtain their GED, receive vocational and technical training, and utilize on-the-job training to find permanent employment—all at no cost.

I am proud to recognize the Loring Job Corps Center for its years of committed service, and I look forward to its continued success in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Loring Job Corps Center as it celebrates 50 years of the Job Corps program.

HONORING NATHAN MCCOWN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Nathan McCown of Killeen, TX. Heroism is, in the words of athlete and activist Arthur Ashe, ''not the urge to surpass all others at whatever cost, but the urge to serve others at whatever cost.'' McCown's extraordinary bravery in the face of imminent peril, along with his unwavering commitment to duty, has brought those words to life.

McCown's boyhood dreams of becoming a soldier were realized before he was 18. During extensive and dangerous deployments in Iraq, he distinguished himself as a warrior and leader. On numerous occasions, he put his own safety at risk to protect his fellow soldiers. Sadly, due to injuries incurred during combat he severely damaged his knee and back, and was ultimately medically separated from his beloved military. Yet his faith in his mission, his love of country, and his status as a leader of his fellow soldiers never wavered.

McCown's departure from the military didn't stop his drive to serve, defend, and protect. He soon responded to the noble calling of law enforcement. The road back to service was not an easy one as McCown had to rebuild a body damaged by war. Yet he soon joined the elite Special Weapons And Tactics (SWAT) team of the Killeen, TX Police Department. On occasions too numerous to count, McCown rushed headfirst into peril and put his own safety on the line to protect citizens and fellow officers. A recent incident resulted in further injuries to his knees and has him temporarily out of commission. But anyone who knows McCown is certain he won't be out for long.

I send my deepest and most heartfelt wishes for McCown's speedy recovery so he can resume his life of extraordinary service. Brave men like him remind us all what true heroes are.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of what is now the Congressional Research Service (CRS). Since its founding in 1914, this legislative reference service unit of the Library of Congress has served as a repository of information and expertise for Members of Congress and their staff.

The CRS was an idea first championed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette Sr. and Representative John M. Nelson, and established on July 16, 1914 by former Librarian of Congress, Herbert Putnam. Previously known as the Legislative Reference Service (LRS), this service unit provided basic reference services for Congress in its early years.

As a result of rising demand for LRS services following World War II, the Legislative Reorganization Act (LRA) of 1946 expanded the size and scope of LRS by hiring policy experts in issues consistent with the new committee system. A second transformation of the Service occurred in 1970 when the LRA was amended to mandate that LRS provide reliable and objective research and analysis, and strong support for Members and committees. LRS became what we know today as CRS.

Over the past 100 years, the contributions of CRS have been invaluable to the efficiency and effectiveness of Congress. Today, CRS provides broad, non-partisan research and analysis for members of Congress on all legislative and oversight issues of interest. Its utmost priority is to certify that Congress has uninterrupted access to the nation's best thinking.

The Service employs a diverse workforce of over 600 analysts, data professionals, counselors, and support staff who are dedicated to supporting our Federal legislative process. In Fiscal Year 2013 alone, CRS provided more than 630,000 briefings, reports, and analyses for Members and committees.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the past and present staff of CRS for decades of invaluable contributions and service.

HONORING JACOB CHRISTIAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Christian. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 87, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Christian for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 414 on final passage of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, I would have voted ''aye,'' which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

CONGRATULATING THOMAS W. DEWITT ON HIS ELECTION TO THE NAFCU BOARD OF GOVERNORS

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Thomas W. Dewitt on his election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU). This is just the latest chapter in a long and productive career in financial services, and I know he will be a great asset to NAFCU.

The core mission of credit unions is to serve their members, and Thomas Dewitt has embodied that spirit throughout his career. For nearly the past two decades, he has served 130,000 members in Central Illinois and around the country as the President and CEO of State Farm Federal Credit Union, headquartered in Bloomington, Illinois.

In addition to his role at State Farm, Mr. Dewitt has been an active participant in the activities of the NAFCU, most notably in the regulatory and legislative committees. In all, he brings 40 years of financial services experience to his new role at NAFCU, and he has consistently demonstrated his firm grasp and understanding of the issues important to credit unions and their members.

Once again, congratulations to Mr. Dewitt on his election to the Board of Governors, and to NAFCU for gaining such a capable and seasoned addition. I look forward to working with Mr. Dewitt in his new role and wish him all the best.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkish armed forces. While there has been some progress made regarding a resolution, thousands of Greek Cypriots continue to be denied their fundamental right to return to their homes.

Turkey must live up to its international responsibilities and return all of Cyprus' territory to the Cypriots. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have supported a variety of initiatives in support of this outcome, including sending letters to President Obama applauding the administration's commitment to exercise U.S. leadership in the negotiation for a just solution on Cyprus. This solution should result in a single, sovereign country within a bi-zonal, bicommunal federation. Forty years of discord is long enough; Cypriots deserve a government for them and by them.

I applaud President Anastasiades' proposal from early 2013 that, if adopted, would significantly contribute to creating an atmosphere that would facilitate the negotiating process. Unfortunately, the Turkish side has continued to reject proposals that would enhance cooperation and move the two sides toward a resolution.

Despite continued pressure from the United States, Turkey continues to obstruct Cyprus from exercising its basic sovereign rights including accessing its own natural resources.

With the situation in the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean growing more volatile each day, it is paramount that Turkey and Cyprus come back to the negotiating table, and that Turkey return occupied territory back to the people of Cyprus.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. LILLIAN K. KURTZ

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Lillian K. Kurtz. I join her family members and friends who gather on August 2, 2014, in Minneapolis to commemorating this special day. Lillian Kurtz was born August 1, 1914, in Minneapolis, MN. She started life in Northern Minnesota on her father's farm where she attended school in a one-room school house.

Lillian's outlook on life was molded by the Great Depression and World War II. During World War II, she traveled as an officer's wife and lived in many areas around the country. She did volunteer work for the Red Cross. After the war, she and her husband settled in South Minneapolis where she has lived ever since.

She worked as a floral designer for Bachman's in South Minneapolis while raising her family. Her husband of over 62 years, George Kurtz, was a noted attorney, Workers Compensation Judge and Air Force Reserve Colonel. She has two children Kathleen and Michael, seven grandchildren, five great grandchildren and three great-great grandchildren.

She is still living on her own at the Walker Place in South Minneapolis. She continued her volunteer work at the Walker until recently.

Lillian has led an outstanding life, highlighted by her love of family and service to her community. I wish her many more years of health and happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress. Throughout the past 100 years, the Congressional Research Service has been of great importance to members of Congress. It has provided insightful research analysis necessary to effectively legislate.

CRS professionals have expertise in a range of matters spanning across foreign and domestic affairs. Their reliable and efficiently prepared analyses provide all members of Congress with a deeper understanding of the important issues that challenge our country every day. As evidence of their fine work, the CRS website holds nearly 10,000 reports that are easily accessible and well organized.

I speak now with great gratitude for CRS's dedicated analysts, legislative attorneys and information professionals. I hope that the beneficial relationship between the CRS and Congress only enhances in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, July 20th, will mark the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the island of Cyprus. This is not a happy anniversary, Mr. Speaker. It marks 40 years of invasion, occupation, and the forcible division of Cyprus. The time has come to end this tragic conflict, which the people of Cyprus have endured for far too long.

Thousands of Greek Cypriots are still being denied their fundamental human right to return to their homes because of Turkey's continuing occupation of northern Cyprus. Greek Cypriot properties are constantly being illegally confiscated or sold without their owners' consent. Turkish troops remain stationed on the island, and thousands of colonists from mainland Turkey have been moved to this occupied area. Freedom of worship is severely restricted, access to religious sites blocked, religious sites continue to be systematically destroyed, and large numbers of religious and archaeological objects stolen.

Turkey continues to obstruct the process to determine the fate of missing persons—military and civilian—since the 1974 invasion. It prohibits the exhumation of remains from mass graves that are located in areas that Turkey has classified as ''military areas,'' even when such a process would take place under the supervision of the United Nations. On this grave and poignant humanitarian matter, I urge the U.S. government to exert its influence over Turkey, allow these exhumations to take place so that the bodies in mass graves might be identified, and so that families may finally, after 40 years, be allowed to grieve the loss of their loved ones and respectfully lay their remains to rest. This is not too much to ask of any government, anywhere in the world.

I applaud the fact that the Cyprus Government remains fully committed to the U.N.-sponsored process to reach a sustainable and enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bi-communal federation, in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. I hope the United States will continue to press the Government of Turkey to move forward with advancing confidence-building measures and initiatives to achieve a final, just and lasting settlement to reunite Cyprus.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of the Republic of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, Turkish forces occupied over a third of the northern part of Cyprus leading into the forcible division of the country.

Turkey's occupation of the northern part of Cyprus divided the country between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Currently, Greek Cypriots are not given the freedom to return to their homes and are having their property and religious sites destroyed. The people of Cyprus are experiencing a violation of their human rights and the country continues to pursue an ethnically segregated state.

The U.N. Security Council has been assisting the Cyprus government with the process of reaching a sustainable settlement that would unify Cyprus. In addition, President Anastasiades introduced a proposal that aims to rebuild a relationship between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, which the U.S. has accepted. I urge Turkey to contribute in the process of reuniting the Republic of Cyprus.

Members of Congress and the international community must work together to solve the ongoing conflicts and reach a comprehensive settlement that will unify the country. We must strongly urge Turkey to resolve the continuing humanitarian issues the people are facing.

The United States strongly supports the sovereign rights of the Republic of Cyprus. The Cyprus Government's commitment towards working with the United States will ease the process of finding possible initiatives that will further mend the country's division. I believe the international community must focus on reunifying the Republic of Cyprus and support the ideals of freedom and justice.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, July 20th marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. In 1974 over 200,000 Greek Cypriots were driven from their homes, becoming refugees in their own country. The legacy of this occupation still weighs heavily on the northern third of the island, which remains occupied by Turkish troops.

There is consensus in the international community that a unified, sovereign Cyprus is the only solution to rectifying decades of injustice. I believe the United Nations-led negotiations currently underway are the best means to achieve a fair and permanent settlement which will reunify the island. We are at a critical juncture in the pursuit of peace and prosperity for all Cypriots, and I urge all parties to move toward a peaceful resolution and reunification effort that will build a more united and prosperous Cyprus.

Cyprus is a strategically important ally of the United States, and Cyprus has proven itself to be a reliable partner in efforts to counter terrorism. I look forward to a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace, security and stability.

RECOGNIZING SECOND LT. ELLEN AINSWORTH

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth for her bravery, service and sacrifice on February 10th, 1944, in Anzio, Italy.

Second Lt. Ainsworth hailed from the small Wisconsin town of Glenwood City, where she is remembered for her service. In 1942 she entered the United States Army Nurse Corps and deployed to Tunisia, then to Anzio, Italy. Although the risk of serving in this high actions area was great, Lt. Ainsworth did not waiver from her commitment to serve her country.

On February 10th, 1944 Lt. Ainsworth's hospital tent came under heavy artillery fire in an area many described as ''hell's half acre''. With complete disregard for herself, she brought to safety forty-two patients to lessen the chance of their further injury. Lt. Ainsworth was hit by enemy fire and succumb to her wounds six days later. At just twenty-four years old she was the only Wisconsin service woman to make the ultimate sacrifice during World War II, due to enemy fire.

Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth was recognized posthumously for her gallant actions by being awarded with a Silver Star, Purple Heart, and a Red Cross Bronze Medal.

As Glenwood City and the town of Anzio, Italy commemorate the 70th anniversary of her death this year, Lt. Ainsworth's courageous actions are witnessed today by the children of the soldiers she saved, who would not be with us if not for her heroic sacrifice. She personified American heroism and for that, Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Lt. Ainsworth for her acts of valor.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity's centennial anniversary. My good friend, the Gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), is sponsoring the Senate companion to this resolution.

As a Sigma brother, I am proud that this fraternity has grown into a worldwide institution. One hundred years ago, A. Langston Taylor, Leonard F. Morse, and Charles I. Brown founded the fraternity at Howard University. These men were committed to the idea of ''Culture For Service and Service for Humanity.'' They believed that all potential members ought to be judged by their own merits. Family background, wealth, race, and nationality are irrelevant to a prospective brother's worth; instead, the fraternity built a brotherhood of individuals who shared a deep commitment to service, education, and brotherhood.

Today, Phi Beta Sigma continues to build upon its founding principles and expand its legacy across the country and around the globe. With more than 150,000 college-educated Sigma brothers and 650 chapters, the fraternity organizes many service projects and missions. These include: Sigma Beta Club, equipping youths with leadership skills; Project Vote, which encourages voter registration; Sigma Wellness: Living Well Brother-to-Brother, an initiative seeking to eliminate health disparities for men of color; and the Ghana School Project, which provides vocational opportunities for children worldwide. As many of you know, these are just a few examples of Sigma contributions to American society and our brothers and sisters around the world.

This week, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity's historic centennial anniversary and congratulating the Sigma brothers for a century of service to all Americans.

CONGRATULATING THE LANCASTER FESTIVAL ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lancaster Festival on its 30th Anniversary.

The Lancaster Festival has the mission of celebrating the artistic creativity of all cultures and serves as a foundation for year-round community efforts to promote participation in the arts. The festival is committed to encouraging the growth of the Lancaster Festival Orchestra as the cornerstone of classical music programming, as well as supporting and providing visibility for local artists, being all-inclusive in the appeal to the community, and being an advocate of arts education for children.

On August 5, 1984, The Columbus Symphony Orchestra played its first concert held at Ohio University-Lancaster's outdoor auditorium. The Lancaster Festival was first held in 1985, lasting eight days and including multiple concerts from The Columbus Symphony Orchestra and a full week of community arts and music events. By 1987, The Columbus Symphony Orchestra withdrew from the festival and Maestro Gary Sheldon was hired to create the Lancaster Festival Orchestra.

Today, the Lancaster Festival has gained increased recognition throughout the state for its excellence in promoting the arts. Over the years, the festival has expanded and today it lasts 10 days, and includes a wide variety of art and music events, including two feature performances by major music artists and the orchestra. Additionally, Maestro Gary Sheldon has continued to serve as the Artistic Director for the festival and as the Conductor of the Lancaster Festival Orchestra.

Throughout its 30-year history, the Lancaster Festival has been unwavering in the promotion of arts in our community. I would like to thank all those involved with the festival for their dedication, as well as offer my congratulations on reaching the 30th Anniversary milestone.

HISTORY OF THE WEST PALM BEACH VETERANS ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CLINIC

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I submitted this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 2001 and resubmit it today, July 16, 2014 on the 42nd anniversary of the passing of Pfc. John Mica.

Mr. Speaker, The West Palm Beach Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida was inspired by the life, military service and death of Pfc. John Mica. Army Corpsman Mica was born on April 3, 1915 in Binghamton, NY, served as a private in the U.S. Army from 1943–44, and died July 16, 1972 in a crowded veterans hospital in Miami, Florida.

Because of the circumstances of John Mica's death in that veterans facility, which was strained to capacity, his son Daniel A. Mica made construction of a new South Florida veterans hospital one of his goals when elected to the U.S. Congress. From 1978 to 1988, Congressman Daniel Mica, a member of the House Veterans Committee, cited the need for additional veterans medical facilities in Florida at every meeting of that Congressional panel over the decade of his service.

Congressman Daniel Mica, on February 8th, 1983 during the 98th Congress, introduced H.R. 1348, ''A bill to construct a new Veterans Administration hospital in the State of Florida.'' Construction of the Palm Beach County Veterans' hospital was completed in 1994.

This history has been submitted by Congressman JOHN L. MICA in memory of his father, Pfc. John Mica, and also in recognition of his brother Daniel's contribution to the veterans of the State of Florida.

IN MEMORY OF EAST HARTFORD LEGEND, FREDERICK W. LEONE, JR.

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following is a heartfelt eulogy that was delivered by Mary Ann Oliva Leone on the life and passing of my dear friend and East Hartford legend, Fred Leone. It is an honor for me to submit her beautiful remarks that so eloquently capture this great American:

EULOGY FOR MY HUSBAND FRED

Good morning. We would like to thank everyone for attending today to celebrate the life of my husband Fred, better known as ''Rick'' to his family and others. I know many of you have traveled a long distance on this bitter, cold, wintry day to be here today. I know too, Rick probably had his hand in this storm, as he loved this kind of ''put on your fur trappers hat and fire up the snow blower'' weather. If he couldn't be in his beloved state of Vermont, then he was going to bring Vermont to him! Rick was always intrigued by the weather, especially the makings of a good storm. We were appreciative of all efforts at Glastonbury HealthCare Center to have his bed by the windows so he could watch the day's weather unfold into the night.

January 18, 1969: On a cold Sunday similar to this one, I walked into this St. Rose Church to attend the 10:30 am Mass. The church was very crowded back then and I sat in the same seat in the back that I always took right under the Station of Cross of ''Veronica wiping the face of Jesus.'' This particular morning however, I felt a presence next to me. I could not concentrate on the Mass; I could barely breathe and I could not wait to go to Communion, just to regain my composure. Returning back from Communion, I could not find the pew that I had always sat in . . . then I see this about 6 foot or so, tan camel hair coat, white t-shirt wearing guy laughing and pointing to the seat right next to him! Embarrassed, little did I know that I was standing next to my future husband. As the story goes, Fred offers me a ride home from church. Now keep in mind, the Oliva homestead was less than 5 minutes from the church's front steps! I accepted the ride anyway . . . Fred in the driver's seat and his Mom in the middle of course, and then myself. That seating arrangement would remain that way for a very long time with Marjorie in the middle. A week later we went on our first date, two weeks later Fred went to the Military Academy for a visitation to attend West Point. He instead chose the University of Vermont and I, Central Connecticut.

July 30, 1977: Fred and I marry here at St. Rose Church where we first met. Prior to marriage, you have to provide your baptismal certificate. When I came across the certificate, attached to it was a clipping from the St. Rose Church bulletin dated April 1951, stating Fred and I were both baptized together here at St. Rose. We were born a week apart; Fred on April 1st and I on April 8th. Also, Fred's cousin Kip was baptized that day as they both shared the same birthday. Further research showed that Fred and I received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion the same day here at St. Rose. We also both received the sacrament of Confirmation together at St. Isaac Jogues Church because they happened to be remodeling St. Rose at the time. All our sacraments together here in this Church!

Being born on April Fool's Day gives you a certain role to fulfill, and Fred took it very seriously. Senior year in high school he was elected Class Comedian. At the University of Vermont he was written up in several publications as a ''Super Fan.'' Allow me please, to read one such article from the Burlington Press entitled, ''SUPER FANS'' by Wally Johnson:

''The stands at the UVM rink are filled to capacity for games, and the students yell their lungs out. One student, a freshman football player, is sort of an unofficial cheerleader, and when he gets people fired up in one section of the stands, the excitement is usually contagious. The gridder is Rick Leone, from Hartford, Conn. And he was the guy waving his coat and shirt around in the cold confines of the hockey rink during the Catamounts upset of UNH. Leone, who also has some pretty good monologues about all sorts of subjects, is loud, wears the wildest purple hat ever made, and is funny as well as a big sports fan. ''You just can't get mad at the guy, he's too funny,'' a UVM student who sat behind Rick during the last game said. Every school has its own Rick Leone, be it at high school or college and this type of person, perhaps best described as a ''super fan,'' is an asset every coach would like to have at his side.''

Fred did not love April Fool's Day because it was his birthday, but because it was a full continuous day of sharing his stories, pranks and jokes with everyone. Former employees would tell you the front counter of the liquor store was his ''pulpit'' where he did what he loved best . . . interacting with everyone. A funny story, joke, or local happening passed on from one customer to another. Fred loved going to make his morning deposits at Webster's bank where another audience of the girls and customers waited for his ''joke of the day.'' Sunday mornings at Stop & Shop where he regularly checked in with Jeff ''the butcher,'' meeting and greeting neighbors and customers as he shops. I, however, ruined the shopping experience for him. I just wanted to go in, get my groceries and return home so I could start cooking Sunday dinner. So we left Sunday shopping for Fred to enjoy his weekly adventure!

Fred was a brilliant man with background knowledge on almost any subject that was brought up in conversations. We attribute that to his love of reading. Out attic, cellar and shelves at home are filled with books. If Fred could not pass a book along then it got shelved in one of these places. When Gianni was in second grade, I remember Fred reading Gianni, ''The Old Man and the Sea'' by Ernest Hemingway. Explaining details as he read aloud to his grandson and it was Fred's own personal copy he had back when he was in school! Vermont and National Geographic were his favorite magazines. When our daughters were much younger they too awaited the monthly issues of National Geographic because their father had made a game out of checking the covers of each issue. The best was when he was the baboon, gorilla, or other exotic creatures from who knows where on the covers, and you knew it was happening when Fred would announce holding up the magazine . . . ''Look everyone—your mother made the cover of National Geographic again!'' The girls would crack up laughing . . . Very funny, Fred!

Then there was a serious side of Fred, a man of great faith, the importance of attending mass and participating in the church community. When our family was younger we attended pot luck suppers, organized bake sales and arts and crafts and tag sales. Our life for one week in July revolved around Fred co-chairing the popular St. Rose Carnival with the Futtner and Ramsey families. Our wedding anniversary always fell during carnival week and Fred would joke ''What more do you want on our wedding anniversary, Mary? We have games, entertainment, music (from the carousel), good food (sausage and peppers and fried dough)—all on the grounds of the church we were married!'' We always later celebrated at a very nice restaurant.

Family . . . What more can I say? Rick's loyalty and love for his grandparents and their rich traditions . . . how he loved to retell stories about life on the tobacco farm. Following into his father's footsteps with his help and guidance as he sat in on business meetings . . . to move forward into the future . . . all for the love of his family; so proud of his daughters Marisa and Vanessa in their accomplishments in life. Gianna and Angelina were the special joys of his life; how he loved taking Gianni to Boy Scout campouts and events. He introduced him to the Three Stooges. He enjoyed taking and picking up Angelina from preschool. Fred introduced her to Tom & Jerry cartoons! A special place in Fred's heart he had for all his nieces and nephews . . . especially when Ted and Josh took their Uncle Fred to a Jethro Tull Concert . . . He loved it! Fred would relive their performance every time he heard one of their songs!

As Fred's illness progressed, and it did very rapidly, he continued to stay involved in everything the best he could and gradually we came to him now to accommodate his needs and wants. Nothing made him happier than all your lines of communication; texts, emails, Caring Bridge, phone calls, cards, notes and visits . . , for our dear friends and family I thank every one of you!

Thank you to Mom, Dad, Tom, Camille, Marisa, Gianni and Angelina for all your support and for standing by me these last few months. I could not have done this without you. This was a group effort of love and you did it beautifully—with me.

Before Fred went on the respirator a couple of weeks ago, he said to me, as I was giving him ice chips to soothe his dry mouth, ''Mary I think I now know how Jesus felt.'' I said, ''What do you mean, Fred?'' ''The pain Jesus must have felt being nailed to the cross and when they took a cloth soaked with vinegar and applied it to his lips . . . How he must have suffered!''

You—my dear husband will now suffer no more.
Until we can breathe deeply again,
Enjoy the fruits of the vine again,
And hold each other's hand again,
I wish you peace.
Please watch over us, guide and protect us.
And I ask this through Christ our Lord.
Amen and God Bless.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE CENTENNIAL

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) and to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women of CRS.

Established in 1914 as the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) thanks to the efforts of Senator Robert LaFollette, Sr. and Congressman John Nelson, the organization's early mission was to provide basic reference services to lawmakers. Researchers benefited then, as they do today, by being housed in the Library of Congress and having access to its unparalleled collection.

Over the course of its 100 years, CRS has evolved time and time again to meet the needs of the Congress and the American people. From its inception as a relatively small division of the Library of Congress in 1914, to its pivots and expansions in 1946 and 1970—the latter of which included renaming the institution as the Congressional Research Service—the organization has distinguished itself as a world-class source of objective and authoritative research and analysis.

Today, CRS continues to thrive as it meets the demands of the 21st century Congress. With a workforce of more than 600, CRS has the unique ability to bring interdisciplinary scholarship to bear on complex issues of policy by recruiting scientists and engineers to work alongside policy analysts and attorneys. It is this melting pot of expertise and backgrounds that allows CRS to provide comprehensive, objective and non-partisan research to the entire Congress on all legislative issues.

Through the House Democracy Partnership (HDP), I have witnessed firsthand the ability of CRS professionals not only to share their expertise with members of Congress, but to teach others about the inner workings of Congress and to assist parliamentarians in establishing and improving their own research bureaus. As a Commission working with 16 developing democracies, the Partnership has found an essential partner in CRS.

All this began over twenty years ago with the Frost-Solomon Commission's work with emerging parliaments of Central and Eastern Europe. CRS employees were absolutely critical to our efforts, giving extraordinary time and effort in consulting with these parliaments as they set up libraries and research services.

More recently, CRS has supported HDP in establishing research operations and services in Afghanistan, Indonesia, Georgia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Peru and Timor-Leste.

Just last month, as we hosted delegations of parliamentarians from five partner nations for a seminar on committee operations, several of our sessions were ably led by senior

CRS experts, including the Director herself. Not surprisingly, when we asked our guests what lessons they learned at the end of that seminar, every last one of them commented how lucky we are to have the Congressional Research Service supporting us in our work.

That is just a small testament to the importance of CRS to the work that we all do here, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the Congressional Research Service on its 100th anniversary.

HONORING GAYLE CARLTON

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Gayle Carlton of Cedar Park, TX who became an angel on May 24, 2014. My thoughts and prayers are with her family and friends during this difficult time.

Gayle was married to J. Preston Carlton, the love of her life, for nearly 52 years. During their joyous half century together, they lived, loved, and prospered as one. Proud parents of two children and grandparents of seven, Gayle and Preston kept family at the center of their lives. As beloved pillars of the Cedar Park and Austin areas, they watched and helped those communities grow from quiet towns to the very modern and cosmopolitan cities they are today.

An avid reader, Gayle had an insatiable intellectual curiosity and lived by da Vinci's words, ''Learning never exhausts the mind.'' In her 60s, when most women her age were tending to grandchildren, she graduated with a perfect GPA from St. Edward's University. She embraced the challenge of researching her genealogy and was intensely proud of her family's rich heritage. Gayle was a great storyteller and, like all Texans, was wise enough to never let the truth get in the way of a good yarn.

While we mourn Gayle Carlton's passing, her presence was a blessing for all who knew her. The positive impacts she had on the lives of others will live on and remain in our hearts forever.

THE KIDNAPPING OF 300 NIGERIAN SCHOOL GIRLS

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 3 long months since nearly 300 Nigerian school girls were kidnapped and have since been held captive by Boko Haram. One day is too long, but yet 3 months have dragged on since this unconscionable crime and these families are still broken. I stand here now—with as much urgency as ever—with Nigerians, with the girls' parents, and with the rest of the world asking please bring back our girls.

We must not lose focus, we must send a clear message that these acts will not be tolerated and we will join on a multi-national front in order to reunite these girls with their families. As a father of 3 young women I can only imagine the heartache and pain of the affected parents and communities and the terror felt by the girls, it is for them that I stand here today. This unthinkable crime is not only an unconscionable act against humanity but also against international law and we must stay vigilant until Boko Haram is brought to justice.

I am encouraged by the leadership of President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry in their commitment of resources to help find these girls. I will continue to support any action that the U.S. can take to ensure their safe return. I stand strong with Nigerians, and those protesting internationally, to bring back our girls and make sure their deplorable captors are brought to justice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE 2014 UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION'S DIVERSE SCHOLARS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to modernize the health care system requires improving the quality and delivery of health care, the backbone of which is the health care workforce. I am pleased to have the opportunity today to talk about a group of students from across the country who represent some of the brightest individuals preparing to enter the health care workforce. This year's United Health Foundation Diverse Scholars Initiative scholarship recipients represent 28 states. They are working hard in their undergraduate and graduate programs—whether they are studying to be doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, public health specialists, or technicians—to increase the number of skilled professionals entering the health care workforce.

Beyond their academic achievements, I would also like to recognize their commitment to making the health care system more culturally relevant and their dedication to improving the health outcomes of the individuals they will one day serve. Research shows that when people are treated by health professionals who share their language, culture, and ethnicity, they are more likely to accept and receive medical treatment. This will be a great asset to our nation's health care system.

Next week, these scholars will be joining us in Washington, DC to examine some of the nation's most pressing health care problems and potential solutions as part of the United Health Foundation's Annual Diverse Scholars Forum. Since 2007, the United Health Foundation has helped more than 1,400 multicultural students from across the country realize their dream of pursuing careers in health while focusing on the needs of local communities through the Diverse Scholars Initiative.

To these exceptional scholars, congratulations and best wishes for success in all of your future endeavors. I know that our nation's health care system will benefit from your hard work and talent.

Jason Russell, Alabama's 2nd Congressional District; Cadijah Allen, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Mycolette Anderson, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Carlene Black, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Tierra Jishie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Wayne Nez Jr., Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Lavalerie Tsinnajinnie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Fallon Yazzie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Miranda Yellowhorse, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Danelle Cooper, Arizona's 9th Congressional District; Brian Daniel, California's 11th Congressional District; Bonnie Chen, California's 12th Congressional District; KaiShan Li, California's 12th Congressional District; James Salazar, California's 12th Congressional District; Rebecca Sedillo, California's 12th Congressional District; Lois Chen, California's 13th Congressional District; Hector Zamudio, California's 13th Congressional District; Qianwen (Polly) Zhang, California's 13th Congressional District; James Yang, California's 16th Congressional District; Monserrat Baeza, California's 19th Congressional District.

Kenia Flores, California's 21st Congressional District; Taylor Jackson, California's 30th Congressional District; Angie Milian, California's 31st Congressional District; Oswaldo Hasbun Avalos, California's 32nd Congressional District; Jennifer Leiva, California's 32nd Congressional District; Samantha Perez, California's 34th Congressional District; Luis Suarez, California's 35th Congressional District; Juan Ramirez, California's 37th Congressional District; Kristy Vang, California's 3rd Congressional District; Tumai Nguyen, California's 41st Congressional District; Elia Salazar, California's 44th Congressional District; Christopher Zermeno, California's 44th Congressional District; Tomas Zurita, California's 45th Congressional District; Jovy Mann, California's 48th Congressional District; Cabiria Lizarraga, California's 50th Congressional District; Abraham Avila, California's 51st Congressional District; Sophia Jimenez, California's 51st Congressional District; Jasmine Nguyen, California's 53rd Congressional District; Jennifer Villalobos, Colorado's 1st Congressional District; Shawntira Johnson, Florida's 20th Congressional District.

Hermán Powery, Florida's 20th Congressional District; Emmanuel Adejo, Florida's 24th Congressional District; Evelande Gedeon, Florida's 24th Congressional District; Stephany Feijoo, Florida's 26th Congressional District; Isabella Masieri, Florida's 26th Congressional District; Bricia Santoyo, Florida's 9th Congressional District; Sharmori Lewis, Georgia's 13th Congressional District; Valencia Johnson, Georgia's 4th Congressional District; Marcqwon Day, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Ray Hill, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Ashley Martinez, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Whitney C. Nwagbara, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Nicholas Kenji Taylor, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Ambra Jordan, Georgia's 6th Congressional District; Mayra Estrada, Idaho's 2nd Congressional District; Chiemela Ubagharaji, Illinois' 5th Congressional District; Alma Guzman, Illinois's 4th Congressional District; Emily Soza, Kansas's 2nd Congressional District; Marcus Rushing, Kansas's 3rd Congressional District; Walter Ford, Louisiana's 2nd Congressional District.

Andy Tran, Massachusetts's 5th Congressional District; Maria Loza-Lopez, Michigan's

8th Congressional District; Linda Kerandi, Minnesota's 5th Congressional District; David Koffa, Minnesota's 5th Congressional District; Katherine Laddusaw, Missouri's 4th Congressional District; Nohemi Alvarez, Missouri's 5th Congressional District; Rebecca Espinoza, Nevada's 4th Congressional District; Vivienne Meljen, New Hampshire's 2nd Congressional District; Rose Parks, New Jersey's 1st Congressional District; Genel Wright, New Jersey's 3rd Congressional District; Tatiana Londoño Gentile, New Jersey's 6th Congressional District; Lesley Eldridge, New Mexico's 1st Congressional District; Sheridan Cowboy, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; D'Ayn DeGroat, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Patricia Dixon, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Martina Martinez, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Katrina Morgan, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Natasha Ramsey, New York's 12th Congressional District; Rick Aguilar, New York's 13th Congressional District; Adrial A. Lobelo, New York's 13th Congressional District.

Karen Mendez, New York's 17th Congressional District; Aira Domingo, New York's 22nd Congressional District; Edgar Flores, New York's 3rd Congressional District; Saera Fernandez, New York's 7th Congressional District; Maya Bryant, North Carolina's 5th Congressional District; Kane Banner, North Carolina's 8th Congressional District; Davontae Willis, Ohio's 3rd Congressional District; Evelyn Gutierrez, Oklahoma's 2nd Congressional District; Jalane Jara, Oregon's 3rd Congressional District; Sophia Barrios, Pennsylvania's 1st Congressional District; Chiemeka Onyima, Pennsylvania's 2nd Congressional District; Jorge Jaramillo, South Carolina's 4th Congressional District; Elizabeth De La Rosa, Texas's 14th Congressional District; Emily Gao, Texas's 14th Congressional District; Brian Ibarra, Texas's 16th Congressional District; Stephen Igwe, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Isis Reyes, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Joann Sorn, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Rio Reyna Pilar, Texas's 20th Congressional District; Duy Bui, Texas's 24th Congressional District.

Tina Anh Huynh, Texas's 27th Congressional District; Valeria Salazar Balli, Texas's 34th Congressional District; Laura Benavides, Texas's 5th Congressional District; Mohammad Ali, Texas's 7th Congressional District; Andrea Burgess, U.S. Virgin Islands, At-large; Yajaira Peralta, Utah's 1st Congressional District; Jose Mendoza, Washington's 4th Congressional District; Sandra Valencia, Washington's 4th Congressional District; Harpreet Singh-Gill, Wisconsin's 4th Congressional District.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 17, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings to examine abuse of structured financial products, focusing on misusing basket options to avoid taxes and leverage limits, including a set of transactions that utilize financial engineering and structured financial products.
SH–216

10 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the United States Tax Code.
SD–215
Committee on Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 13, 2006, and signed by the United States of America on June 30, 2009 (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 112–07).
S–116
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety
To hold hearings to examine coal miners, focusing on black lung claimants.
SD–430
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine anti-semitism, racism and discrimination in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region, including xenophobia, discrimination against Christians, and members of other religions, and intolerance and discrimination against Muslims.
SD–562

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine leveraging America's resources as a revenue generator and job creator, focusing on the state and local government benefits in terms of revenue generated and jobs created from natural resource production.
SD–366

2 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert Alan McDonald, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
SR–418

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development
To hold hearings to examine building economically resilient communities, focusing on local and regional approaches.
SD–538
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine S. 1340, to improve passenger vessel security and safety, focusing on improving consumer protections for cruise passengers.
SR–253

3 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs, International Environmental Protection, and Peace Corps
To hold hearings to examine United States security implications of international energy and climate policies and issues.
SD–419

JULY 23

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine meeting the challenges of feeding America's school children.
SR–328A
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed carbon pollution standards for existing power plants.
SD–406

10 a.m.
Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight
To hold hearings to examine saving for an uncertain future, focusing on how the ''Achieving a Better Life Experience Act'' (ABLE) can help people with disabilities and their families.
SD–215
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider H.R. 2083, to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees, S. 315, to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008, S. 2154, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, S. 531, to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans, S. 2405, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, S. 2406, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents, S. 2539, to amend the

Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, S. 2511, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine S. 2516, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, focusing on the need for expanded public disclosure of funds raised and spent to influence Federal elections.

SR–301

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine H.R. 412, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1189, to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, bills to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1641, to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, S. 1718, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 1750, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 1785, to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, S. 1794, to designate certain Federal land in Chaffee County, Colorado, as a national monument and as wilderness, S. 1866, to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, S. 2031, to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, S. 2104, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 2111, to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, S. 2221, to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan, S. 2264, to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, S. 2293, to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, S. 2318, to reauthorize the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act, S. 2346, to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, S. 2356, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve, S. 2392, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 2576, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and S. 2602, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

SD–366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight

To hold hearings to examine a more efficient and effective government, focusing on the National Technical Information Service.

SD–342

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine empowering women entrepreneurs, focusing on understanding successes, addressing persistent challenges, and identifying new opportunities.

SH–216

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on the next 25 years.

SD–628

JULY 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

SD–366

JULY 30

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the next steps for the ''Violence Against Women Act'' (VAWA), focusing on protecting women from gun violence.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine responses to natural disasters in Indian country.

SD–628

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 17, 2014*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Strengthen the constitutional commitments of the Members of this people's House in their work today. Guide and sustain them in Your wisdom, and inspire all, especially those in leadership, with the insights needed to assist our Nation at this time.

As the Members return once again to their districts, may their encounters with those whom they represent be fruitful and bring confidence to all that our future as a Nation will be secure and productive.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ENYART led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SAVE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Securing Access Via Excellence, or SAVE, Medicare Home Health Act, legislation introduced by my colleagues Mr. WALDEN and Dr. PRICE to replace the cuts to Medicare home health funding under the President's Affordable Care Act with a value-based purchasing program.

Home health care allows the ill and disabled to access essential care services within the home setting and enables our seniors to have more control over health care decisions.

The Affordable Care Act cuts Medicare home health by 14 percent by the year 2017. This will have a devastating impact on a large portion of the 3.5 million Americans who receive these services, including more than 143,000 in Pennsylvania. Of equal concern, these cuts could result in the loss of thousands of jobs for caregivers and health professionals.

The SAVE Medicare Home Health Act will achieve the same level of savings in the Medicare program. Rather than indiscriminately cut this funding, this legislation protects beneficiaries' access to home health by making these services more effective and cost efficient.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. America's seniors deserve as much.

PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN KEN GRAY

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commemorate the life of a great southern Illinoisan, a man who knew this Chamber very well, U.S. Congressman Ken Gray.

Kenny's ability to fight for southern Illinois is unmatched, from building interstate highways, Rend Lake, the Marion Federal Penitentiary, to building bridges, countless post offices, and water lines.

Whether convincing President Carter to tour an underground mine or escorting President Kennedy to Carbondale and Marion, Congressman Gray was a one-of-a-kind advocate for southern Illinois.

I counted Kenny among my friends, and he loved serving in this House. We will always remember him as the gentleman whose personality was as colorful as the suits he wore to the Capitol each day.

Colleagues, join me in remembering World War II veteran, Congressman Ken Gray.

Kenny, thank you for your service to your Nation, your State, and to southern Illinois.

PROTECTING OUR DIGITAL ECONOMY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to highlight legislation that the House passed this week protecting the future of our digital economy.

The rise of the Internet has been a great American success story. One of the biggest reasons for its success is the fact that the government hasn't needlessly gotten in the way of innovators who have grown the information superhighway to what it is today.

This week, the House passed, with bipartisan overwhelming support, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act to continue to allow the Internet to flourish and protect the opportunities that arise with it.

Without this legislation, we will see taxes increased on hardworking Americans and decreased access to the Internet. It is estimated that low-income households would actually bear 10 times the financial load as high-income households just to go online.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that was voted on this week is as commonsense as it comes. I ask and urge the Senate to take action as well so we can protect Internet access from taxation.

NOT MY BOSS' BUSINESS ACT

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, last month's Supreme Court decision in the Hobby Lobby case is a serious step backwards for women's health. It sets a dangerous precedent where bosses are in control of their employees' health care decisions. And it worries me.

As a doctor, I know that in order for a woman to make the best decision, she needs to sit down and have a conversation with her physician. It is important that we have all options available.

Long-term contraceptive methods like IUDs are often the safest option and up to 20 times more effective than the birth control pill, but upfront costs can make it difficult for some women, particularly low-income women, to afford these methods. Prescription birth control can often cost up to $600 a year, and if women can't afford it, they are more likely to use it in an inconsistent manner.

That is why I am proud to support the Not My Boss' Business Act, which

ensures that employers can't pick and choose what health services a woman can receive. Health care decisions should be made between a patient and a doctor, not her boss.

ENERGY AND ROADS EQUAL JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, the people of West Virginia want to invest in the future of our State and our Nation. We want safe roads and the opportunity to work.

This week, we took steps in the House to invest in our infrastructure and our domestic energy production, actions that will help create and sustain American jobs. On Tuesday, we passed a bill in the House to invest and rehabilitate our Nation's infrastructure. Roads create jobs. Investing in our roads and bridges creates not only construction jobs, but also grows the economy by ensuring reliable interstate commerce and travel.

I have seen firsthand the difference that good infrastructure can make. Whether it is in Berkeley County or U.S. Route 35 in Putnam and Mason Counties, it has helped to grow that local economy.

Yesterday, my bill, the Coal Jobs Protection Act, passed in the House Transportation Committee with bipartisan support. A robust mining industry is not only good for the miners and their families, but good for the businesses who depend on these workers to buy goods and services and good for the communities who depend on those tax dollars.

Investing in our roads and our energy production will create more prosperous times for my State of West Virginia and for our Nation.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the humanitarian crisis that is happening at our border.

Since October of last year, more than 50,000 children have fled their homes and turned themselves in to the United States Border Patrol. These children are fleeing extreme violence, extortion, and poverty. As they await their hearings, some are being transported to my district in the Inland Empire.

Several weeks ago, the first wave of buses transporting these children was scheduled to arrive right outside my district. I was disappointed and disturbed to see some of my fellow Americans curse, spit at, and block one of these buses filled with women and children who have endured traumas many of us will never understand.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. We are a nation of laws and compassion. As this body determines its course of action, we should ensure that every one of these children is taken care of and treated with dignity.

ISRAEL UNDER SIEGE

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the real and present danger that Israel finds itself in today. Quite simply, Israel is under siege.

Hamas has fired over 1,000 rockets in the last few weeks into the country. Millions of Israelis are at risk. Hamas is a designated terrorist organization that calls for the destruction of Israel.

The aggression of Hamas leaves Israel with no choice but to defend its citizens, and we must show that we stand with Israel against unprovoked rocket attacks. Hamas must immediately end the unprovoked attacks and agree to a ceasefire.

In addition, Israel finds itself under siege by the persistent threat of a nuclear Iran. Stringent economic sanctions remain our only peaceful option by which to persuade Iran to suspend its quest for nuclear weapons. However, with the negotiations deadline approaching this Sunday, we must present a credible military threat and strengthen sanctions should Iran not respond to peacefully ending their pursuit.

The last window of opportunity we have to keep Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability is soon closing. Preventing Iran from achieving nuclear weapons capabilities is essential. We must stand with Israel.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I heard on the radio a Palestinian mother who said: I wish the bombing would stop so that I could get food for my children.

I don't expect that that mother would in any way deny Israeli mothers and fathers from their ability to live in peace.

I rise today to stand with the right of Israel to exist and to defend herself and to call upon the redoubling of peace efforts by the United States to ensure that there is a peace resolution. I also hope that, as Egypt is negotiating a ceasefire, the terrorist group Hamas can be isolated and the people in the Palestinian area in Gaza and the West Bank would come together as one, with Mr. Abbas leading a peaceful region.

It is time now for the unprovoked rockets to stop and for people to come together in a coalition of peace.

I have been to Israel. I have seen the Iron Dome. It is an Iron Dome of protection. I have listened to the President of Israel, who has argued for peace.

Let us stand for peace and the ceasing of the firing of rockets and a negotiation of settlement that is permanent.

WORKERS AT SPINA BIFIDA ASSOCIATION LATEST VICTIMS OF PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is increasingly detached from the needs and concerns of western Pennsylvanians.

The Spina Bifida Association of Western Pennsylvania works to improve the quality of life for people with spina bifida and their families by providing much-needed service, education, advocacy, and housing.

Mr. Speaker, I recently visited with the men and women who work there, as well as the residents and program participants of the facilities and programs they operate. The workers are dedicated and caring people, and they do tremendous work.

As of July 1, 2014, Mr. Speaker, the Spina Bifida Association was forced to discontinue coverage for its 25 full-time employees because President Obama's health care law made it so unaffordable for them to continue—another broken promise of President Obama's oversold health care law.

It is past time for President Obama and his unelected Federal elites to change course and begin pursuing policies that help people and not his out-of-touch and out-of-control Washington, D.C.

□ 0915

NIGERIA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore this country and the world to direct our attention to the kidnappings of more than 300 young Nigerian women in May and of another eight girls just yesterday.

The leader of the Nigerian Islamist group, Boko Haram, who claims responsibility for the kidnappings, has referred to these young women as ''slaves'' and has threatened to sell them like chattel.

These deplorable actions can only be stopped by bringing the full weight of

international condemnation and law enforcement to bear on those responsible and the ideology that they exploit. We must find the perpetrators and combat their backward ideas in the court of public opinion.

Every child has an absolute right to receive an education in a safe and protected environment. We must redouble our efforts to better the lives of people around the world who may be too poor and too isolated to protect themselves. These girls could have been our daughters, our sisters, our nieces, or our friends.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4719, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 670 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 670

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-51 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 670 provides for the consideration of a package of tax deductions for charitable contributions to organizations in the form of excess food inventory and conservation easements, as well as authorizing tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts, lowering the excise tax on private foundations, and extending the date by which taxpayers can make charitable contributions to be considered for a tax deduction. This is a package of policies, each of which has been supported by the overwhelming majorities of both parties.

The rule before us today provides for a closed rule for H.R. 4719, which is the standard rule for tax bills. Of course, the minority will have its customary motion to recommit. This is a straightforward rule.

H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, will benefit the countless numbers of Americans who rely on and utilize charitable organizations in communities throughout the country. A great incentive for many Americans to contribute to those organizations or to contribute in a greater capacity than they otherwise might are the tax deductions that have been made available by the Federal Government. Congress, long ago, decided it was sound public policy to incentivize charitable giving, encouraging citizens to open their pocketbooks and lend a hand to those less fortunate—and Americans are a generous people. Moreover and importantly, today's bill makes these tax provisions permanent so that Americans will not have to worry from year to year whether the tax deductions on which they have come to rely will be available to them that year.

Recently, the House passed a permanent tax credit for corporate research and development. There were 62 Democrats who voted against the measure. Their reasoning, as far as I can tell, was not against the policy but of maintaining that the measure was not paid for. However, pay-fors are something in Congress that we need when we are creating new programs or are allocating money not previously appropriated, essentially making the American people pay more in taxes. The offsets are unnecessary and not needed when we are actually shielding the American people from having their money taken in the first place in the form of a tax.

Moreover, we heard on Tuesday night while in the Rules Committee markup of today's rule—and I suspect we will hear some about it today—the fact that the two tax-related bills before us today in the rule are not paid for. Congress only needs to pay for a tax credit if one subscribes to the belief that all money in our country belongs first to the government, then to the people. I reject this mindset. Congress does not need to justify or pay for not taking more money from the American people. Congress needs to justify and, thus, pay for policies that take money from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, even if you did subscribe to the notion that all money in this country, first and foremost, belongs to the government and that the government has to pay for allowing Americans to keep their money, the exact provisions contained in the America Gives More Act have traditionally not been offset, and Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee, on the Rules Committee, and Democratic leadership have often voted in favor of these same provisions in un-offset legislation in previous years.

In the absence of a larger, comprehensive tax reform package, permanent extenders like these make sense. They bring back stability and certainty to businesses that are constantly having to wait to see if Congress will, in fact, act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. The legislation consists of a package of five bills previously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, which would add an estimated $16 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Like every Member of this body, I strongly support charitable giving. I tout the fact in the Rules Committee frequently that I am proud of the fact that I work directly with three food pantries—one that I am extremely proud of that works with grandmothers and grandfathers who are taking care of their children's children and who find great needs. I might add that that particular charity has seen a diminution, a diminishing, of charitable giving. I might add additionally to that, when I look across the board in my community, I find that charitable giving is down, and I think that is commensurate with the kind of economy that we are in.

I applaud Americans who donate what they can to the causes they care about. I would go as far as to say that I support many of the measures that are in this bill. However, in its present form, I cannot support it. The Republican majority has divided what used to be a complete extenders package into smaller parts, some of which will be debated here today and some of which, I predict, will never reach the floor for debate, certainly not a vote. My friends have managed to make a traditionally nonpartisan and noncontroversial issue both partisan and controversial. The provisions we are debating are not paid for and, yet, are made permanent.

I am afraid that this bill is part and parcel in a pattern of what I perceive

as reckless, irresponsible behavior on the part of the majority. Republican inconsistency on fiscal responsibility and the deficit is stunning. Whenever we are considering a bill they like, they are happy to ignore the deficit and waive all of the rules that enforce fiscal discipline; but whenever Republicans don't like a proposal, they hide behind budget rules to block it. On the one hand, they have blocked or delayed everything from extending unemployment insurance, to an SGR doc fix, to emergency hurricane relief, demanding that they are fully offset. Yet, when it comes to tax credits, they waive their own budgeting rules, as they are doing here, and run up the deficit as they are doing here. This bill alone will add an additional $16 billion to the deficit over 10 years. These are the people who continuously decry the fact that we have deficits, and these are the people who continue to say that they are spendthrifts in the sense that they are taking care of the budget. That is just the beginning.

Today, the Ways and Means Committee has reported 12 unpaid-for tax extenders at a cost of $614 billion over 10 years. The House has passed five at a cost of $518 billion over 10 years. I might add this is budget hocus-pocus. It was referred to as ''voodoo economics'' at another point in time. For example, you take something like we did with the highway trust bill earlier, and you pay for it. You spend the money in 6 months, and then you pay for it over a 10-year period of time, which substantially mitigates against what their intent is rather than to do what is needed, and that is a highway infrastructure bill that will give our Nation reassurance with reference to construction measures and make sure our bridges are not falling down and that our roads are safe to drive on.

Look at the bill that we were dealing with last week. My friends threw away another $287 billion, or at least they proposed to. Much of this stuff isn't going anywhere, but they proposed to throw away another $287 billion on an extenders package just like this one. Let me repeat: $287 billion. Now we are going to add another $16 billion to that number. It is as if we are looking for new ways to be dysfunctional.

Instead of creating a stable economy, they are picking and choosing their favorite provisions and are extending them piece by piece. Rather than reforming our Tax Code, they are making it up as they go along. Assuredly, all of us have great respect for our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have that awesome responsibility of finding the ways and the means to fund this government, and I for one—and I am sure I speak for many—have great respect for DAVE CAMP, the chairman of that committee.

At the beginning of this session, Chairman CAMP proposed tax reform. I might have agreed or disagreed with an awful lot of it, but inside his own Conference, he could not get people who would support meaningful tax reform. Instead, now, in refutation to much of what he had put forward by denying some of these 60-plus extensions—he had said that many of them should not be in the measure—they come and cherry-pick and get the ones that they want and put them here rather than reform this Tax Code.

Is there anybody in this country, in this Congress, in the House, or in the Senate who believes that the Tax Code is fair and simple for everybody—business and/or Americans? No. They are making it up as they go along—a tax extender here, a tax extender there, something I like here, and I don't like that over there.

Let me tell you what we should be doing. We should be passing bills that create jobs in this country.

□ 0930

We should be repairing our infrastructure, and all of us know this.

When I came to Congress in 1992, then-President Bill Clinton identified—and we agreed—that there were 14,000 bridges in America that were in need of repair, but now, what we find is that there are substantially more bridges, and some have fallen down in that period of time, and yet, we are piecemealing the transportation issue, kicking the can down the road.

I commented in the Rules Committee some time back, this kicking the can down the road concept, if it were an Olympic sport, then Congress would not only get gold and bronze and silver, they would also get aluminum because they are real good at kicking the can.

We should be passing bills that tackle comprehensive immigration reform. Is there anybody, including all of the don't come here people that are out there shouting at children—in many instances—and mothers and people who don't speak our language, that have undertaken the most unreasonable, for any of us, journey to try to get to a better life for themselves—and people standing there, shouting at them, rather than collecting ourselves as a sensible country—of immigrants, I might add—and allow, among other things that we try to do, not just comprehensive immigration reform, indeed, we should do border security.

We have to have clarity, not only for those who may seek to come here, but for all of us. We need clarity as it pertains to immigration.

Will they put it on the floor just for a vote? No. It will not happen, and yet, we will see this piecemeal, and we will see this back and forth some time next week.

The President proposes $3.7 billion. Someone on the other side said that is too much money. The President says we need more judges and more lawyers, and we need lawyers on both sides I maintain, and yet, we find ourselves in the position of not being able to do anything and not doing it hurriedly enough.

We have this crisis on our border, which doesn't even come close to rivaling the many issues that are developing in the world, from Ukraine to Israel to Yemen, back across the board to Syria, and countless other places, our relationships are in jeopardy, and all of it is placed at the hands, if you let these people tell it, of Barack Obama.

Many of the issues that are developing developed over periods of time, and they largely did so because this Congress does not have the courage to stand up and do the things that are vitally necessary for all of America, Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal. The needs are great, and we are doing very little of anything at all.

We have 10 more days until we go on recess to campaign, and when we do go on recess to campaign, that will be for the whole month of August. Then we will come back here a few weeks in September, and we will be gone the whole month of October.

What in the world would stop us then from having the time and the necessity to sit down together in a bipartisan way and come up with what is needed for immigration reform in this country?

We have 3.3 million people—after the expiration of the unemployment insurance measures in this country in the month of December, we now number 3.3 million people out of work, in the cold, and that has cost the economy more than $10 billion.

Of those 3.3 million people, I remind my friends who stand up here with their patriotic notions that they espouse, and I believe they believe in our troops. We are fond of saying that around here.

I believe they believe that we should be secure, as do I, with reference to our military, but 300,000 of those people that are unemployed are veterans, not to mention all of the problems at the veterans hospitals that we need to attend to, rather than finger-pointing and trying to find measures to beat each other down, rather than try to lift America up.

House Republicans have found time to sue President Obama for doing his job, but we haven't found time to pass these important bills.

I said humorously, before I began to hear it often, that if President Obama is going to be sued by the Speaker for doing something, then I want to participate in the lawsuit against the Speaker for doing nothing.

We can try to appease the most extreme end of the Republican Party, but we can't pass the laws that address the challenges facing Americans all across

this Nation, and for this dereliction of duty, maybe somebody should consider when we are talking about a lawsuit—what I said humorously—really considering suing this institution and its Speaker for not doing those things that are a few that I have identified.

In yesterday's hearing in the Rules Committee, I ended my remarks—and we had outstanding witnesses, experts in this area, ranging from Elizabeth Foley, from Florida International University; to Jonathan Turley, from George Washington University; Simon Lazarus, from the Constitutional group; and Walter Dellinger—all of them—at least three of them being extremely experienced in the subject matter and each of them addressing the subject of standing, as I did, in asking them questions at different times.

Most of us know that this lawsuit is not likely to go anywhere, and at some point, all of the witnesses agreed that there are challenges ahead with reference to this lawsuit, and all of them knew and know that there is absolutely no precedent for this action, none.

There is a case, McClure v. Carter, that has some similarities, but even that one did not cross the threshold that is needed. I did end my comments by saying that I was being partisan, and I will end this portion of my comments by saying I am being partisan.

These are the people that for the 52 years, nearly, that I am a lawyer, that have argued against frivolous lawsuits. If there was ever a frivolous lawsuit, then the one that is proposed to be filed by the Speaker of this House gives frivolous new meaning. It is indeed just that.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on this matter, the administration, as it is wont to do, filed administration policy. We refer to them in our committees and around the House as a SAP.

What the administration said is the following:

> The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

I am going to come back to this, but before we go forward, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would give Members a second opportunity this week to consider reversing the damage done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision.

No employer should have the right to limit the health choices of its employees, male or female. It is pure discrimination when 99 percent of women in this country have used some form of birth control during their lifetime, but to now have to literally go through unreasonable measures to simply secure the fundamental health care they need.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Justice Elena Kagan, our three women Justices stood unanimously against the Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case.

They sit on the highest court in the Nation, and by no coincidence, the three women's dissent is representative of what I heard from the women I talked to in my district.

I asked women at home to send me in three words how they feel about the Court's decision. This is what they shared with me: Jennifer from Melrose, sad, disappointing, disturbing; Anna from Framingham, backwards, scary, hurtful; Jeanine from Waltham, disgusted, wrong, outraged; Susan from Cambridge, need more Ginsburgs.

The Court's decision to strike down women's access to basic health care is only the latest in systemic efforts to unwind the progress women have made.

Why aren't we demanding equal pay for women from our employers, rather than giving a woman's boss the right to make the most personal health care decisions for her and her family?

Congress has an obligation to correct this course. The amendment and the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act makes certain that a woman's boss does not interfere in her basic health care. It simply affirms that when the law provides for insurance companies to cover basic health care for all, all people are entitled to that health care, period.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a good friend who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to this body about the outrageous Supreme Court decision, the Hobby Lobby case.

I look at this, not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor. Now, in my training, we took an oath. That oath was to put our patients first, to do good.

My core job as a doctor is to sit with my patients, answer her questions, talk about the risks and benefits and the various options that are available, but then to empower my patients to make the decisions that best fit their lives.

To women, there is no greater decision than when to start a family, when to become a mother, and that is why protecting those reproductive rights and reproductive options are so important. That is core to our oath as physicians, and that is why the Supreme Court's decision on Hobby Lobby was so outrageous.

We have got to fight against this encroachment of the government or the Justices in the Supreme Court coming into my exam room and getting between me and my patients. That is outrageous. It is an affront to individual liberties. It is an affront to what we do as doctors.

It is not just me speaking. This is doctors all across America. The American Congress of OB/GYNs calls this ruling outrageous.

□ 0945

We need to have all options available. But what am I to do now if a Hobby Lobby employee comes to me as a patient, sits down and says: You know, I am not ready to start a family at this juncture. I would like to know what my contraceptive options are; I would like to know what some of the safest methods are.

Well, IUDs often are 20 times more effective and are extremely safe, but the Supreme Court has now made that option unavailable for me. They didn't go to medical school. I did. As a doctor, it is my oath to provide all those options.

Now, others might say, well, that patient can still choose to get it. The reason people have health insurance is because they want to have health care available when it is necessary. What if that patient can't afford that health care option? For many patients, hourly workers, often contraception can cost up to $600 a year. They are not able to afford it. That is why this is such an outrageous decision. We have got to keep the government and the Supreme Court out of our exam room.

And it is even more personal than that. I am a husband and I am a father. I want my daughter to grow up in a country where she is in control of her health care decisions, where she is in control of her body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BERA of California. So as a doctor, as a father of a daughter, I am proud to support the Not My Boss' Business Act because it puts patients back in charge of their health care decisions. We, as a country, prize individual liberties and individual freedoms above all. So this gives those decisions back to the patients.

Mr. BURGESS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my classmate and good friend.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to bring the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act to the floor.

In 1993, I was a leader in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. If you had told me then that RFRA would one day be used to allow employers to dictate to employees what preventive health care they can or cannot use, if you had told me then that I would stand on the House floor in 2014 fighting to ensure that women have the ability to make their own most basic health care decisions regardless of their boss' religious beliefs, I would never have believed it.

We wrote that bill to be a shield to protect an individual's personal exercise of religious beliefs, not a sword to enable employers to impose their religious beliefs on their employees.

No matter how sincerely held a religious belief might be, for-profit employers, like Hobby Lobby or Conestoga Wood, must not be allowed to impose their beliefs or that belief on their employees as a means of denying their employees access to critical preventive health care services.

I was proud to work with the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) to introduce this simple legislation to ensure that, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's mangling of RFRA, employers cannot deny their employees access to federally mandated health services.

Every woman must have the right to follow her own beliefs and guidance when making health care choices. This bill simply guarantees that the boss' beliefs cannot supersede that right.

I was disappointed to see that none of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted earlier this week to bring this bill to the floor. I urge them to stand with us today or else, when they go home this weekend, to tell the men and women of their districts that their health care decisions are now going to be made for them by their bosses, regardless of their own choices, regardless of their own religious beliefs or the doctor's recommendations; and tell them that you believe that their boss' religious beliefs must be imposed on them, notwithstanding their own religious beliefs, which don't count; and tell them you did nothing to stop this.

This country will not stand for that. We have fought for too long to preserve the right of all Americans to make their own health care choices and, I must add, to make their own religious decisions to refuse to act now.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, allow this bill to come to the floor, and send a strong message that health care choices are not your boss' business and that your religious beliefs trump your boss' religious beliefs.

Your boss has a right to his beliefs. You have a right to your beliefs. Government must not allow him to impose his beliefs on you.

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

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

I am a proud cosponsor of the measure that was just spoken to, and I am very pleased that my colleague came here to speak on it.

Rather than read the entirety of the Statement of Administration Policy at this time, I will submit that statement for the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4719—AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Reed, R-New York, and 9 cosponsors, July 17, 2014)

The Administration supports measures that enhance non-profits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's Budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

However, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 4719, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations and add another two similar provisions without offsetting the cost. If this same, unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add $500 billion or more to deficits over the next ten years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013. Just two months ago, House Republicans themselves passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures.

As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue and create tax breaks that primarily benefit higher-income individuals, while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and non-defense priorities such as research and development in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. House Republicans also are making clear their priorities by rushing to make these tax cuts permanent without offsets even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the Earned Income Tax Credit, Child Tax Credit, and education tax credits expire.

The Administration wants to work with Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's social sector. However, H.R. 4719 represents the wrong approach.

If the President were presented with H.R. 4719, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Now, there is something else we need to discuss about this rule. Once again, we are debating a closed rule.

When I came to Congress, I was listening on the radio. I didn't know very much about rules. And a part of why Democrats in the majority lost, in my opinion, was the harangue that was going on on the radio about closed rules.

Well, I came here, and I wound up on the Rules Committee, and now I know a little bit about closed rules. I also know that we have set an all-time record in the history of the United States Congress, for now, in this particular rule that is before the House of Representatives, the 65th time this session, we are going to have a closed rule. What that means, America, is that your Representative on either side will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment to this measure with reference to tax extenders. This is the most closed rules that this Congress has considered ever, and I expect we are not finished yet and that the number of closed rules will continue to grow.

We started the 113th session with a pledge of transparency and openness from the Speaker of the House, but that has fallen by the wayside, and it has done so in historic proportion. Enough already. The majority should do the responsible thing and bring up bills that actually matter, bills that will address the many challenges facing this country, challenges, as I have pointed out before, about our crumbling infrastructure and, most importantly, creating jobs, even as it pertains to immigration reform.

Everyone who looks at that measure that says, if we had clear immigration policy, whether it was dealing with H–1B visas, whether it was dealing with farmworkers, whatever the measure, that it would increase our revenue in this country and enhance our overall economic circumstances.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on this 65th closed rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me try to take some of these points in order that we have heard over the last 45 minutes.

The gentleman talks about tax reform. I hope that means that he is prepared to join me on H.R. 1040, a measure that would provide a flat tax to the citizens of the United States. There is no more egregious function that most of us have to deal with every year than dealing with the IRS.

Unfortunately, because of the actions of the administration, the IRS now stands in ill favor with a majority of Americans. The President, himself, promised in 2013 that he would get to the bottom of the problems in the IRS and that he would get them corrected. I believe that he should. This is the agency with which we all have to deal every year. No one likes the taxman, but it is imperative that the American people have the confidence in the agency that is tasked with collecting their taxes.

On the issue of the VA, it is in conference. We will hear from them. Is the VA going to require a higher appropriation than we gave a few weeks ago? Perhaps. But I would also like to see the new administrator, the new Secretary of the VA be able to discharge people from his employment if they have, in fact, acted in bad faith.

I must have missed the firings that have occurred at the VA amongst the Senior Executive Service. I am not even talking about political appointees. I am talking about people who are lifers within the VA who seem perfectly content to continue business as usual. You are not going to fix that problem if you just pump more taxpayer money into the system. I wouldn't disagree that more money may be necessary at the VA, but we do have to fix the problem that is endemic in the agency if we don't expect the same result to be clearly evident in 2 or 3 years' time.

Let me just talk briefly about the issue that came up about the Supreme Court decision. Unlike Mr. NADLER, I was not here in 1993 and 1994. I was not part of the Congress that passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, but many of the same people who wrote and voted for and defended the Affordable Care Act, the cast of characters is remarkably similar. In fact, the gentleman from New York, Senator SCHUMER, when he was a Member of the House, was, I believe, the lead sponsor of that, and he is now in the Senate. The majority leader in the Senate was a ''yes'' vote on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

So this is a law that was written by Democratic sponsors in a Democratic-controlled House, signed by a Democratic President. How could they not know? How could they not know of its existence when they were writing the Affordable Care Act?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Let me continue with this thought, and if there is time, I will consider yielding to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Now, while they were crafting the Affordable Care Act, they were fully cognizant of the same restrictions they had written into law in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The Supreme Court simply looked at the facts and said that a Federal agency—in this case, the Department of Health and Human Services—in a rulemaking activity cannot negate a law that was passed by the people's representatives in the Congress. I think that is as it should be.

If there was anything, there were drafting errors in the Affordable Care Act. I have spoken about that time and again. But why weren't the same people who were tasked with writing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, why weren't they watchful while they were writing their own health care law?

Now, let's talk for just a minute about the Hobby Lobby decision. The first thing—and it is important to stress this—no FDA-approved contraceptive that was available to women before the decision is unavailable after the decision. The Court simply said that the government cannot force a citizen to violate his or her religious beliefs paying for medicine that a citizen believes takes a life. No employer before or after Hobby Lobby can prevent a woman from purchasing any contraceptive that is currently available.

We also heard criticism from the minority that the House was doing other things than doing its work. I would just point out that the House is doing its work. Forty jobs bills have passed this House and are sitting, waiting for activity over in the Senate. And we saw how quickly the SKILLS Act, after the Senate renamed it and it came back to the House, how quickly it got to the President's desk. So the fact that the bills are over there waiting is a problem of the other body. It is not a problem of the House. The House has been doing its work.

Yesterday we passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill. Mr. Speaker, I would ask rhetorically: When was the last time that the House passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill? It was 2007, the first year that the Democrats had taken over the majority. We haven't seen an appropriations bill for Financial Services in—what?—5 years' time. This was a landmark achievement yesterday.

Let's look for just a moment at the number of amendments that have been heard under open rules. On appropriations bills this year, we are through seven appropriations bills as we sit here in the middle of July. That is a significant achievement in and of itself. There have been 395 amendments heard to appropriations bills. That hardly sounds like a closed process. There have been 210 Republican amendments, 185 Democratic amendments, and that was exclusive of yesterday's passed appropriations bill.

So I don't think you can rationally make the argument that the House is not doing its work and that, as we go through the appropriations process, it is not open.

□ 1000

I have some other things that I want to say about the deficit, but I will be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding for just a moment because this is a colleague from Texas, and there are many issues that we have agreed on with respect to Texas.

I might say to you that I am a strong proponent of religious liberty. You had mentioned Hobby Lobby in terms of some of the issues you were discussing. I think I have stood fast on that question. I only raise the point, and you made the point that anything that was approved pre-Hobby Lobby by the FDA, but in actuality we know that, just from the religious liberty point of view, this is a slippery slope because it pits the large entity against the individual rights, and we know under our Constitution that the very premise of religious freedom is the idea that there is no pronounced, structured religious plan in place that denies me my freedom. And that is what you have done to women as it relates—when I say ''you,'' excuse me—that is what the decision has done. It has made the boss in charge of an individual.

I would just make the argument we can stand for religious liberty, but we must stand for it not only for corporations but for individuals such as women who use contraception for health care, Doctor. And you know that that happens. You are certainly very much an experienced medical professional. I would just make the argument that I can't imagine in the course of your medical history that you have not seen women who need contraception for health care.

The other point that I would just finish on is that, as I indicated on the question of a slippery slope, how else can a corporation suggest that I am, because of my needs, infringing upon their religious liberty? I am obviously going to be disadvantaged because, in essence, I am a minority of one. I am an employee. I am scared for my job. But I need to be able to express my religious freedom, and it may infringe upon someone else's. Let us be careful about this. And I frankly hope——

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I need to reclaim my time. Mr. Speaker, slippery slopes work both ways, and those people who are worried about laws that would require the ending of life are worried about that slippery slope as well.

I would just reiterate the point: no contraceptive that was previously available is now unavailable because of the Hobby Lobby decision. If there are problems in the way the law was written, I would remind people it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President who signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President that signed the Affordable Care Act. They perhaps should have taken better care in writing their law.

We had the hearing yesterday in the Rules Committee about the President taking care that the laws are faithfully executed. Perhaps we ought to have a faithful writing of the laws, as well.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of the America Gives More Act of 2014, making permanent the tax deductions for charitable contributions to food banks and conservation easements, and allowing for tax-free IRA deductions. It is a sound public policy, and I am certainly grateful to my colleague from New York (Mr. REED) for writing this legislation, which will have a positive impact on the countless charities in this country which provide such critical services to our neighbors in need.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 670 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5051) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5051.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 670, if ordered, and adopting the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Amash	Gardner	McClintock
Amodei	Garrett	McHenry
Bachmann	Gerlach	McIntyre
Bachus	Gibbs	McKeon
Barletta	Gibson	McKinley
Barr	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris Rodgers
Barton	Gohmert	Meadows
Benishek	Goodlatte	Meehan
Bentivolio	Gosar	Messer
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Mica
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Miller (FL)
Black	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Boustany	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Brady (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Bridenstine	Grimm	Neugebauer
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Noem
Brooks (IN)	Hall	Nugent
Broun (GA)	Hanna	Nunes
Buchanan	Harper	Olson
Bucshon	Harris	Palazzo
Burgess	Hartzler	Paulsen
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Camp	Heck (NV)	Perry
Cantor	Hensarling	Peterson
Capito	Herrera Beutler	Petri
Carter	Holding	Pittenger
Cassidy	Hudson	Pitts
Chabot	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Clawson (FL)	Hultgren	Posey
Coble	Hunter	Price (GA)
Coffman	Hurt	Rahall
Cole	Issa	Reed
Collins (GA)	Jenkins	Reichert
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cook	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Cotton	Jones	Rigell
Cramer	Jordan	Roby
Crawford	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Denham	Kline	Rokita
Dent	LaMalfa	Rooney
DeSantis	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Roskam
Duffy	Lankford	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Royce
Ellmers	Lipinski	Runyan
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fincher	Long	Salmon
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Sanford
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Fleming	Lummis	Schock
Flores	Marchant	Schweikert
Forbes	Marino	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Foxx	McAllister	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	

Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Labrador
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1031

Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KINZINGER, FORBES, PETERSON, ADERHOLT, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 428 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 183, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Conyers
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Hanabusa
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott, David
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield

□ 1039

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 213, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—201

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Conyers
DesJarlais
Foster
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Simpson
Sires
Stivers
Whitfield

□ 1046

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3212. An act to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON H. RES. 645, REQUESTING PRESIDENT TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011; AND REPORT ON H. RES. 647, DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011

Mr. CAMP, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged adverse report (Rept. No. 113–524) requesting that the President of the United States transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the executive office of the President that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; and a privileged adverse report (Rept. No. 113–525) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, which were referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 670, I call up the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 670, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–51 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4719

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''America Gives More Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOOD INVENTORY.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (iv).

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking clause (ii), by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clauses:

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of such contributions for any taxable year which may be taken into account under this section shall not exceed—

''(I) in the case of any taxpayer other than a C corporation, 15 percent of the taxpayer's aggregate net income for such taxable year from all trades or businesses from which such contributions were made for such year, computed without regard to this section, and

''(II) in the case of a C corporation, 15 percent of taxable income (as defined in subsection (b)(2)(D)).

''(iii) RULES RELATED TO LIMITATION.—

''(I) CARRYOVER.—If such aggregate amount exceeds the limitation imposed under clause (ii), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)) as a charitable contribution described in clause (i) in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

''(II) COORDINATION WITH OVERALL CORPORATE LIMITATION.—In the case of any charitable contribution allowable under clause (ii)(II), subsection (b)(2)(A) shall not apply to such contribution, but the limitation imposed by such subsection shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of such contributions. For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), such contributions shall be treated as allowable under subsection (b)(2)(A).''.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—If a taxpayer—

''(I) does not account for inventories under section 471, and

''(II) is not required to capitalize indirect costs under section 263A,

the taxpayer may elect, solely for purposes of subparagraph (B), to treat the basis of any apparently wholesome food as being equal to 25 percent of the fair market value of such food.''.

(d) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vi) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—In the case of any such contribution of apparently wholesome food which cannot or will not be sold solely by reason of internal standards of the taxpayer, lack of market, or similar circumstances, or by reason of being produced by the taxpayer exclusively for the purposes of transferring the food to an organization described in subparagraph (A), the fair market value of such contribution shall be determined—

''(I) without regard to such internal standards, such lack of market, such circumstances, or such exclusive purpose, and

''(II) by taking into account the price at which the same or substantially the same food items (as to both type and quality) are sold by the taxpayer at the time of the contribution (or, if not so sold at such time, in the recent past).''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 2013, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) LIMITATION; APPLICABILITY TO C CORPORATIONS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENTS ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 408(d)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (F).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Subparagraph (E) of section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (vi).

(2) CORPORATIONS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking clause (iii).

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES BY NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any qualified conservation contribution (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) which—

''(I) is made by a Native Corporation, and

''(II) is a contribution of property which was land conveyed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act,

shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer's taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(2)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 15 succeeding years in order of time.

''(iii) NATIVE CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'Native Corporation' has the meaning given such term by section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 170(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''subparagraph (B) applies'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B) or (C) applies''.

(3) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this subsection (or any amendment made by this subsection) shall be construed to modify the existing property rights validly conveyed to Native Corporations (within the meaning of section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act) under such Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) TREATMENT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY INDIVIDUALS BEFORE DUE DATE OF RETURN.—If any charitable contribution is made by an individual after the close of a taxable year but not later than the due date (determined without regard to extensions) for the return of tax for such taxable year, then the taxpayer may elect to treat such charitable contribution as made in such taxable year. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual's distributive share of a partnership's charitable contribution, and an individual's pro rata share of an S corporation's charitable contribution, shall not be treated as charitable contributions made by such individual.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to elections made with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF THE TAX RATE FOR THE EXCISE TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2 percent'' and inserting ''1 percent''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4719.

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

There was no objection.

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

The American people are the most charitable people in the world, donating money, food, and clothing in times of need. Their donations ensure that charities and foundations can help individuals and communities across the country.

There are numerous provisions in the Tax Code that encourage giving, and the bill we have before us today, H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act, ensures that some of these provisions are made permanent so individuals, businesses, and farmers can donate and give back more. The first provision will make permanent and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory by businesses, regardless of how they are organized.

Food banks are a vital part of communities, helping Americans put food on the table and provide for their families when they have come across hard times or suffered through a natural disaster.

The Food Donation Connection has estimated that since this tax deduction was expanded in 2006, donations have increased 127 percent. Unfortunately, a provision in current law that encouraged passthrough businesses to contribute food inventory expired at the end of last year, and charities and foundations across the country are urging that it be restored and made permanent.

According to Feeding America, 3.6 billion pounds of food is distributed by food bank members each year. This legislation would significantly increase food bank access to the 70 billion pounds of nutritious food wasted each year.

Today, we have the opportunity to continue this important credit, allowing all businesses, farmers, and ranchers to take advantage and donate more nutritious food to the millions of Americans who need it most.

This bill also ensures that seniors who donate to charities from their Individual Retirement Accounts can do so without a tax penalty. According to the Independent Sector, this provision has ''prompted more than $140 million in gifts to the work of nonprofits since enactment, assisting social service providers, religious organizations, cultural institutions and schools, and other nonprofits.'' Making this provision permanent can only serve to increase the generous donations that charities rely on.

In addition, the bill will make permanent the deduction for contributions of conservation easements. This provision will also increase the amount of land or property donated for charitable use. Witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee have testified that in the first 2 years of the enactment of conservation easements, the number of donations doubled compared to the previous 2 years, resulting in a 32 percent increase of acreage conserved.

This is one area, especially, where long-term planning is essential. To allow this to expire makes it much more difficult for the often multigenerational planning necessary to take place. In Michigan, I have seen the benefits of conservation easements firsthand. This is a tremendous legacy for future generations.

The tax reform draft the committee produced earlier in the year would encourage charitable giving in several important ways and, by creating a stronger economy, analysis found that it would increase charitable giving by an estimated $2.2 billion each year.

Two important charitable provisions from the draft—lowering the excise tax on private foundations and extending the tax deadline for charitable contributions from December 31 to April 15—are included in the America Gives More Act.

At the end of the year, many taxpayers have no idea what their tax liability will be, and it is only after struggling through the daunting process of preparing their tax return that they know with certainty. If taxpayers were permitted to make and deduct contributions prior to filing their tax return, I believe many Americans will be even more generous in supporting religious and charitable causes. Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee found that allowing donors to deduct gifts until April 15 would result in significantly more charitable giving.

Another provision from the draft would lower and simplify the excise tax on private foundations, making compliance easy, especially for smaller foundations. As a result, foundations will have more of their resources available to support charities and exempt organizations across the country.

All of these provisions are bipartisan and have the support of over 850 charities and foundations across the country, who wrote to Congress stating:

Without an incentive in place and assured, many of the gifts the charitable incentives were intended to promote will simply not take place.

I will insert in the RECORD the letter from Independent Sector, supported by 850 charities and foundations across the United States.

INDEPENDENT SECTOR,
July 15, 2014.

OPEN LETTER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Millions of individuals and families are served by the essential work of America's public charities, which is made possible in part by incentives for charitable giving in our tax code. The House may soon have an opportunity to address tax legislation that would renew and make permanent three key incentives for donations to America's public charities. We strongly urge you to approve legislation that would renew the IRA charitable rollover and the enhanced incentives for donations of food inventory and land conservation easements, each of which expired as of January 1, 2014.

Originally enacted in the Pension Protection Act of 2006 as a way to encourage increased charitable giving, these three provisions have demonstrated a significant impact on the nonprofit community. The IRA charitable rollover increases the ability of older Americans to make gifts to charities by allowing individuals age 70½ or older to donate up to $100,000 to a qualifying public charity directly from their IRAs without incurring tax on the withdrawal. The provision has prompted more than $140 million in gifts to the work of nonprofits since enactment, assisting social service providers, religious organizations, cultural institutions and schools, and other nonprofits.

The enhanced deduction for donations of food allows individuals and organizations to reduce their taxable income by providing qualifying food inventory to certain charitable organizations. According to Feeding America, 3.6 billion pounds of food is distributed by food bank members each year. This legislation would significantly increase food bank access to the 70 billion pounds of nutritious food wasted each year, particularly the 6 billion pounds of produce that does not make it to market.

The enhanced deduction for donations of land conservation easements allows land owners to get a meaningful deduction for permanently retiring development rights to their property to protect and preserve significant natural resources. A survey by the Land Trust Alliance showed that this incentive helped 1,700 land trusts increase the pace of conservation by a third—to over a million acres a year.

Unfortunately, these charitable tax provisions were allowed to expire on January 1 for the fourth time in recent years. On each of the three previous occasions, an entire package of tax extenders was reinstated retroactively at the end of the following year. While this may be an adequate solution for many provisions in the extenders package, these charitable provisions are different. Without an incentive in place and assured, many of the gifts the incentives were intended to promote will simply not take place. The time to plan and execute the gifts will have already passed by.

For all these reasons, we urge you to support legislation to permanently reinstate these critical giving incentives, namely: H.R. 4619 (to make permanent the IRA charitable rollover); HR 4719 (to permanently extend the charitable deduction for donation of food inventory); and H.R. 2807 (the Conservation Easement Incentive Act). We hope to see them combined and passed as a package as soon as possible in order to continue sustaining the vital work of charitable organizations in our communities.

Thank you for your consideration,

Independent Sector; 92nd Street Y; Achievement Centers for Children; Ackland Art Museum; Acton Conservation Trust; Adults with Developmental Disabilities; Advonance; Agricutural Stewardship Association; Agudath Israel of America; Agudath

Israel of the Five Towns; Air Force Museum Foundation; Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank; Alabama Dance Council; Alachua Conservation Trust; Alexander Haas; All Saints Church; All Stars Project (ASP); Alliance for Children and Families; Alliance of Arizona Nonprofits; The ALS Association; Amador Livermore Valley Historical Society & Museum on Main; American Alliance of Museums; American Autoimmune Related Diseases Association; American Behcet's Disease Association; American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network; American Chemical Society.

American Clock & Watch Museum; American Folk Art Museum; American Friends Service Committee; American Heart Association; American Jewish Committee (AJC); American Library Association; American Lung Association; American Red Cross; Americans for the Arts; Americans for the Arts Action Fund; America's Charities; Amon Carter Museum of American Art; The Ananda Center for the Arts; Anderson County Museum; Andy Warhol Museum; AngelCare/Americans Care & Share; Angus Nazarene Food Pantry; Ann Arrundell County Historical Society, Inc.; Annette Strawder Here to Help Pantry; Antique Boat Museum; Apache Creek Deaf and Youth Ranch, Inc.; Appalachia Ohio Alliance; Argus Museum; Arkansas Nonprofit Alliance; Armstrong County Museum; Arthurdale Heritage, Inc.; Association for Healthcare Philanthropy.

Association of Art Museum Directors; Association of Direct Response Fundraising Counsel; Association of Fundraising Professionals; Atlantic Coast Conservancy; Auburn Automotive Heritage, Inc. & Auburn Cord Duesenberg Automobile Museum; Bainbridge Island Land Trust; Baltimore Heritage Area Association; Baltimore Museum of Art; Bass Museum of Art; Bay Area Food Bank; Bayer Center for Nonprofit Management at Robert Morris University; Bayou Land Conservancy; Bayshore Baptist Church Food Pantry; Bedford Historical Society; Believer's Sanctuary; Bellville Christian Food Pantry; BethanyKids; Bishop Hill Heritage Association; Black Swamp Conservancy; Blair County Historical Society; Blue Ridge Conservancy; Blue Ridge Land Conservancy; BoardSource.

Boise Art Museum; Boston Baroque; Boston Children's Museum; Bowers Museum; Boys & Girls Clubs of Austin County, TX; Boys & Girls Clubs of Southeastern Michigan; Branford Land Trust, Inc.; Brazoria County Alcoholic Recovery Center; Briar Bush Nature Center; The Bridge Ministries; The Bridge Over Troubled Waters; Bridging for Tomorrow; BrightFocus Foundation; Buckner Children & Family Services; Burchfield Penney Art Center; The Burd Group; Califomia Association of Food Banks; Califomia Association of Museums; Califomia Museum of Ancient Art; Califomia Science Center Foundation; Califomia State Parks; Calyx Sustainable Tourism; Capital Area Food Bank of Texas; Carbon County Museum; Care and Share, Inc.; Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy; CASA Program for the Ogeechee Circuit; Casa Rosa Food Pantry.

Catawba Lands Conservancy; Cathedral Arts Project, Inc.; Catholic Foundation of Eastern Montana; Cedar Rapids Museum of Art; Cedarhurst Center for the Arts; Celiac Disease Foundation; Center for History; Center for Nonprofit Excellence; Center for Non-Profits; Center for Success and Independence; Central Co-op; Central Pennsylvania Food Bank; Champlain Area Trails; Cheyenne Center, Inc.; Chicago Humanities Festival; Children's Discovery Museum; Christian Tabernacle; Civil War Trust; Clay Center for the Arts & Sciences of West Virginia; Clear Lake Food Pantry; ClearWater Conservancy; Cleveland Zoological Society; Clinton Symphony Orchestra; Coalition for Pulmonary Fibrosis; Colby College Museum of Art; Cole Art Center at Stephen F. Austin State University.

Collins Group, A Division of Donald A. Campbell & Company; Colorado Nonprofit Association; Colorado-Wyoming Association of Museums; Columbia College (MO); Columbia Land Trust (OR & WA); Columbia Museum of Art (SC); Columbia Pacific Heritage Museum; Columbus Museum of Art; Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley; Community Care Center, Inc.; Community Food Bank of Eastern Oklahoma; Community Food Pantry in Tool (TX); Community Food Pantry of Franklin County, Texas; Community Foodbank of New Jersey; The Community Foundation for Crawford County; Community Foundation for Muskegon County; Community Foundation for Southwest Washington; Community Foundation of Eastern Connecticut; Community Foundation of Northern Colorado; The Community Foundation of South Puget Sound; Community Foundation of the Great River Bend; Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area; Congaree Land Trust; Connecticut Electric Railway Association dba Connecticut Trolley Museum; Connecticut Farmland Trust.

Connecticut Food Bank; Connecticut Land Conservation Council; Connecticut Nonprofit Human Services Cabinet; Connemara Conservancy Foundation; Conservation Foundation of the Gulf Coast; The Conservation Fund; Conservation Tax Credit Transfer, LLC; Conservation Trust for North Carolina; The Contemporary Austin; COPD Foundation; CoreStrategies for Nonprofits, Inc.; Cornerstone Outreach Center of Amarillo, Inc.; Council for Christian Colleges & Universities; Council of Michigan Foundations; Council on Foundations; Cow Marsh Creek Consultants, LLC; Cradle of Texas Conservancy, Inc.; Crawford County Historical Society; Crested Butte Land Trust; Crisis Center of the Plains; Crocker Art Museum; Crossroads at Park Place, Inc.; Cultural Alliance of Fairfield County; Cultural Assets Consulting; Cumberland Land Trust.

Currier Museum of Art; Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; Da Vinci Science Center; Dallas Museum of Art; Dance/USA; Dare to Believe Ministries Outreach Center; Dare to Care Food Bank; Datil Educators Club; Deke Slayton Memorial Space & Bicycle Museum; Delaware Center for the Contemporary Arts; Delaware Highlands Conservancy; Denver Art Museum; Des Moines Art Center; Desert Foothills Land Trust; Dixon Gallery and Gardens; DMA Nonprofit Federation; Donors Forum; Douglas County Historical Society; The Drawing Center; Duck Hollow; DuPage County Historical Museums; Dutchess Land Conservancy; Earl Scruggs Center; East End Baptist Church; East Hillsborough Historical Society, Inc.; East Texas Food Bank; Eastern Sierra Land Trust; Ecology Project International.

EcoTrust; Edisto Island Open Land Trust; Eightmile River Wild & Scenic Coordinating Committee; Ellis County Museum, Inc.; Eno River Association; Epilepsy Foundation; Epiphany Lutheran Church; Equestrian Partners in Conservation (EPIC); Erie Art Museum; Essex County Greenbelt Association; Exploration Place; Family Abuse Shelter of Miami; Family League of Baltimore; Family Worship Center Food Pantry; Faye Gehl Conservation Foundation; Fayette CARE Clinic; Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies; Feeding America; Feeding America San Diego; Feeding America Southwest Virginia; Feeding America Tampa Bay; Feeding Indiana's Hungry; Feeding Pennsylvania; Field Museum; First Baptist Church (Atlanta, TX); First Baptist Church (Bovina, TX); First Christian Church Food Pantry.

First Christian Church Outreach (Conroe, TX); First Resource Center; Fishtown Preservation Society, Inc.; Flathead Land Trust; Florida Holocaust Museum; The Florida Orchestra; Florida Philanthropic Network; Food Bank of Central New York; Food Bank of Delaware; Food Bank of Northeast Arkansas; Food Bank of the Albemarle; Food Bank of the Rockies; Food Bank of the Southern Tier; The Food Bank of Western Massachusetts; FOOD for Lane County; Food Industry Alliance of New York State; Foodbank of Southeastern Virginia; The Foodbank, Inc.; Foodshare; Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina; Forgotten Harvest; Fort Ticonderoga; Foundation Layers; Fox Valley Family YMCA; Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center; Franklin Area Community Services.

Franklin County (KS) Historical Society; Franklin Institute; Franklin Park Conservatory and Botanical Gardens; Freshwater Future; Freshwater Land Trust; Frick Art and Historical Center; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Friends of Balcones Canyonlands National Wildlife Refuge; Friends of Lopez Island Pool; Friends of the Mitchell Gallery of Flight; Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge; Frist Center for the Visual Arts; Galveston Bay Foundation; Gates Mills Land Conservancy; Gateway Science Museum; Gathering Waters Conservancy; Geist Fall Creek Watershed Alliance; The General Society of Mayflower Descendants; Genesee Valley Conservancy, Inc.; George Eastman House; Georgia Center for Nonprofits; Georgia Charitable Care Network; Gilroy Historical Society; Girl Scouts of San Gorgonio; Girl Scouts of the USA; Girls Inc.

Glen Ellyn Historical Society; Glencairn Museum; Global Orphan Assistance Foundation; God's Pantry Food Bank; Gold Coast Railroad Museum; Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy; Golden State Bonsai Federation and Bonsai Garden at Lake Merritt; Goldstein Museum of Design; Good Neighbor Community Builders; Good Samaritan Health & Wellness Center; Goshen Land Trust; Grand Encampment Museum; Grand Haven Area Community Foundation; Grand Rapids Art Museum; Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy; Grantmakers Forum of New York; Grassroots International; The Graue Mill & Museum; Great Peninsula Conservancy; Great Plains Food Bank; Great Plains Welsh Heritage Project; The Greater Boston Food Bank; Greater Chicago Food Depository; Greater Grace Outreach; Greater Hudson Heritage Network; Greenbelt Land Trust of Mid-Missouri.

Greensboro Land Trust; Grosse Ile Nature and Land Conservancy; Grounds For Sculpture; Gulf Coast Community Foundation; Gulf Coast Symphony; Hammer Museum; Harmony House; Harry Chapin Food Bank of Southwest Florida; Harry S. Truman Little White House; The Hartt School; Harvard Art Museums; Harvest Assembly, House of Blessing; Harvest House; Harvest Texarkana Regional Food Bank; Harvesters—The Community Food Network (KS); Harvesters—The Community Food Network (MO); Hawaiian Islands Land Trust; Heart of the Lakes Center for Land Conservation Policy; Heaven's Windows; Hedley Senior Citizens; Heifer

Foundation; Heifer International; Helping Hands Outreach Center of Gasconade County; Henderson Food Pantry; The Henry Ford; Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art.

Heritage Museum (OR); Heritage Museum of Orange County; Hidalgo Medical Services; High Museum of Art; High Plains Food Bank; Higher Heights Church of God Food Pantry; Highlands-Cashiers Land Trust; Hill Country Land Trust; Hillsboro Independent School District Education Foundation; Hillwood Estate, Museum & Gardens; Historic Flat Rock, Inc.; The History Center in Tompkins County; Holy Family Home and Shelter, Inc.; Holy Family St. Vincent de Paul; Holy Ghost St Vincent de Paul; HomeAid Atlanta; Honolulu Museum of Art; Hope Food Pantry; HOPE Outreach; House of Help Hempstead; The House of the Seven Gables Settlement Association; Houston Food Bank; The Humanity Institute for Children & Families (HICF); Hunger-Free Pennsylvania; Hyde Hall; IBB Local 684 Labor Participation.

Idaho Coalition of Land Trusts; The Idaho Foodbank; Iglesia Trinidad (TX); Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Illinois Collaboration on Youth; Illinois Network of Charter Schools; Illinois Valley Symphony Orchestra; Immune Deficiency Foundation; Indian Hill Music; Indiana Philanthropy Alliance; Indianapolis Museum of Art; Informal Learning Experiences; Inner Wisdom, Inc.; Interfaith Caring Ministries; International Primate Protection League; Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation; IRIS Orchestra; Iron and Steel Museum of Alabama; Irving S. Gilmore International Keyboard Festival; Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum; The Isamu Noguchi Foundation; Islamic Society of North America; Jack Hadley Black History Museum; Jacksonville Zoo and Gardens; Jacob and Terese Hershey Foundation; Jefferson Land Trust.

Jemez Helping Hands; Jeremiah Call Christ Ministry/Jeremiah's Food Pantry; Jesus Outreach Ministries; Jewish Federations of North America; The Jewish Museum; Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art; Joseph's House; Julian Pathways; Kansas City Symphony; Kansas Land Trust; Kenton Conservancy; The Kingdom Zone Before & After Community Center; Kings Local Food Pantry; The King's Palace Food Pantry; Kohl Children's Museum of Greater Chicago; The Kreeger Museum; Kress United Methodist Church; Ku'ikahi Mediation Center; K–VA–T Food Stores/Food City (TN); K–VA–T Food Stores/Food City (VA); Ladies In Action; Lafayette Symphony; Lancaster Community Library; Lancaster Farmland Trust; The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County; Land Conservancy of Adams County; Land Trust Alliance.

The Land Trust for Tennessee; Laredo Crime Stoppers, Inc.; LeadingAge; League of American Orchestras; Leander Independent School District Educational Excellence Foundation; Lebanon Food Pantry; Leelanau Conservancy; Lehigh Valley Abundant Life Ministries; Leigh Yawkey Woodson Art Museum; The Leighty Foundation; Life Challenge; Light of Christ Food Pantry; Literary Arts; Little Miami Food Service; Littleton Conservation Trust; LIVESTRONG Foundation; Living Faith Food Pantry; Living Water I.A.M; Livingston County Historical Society; LJC Mercy Ministries; Local Infant Formula for Emergencies, Inc. (LIFE-Houston); Lorraine Street Church of God in Christ; Los Angeles Regional Food Bank; Louisiana Food Bank Association; Louisiana Landmarks Society.

Louisville Zoological Garden; Lowe Art Museum; Lupus and Allied Diseases Association, Inc.; Lutheran Services in America; Magdalena Samaritan Center; Maiden Alley Cinema; Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust; Maine Association of Nonprofits; Maine Coast Heritage Trust; March of Dimes; Marin Agricultural Land Trust; Martin Luther King Jr. Center; Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation; Mason Food Pantry; Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition; Massillon Museum; Matthew 25 Ecumenical Food Pantry; Maxwell Museum of Anthropology; McCary's Chapel United Methodist Church; McHenry County Historical Society & Museum; Mead Art Museum; Meadowlark Methodist Food Pantry; Meals On Wheels Association of America; Memorial Baptist Food Pantry; Menil Collection; Mental Health Association of Rhode Island; Mesothelioma Applied Research Foundation.

Miami Springs Historical Museum; Michigan Historic Preservation Network; Michigan Nonprofit Association; Mid-South Food Bank; The Miller Art Museum; Milwaukee Art Museum; Mims Chapel Drydock Food Pantry; The Minneapolis Foundation; Minneapolis Institute of Arts; Minnesota Historical Society; Minnesota Land Trust; Mission Aviation Fellowship; Mission Northeast, Inc.; Mississippi Food Network; Mississippi Valley Conservancy; Missouri Association for Museums and Archives; Missouri Street Church of Christ Pantry Program; Mitchell Prehistoric Indian Village Preservation Society; Mobile Medical Museum; Mojave Desert Land Trust; Molly Brown House Museum; Mon General Foundation; Monadnock Conservancy; Montana Association of Land Trusts; Montana Food Bank Network; Montclair Art Museum.

Montgomery County Emergency Assistance; Montgomery County Food Bank (TX); Montgomery County Lands Trust (PA); Montgomery County Youth Services (TX); Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts; Morton County Historical Society Museum; Mountain-Plains Museums Association; Mt. Canaan Missionary Baptist; Mt. Manna; Murphysboro Food Pantry, Inc.; Muscarelle Museum of Art; Museo de Arte de Ponce; Museum Association of New York; Museum at FIT (Fashion Institute of Technology); Museum of Arts and Design; Museum of Contemporary Art; Museum of Contemporary Art Denver; Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego; Museum of Cultural and Natural History; Museum of Danish America; Museum of Fine Arts Boston; The Museum of Fine Arts Houston; Museum of Fine Arts, St. Petersburg, FL; The Museum of Flight; Museum of Glass; Museum of Latin American Art; Museum of Science, Boston.

Museum of Zavkhan Province; My Brother's Keeper Outreach Center; Mystic Art Association, dba Mystic Arts Center; N.C. Center for Nonprofits; Nacogdoches HOPE; Nantucket Historical Association; Naperville Heritage Society; Naples Historical Society; National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Omaha; National Association for Interpretation; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Clock and Watch Collectors; National Atomic Testing Museum; National Audubon Society; National Bottle Museum; National Civil Rights Museum; National Council of Nonprofits; National Czech & Slovak Museum & Library; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; National Museum of American Jewish History; National Museum of Wildlife Art; National Parks Conservation Association; National Soaring Museum; National Veterans Art Museum; National Watch and Clock Museum.

National Wildlife Federation; National Woodland Owners Association; National Youth Leadership Council; Native American Rights Fund; Natural Land Institute; Natural Lands Trust; Natural Resources Defense Council; The Nature Conservancy; Nebraska Land Trust; Needy Basket of Southern Miami County, Inc.; Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art; Nevada Land Trust; New Canaan Historical Society; New Covenant Christian Fellowship; New England Museum Association; New Hampshire Boat Museum; New Hampshire Charitable Foundation; New Hope Seventh Day Adventist Church; New Jersey Conservation Foundation; New Museum; New Path, Inc. aka New Path Outreach; New River Conservancy; New River Land Trust; New York Botanical Garden; New York Live Arts; NGO Foundation; Nisqually Land Trust; Nonprofit Association of Oregon.

Nonprofit Coordinating Committee of New York; Nonprofit Institute at College of Southern Maryland; Norman Rockwell Museum; North Carolina Museum of Art; North Carolina Symphony; North Creek Baptist Church; North Creek Baptist Church Food Pantry; North Group Consultants; North Olympic Land Trust; North Salem Open Land Foundation; North Shore Land Alliance; Northeast Iowa Food Bank; Northwest Montana Historical Society; Northwest Railway Museum; Norwich University; NPO Accounting Solutions; Nunda Historical Society; NY Textile Conservation, LLC; Oblong Land Conservancy; Ohio League of Conservation Voters; Okanogan County Community Action Council; Okanogan Land Trust; Oklahoma City Museum of Art; Old Pine Farm Natural Lands Trust; Old Stone Fort Museum.

One Powerful Movement Community Development Center; Onondaga Historical Association; Open Door Pantry; OPERA America; Orlando Museum of Art; Orlando Science Center; Ouabache Land Conservancy; The Our House Tavern; Ozark Regional Land Trust; Pacific Battleship Center; Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History; Pacific Science Center; Paducah Area Food Pantry; Paducah Symphony Orchestra; Pajarito Environmental Education Center; Palm Springs Art Museum; Parkdale Valley Land Trust; Parks & Trails New York; Passages Alternative Living Programs, Inc.; Pathways Food Pantry; Patsy's Place Transitional Home; Peabody Essex Museum; Pelican Coast Conservancy; Pennsbury Land Trust; Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts; People Attempting To Help ''PATH''; People Helping People.

Peoria Riverfront Museum; Peralta Memorial United Methodist Church; Petersen Automotive Museum Foundation; Philabundance; The Phillips Collection; Phoenix Art Museum; PhotoArts Imaging Professionals, LLC; Pines and Prairies Land Trust; Pinnacle Community Church; The Pittsburgh Foundation; Places of New Beginnings; Plant City Photo Archives & History Center; Point Blue Conservation Science; Portland Art Museum (OR); Portland Museum of Art (ME); Pound Ridge Land Conservancy, Inc.; Prairie Public Broadcasting; Primary Care Development Corporation (PCDC); Project Restoration Outreach; Project Sister Family Services; Prospect House Museum; Puerto Seguro, Inc. (PSI) Safe Harbor; Pulitzer Arts Foundation; Ralphs Grocery Company; Redwood Empire Food Bank.

Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland, African American History and Culture; Regional Food Bank of Northeastern New York; Renaissance Charitable Foundation, Inc.; Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center; Rensselaer County Historical Society; Rescue Rehome Resource; Restoration Care Ministry; Restore & Enlightenment Ministries;

Riverside Baptist Church Crisis Closet; Rochester Area Community Foundation; Roger Williams Park Zoo; Rooted In; Roxbury Land Trust; Sacramento Mountains Senior Services, Inc.; Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust; The Salvation Army; San Angelo Museum of Fine Arts; San Antonio Food Bank; San Antonio Museum of Art; San Diego Natural History Museum; San Diego Youth Symphony and Conservatory; San Diego Zoo Global; San Francisco Heritage/Haas Lilienthal House; San Isabel Land Protection Trust; San Jacinto County Historical Commission; San Jose Museum of Art; San Jose Museum of Quilts & Textiles.

Santa Fe Texas Education Foundation; Save The Prairie Society; Scenic Hudson; Schingoethe Museum, Aurora University; Science Factory Children's Museum & Exploration Dome; Scleroderma Foundation; Sealy Christian Pantry; Seattle Art Museum; Second Harvest Food Bank Mahoning Valley; Second Harvest Food Bank of Central Florida; Second Harvest Food Bank of East Central Indiana; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northeast Tennessee; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northeast Tennessee; Second Harvest Food Bank of Northwest North Carolina; Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties; Second Harvest North Central Food Bank; Sedoan Historical Society; Senior Connections; Sequoia Riverlands Trust; Seventh-Day Adventist Church (Tulia, TX); Shared Harvest Foodbank; Sharlot Hall Museum; Shepherd Senior Citizens, Inc.; Sheridan Community Land Trust.

Shiloh Museum of Ozark History; Sierra Foothill Conservancy; Silver City Gospel Mission; Six Rivers Land Conservancy; Skagit Land Trust; Society for Experimental Graphic Design (SEGD); Society for Preservation of Long Island Antiquities; Society of St. Stephen Outreach Ministry (SOSS); Society of St. Vincent de Paul in Houston, TX; Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum; South Carolina Conservation Exchange; South Texas Food Bank; South Union Church of Christ Food Pantry; Southbury Land Trust; Southeast Area Ministries; Southeast Missouri Food Bank; Southeast Texas Arts Council; Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy; Southside Church of Christ Food Pantry; Spearman Ministerial Alliance; Spinal Cord Injury Network International; Springfield Museum of Art; Squam Lake Natural Science Center; St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary; St. Andrews United Methodist Church Food Pantry; St. Anne de Beaupre Food Pantry; St. Anthony's Bread Food Pantry; St. Augustine Lighthouse and Museum.

St. James Episcopal Church Food Pantry; St. John of the Cross Food Pantry; St. Joseph Museums, Inc.; St. Leo the Great St. Vincent de Paul; St. Louis Area Foodbank; St. Louis Art Museum; St. Mary's Food Bank Affiance; St. Mary's United Methodist Church (TX); St. Monica Food Pantry; St. Monica Knights of Peter Claver, Ladies Auxiliary, Court #151; St. Monica's Altar Society; St. Paul's Lutheran Food Pantry; St. Stephen Presbyterian Food Pantry; St. Stephen's of St. Andrews United Methodist Church (TX); St. Vincent de Paul in Los Lunas, NM; St. Vincent de Paul in Artesia, NM; St. Vincent de Paul Society (St. Philip Neri Catholic Church); Stax Museum of American Soul Music; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute; Stockton Symphony Association; Sts. Joachim and Ann Care Service.

Stuart Pimsler Dance & Theater; Studebaker National Museum; Sullivan Museum and History Center; Summit Land Conservancy; Tacoma Art Museum; Tall Timbers Research Station & Land Conservancy; Tampa Museum of Art; Telfair Museums; Temenos CDC/Bread of Life, Inc.; Temple University Anthropology Laboratory; Tennessee Parks and Greenways Foundation; Texas Land Conservancy; Texas Land Trust Council; Texas Quilt Museum; THE PROGRAM for Offenders, Inc.; Theatre Communications Group; Three Angels Seventh Day Adventist Church; Three Village Community Trust; The Time IN Children's Arts Initiative; Timken Museum of Art; Toledo Museum of Art; Toledo Northwestern Ohio Food Bank; Towne Learning Center; Travis Audubon; Tread of Pioneers Museum; The Treehouse Center, Inc.; Tri County Assembly Choice Food Pantry; Triangle Land Conservancy; Tri-county Meals.

Trinity Garden First Food Pantry; The Trust for Public Land; U.S. Military Combat Camera History & Stories Museum; U.S. Pain Foundation, Inc.; UJA-Federation of New York, Inc.; The Ukrainian Museum; Ukrainian National Women's League of America; Union Symphony Society, Inc.; United Assembly (Plainview, TX); United Food Bank; United Way Fox Cities; United Way of Buffalo and Erie County; United Way of Greater Cincinnati; United Way of Portage County; United Way Worldwide; University Christian Church; University of Michigan—Dearborn; University of Michigan Law School; Upper Savannah Land Trust; Upscale CDC; Upshur County Shares Food Pantry; Urban Gateways; Utah Food Bank.

Utah Museum of Fine Arts; Uvalde Baptist Church Food Pantry; Venice Community Housing Corporation; The Vermont River Conservancy; Vermont Symphony Orchestra; Vero Beach Museum of Art; Vesterheim Museum; Vietnamese American Community Center; Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; The Viscardi Center; Vision Weavers Consulting, LLC; VisionServe Alliance; Voices of Victory; Walker Art Center; Wallowa Land Trust; Wartburg Community Symphony; Washington Association of Land Trusts; Washington Nonprofits; Washington State Historical Society; Washington Street Family Service Center; Way Food Pantry; Wee Care Child Center, Inc.; Wellsprings Village, Inc.; West Central Ohio Land Conservancy; West Side Baptist Early Education Center; West Wisconsin Land Trust; Western New York Land Conservancy; Western Reserve Land Conservancy; Western Rhode Island Civic Historical Society; Westmoreland County Agricultural Land Preservation.

Westmoreland Museum of American Art; Westport Arts Center; Whidbey Camano Land Trust; White Deer-Skellytown Lighthouse Food Pantry; Whitney Museum of American Art; Wilbarger Creek Conservation Alliance; The Wilderness Society; Wildling Museum; Wildwood United Methodist Church; Williams Temple Church of God In Christ; Wilmette Historical Museum; Wings for L.I.F.E. (Life skills Imparted to Families through Education); Winston-Salem Symphony; Wisconsin Youth Symphony Orchestras; Wood County Senior Citizens Association; Woods and Waters Land Trust; Wyoming Symphony Orchestra; Yellowstone Art Museum; YMCA of the USA; York County Heritage Trust; Zimmerli Art Museum.

Mr. CAMP. The goodwill of the American people is unmatched, and we should do everything we can to encourage Americans to do more, enabling charities, nonprofits, foundations, and schools across the country to expand their reach and serve those most in need.

A ''yes'' vote on this bill is a vote for hardworking Americans who selflessly lend a hand every day to their neighbors, communities, and others in need.

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

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

I want to be clear what this debate is about and what it is not about. It is not a debate about the merits of public charities and private foundations.

All of us support the good works of the charitable community and strive to provide charities and foundations with the resources they need to carry out their mission. Indeed, along with Congressman GERLACH, I am the lead sponsor of the food donation deduction.

I think that highlights that this is a debate not about charities, not about foundations. It is about fiscal responsibility and fiscal priorities.

Today, Republicans have selected to make permanent 10 of the approximately 60 expired tax provisions without a single dime of offset—not a single dime. After today, if this bill passes, the House will have approved $534 billion worth of tax provisions without a single offset, wiping out more than half of the total deficit reduction enacted last year during the bipartisan fiscal deal.

Indeed, this bill is totally inconsistent with the Republican tax reform draft they unveiled in February. And, I might add, if you add up the 14 bills that came out of the Ways and Means Committee, entirely unoffset, it is $825 billion.

I was reading, this morning, the debate which I heard yesterday on a motion to recommit. I was reading this language from Mr. CRENSHAW in opposition to the motion to recommit.

□ 1100

This is what he said about how Republicans proceed with budget issues:

> We do it just like every American business does, like every American family. They sit down. They take the money that they have, and they set priorities. Then they make some tough choices. That is what we have done.

There is not a single tough choice in what the Republicans are doing. It is, essentially, throwing discretion and tough choices to the wind.

Also let me say that their approach is inconsistent with their own tax reform draft of some months ago. The enhanced deduction for food contributions that the chairman has spoken so eloquently about was expressly repealed in the Republican reform draft, and the rollover provision was allowed to expire. So you have irresponsibility, you have inconsistency, and you also have a violation of priorities, because left to an uncertain fate are important provisions, like the Work Opportunity

Tax Credit, the New Markets Tax Credit, and the renewable energy credits, as well as the long-term status of expansions to the EITC and the Child Tax Credit.

This is the Statement of Administration Policy just issued:

The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges.

The President's budget includes a number of these proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals. However, the administration strongly opposes the House passage of H.R. 4719, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations and add another two similar provisions without offsetting the cost. If this same unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add $500 billion or more to deficits over the next 10 years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013.

Just 2 months ago, House Republicans, themselves, passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures. As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue and create tax breaks that primarily benefit higher income individuals while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and non-defense priorities such as research and development in the bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

House Republicans are also making clear their priorities by rushing to make these tax cuts permanent without offsets, even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the EITC, to the Child Tax Credit, and to education tax credits expire.

The administration wants to work with Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's social sector. However, H.R. 4719 represents the wrong approach. If the President were presented with H.R. 4719, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

So what in the world are we doing here today? What in the world are we doing? We are passing another bill that deepens the deficit, that is contrary to the rhetoric of the Republicans and is going nowhere in the Senate—zero. It is hard to figure this out, Mr. Speaker. What is motivating Republicans to be so totally inconsistent and irresponsible?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

I want to start my comments today by focusing on the merits of this proposal and then by offering some comments in response to my good friend from Michigan in regards to the budgetary concerns that he articulated in his opening remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a commonsense bill that is the right thing to do for America. It is the right policy because what we are doing with the America Gives More Act of 2014 is putting in our tax policy provisions on a permanent basis that are going to provide for enhanced charitable giving in America. That is the right thing to do. We care about Americans, especially fellow American citizens. In times when they need it the most, we are going to stand with them. Our tax policy under this provision would be made permanent to encourage fellow Americans to help Americans. To me, it makes sense. It is a fundamental question of fairness, and it is a fundamental question of: Do we care about our fellow citizens in their time of need?

I have one piece of legislation in this underlying bill in particular that I wanted to articulate, and I want to thank my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee who are going to speak after me in regards to their individual pieces of legislation that make up this America Gives More Act of 2014. That provision that I am going to talk about is the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act.

Essentially, all we are doing under the Tax Code is recognizing that we are going to treat all businesses, all people the same across America when it comes to their excess food inventories—be it in their restaurants, expanded to farms—so that our farmers can be in a position to give that food that otherwise would go into a landfill to the people who need it most: fellow hungry Americans.

To me, that makes sense, and that is where we have supported this legislation. It has come out of the committee, and it has gotten bipartisan support. Groups across the country took out an ad in our local paper here today, and they support this effort to not have food go to a landfill but to go onto the tables, onto the plates of fellow Americans who need it most. That is why this legislation is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague talk about the concern about the deficit. I share that concern, but the question that has to be answered is: Why have these extenders historically been renewed on a temporary basis without an offset? It is because it is the policy of the Tax Code that we are trying to make permanent here. Prior Members of Congress—and the President, himself, when he was in the Senate—supported the extension of these extenders without an offset because it was good policy. It is the right thing to do, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. REED, do I care? It is my bill, with Mr. GERLACH, that you have taken and put your name on—my bill. To make it permanent without any offset, with over $500 billion already done, is the wrong way to do the right thing. I care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another member of the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the tax provisions that are being considered today include the much-needed Conservation Easement Incentive Act, a bill I introduced with my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH). As a matter of fact, I have worked on this issue ever since I have been here. The last time that we introduced the bill, it was Mr. CAMP and I who carried the bill.

It is important, and since its first passage in '06, farmers, ranchers, hunters, and conservation groups alike have waited a long time for the security provided in this measure. It needs to be extended, and it needs to be made permanent. Conservation easements help protect valuable natural resources and scenic open spaces by allowing private landowners to permanently retire the development rights on their land. This bill keeps farmers and ranchers on the farms and on the ranches.

This provision is more than just about landowners, however. More than 70 percent of our wildlife gets food and shelter from our privately owned working farms, ranches, and forest lands, but we are losing these habitats to development at an alarming rate of about 5,000 acres per day. As an outdoors person—a hunter, a fisher—I am well aware of the importance of having places to hunt and fish and of the importance of that to our communities. I also know that many outdoor recreational activities depend on maintaining viable fish and wildlife habitats.

It is also important for clean habitats. Our urban areas benefit from this—watersheds, for instance, right outside of New York. If it weren't for this type of measure, we wouldn't have clean watersheds. New York City and the surrounding areas wouldn't have water. This incentive helps maintain healthy wildlife populations, hunter access, and healthy communities. It is not just land trust and government agencies that depend upon this. All types of charitable groups—Ducks Unlimited, Mule Deer Foundation, Pheasants Forever—depend on this type of legislation.

As much as I support this measure—as I said, it is my bill—as much as it is important to the country, the fact remains that it is not paid for. This is an incredibly popular bill. There has never been a time that we have introduced it when it hasn't had over 200 coauthors. As we know, during these divisive political times, it is hard to get 200 of us on this floor to agree on what time it is. This bill has over 225 coauthors this year, but, again, it is not paid for. The fact of the matter is that this, in combination with the other fiscally irresponsible measures that the committee has marked up, realizes an $825 billion shortage. It is not paid for.

I support the measure, but I don't support it in the fashion that it has been drafted. We need to pay for it, and we need to pass it. We need to do it right.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the chairman for his recognition and for his strong leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this legislation and specifically to highlight section 4 of the bill, which would make permanent the hugely successful conservation easement tax incentive.

When the time comes for families across our great country to decide the future of land that has been farmed for generations or is blessed with abundant natural resources, the choices should not be limited to simply selling that land or struggling to pay bigger tax bills to hold onto what are likely their most valuable family assets. The extremely difficult decisions families make about their farms and their property ultimately affect not only their lives but also the quality of life for their neighbors and the character of their communities. Conservation easements provide property owners with another choice when looking for an alternative to selling their land.

Before expiring at the end of 2013, modest-income property owners, family farmers, and other landowners utilized this Tax Code incentive to voluntarily protect millions of acres of land across the country. I have been fortunate to meet many of the families in my district who have been able to preserve their property thanks to the conservation easement deduction.

They are folks like Don Hawthorne, who in 2006 donated a conservation easement on 28 acres of his land to the Montgomery County Lands Trust in order to preserve an active Christmas tree farm, a fruit orchard, and a blueberry patch prized by the local community.

□ 1115

He expressed his support for making permanent the Federal Conservation Easement Tax Incentive this way:

> Knowing that farming will likely continue on this land long after I am gone gives me peace of mind. It really would be wonderful if the Federal tax incentive would be made permanent so other farmers who choose to preserve their land can benefit.

The Great Marsh area of Chester County has been part of Jim Moore's family for many generations. It is the most biologically diverse wetland in southeastern Pennsylvania and home to 155 species of birds, 200 species of flowering plants, and perhaps, most significantly, the headwaters for Marsh Creek, which is the primary source of drinking water for Wilmington, Delaware.

Mr. Moore explained why conservation easements are important:

> Open space is really about the next generation. We preserved this land because we love it and want to share it . . . and the tax benefits from easement donations make it more feasible to do that.

This legislation before us includes language identical to a bill that I have been working on with my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON of California, to pass for a few sessions now.

Last session, our bill had over 300 cosponsors, and now has over 200 cosponsors here in the House this session, and for anybody to see that kind of consensus here in Washington, D.C., is noteworthy indeed.

I believe the conservation easement incentive enjoys broad bipartisan support in Washington because it works in our communities. Therefore, that is why I am urging our colleagues to support this important legislation today to provide property owners with the freedom, the opportunity, and the certainty they deserve when making critical choices about the future of their land.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to approving this permanent Republican tax break for Twinkies. That is exactly what this bill does. I think we should encourage charity, but also fiscal responsibility and accountability. This bill fails on both the latter two points.

A while back, there was a Texas official who often derided the war on poverty and Social Services in general by declaring: America is the only country in the world where most of the poor people are fat.

Well, in more recent years, we have come to understand that the challenges of obesity and poverty are different faces of the same problem, that diabetes and hunger sometimes go hand in hand. Disadvantaged neighbors, who too often lack enough to eat, too often make up for it with high, sugary, fatty foods that provide temporary relief from hunger, while making them more prone to disease.

According to the American Heart Association, 1 in 3 American children are obese or overweight. That is nearly triple the rate of 50 years ago, and 1 in 3 children will contract what was once called adult-onset type 2 diabetes.

Now, we can address these challenges through direct government expenditures like WIC, the Women, Infant and Children nutrition program, and we can address the challenges with tax expenditures like the one that is proposed here today.

I happen to believe that we need both of them, that we should be encouraging food banks and the businesses that donate to them—who do some excellent, some valuable work, we ought to encourage them to expand the work that they do. But when we tell a taxpayer that they don't have to pay the same taxes as their competitor if they donate for a good cause, we ought to be sure that that cause is good.

Just as we scrutinize the WIC program and other food security programs to ensure no misuse, no ineligibility—we want to see that every one of those dollars spent is spent efficiently—we need to do some of the same with reference to tax expenditures like that is proposed for permanent extension here.

We need accountability, and you lose that when this and the other provisions are extended forever and never carefully evaluated.

Now, the expenditure that is provided here for food donations is one that the law says is available for any food that is ''apparently wholesome food.'' The only problem is that apparently wholesome food includes much food that is not actually wholesome.

For example, some potato chips that have long since had their expiration date, they qualify. A can that fell off and was run over by the forklift and is very damaged, it qualifies.

Most particularly, if you have candy at Halloween and you overstocked and you have a significant amount of candy left—or for the Easter Bunny or at Christmas—the shelves at some food pantries overflow with these products.

Why is that? Because the business that donates the Twinkies or the stale potato chips is entitled to deduct not the cost of what they cost that business, but twice the cost of what it cost that business, and this bill makes that permanent.

Why should we at a time of great fiscal concern be paying twice the cost of stale potato chips and Twinkies and sugary nonwholesome and nonnutritious foods—why should we be paying for that?

It is a tax break that goes too far, that requires more careful evaluation. Indeed, one 2011 NPR report that was

entitled ''Overburdened Food Banks Can't Say No to Junk'' because some of the same retailers that they rely on and count on for wholesome food dump the Halloween candy, dump the Easter eggs there, and they are available and treated just the way that wholesome food is treated.

I say, Mr. Speaker, let's encourage donating the good stuff, but let's not pay for the junk. We have the power to correct that problem by, instead of having a flawed permanent bill, having one that is available for evaluation on a more regular basis, just as we do with reference to these other provisions.

The cost of this bill is part of the overall cost and strategy to wreck our budget and reduce hunger programs in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. The same Republicans that are advancing this include a group that have characterized as welfare Pell grants, school breakfast programs, senior nursing care programs. They want to lump all that as welfare, and they say we just can't afford that.

I don't believe that we can't afford to target public resources where they are needed, whether they are tax expenditures or direct expenditures, but we don't need a permanent tax break for Twinkies and stale potato chips.

Let's take the fiscally responsible, accountable approach, not the irresponsible approach that is being advanced today, and reject this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for introducing this important piece of legislation that is being supported by the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association, the Salvation Army, United Way Worldwide. All want to see the IRA charitable rollover which is contained in this bill made permanent.

The IRA charitable contribution incentive was established as a temporary provision of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, but the past 8 years, we have extended provision with strong bipartisan support.

Why? Because Republicans and Democrats have known that our Nation's charities comprise the most effective army of mercy and often are on the front lines of meeting the needs of our friends and neighbors when disaster strikes.

The war against poverty, homelessness, illness, and illiteracy is fought by our churches, private foundations, and the public charities in communities throughout the United States and around the world.

I have been working closely with one such organization, the Global Poverty Project, with my good friend, Hugh Evans, who has implemented a vision to eradicate extreme poverty, increase economic opportunity for women and children, and bring the developing world clean water, modern sanitation, and the health care they need.

It is organizations like this and the many public charities in my district—like the Boys and Girls Club of Bloomington-Normal, Peoria's Hult Center for Healthy Living, and the Community Foundation of Central Illinois—all of which stand to benefit from making this provision permanent.

In the first 2 years Congress made the option available, more than $140 million was donated to public charities in the United States. Since that time, hundreds of millions more have been committed.

In Illinois, one single charity, the Jewish Federation of Chicago, has raised more than $11 million just from 1,000 IRA contributions since 2006.

Every dollar that is voluntarily contributed on charitable work means one less dollar that U.S. taxpayers are forced to spend to meet the same basic human needs here in our communities.

Last year, charitable giving in the United States grew by 4.9 percent, topping $316 billion. Globally, the United States gives more to charitable causes than any other countries, according to the World Giving Index of 2013.

This provision helps accomplish that, and that is why it should be made permanent. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is sort of an Alice in Wonderland experience here. We deal on an ongoing basis with provisions in the Tax Code. We have routinely extended some, as has been referenced; but what we have attempted to do historically is work together to be able to weigh, to balance—in many cases, pay for—for a duration that is not going to have the fiscal discipline evaporate.

We need to be able to manage these provisions because they actually cost the Treasury money, and some are more valuable than others. There are tradeoffs.

My friend, the chairman, worked for years producing a deficit-neutral tax reform, which had much to commend it, and I commend him for his hard work. All of these elements were addressed in his tax reform, but they were dealt with differently. Not all were extended permanently. In some cases, they were modified, some were repealed, some were made permanent—as part of a deliberative process to evaluate the impact and to not break the bank.

He did it right. I appreciate it. I am sorry that it has not been introduced, and it was dismissed by the Speaker. I think that was a mistake.

Today, we are continuing an effort to abandon any semblance that this Congress is going to work on major accomplishments before we adjourn.

This week, we passed legislation that, if it were enacted, would kick into the next Congress our transportation bill, handing off that responsibility at least to the next Congress, probably the Congress after that.

We have found that they are giving up on deficit reduction, with budget-busting proposals roaring through here with no semblance of honoring their own budget rules under their budget resolution.

They have given up on tax reform because we are not going to be able to have meaningful tax reform if we are just willy-nilly going to rush all these provisions through, an avalanche of spending.

It takes away the tools that are necessary to make the changes we all know are necessary with the Tax Code and for what my friend, the chairman, worked on so hard.

Last, but not least, they have given up on the previous tradition of bipartisan cooperation. Republicans have forced responsible Members to oppose what they passionately support. Well, luckily, this bill will not be enacted. We will be able to work with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This bill is not going to be enacted into law, and we will be able to pick up where it left off and, frankly, where Mr. CAMP left off, as we work with our friends in the other body.

My friend and fellow Oregonian, Senator WYDEN, the Chair, has already advanced some proposals we will be able to work with. It is a little more even-handed, and that is how ultimately we are going to go, but I am sorry for what this represents in terms of this Congress giving up.

I think we can do better. I hope people will vote against this, and we will commit to move forward on the things that we are all committed to in a way that is fiscally responsible, is bipartisan and thoughtful, working with the interest groups that deserve us to work together to get the outcomes we all want for them.

□ 1130

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the legislation, H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act. This is important legislation that is actually

going to increase charitable giving for the benefit of individuals in need across the country while also assisting those vital charities and foundations that serve them in all of our Nation's communities.

These are bipartisan proposals, Mr. Speaker, and the bill will make many of these provisions permanent. It will improve a variety of tax rules governing charitable donations and charitable organizations, encouraging America's taxpayers to give even more generously and enabling charities to serve those in need even more effectively.

I would also like to address a provision specifically, Mr. Speaker, that I authored that reduces and simplifies the provision, the excise tax on private foundation investment income.

Now, private foundations make a world of difference in our communities. I look at Minnesota, my home State. We have 1,400 different foundations. In 2011, about $1 billion is what they annually would donate to those in need. Nationwide, we have got 81,000 foundations that donated almost $50 billion in 2011.

These are impressive numbers, impressive figures, but as impressive as those figures and statistics are, the reality is they could easily be higher. Unfortunately, the Tax Code is actually discouraging large and increasingly larger donations given by private foundations.

Today these institutions, these foundations face a very complicated two-tiered system of taxation, and there are actually perverse incentives built into the Tax Code for a foundation not to make a donation, not to give a contribution in times when those needs might be greatest, such as after a natural disaster.

This legislation eliminates that disincentive so we can make large donations in times of need and replaces the two-tiered system with a simple, flat 1 percent excise tax on all foundation investment income.

It also simplifies the tax planning process. Especially for smaller foundations, this is important so that they can spend their valuable resources not on expensive accounts, not on expensive or high-priced lawyers but, instead, providing grants to grantees. We need to ensure that charitable decisions are based on the needs of our communities, not based on the Tax Code.

This legislation is strongly supported by the Council on Foundations.

The bottom line here, Mr. Speaker and Members, is that every dollar that these organizations are either paying in taxes or they are giving to accountants or attorneys is one less dollar going to those in need. This bill makes compliance easier and ensures that more resources are available.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for his leadership. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I cannot support $825 billion in unpaid for, permanent, and piecemeal tax cuts while other critical investments that help our most vulnerable citizens, like the long-term unemployed and working poor, go unmet.

I strongly support extending the IRA charitable rollover, tax incentives for property owners who protect natural resources through conservation easements, tax incentives for charitable contributions of food inventory, and improving the private foundation excise tax to allow a better response to communities during economic troubles and natural disasters, a bill which I introduced.

However, I oppose adding almost $1 trillion to the deficit that will imperil our economic recovery and the well-being of our citizens. I oppose leaving behind other critical tax provisions that help the working poor, strengthen economically distressed communities, promote affordable housing, help cover transportation costs, incentivize businesses to hire hard-to-employ workers, and assist teachers with classroom expenses.

Many of these bills provide examples of smart Federal investment. For example, in the first 2 years the IRA charitable rollover was available, more than $140 million was donated to support charities, with the median gift just under $4,500.

I strongly support giving food to the hungry and helping the needy. However, I cannot vote in favor of this package of bills because of their fiscal impact and the lack of fiscal responsibility to balanced policy.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, for bringing this important set of charitable bills, the America Gives More Act, H.R. 4719, to the floor for a vote.

H.R. 3134, the Charitable Giving Extension Act, is a bill I introduced that would make a small change in the Tax Code but make a huge change in the lives of every American. This legislation would extend the yearly deadline for making charitable giving deductions from December 31 to April 15 of the following year so that all Americans can have an extra 3½ months to give to charity and include those donations in that year's tax returns. No longer would Americans be forced to complete their charitable giving by New Year's Eve.

Let me tell you, this is something that goes far deeper than that, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) referenced it. According to the World Giving Index, America is the most big-hearted nation in the world—in the world. All this is is an affirmation of who we are as Americans. Believe me, my friends, this charitable virtue that we have is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. This is who we basically are as Americans.

We look at what happens. I want to you think about any time there is any kind of a crisis or tragedy in the world. Who is the first responder? America, always America. It is just who we are. It is the very fabric of this Nation and what has been given to us.

We have been so blessed by God. And then the question becomes: Well, I would like to give a little bit more, but I didn't know by the end of the year that I was going to have that little bit extra to work with.

I am talking about guys and gals who get up every morning, the alarm goes off, they throw their feet out over the bed, and they want to do it for one reason: to put a roof over their family, food on their table, clothes on their backs, and prepare for their future.

Then they say at the end of that day: I have a little bit left over. I want to be able to give that to a charitable organization.

Is there anyplace else in the world where we see that happen, and happen on a regular basis, day in and day out?

Now this is not just thumping, ''I am proud of America.'' This is a humble pride that says, I thank our Lord and God for putting us in the position where we can actually share that which we have.

''From everyone who has been given much, much will be required.'' I understand that, but please don't turn this into a political argument when it comes to good policy. You know in the depths of your hearts where the American people are. You know what they have done year after year, in good times and in bad times. And we turn this into political theater when we talk about policy that is good, not just for every single American, but for every person they help.

Now, please, on the floor that sometimes seems so divided and wants to pick sides on who is doing the best job, I came here for one reason, and that was to serve the people from Pennsylvania's Third District who sent me here—both Republicans and Democrats, some that vote and some that don't vote—and to serve the needs of the American people.

Have we gone so far from those goals that we decide to make everything political? It is not just enough to agree with every single thing that comes forward, but then we use the hypocrisy,

''But wait a minute. This is not paid for,'' and the idea to pay for it is taxing people more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would hate to be in the position where I tell every American: You know what? We know how to spend the money better than you. We will make the decisions of how it gets doled out. In your heart of hearts, when you want to give to a charitable organization, forget it. We will make that decision. Send the money to Washington, because we have done such a wonderful job with it.

No, my friends, that is not America. That is not who we are. That is not who we will ever be. That is not the fabric of this great Nation.

So I ask you to look past your political ambitions and beating each other up, and look at what is good policy for every single American. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how much time remains on each side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Over the last few weeks, the Ways and Means Committee has been bringing bill after bill to the House floor to make permanent changes to the Tax Code, but in a lot of the policy behind it, there is very little dispute and debate. It is the fact that they are bringing these bills to the floor without any pay-fors, without any offsets, and instead they are leaving this legacy of debt for future generations to have to contend with, or they increase our borrowing costs with China at a time when most of the discussion about this place has been about fiscal responsibility. It certainly must be an election year, because any limit to fiscal responsibility is out the door.

Here again today, we have got five bills that would make five permanent changes to the Tax Code, none of which is offset. One would extend the charitable deduction for firms that donate food from their inventories.

One would permanently extend the charitable deduction for donations of qualified conservation easements, a bill I have been particularly working hard to find a permanent fix in the Tax Code, having seen the good work that our land trusts in the Mississippi Valley Conservancy back home have been doing with those tax incentives in the Code.

Another bill would extend the tax-free exclusion from income of charitable contributions from the individual retirement accounts, the so-called IRA rollover charitable contribution, something that the chairman of the committee himself actually eliminated in his comprehensive tax reform discussion draft that was introduced earlier this year.

The Joint Committee on Taxation says you add all these five bills up, it is at a cost of over $16 billion. And again, not a nickel in it. There is no offset to pay for any of this.

At a time when long-term unemployment benefits have expired in the early part of this year, the cost of this bill here today alone would cover 35 times the cost of those emergency unemployment benefits for the duration of this year—35 times.

We are doing nothing to permanently change the so-called SGR, or the doc fix. We have sequestration hanging over our heads that is about to do more damage to our military and to the Federal budget, and no work is being done on that front.

Last week, we passed legislation, scratching and clawing, trying to find a little over $10 billion in offsets for a temporary extension of the infrastructure investment we have to be making in this country to keep the highway trust fund funded, and yet here we are with another five bills that will cost us $16 billion. Apparently, some in this place don't even blink about spending that type of money. That is where we have got a problem—philosophically, I am afraid—as far as our approach to this.

There are better ways of doing this. I think one of the ways that could help jump-start this economy is working hard, making tough decisions, and moving forward on comprehensive tax reform to make our Code more competitive globally. And now we have got an emergency situation of more companies here in the United States trying to find some small entity overseas where they are foreign shopping for a low-tax jurisdiction to avoid taxation here in the United States, and this place is doing nothing about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KIND. I would submit that between these five bills, the nine bills that have already come out of committee at a total cost of close to $900 billion, if we move forward down that track, there is no way, no ability for us to come back and address comprehensive tax reform in a fiscally responsible manner.

I, again, commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, for the courage he has demonstrated by offering that discussion draft, but in doing so, he had to make some tough decisions on what expenditures, what loopholes we would have to go without in order to pay for a lowering of rates.

If we give the store away today and with the previous bills that were passed and what might be coming up tomorrow, there will be no ability for us to be able to seriously work on the comprehensive tax reform that our country desperately needs in order to put us in a more competitive position in this 21st century global economy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, for his work on this important legislation.

H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, is a package of bipartisan bills to improve or make permanent several tax rules governing charitable donations. Especially, I would like to speak to a provision in the bill concerning Alaska Native Corporations.

Alaska Native Corporations generally pay Federal corporate tax at the highest marginal rate but are not able to take advantage of many of the corporate tax credits like the other corporations.

□ 1145

Under the current Tax Code, the Federal Government provides favorable tax treatment for conservation easements donated by certain corporations owned by farmers and ranchers. Considering that in Alaska, Native corporation lands have high conservation value and lack access to many other corporate tax credits, it makes sense to extend these favorable tax benefits to Alaska Native corporations.

I must make it clear this provision does not mandate the creation of conservation easement, but allows Alaska Native landholders to determine themselves which lands will be best suited. I strongly support this provision and underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting. We talk about our good chairman's proposal for tax reform. If I remember correctly, that side of the aisle criticized that tax reform badly, and did not do it when they were in the majority. They passed ObamaCare, they passed cap-and-trade, they passed the stimulus package, and they passed Dodd-Frank. They didn't address this issue of being fiscally responsible. That amazes me.

Now I hear from that side ''be fiscally responsible.'' Well, what we are trying to do here is give an extension for those who want to give instead of going through this Congress. Let's let the private individual be the one that is able to help his neighbor, not through a bureaucracy. I mean, it is

amazing to me how this changes, how somebody on that side can say, well, we need reform, we need reform, and it was criticized by that side of the aisle.

I want to compliment the chair again for his hard work, and especially my provision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder where the gentleman from Alaska was. I mean PAYGO existed under Democrats. We tried to pay for things, and we did not dismiss out of hand the tax proposal.

The ones who are throwing it to the winds are Republicans. It is the Republicans. You are throwing fiscal responsibility to the winds. You are throwing any kind of prioritization to the winds. You are coming here and just saying, do anything and pay nothing.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is there now on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining. The other gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded again to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the America Gives More Act because it encourages charitable giving. This bill includes the Conservation Easement Incentive Act, which is very important to the people of Montana.

Rising property values and estate taxes make passing down working lands to future generations very, very difficult. In fact, in 2010, the Leep family, a family that has farmed in the Gallatin Valley, my home county, since 1926, faced the challenge of transferring a family farm to the next generation. Because of this incentive, the Leeps were able to donate land to the Gallatin Valley Land Trust, an organization that works on conserving working lands and other areas valued for wildlife habitat and for outdoor recreation, and kept the land in production and in the family's ownership.

The America Gives More Act makes this provision permanent and gives landowners the assurances they need to make long-term estate planning decisions. It is a commonsense, smart tax policy that makes a real difference in the lives of Montanans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this measure.

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

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, Mr. CAMP, for his leadership on this issue. And I also want to thank and recognize Representative GERLACH of Pennsylvania. Over several terms here during his time in the United States Congress, he has been a constant advocate for so many important issues, including the conservation easement tax program which has helped a lot of people. And while this is another extension, what we really need is that it be made permanent in tax law.

Even with the temporary extension, so much good has been done. I remember coming here in 1999, while serving as a local elected official, a Bucks County commissioner. I was asked to testify before the United States Senate on this topic on the Federal Government helping to preserve land throughout our great Nation. And in those 15 years since, in my community of Bucks County, we have preserved over 10,000 acres of farmland, parkland, and critical natural areas.

It is important for so many different reasons, not just for good land use, planning, and quality of life, but also creating food security for our Nation. It reduces the cost of providing local government services.

So much good has come of the conservation easement program and this incentive act, which is part of the greater America Gives More Act we are debating today. It is not only good tax policy, but it is good environmental policy. These are issues that can bring us together as Democrats and Republicans in this House.

So by permanently removing the uncertainty for those communities who would set aside land for conservation easements, we are going to help ensure that we can pass on open spaces and wild places to future generations of Americans yet to be born.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this legislation will pass the House today, it will proceed swiftly through the United States Senate, and we can come together around an American ethic of preserving and conserving our open spaces and get this bill to the President's desk.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Conservation Easement Incentive Act as well. Conservation easements are a cost-effective way of protecting valuable open space and farm and ranch land in the West, including in my home State of Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, easement conservation is an alternative to government landownership and allows our local land stewards to continue the best management practices on private land.

The expiration of enhanced tax incentives for landowners discourages modest-income and working ranchers and farmers from participating in a program to permanently protect their land resources and their way of life. While these enhanced tax deductions have been extended multiple times, their on-again, off-again eligibility makes business and tax planning difficult for donors, especially since they are often delayed by the Federal Government's timeline.

Mr. Speaker, conservation easements leverage ranchers' and farmers' love of their land and allows them to maintain operations that are beneficial not only for agriculture, but for habitat, recreation, and our landscapes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the Ways and Means Committee chairman, for this time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3 minutes remaining. The other gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to rise today for this whole package but in particular H.R. 2807, which permanently extends conservation easement tax incentives. This worthy provision incentivizes property donations to groups who maintain the property for conservation purposes, encouraging good stewardship of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the area in Illinois that you and I represent, suburban Chicago and areas outlying, are incredibly significant. There are beautiful places in the five counties that I represent and the many counties that you represent, Mr. Speaker, and this is an opportunity for the Tax Code to work in favor of land preservation and open space and to do it in a way that is thoughtful, to do it in a way that is inclusive, and to do it in a way that ultimately saves and preserves these precious natural resources and uses them not just for our generation but for the generations to come.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a severe case of losing the forest for the trees. This is not about the benefits of charity. This is not about the benefits of foundations. It is not about the benefit of conservation easements. This is a dramatic challenge to Republicans in terms of fiscal responsibility and fiscal priorities.

They passed a budget that cuts severely into needed programs, and then they come here and say, let's pass provisions that would add up to close to $1 trillion and not pay one dime.

I don't think anything can be more fiscally irresponsible and hurt the priorities of this country. Maybe they do this because they know it is a dead end in the Senate. So they think somehow they can use this to their political advantage. But it is reckless, and it is to the harm of the Nation, and I think the process is on a bipartisan basis of this institution.

I urge everybody to vote ''no''. There is so much a better path than this reckless one.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the provisions we are talking about today, the policies, whether it is donations to food inventory or IRA contributions, excess dollars from an IRA, or whether it is a conservation easement, these are all items that have been extended unpaid for, if you will, time and time again.

We have heard a lot about the cost from the other side. But if charities, religious groups, foundations, food banks, if we can make these permanent—because, right now, these three are expired. They can't be used. But if we can make these permanent, we will see an increase in charitable giving—850 organizations have written us and said that would happen, all of them who serve the poor, who serve the needy, who serve Americans in trouble.

Also, it doesn't go through the government. What these charities do, what these religious groups do, and what these foundations do is beyond the power of government to give. Let's make these permanent. Let's extends these provisions. Let's increase charitable giving in the United States, and let's help people help themselves.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 4719, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2014.

The legislation before us today is another in a long line of picking and choosing which tax extenders to make permanent. Instead of looking at all of the tax extenders comprehensively we are again picking the extenders that many Members may find easy to approve, and making them permanent. I find it ironic that Representative CAMP has continued to bring permanent extenders to the floor, some of which he chose not to extend at all when he released his plan for comprehensive tax reform earlier this year.

But that aside, what is truly at issue here is again the unwillingness to find a way to pay for these tax expenditures. This package of five bills would increase the deficit by $16.2 billion over 10 years. With the passage of this package today the House will have approved $534.4 billion in tax breaks over ten years. This is more than the entire non-defense discretionary budget for all of this year. Republicans say that we do not have enough money to pay for an extension of unemployment insurance or to feed the most vulnerable in our society, yet here we are spending money they have said over and over that we do not have.

I support some of the individual extensions in this bill such as the Conservation Easement Incentive Act which allows for family farmers, ranchers and forest land owners to receive a tax break for setting aside areas of their land for conservation purposes, which is a noble and well intentioned goal.

However, I cannot support this legislation without considering the cost. We cannot continue to blindly pass permanent tax breaks, even if the outcome of such breaks would benefit charitable organizations.

I have seen firsthand what happens when we take that approach. We did that under President Bush and went from budget surpluses to budget deficits. Deficits that have pushed Congress to reduce investment in our country in recent years.

I look forward to Congress addressing the tax extenders that require action by the end of the year in a serious way, not the way in which they have been brought before us thus far.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4719.

The bill before us today includes policies that enjoy broad bipartisan support, and have been passed by this body before with Members from both sides speaking out in favor. Unfortunately, the manner in which they are being presented to us today leads me to oppose this bill.

As we debate this legislation, many of our constituents cannot climb out of long-term unemployment. Our inaction on extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) program means they will not have access to benefits that support their efforts to search for a new job. The Senate has passed legislation to extend the EUC program, but in the House we have been told that the cost of the legislation must be offset. Today, however, we are being asked to support a bill that will add $16.2 billion to the federal deficit over the next ten years that is not offset. This is a double standard that is unfair to our constituents and does a disservice to the policies we are considering extending here today.

In January 2013, I voted to support a legislative package that extended these three expired provisions: the conservation tax incentive, the IRA contribution provision, and the food inventory donation incentive. The American Taxpayer Relief Act extended these provisions for two years, as did the motion to recommit this bill, which was offered by our colleague from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I was glad to support these provisions in 2013, and in the motion to recommit this bill, because policies to promote charitable giving can help bolster the social safety net that has remained stretched by the lingering effects of the recession. But to attempt to reinforce the safety net in this one area by undermining it in another and refusing to extend EUC is a choice that I am not willing to make.

I look forward to considering these provisions under different circumstances, and for standing up for the importance of charitable giving. This is, unfortunately, not a bill that I can support, and I urge my colleagues to oppose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 670, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4719 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, strike lines 7 through 9 and insert the following:

(a) TWO-YEAR EXTENSION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 1, starting at line 12, strike ''by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv)'' and insert ''by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively''.

Page 3, line 16, strike ''(v)'' and insert ''(vi)''.

Page 4, line 7, strike ''(vi)'' and insert ''(vii)''.

Page 5, strike lines 15 through 21 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 408(d)(8)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 6, strike lines 1 through 10 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS EXTENDED AND MODIFIED.

(a) EXTENSION.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Section 170(b)(1)(E)(vi) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(2) CORPORATIONS.—Section 170(b)(2)(B)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 7, after line 23 insert the following:

''(iv) TERMINATION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to any contribution made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.''.

Page 8, line 23, strike ''after the close of a taxable year'' and insert ''after the close of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015''.

Page 9, striking lines 16 through 22 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''(1 percent in the case of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015)'' after ''2 percent''.

(b) REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940(e) of such Code is

amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) COORDINATION WITH TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF RATE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any taxable year beginning in 2014 or 2015.''.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 8. TAX BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASE OF INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an inverted domestic corporation, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of, and amendment made by, this Act had never been enacted.

(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ''inverted domestic corporation'' means any foreign corporation—

(A) which, pursuant to a plan or a series of related transactions, completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

(B) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of which, after such acquisition, is held—

(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

(C) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group of which, after such acquisition, occurs (directly or indirectly) primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation for purposes of this paragraph if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ''substantial business activities'' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations under 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this subparagraph.

(3) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

(4) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ''foreign country'' and ''relevant foreign country'' as references to ''the United States''. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(5) EXPANDED AFFILIATED GROUP.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''expanded affiliated group'' has the meaning given such term in section 7874(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. CAMP. I object, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1200

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit does two things. First, it ensures that the charities we support, we support in a fiscally responsible manner by extending these incentives for 2 years, rather than permanently in order to, number one, give taxpayers clarity, but also to give this Congress time to work together on tax reform without piling up huge new deficits.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday in the Budget Committee, we had a hearing on the long-term deficits. Our Republican colleagues said they worry about the long-term deficit picture, and yet, in the last 6 weeks, they have added over $500 billion to the deficit, in violation of their own budget, including what we are doing today. So let's do this extension for 2 years and in a fiscally responsible manner.

The second thing this motion does is it denies the benefits of this legislation to any corporation that effectively renounces its U.S. citizenship and reincorporates overseas to avoid taxes. These so-called corporate inversions are generating outrage among families and small businesses around the country who can't simply tell the IRS they have moved their residence to some tax haven country because they don't want to pay their taxes.

In recent months, we have seen corporation after corporation jumping on this bandwagon. In fact, the financial press reports that Walgreens, the drugstore chain that has almost all of its stores right here in the United States, is thinking about moving to Switzerland.

Now here is the catch: Walgreens' management doesn't want to do it, but they are being driven by outside hedge fund stockholders to do this simply for tax purposes, so we have a situation where the management of an American company is being forced to decide between pressure from hedge funds to exploit a tax dodge and loyalty to the United States of America, the country where Walgreens was built into a company and where its customers are.

Just on Tuesday, Secretary Lew wrote to Congress expressing urgency to stop this fled of inversions now as we deal with broader tax reform. He called for a new sense of economic patriotism, and I couldn't agree with him more.

The ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN, and others have worked together to do this. We have got to get it done. The respected reporter, Alan Sloan, just wrote about this in Fortune magazine this month and said he was angry about this.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be angry. We should do something about it. We have already voted to say, on appropriations bills, that you shouldn't benefit from contracts if you are just going to move your residency overseas.

We should say the same thing with respect to tax benefits. You shouldn't get a tax benefit if you are renouncing

your U.S. citizenship and deserting U.S. taxpayers and the country for tax-avoidance schemes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

To listen to the histrionics from the other side here today, you would think that we could run the Pentagon through charitable giving. You would think that if there was just a deduction for charitable giving, we would have people volunteering to give their money to the Pentagon.

The reality is that, in this institution, we have had time for Benghazi. We have had time for the IRS, and guess what, next week and the week after, we are going to find time to sue the President of the United States, but we don't have time to address the American Tax Code where, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN has just described, 40 companies are lined up to leave.

Yesterday, the acting head of the VA said we are going to need $18 billion to straighten out the VA, based upon the men and women who have honorably served this Nation.

Mr. CAMP said yesterday, in an email to The Wall Street Journal:

Our Tax Code is dysfunctional.

Let me refer to what the gentleman from Alaska said just a few moments ago. He blamed Democrats in this Chamber for thwarting tax reform. I guess he didn't vote for the Speaker of the House because the Speaker of the House looked at the issue and said ''blah, blah, blah'' about tax reform—even as $20 billion, in terms of base erosion, is about to abandon the United States.

If you want to do something about charitable giving—and everybody in this institution honors Tocqueville's description of what is known as habits of the heart, we do it naturally. It is the third largest expenditure in the American Tax Code.

Nobody is talking about disarming charitable giving. What we are saying is that Mr. CAMP is correct in his email to The Wall Street Journal yesterday. The Tax Code is, in fact, dysfunctional, and we should be addressing it.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this motion would create chaos for the charitable community. Americans are more generous than any other nation in the world. What we need is certainty in our Tax Code—certainty for those who want to donate food to food banks, certainty for those who want to make excess contributions to IRAs, and certainty for those who want to preserve fragile land for future generations.

This motion makes it much harder to help those in need, and God knows, we have a lot of Americans in need with a contracting economy and the worst recovery since the Great Depression.

We are the only nation in the world with temporary tax policies. Some of these provisions have expired and have been renewed time and time again, and we need to admit it and make them permanent.

Let me just say, when it comes to inversions, the administration agrees with me that the best way to address this issue is through lower rates and through comprehensive tax reform, and we should be doing that, but this motion actually creates a perverse incentive for American companies to pack up and move overseas. That is the worst thing we can do for American workers.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this motion to recommit and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 227, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—185

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Coble
Conyers
Cuellar
DesJarlais
Gibson
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Whitfield

□ 1234

Messrs. LUETKEMEYER, SENSENBRENNER, POSEY, and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 130, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—277

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—130

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Gabbard
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Byrne
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Coble
Conyers
Cuellar
DesJarlais
Gohmert
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Nunnelee
Quigley
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Whitfield

□ 1241

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1245

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader-elect the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow and which, I am proud to say, will include additional bills to combat human trafficking.

In addition, the House will consider two bills to support innovation and enhance financial counseling in higher education: H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, authored by Representative MATT SALMON; and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, authored by Representative BRETT GUTHRIE.

The House will consider H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. It is a bipartisan bill, authored by Representatives DIANE

BLACK and DANNY DAVIS, to ensure a simple and fair Tax Code so that students and families can afford a college education.

The House will consider H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, authored by Representative LYNN JENKINS, to help low- and middle-income families save for child expenses.

Finally, the House will also consider legislation to address the growing crisis on the border and the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

He mentioned, in closing, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. As the gentleman knows, that bill did not come to the floor this week as we may have thought it would. We think this bill is a very, very critically important bill that needs to be addressed before it expires at the end of this year.

As the gentleman probably knows, the Senate is expected to vote on the passage of their bill, as I understand it, today. I expect it to be a bipartisan vote, as TRIA has been a bipartisan vote in the past. I hope that we can follow suit with that quickly, so I am pleased to see that the gentleman says that that may well be on the agenda for next week. I don't know whether the gentleman wants to make any further comment, but we believe that is a very, very important piece of legislation for us to move.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

I did say ''may'' come up. We would always like to work together on any capabilities that we can on legislation that we move forward, and once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing on the measure to determine the process by which the bill will be brought before the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Again, I hope that we can do that as soon as possible. To the extent that we pass it before the August break, I think that will give confidence to the construction industry and confidence to municipalities in areas around the country. Hopefully, we can do that, as I said, sooner rather than later.

There is another matter that is critically time sensitive, in my view, Mr. Leader. As we all know, we have a humanitarian crisis on the border, and addressing this crisis is very necessary for us to do in a timely fashion. I think almost everybody agrees on that. The supplemental is not on the schedule for next week, but I am wondering whether or not you contemplate that supplemental. The Speaker had said we ought to do something before the August break. We have 3 weeks left to go, and I am wondering whether you could give us some insight into the progress of that supplemental that the President has requested.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I mentioned, in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for the possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. Once again, once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing on the measure to determine the process by which the bill will be brought before the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that news. That is good news. Hopefully, we will be able to move on this next week because it is very important that we get this done as soon as possible because the crisis is posing immediate demands on our resources.

I would say to the gentleman, can he illuminate at all whether or not that supplemental will be limited to the resources necessary to confront the crisis?

I have heard some comments that there may be changes in the underlying law with respect to how individuals at the border are treated depending upon where they come from. While I think that both the administration and others have indicated that that matter ought to be considered, there is no doubt that it will be more controversial than, I think, the supplemental will be.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he expects the supplemental to include attempts to amend existing immigration law, or whether or not we can consider changes to immigration law in a more either comprehensive form or in an individual bill form and, perhaps, in conjunction with the border security bill that has passed out of the Homeland Security Committee in this House, as I understand it, on voice vote? I don't know whether it was unanimous, but I don't think there was opposition to it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there has been ongoing consideration of this.

As the gentleman knows, from this side of the aisle, many of our Members, including on your side of the aisle, have been to the border to see this crisis, and it is the intent that we solve this problem and solve it for the long term. So, as I did mention in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should still be prepared for the possible consideration of the legislation to address the ongoing border crisis, and we will keep you posted.

Mr. HOYER. Again, I would just reiterate that I think we both feel that we need to act on this, but I would urge the gentleman to urge his committees and his side of the aisle to bring the supplemental—and I talked to Mr. ROGERS about bringing the supplemental—whatever that supplemental may entail, on the resources necessary to deal with the crisis and not to try to also deal with the legislative issue, which, I think, is a substantive issue. As you point out, on both sides of the aisle, people have raised this issue, but there is no doubt that that will slow down considerably the passing of a supplemental for the emergency money that is necessary today.

So I would hope that he would keep that in mind and that he would, hopefully, urge his party and his committee—the Appropriations Committee—to report out a clean bill at whatever levels they believe are appropriate for whatever objectives they believe are appropriate and let us deal with the resources now and the policy in a more considered way after hearings. I will be glad to yield if you want to respond.

Lastly, Mr. Leader and Mr. Speaker, we have talked about a Make It In America agenda. As the gentleman knows, there are some 70 bills that we have suggested as part of that agenda. We believe this House needs to focus on jobs, and it is still the main concern of the American people.

I know the gentleman, in telling us the schedule, indicated there are some bills on there that are trying to deal with jobs. It is my understanding that Representative SWALWELL's bill will be on the calendar next week as a suspension bill. I want to thank the gentleman for putting that on the suspension calendar, and I hope that I can work with him.

Mr. CANTOR and I had discussed some of the Make It In America bills, and I hope that I can work with him on these bills, which I think are bipartisan. Every Member of this Congress wants to see more jobs created and more stimulus to create jobs provided.

There is a particular bill that was going to be on the suspension calendar some months ago, and it has not yet made it. The gentleman and I have discussed it. Mr. LIPINSKI has a bill which deals with a plan for making America as competitive as it can be. That bill passed out of the last Congress unanimously out of committee, and it passed this House with over 350 votes. It has again passed out of committee overwhelmingly. I don't know whether there was a recorded vote or not, but it overwhelmingly came out of committee, and I would hope that the gentleman would, with his staff, review and consider adding that bill as well to the suspension calendar at some time in the future.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, we have had those conversations, and I appreciate the continual conversations.

As the gentleman knows, the Science Committee has several manufacturing and jobs bills before it, and I am confident they are reviewing and giving all

due consideration. The bill that you speak of that passed out of the last Congress was changed within this Congress, and I know the process in which it is going. I do not anticipate any coming up next week, but we will certainly notify the Member of any consideration in the House in the future.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his comments.

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

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 701 of the Senate amendment (relating to the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise today in strong support of the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, which was passed by the Senate 93–7 on June 11 of this year.

This critical piece of legislation is one that must be implemented immediately to provide solutions to the many problems that have been discovered at the Department of Veterans Affairs and to provide the necessary care and assistance that our veterans deserve. We must move immediately on an agreement with the Senate and not further delay the long overdue care that our veterans need and have earned.

The most expeditious way to do this would be to move forward with the Senate bill, one, as I said, that was supported by 93 Senators—Republican, Democrat, and Independent alike. I know that my colleagues in the House and Senate are committed to serving our veterans. Services for our veterans, I am pleased to say, is an issue of great importance and is one that continuously receives strong bipartisan support in both Chambers.

I want to applaud Chairman MILLER and the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their hard work in bringing to light the many problems and the terrible corruption that we have discovered in the VA, and for working to improve the care for our veterans.

I am here to fight for the veterans and the military families in my district and for those across the country. Mr. Speaker, this is a deeply personal issue with me. My father was a veteran of World War II. He joined the Army Air Corps, and probably lied about his age so he could go serve his country.

□ 1300

He served in World War II. He went on to serve in Korea and Vietnam, and when he left the Air Force, he extensively used the services of the veterans administration.

Were he alive today, I know he would be enraged by what has been discovered about the neglect, misconduct, and manipulation of the VA waiting lists, so that top executives could receive financial rewards and bonuses.

The 85,000 veterans I work for in southern Arizona—and countless more nationwide—deserve better from us and from the Department of Veterans Affairs than they have been getting.

I have been pressing for better access to health care for our veterans since I first came to Congress in 2012. One of the first bills I introduced was the Veterans Health Access Act, to ensure that veterans could get the health care they needed in their communities, without long commutes and even longer wait times, and I am pleased that the House and Senate are now working to address this issue.

We must improve the quality and timeliness of care to our veterans, and that is why, today, Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate to support the Senate bill that increases access to care and takes many more steps to improve services and support for our veterans and their families.

Included in the Senate-passed bill is the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship, so that surviving spouses may have a chance to further their education and take care of their families.

The Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship is a current education benefit for the surviving children of our fallen military servicemembers. It has sent many sons and daughters of fallen heroes to college and given them the opportunity to get the American Dream.

However, it is important that we also offer this benefit to the spouses who are left widowed and must singlehandedly care for their families. This scholarship could provide many spouses an opportunity to get the education they need and the jobs that will help them succeed and support their family.

This scholarship was originally created in memory of John David Fry, who was a leader of marines from Lorena, Texas. Gunnery Sergeant Fry, a member of the explosive ordnance disposal community, demonstrated true service to his country and to his fellow marines in Iraq.

With only 1 week left on his tour in 2006, he injured his hand and was given the option to return home early with a Bronze Star. Fry declined the offer and volunteered to go on one last patrol, to defuse bombs for his fellow servicemembers.

Sadly, Gunnery Sergeant Fry was killed that day by an improvised explosive device in Anbar province, Iraq, leaving behind his wife and three small children.

Mr. Speaker, this type of courage and sacrifice has been witnessed countless times in the past 13 years by our men and women in uniform. For example, just recently, on May 12, a soldier from my district with 29 years of military service succumbed to the wounds he received in Afghanistan.

Command Sergeant Major Martin R. Barreras of Tucson was the enlisted leader of his infantry battalion in Harat province and was on his sixth deployment to Afghanistan.

While on patrol with his soldiers, Gunny—as his family likes to call him and remember him—was fatally wounded by small-arms fire while leading his troops into battle.

This was not the only time this respected leader saw combat. In 2003, Sergeant Major Barreras helped rescue former prisoner of war Jessica Lynch from an Iraqi hospital. At the time, he was the enlisted leader of the Army battalion that conducted the mission.

He personally handed Lynch to another soldier to transfer her to the helicopter that evacuated her from the area and to safety. According to reports, he then fended off multiple attacks to retrieve all nine bodies of the other U.S. soldiers missing in action.

Everyone in our country owes all of our fallen heroes, such as Gunnery Sergeant Fry and Command Sergeant Major Barreras, a debt of gratitude for their service and their courage, but we must also remember the silent courage of spouses of our servicemembers who must cope with the rigors of military life and who must live with only the memory of their fallen husband or wife.

These unsung heroes are the ones who maintain the homefront for our deployed men and women in uniform. They are the ones who maintain the morale of our troops. They are the ones who unite with other military families to develop a support network for those spouses and children while their loved ones are in harm's way.

They are the ones who live with constant worry of their servicemember's safety, and they are the ones who must bear the burden in the absence of their husband or wife.

Our military spouses play a pivotal role in our Nation, and it is one that we must never forget. This is a good way to honor that service, by providing a scholarship in memory not just of Gunnery Sergeant Fry and Command Sergeant Barreras, but all of the servicemembers who died for our country and have left behind a loving family.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to instruct, to support the expansion, with no limitations, of the Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship.

I further urge swift passage to pass the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 in its entirety. We must act now to enact this legislation and get our veterans the care that they deserve.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have already heard, the motion to instruct would require the House to recede to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3230.

Solving the problem of timely access to health care and imposing the rule of accountability is absent at VA, and I think that is our first and most important obligation because it is the source of many of the problems that exist within the Department, many of the problems that were uncovered because of the oversight from both Republicans and Democrats on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We are making good progress with our negotiations with our Senate colleagues, and now is not the time to try to tie the hands of the negotiators with what I believe is a partisan ploy.

Moreover, yesterday, Senator SANDERS indicated that he wanted to expand the scope of the conference committee's work far beyond what the Senate bill itself had encompassed, by adding VA's request for an additional $17.6 billion into the mix.

So today, I say to my colleagues I am not even sure that the Senate could recede to the Senate amendment because they keep moving the goalposts.

As I said yesterday, on the last motion to instruct, the inspector general and the GAO have both stated on multiple occasions during our hearings that they do not have confidence in VA's numbers.

Moreover, at every VA budget hearing, the Secretary has been asked: Do you have the dollars you need to take care of the veterans that you are tasked with taking care of? Invariably, we get the answer, every single time, yes.

So why should we believe that, suddenly, VA sees the need to add an additional $10 billion to hire 10,000 new clinical staff and $6 billion in new construction without having those numbers vetted?

When our staff was briefed yesterday on this request for $17.6 billion—actually, I don't even know if it is a request yet, but when the Secretary talked about it, they came to brief our staffs, and they brought three sheets of paper to justify a $17.6 billion number.

To the Members on both sides of the aisle, I caution that, despite the urgency of the current crisis, we have got to root out the cause that has been affecting timely access to care and accountability, not secondary issues, many of which we all support, including the Fry Scholarship fund expansion.

If we don't, those of us fortunate enough to be here years from now will be right back where we are, debating, once again, how things went wrong at the VA.

I would point out again, as I did yesterday, there are dozens of bills sitting, languishing in the Senate, including the authorization of 27 clinics. The motion to instruct yesterday talked about receding to the Senate bill that had 26 clinics.

The House bill was passed in December of last year—27 clinics. If the Senate would just bring it up, pass it, send to it the President, we could immediately make a difference.

I also talked about the expansion of the Fry Scholarship program. That is something that we certainly should look at, but it will do nothing, nothing to increase the care and break the backlog, the lines that our veterans are waiting in now to get the health care that they have earned.

So I would ask the Senate to pass the dozen bills that sit over there on their side, send them to the President today, and I would also point out that I am willing to discuss—and I think most Members on our side—the Fry Scholarship issues, but we don't think that they are in the scope of the emergency that exists today.

Part of the reason that I believe that, section 701 of the Senate bill does not address timely access to care or the cultural corruption that exists within the Department.

A surviving spouse—as my colleague, Mr. BARBER has already said—who has a spouse that was killed on active duty is already entitled to receive financial benefits that include 45 months of GI Bill-type education benefits, $500,000 in death benefits, and $1,215 in monthly dependency and indemnity compensation benefits.

In short, I don't believe it is time for us to be talking about expanding the benefits without expressing them through regular order here on the House floor, especially in the face of what I now understand is the Senate's new effort to move the goal line in our conference committee work.

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, could you advise me on how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce a series of Members who would like to speak to this issue, but before I do, I would just say this: I have been here now a little bit more than 2 years, and I have learned a few things.

One of those things I have learned is that, when you have the public's attention and when you have this Chamber's attention and when you have the Senate's attention on an issue of importance like this, you act, and you do as much as you can to not only take care of the corruption, the systemic problems within the VA, but other issues that have been pending for a long time. To that end, I hope that we will, in fact, recede to the Senate version of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK), ranking member on the Oversight Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has been a strong fighter for our veterans her entire time in Congress.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I support this motion to instruct the conferees. The Senate amendments go beyond a short-term solution to solving the patient access crisis at the VA.

As a member of the conference committee, I continue to push for the provisions in the Senate amendments because they are good for veterans and their families.

We must seize this opportunity to pass meaningful reforms at the VA. Our veterans and their families deserve better than piecemeal, short-term fixes, especially with report after report of veterans struggling to receive timely care and benefits and struggling to find good-paying jobs.

One provision in the Senate amendment will give post-9/11 GI benefits to surviving spouses of servicemembers who have given the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

We cannot forget about surviving spouses. A surviving spouse struggles with the loss of a loved one and often struggles with a financial loss that can make it difficult to provide for the family left behind.

Servicemembers are able to transfer GI Bill benefits to their spouses and children, but the benefits and the ability to transfer this benefit are based on time served on active duty.

We can all agree that surviving spouses should not be cut out of receiving full bill benefits if they lose a loved one before that loved one has served 36 months on active duty.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill will give surviving spouses the opportunity to receive education and training so they

are better able to provide for themselves and their families. It would be wrong of the conference committee and Congress to pass up this opportunity to give surviving spouses this benefit.

We cannot delay passing meaningful veterans legislation. If we do not take this opportunity now, then Congress will once again fail all the American people, veterans, and their families by refusing to act.

□ 1315

Passing VA reform legislation in a meaningful way that gives GI Bill benefits to surviving spouses should be an easy decision for every Member of Congress.

For those who are holding up the progress of this legislation, how will you go home to your district in August and explain to veterans and constituents why Congress was unable to pass something as simple as giving GI benefits to surviving spouses?

I know that all of my colleagues sincerely wish to help veterans and their families, but it is not enough to pay lip service to our military and veterans. Congress must act now. At the very least, the conference committee should agree to this provision in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the last speaker did not imply that anybody on the conference committee from the House was trying to delay the progress on this particular bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada, Congresswoman DINA TITUS, a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has introduced legislation here in the House, H.R. 3441, the Spouses of Heroes Education Act, which would expand this scholarship.

As a university professor at UNLV for more than 30 years, Congresswoman TITUS understands the importance of education and has been a strong leader in education issues both in Nevada and here in Washington, as a former member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a provision that has been highlighted by my colleague from Arizona in his motion to instruct and was also discussed by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

As a member of that committee, I am working hard to ensure that our veterans in Las Vegas and throughout the country have access to high-quality health care in a timely fashion. So it is critical that this conference committee quickly finishes its work so we can send a reform package to the President for his signature.

The gentleman from Arizona's amendment highlights a critical piece of the Senate proposal, which is identical to the legislation I introduced along with Senator JEFF MERKLEY from Oregon just last year, H.R. 3441, the Spouses of Heroes Education Act. Our important legislation amends the post-9/11 GI Bill to expand the Fry Scholarship, which you have heard described most eloquently by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER), by making surviving spouses of the members of the armed services eligible for this education benefit program.

The scholarship provides full instate tuition, fees, a monthly living stipend, and a book allowance to children of servicemembers who have died in the line of duty. Our change would allow spouses to receive those same benefits.

When a servicemember tragically loses his or her life on the field of battle, we owe it to their spouses to do all we can to support them and their families—not just in the immediate aftermath of the tragedy, but going forward. We can ensure that they have all the educational opportunities they need because this will enable them to further their careers and increase the financial stability of that family.

I was pleased that the Senate included this bicameral, bipartisan legislation in the McCain-Sanders agreement that passed 93–3, and it is very important that our conferees continue to fight to maintain that provision. I was also very glad to hear the chairman say that he is so supportive of our looking at that provision here in the House as a stand-alone bill, and I hope to see that move also. So I thank them for their work on this important issue.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman KYRSTEN SINEMA. If you know Congresswoman SINEMA, you know that when she gets her dander up, she fights like hell for whatever the issue is, and that has certainly been true in the fight that she has waged on behalf of our veterans.

As you know, the first evidence of corruption and misdeeds was discovered in Arizona at the VA in Phoenix, and from the very beginning, Congresswoman SINEMA has been on that issue. So I am very proud and pleased to yield to her to speak on this bill.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for offering this motion to instruct and for his leadership and work on behalf of veteran and military families in Arizona.

This motion urges conferees to expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to include spouses of fallen servicemembers. Currently, the scholarship covers the children of servicemembers who are killed in the line of duty. After their tragic loss, the surviving spouse is frequently left to provide for her or his family. It is important that Congress take action to expand this benefit to spouses and to help these military families begin to rebuild.

It is also important that Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs take action to get veterans the care they need. Veterans in my district, which is home to the Phoenix VA, are still waiting for Congress to produce a bipartisan VA reform bill to send to the President's desk. But in Arizona, we are not waiting idly for Washington to take action; we are doing it ourselves.

In Phoenix, we have established a working group of community providers, veterans service organizations, and the local VA to work together to improve access to services. We also recently cohosted our Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans in a variety of ways. Approximately 400 veterans and their families attended and got the care that they earned and that they deserve.

These are examples of the good that results when we set aside partisanship and focus on putting veterans first to help meet their needs, but more action is required.

I appreciate the bipartisan leadership and work the House—especially Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD—has done on this issue, and I call on the conferees to move quickly to produce a bipartisan bill and get it on the President's desk. By working together, we can address this crisis and create a VA system that our veterans deserve.

Let's get this done for our veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to whether or not the gentleman from Arizona has any further requests for time?

Mr. BARBER. I have no further requests for time, but I do have some closing remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, I would urge my colleagues to not support this motion to instruct. And I would also remind my colleagues that even though the number 93–3 has been used for the passage of the Senate bill, the House bill, itself, which was much more narrowly tailored to actually deal with the crisis that exists today, with access to care, passed unanimously, 426–0, in this House. Just prior to the final vote, there was a motion to recommit that did, in fact, want the House to recede to the Senate amendment.

The problem is, again, the goalposts are changing. The House has been working with the Senate. We have made an offer on our particular side. We are waiting for the Senate to return a counter. Things changed yesterday,

unfortunately, because of the additional $17.6 billion that was brought forward by the Department themselves.

So we continue to stay focused. Our intent is to complete this bill and get it to the President's desk before we leave in August.

I appreciate my colleague's comments today.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, could I ask for the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, let me just close with these thoughts.

I came here, as you well know, following the resignation of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, for whom I worked, when she was a Member. Her commitment to veterans was complete and deep. I am pleased to have picked up that mission and have tried to move forward with it in every way possible.

I also came here in the spirit of bipartisanship, looking for partners on both sides of the aisle to move important legislation for our country, and I am very pleased to say that I have found bipartisanship in full measure in the manner with which we have worked together to ensure that our veterans are properly served. Now I call on my colleagues, the conferees, to move quickly to bring our two bills together, to strike now while the opportunity presents.

Back home, when I meet with veterans, they say, What are you waiting for? We need you to act, and act now.

I urge our colleagues to adopt the motion to instruct so that we can get this job done expeditiously and in full measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business.

JOBS BILLS STUCK IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 5 million Americans have given up on their search for a job. For 59 months straight, invisible unemployment has remained above 10 percent. The number of long-term unemployed Americans is double the prerecession figure.

Mr. Speaker, among the 294 bills the Democrat-controlled Senate has failed to act on are over 40 House-passed bipartisan pro-jobs bills that would help put Americans back to work. We have passed legislation to help the long-term unemployed get training for new jobs, a measure to restore hourly wages cut by the 30-hour workweek mandate, and regulatory reform bills to cut the red tape holding back key energy and construction projects that will help create jobs and boost our economy. These measures are commonsense solutions that our country needs right now, policies that reward hard work and provide opportunities for Americans to be self-sufficient.

Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs bills? We hear that over here on the other side of the aisle. You can find them over in HARRY REID's dusty desk drawer waiting for action in the Senate. However, the Senate has refused to vote on them, has refused to take action to help our economy, and has refused to consider any approach but bigger government.

It is time for the Senate to get to work and take action on the jobs bills Americans need.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, last week's Energy and Water Appropriations bill provided another glaring example of an opportunity squandered. We could have invested more in clean energy and certainly weaned our Nation off its heavy dependence on fossil fuels. We could have heeded the warnings of the scientific community and taken greater steps to reduce emissions and adapt our dams and ports and coastal infrastructure to new conditions. We did neither. Even worse, the bill contained riders to prevent the modeling and study of climate change.

The climate deniers are condemning us to a future of crisis management. Organizations, including global manufacturers, governments, aid organizations, and the insurance industry are examining risks to key infrastructure of supply chain disruptions, water shortages, and increased political unrest.

Instead of suing our President for taking action, we should be joining him and organizations around the world in the effort to understand and meet this formidable challenge. Failure to do so will be costly, and failure to do so will be tragic.

We must do better. We should start by doing something.

□ 1330

GAZA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with our good ally and friend, Israel, as it defends its people from Hamas' deadly rockets.

Every nation, Mr. Speaker, has the right to defend its citizens; indeed, it has a moral obligation to do so. And no people ever ought to live in constant fear that their homes, schools, businesses, places of worship, and hospitals might be the target of terrorists' rockets.

Mr. Speaker, there is a town in southern Israel whose name is Sderot which has been the target of over 6,300 rockets since 2007. Mr. Speaker, I have been to Sderot, and I have talked to some of the families there. As the rockets fall, they gather their children in bomb shelters and sing them songs. I have been in the recreational gymnasium. It is itself a bomb shelter. Preschoolers learn to run for cover before they learn to read and write.

If American communities were subjected to what the residents of Sderot—and now cities even as far north as Tel Aviv and Jerusalem—have had to endure, I doubt very seriously whether we would show as much restraint as Israel has shown.

There are two major challenges I hear to Israel's exercise of its legitimate self-defense, and I want to address both of them. First, undertaking this necessary response was not an easy choice for Israel, nor was the decision to agree to a cease-fire on Tuesday. Israel abided by the cease-fire

without any commitment from Hamas, and Prime Minister Netanyahu even fired—removed—his deputy defense minister for questioning that decision, so committed was the Israeli Government to trying to reach a cease-fire and cessation of danger to Israelis and to Palestinians.

Tragically and appallingly—but I suggest not so surprisingly—Hamas not only rejected the cease-fire, but continued to rain missiles upon Israeli communities even while Israel had unilaterally stopped its defensive strikes. Secondly, Israeli forces have continued to do everything possible to prevent civilian casualties as they strike Hamas' leadership and its rocket launchers.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that Hamas' reign of terror extends not only to Israelis, but to their own people, the Palestinians in Gaza, where Hamas continues to use innocent civilians as human shields while firing rocket after rocket after rocket after rocket at Israel.

Prime Minister Netanyahu summed up his country's struggle earlier this week in the following way:

We (meaning the Israelis, and I am quoting Prime Minister Netanyahu) we are using missile defense to protect our civilians, and they are using civilians to protect their missiles.

We are using (the prime minister said) missile defense to protect our citizens, while Hamas is using its own citizens to protect its missiles.

How sad. Just today, while Israel was observing a 5-hour cease-fire to allow humanitarian supplies to reach Gaza, we have seen news reports that Hamas continued firing mortar shells into Israel, in violation of that truce.

This week has seen bitter tragedy for both Israelis and Palestinians. You have to listen carefully to the words of Rachel Fraenkel, the mother of one of the three murdered Israeli teenagers. When she learned of the brutal killing of a Palestinian teenager, Mohammed Abu Khedair, she said this:

There is no difference between blood and blood.

Of course, what she meant by that was the loss of her son and the loss of the Palestinian young man was an equal tragedy. He was gunned down by angry people motivated by the acts of terrorists to seek revenge on innocent noncombatants, in this case on children.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas has the power to end this violence. I call on them to do so before more innocent blood on both sides is shed. The United States, of course, will continue to stand by its ally, Israel, and we will continue to hold in our hearts all of the families, including Rachel Fraenkel, and the family of Mohammed Abu Khaber, who are grieving the loss of loved ones as a result of Hamas' reprehensible and criminal actions.

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

IRAQ PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying the obvious. We are living in a chaotic and dangerous world. But contrary to what some in this Chamber suggest, the solution to every problem is not expanding the U.S. military footprint. There are many of us who are deeply concerned about our renewed military involvement in Iraq. We believe we need a debate. We believe we need a vote. We believe the Congress ought to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by a couple of my colleagues here today who share those concerns and who want to express their beliefs about how we should proceed on this issue. I would like to first yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who has been a leader on these issues.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for your tireless leadership and for hosting this Special Order today. For many years, you have been raising the level of awareness with regard to the responsibilities of Congress, our duties as it relates to war making, as well as the impact of these tragic wars on our brave men and women. So thank you for once again coming forward with now a privileged resolution that directs the President to remove all United States military forces stationed in Iraq within 30 days or by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very reasonable resolution. It is very consistent with what I believe the American people—we know, based on what the American people have said over and over and over again, they are war weary. And Mr. MCGOVERN has really given us an opportunity to vote the views of the American people.

This resolution exempts, of course, troops necessary for the security of the United States diplomatic post and personnel.

We are all familiar with the reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place. We hear many of the same voices who championed the unnecessary war in Iraq once again beating the drum for a renewed war in Iraq today. So we must not let history repeat itself. We must remember history. We must not be dragged back into a war in Iraq. This must be rejected.

Many of my colleagues agree. And I want to remind us that over 100 Members of Congress now from both parties have signed a letter, Congressman MCGOVERN, myself—many—SCOTT RIGELL from Virginia, we are calling for the President to come to Congress for debate on an authorization before any military escalation on Iraq.

Last month, during the consideration of the 2015 Defense Appropriations bill, over 150 bipartisan Members supported our amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were inflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides. The change that Iraq needs must come from Iraqis. They must reject violence in favor of a peaceful democracy that represents everyone and respects the rights of all citizens.

The future of Iraq is in the hands of the Iraqi people. Our job is to continue to promote regional and international engagement, recognition of human rights, women's rights, and political reforms. Only through these actions can Iraq and, of course, the United States, and the rest of the world, begin supporting a process of reconciliation and help the Iraqis secure long-term national stability.

Mr. Speaker, after more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives, and billions of dollars, the American people are rightfully war weary. The American people are looking for Congress to act. We must heed their call and bring this privileged resolution to the House floor for an immediate up-or-down vote.

As our President told the American people in May:

United States military action cannot be the only, or even primary, component of our leadership in every instance.

This is one of those instances.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq. But we must vote on this resolution immediately because I think this would give the American people a clear understanding of what this administration and Congress intends to do, and that is remove all military forces stationed in Iraq.

So I want to thank, again, Congressman MCGOVERN for his leadership for bringing this forward. It is time that we have a clear up-or-down vote on this. I want to thank Congressman JONES for cosponsoring this.

Also, I will finally conclude by saying sooner or later—sooner or later—we have got to go back and repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force which has become a blank check for this war this past decade. It sets the stage for perpetual war. We need to repeal it. The American people deserve a vote on this resolution, and they deserve a vote for repealing this authorization.

So thank you again for your leadership, and let's move forward and vote the will of the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent words and for her leadership on this issue in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here with my colleagues, Congresswoman LEE and Congressman JONES, to talk about I think an issue that deserves a lot more discussion than it is getting. We need to take a look at the recent return of the U.S. military to Iraq.

Iraq is a complicated country with a long history of ethnic and religious divisions. It is now facing a crisis of governance and a crisis of invasion by extremist militant forces. Sadly for Iraq, the two are closely intertwined.

In large measure, Iraq is falling apart because of its sectarian government currently led by Prime Minister Maliki that excludes and represses most Sunnis, Kurds, and other ethnic and religious minorities; and an army that thinks more about saving its own skin than protecting the Iraqi people. This is what has laid the foundation for extremist forces, namely ISIL, to enter Iraq and take control of disaffected communities and territory.

I do not believe we can fix this. Only the Iraqi people can fix this. And I certainly don't believe our brave and stalwart military men and women can fix this.

I believe that we should never have invaded Iraq. I also believe it is foolish to once again commit U.S. troops to try and save an Iraqi Government and army that cannot stand on their own.

As Joseph Cirincione wrote last month in ''Defense One'' magazine:

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion in Iraq in 2002 and 2003.

This is not to say ''we told you so'' but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work, and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the entire Defense One article.

[From Defense One, June 12, 2014]

DON'T BE SUCKED INTO WAR WITH IRAQ, AGAIN

(By Joseph Cirincione)

We never should have invaded Iraq. It would be folly to recommit United States forces to save an artificial Iraqi government and army that cannot stand on its own.

Ten years ago, U.S. forces battled Sunni insurgents in the very same cities that are falling to anti-government fighters today. Hundreds of American lives were lost in the 2004 battles for Mosul, Fallujah, Karbala, Ramadi, Tikrit, Najaf and Samarra. The U.S. spent tens of billions of dollars to train and equip an Iraqi army that was supposed to protect the government we formed to replace the deposed dictator, Saddam Hussein.

This week, that army collapsed. In Mosul, The Guardian reports, ''two divisions of Iraqi soldiers—roughly 30,000 men—simply turned and ran in the face of the assault by an insurgent force of just 800 fighters.'' In other cities, Iraqi troops simply handed over their American-supplied uniforms, guns and armored fighting vehicles to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, or ISIS, fighters, then scattered. ISIS has seized more than $450 million from the banks in these cities, making it perhaps the richest and best equipped insurgent group in the world.

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion of Iraq in 2002 and 2003. The very first sentence of Tom Ricks' 2006 masterpiece, Fiasco, warns, ''President George W. Bush's decision to invade Iraq in 2003 ultimately may come to be seen as one of the most profligate actions in the history of American foreign policy. The consequences won't be clear for decades.''

Well, they are becoming much clearer now. Ricks' concludes his book—which should be read by anyone searching for a solution to the current debacle—with this:

''So while there is a small chance that the Bush administration's inflexible optimism will be rewarded, that the political process will undercut the insurgency and that democracy will take hold in Iraq, there is a far greater chance of other, more troublesome outcomes: That Iraq will fall into civil war, or spark regional war, or eventually become home to an anti-American regime, or break up altogether. In any of these forms it would offer a new haven for terrorists.''

He was not alone. I wrote, with my colleagues at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications, an anatomy of the false intelligence supplied to justify the war:

''It was almost inevitable that a U.S. victory would add to the sense of cultural, ethnic, and religious humiliation that is known to be a prime motivator of al Qaeda-type terrorists. It was widely predicted by experts beforehand that the war would boost recruitment to this network and deepen anti-Americanism in a region already deeply antagonistic to the United States and suspicious of its motives. Although this may not be the ultimate outcome, the latter has so far been a clear cost of the war. And while a successful war would definitely eliminate a ''rogue'' state, it might—and may—also create a new ''failed'' state: one that cannot control its borders, provide internal security, or deliver basic services to its people. Arguably, such failed states—like Afghanistan, Sudan, and others—pose the greatest risk in the long struggle against terror.''

This is not to say, ''We told you so,'' but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Rep. Paul Ryan, R–Wisc., played the game well in his speech at the Center for New American Security conference, in Washington on Wednesday. He blamed the chaos in Iraq on the failure of the Obama administration to negotiate a status of forces agreement, pulling the troops out too soon and for not intervening in Syria. In other words, for failing to double down on the military policy that created the mess in the first place.

Sen. John McCain, R–Ariz., goes even further, calling on the entire Obama administration national security team to resign. McCain went ''roaring onto the Senate floor'' on Thursday, claiming ''Could all this have been avoided? . . . The answer is absolutely yes.''

Part of this is the normal partisan attack on Obama. His political opponents squeeze everything he does into their preferred frame: he is weak, naïve, dangerous, doesn't really care about American security, may not even be an American.

Part of it, however, is the way Washington looks at national security issues: focused on the immediate, ignoring or twisting history. So, the Iraq debacle is something that has happened only now, with perhaps one or two years of prelude. The policy fix should address what can be done today, looking forward a year or two. There must be an immediate solution: bomb, invade, supply, sanction. The so-called ''defense Democrats'' jump in, too, wanting to prove their toughness by advocating one or another military solution.

The Washington Post, which played a key role in convincing policy makers to go to war with Iraq, picks up the pro-war line of attack in its editorial: ''For years, President Obama has been claiming credit for ''ending wars,'' when, in fact, he was pulling the United States out of wars that were far from over. Now the pretense is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain.''

In other words, the problem is not that we started the war, it is that we never should have ended it.

None of these critics have the slightest self-awareness. None take responsibility for their previous policy pronouncements. It's like the driver of a car that has plowed into a crowd of pedestrians blaming the emergency medical technicians for not saving the lives of those injured.

Nor do the defense Democrats want to go back to this debate, preferring to be seen as positive and forward-looking. They want to talk about robotics or new paradigms. They want to get away from any hint that they once were against the war, or hide their own shame that they were once for it.

I understand. But we have to go over this again. The American public long ago decided that the Iraq War was a mistake, that Iraq is not worth fighting for. It is the Washington elite that doesn't seem to have made up their minds. It is the Obama administration that, after being blasted by Republicans for always ''blaming Bush'' whenever they talked about the multiple crises they inherited, stopped drawing the lines from the failed policies of the past to the current dilemmas.

Well, it is time to draw the lines again. It is vital that we not be bullied into squandering more resources into a futile effort. We cannot let politics and ideology and short-term thinking again trick the nation into making a bad situation worse.

There is not a quick fix to this problem. The hard truth is that, like the collapse of the Diem government in South Vietnam a generation ago, there is little we can do to prop up this government. As military expert Micha Zenko tweeted, ''Unless the US has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into PM Maliki, airstrikes in Iraq would

be pointless.'' We may have to revisit then-Senator Joe Biden's strategy from 2006 that the only way to stop the killing and salvage the situation was to scrap Iraq's artificially-imposed boundaries and partition the country into three ethnic regions.

Gen. Colin Powell famously invoked the ''Pottery Barn rule'' about Iraq, but he got it slightly wrong. It is not, ''You broke it; you own it,'' but ''You broke it; you pay for it.'' We broke Iraq. We paid a huge price in lives, treasure and legitimacy. It is time to stop paying.

□ 1345

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Obama has done the right thing to send U.S. forces to Iraq to increase the security and help protect our diplomatic facilities and personnel.

So far, he has sent two contingents—the first of 275 military troops on June 15 and a second deployment of 200 additional troops on June 30. With respect to the second deployment, he noted that they would also be used to reinforce the security of the Baghdad International Airport.

They would consist of additional security forces; rotary wing aircraft; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support. The President specifically noted that they are equipped for combat.

In between these two deployments, the President announced on June 19 and notified Congress on June 26 that he was sending 300 military troops to train, advise, and support Iraqi security forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces, so we could share intelligence and coordinate plans on how to confront the threat of ISIL. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, this deployment concerns me deeply.

In each of these three deployments, the President has rightly formally informed Congress consistent with the War Powers Resolution. The only reason a President has to inform Congress about such overseas deployments—the only time it applies is when the President—and I am quoting now from the War Powers Resolution—has introduced ''United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include for the RECORD the three notifications the President has sent to Congress on deployments of troops to Iraq.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 16, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) Starting on June 15, 2014, up to approximately 275 U.S. Armed Forces personnel are deploying to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 26, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

I have since ordered further measures in response to the situation in Iraq. Specifically, as I announced publicly on June 19, I have ordered increased intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance that is focused on the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). I also ordered up to approximately 300 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel in Iraq to assess how we can best train, advise, and support Iraqi security forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces to share intelligence and coordinate planning to confront the threat posed by ISIL. Some of these personnel were already in Iraq as part of the U.S. Embassy's Office of Security Cooperation, and others began deploying into Iraq on June 24. These forces will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that they are no longer needed.

This action is being undertaken in coordination with the Government of Iraq and has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 30, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I previously reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

In light of the security situation in Baghdad, I have ordered up to approximately 200 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Iraq to reinforce security at the U.S. Embassy, its support facilities, and the Baghdad International Airport. This force consists of additional security forces, rotary-wing aircraft, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support.

This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think the President did the right thing to inform Congress because I believe that our troops have been introduced into a situation in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. In fact, more simply put, if Iraq wasn't engaged in hostilities in a moment of crisis, we wouldn't have sent troops over there.

This is why last Friday, on June 11, my good friends and colleagues, Representatives WALTER JONES of North Carolina and BARBARA LEE of California, introduced a privileged resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 105, to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year, except for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel.

We did this for a simple reason. Congress has the responsibility to authorize the introduction of American troops where hostilities are imminent. In less than 3 weeks, in three separate deployments, the U.S. has sent at least 775 additional troops to Iraq.

We don't know what might happen next to those troops or to yet another deployment of additional troops, but we do know that Congress should debate it. We do know that Congress should vote on whether to authorize it or not.

That is what the Constitution of the United States demands of Congress. That is what the Constitution demands of us. Now is the time for Congress to debate the merits of our military involvement in this latest Iraq conflict—openly, transparently.

Do we approve of these deployments and any future escalation? If so, we should vote to authorize it. If we do not support it, then we should bring our troops back home. It is that simple, Mr. Speaker. Congress has the responsibility to act on Iraq now.

Mr. Speaker, we did not introduce this privileged resolution lightly. By doing so, we started a process to hold a debate on our engagement in Iraq in the coming days, using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution. While this is an imperfect tool, it requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days.

Like most of my colleagues, I would prefer for this House to bring up a bill authorizing our engagement in Iraq, and nothing in this resolution inhibits such important legislation from being drafted and brought before the House for a clean up-or-down vote. Frankly, I wish that were happening, but I have not heard that such an authorization is even under discussion, let alone being prepared for debate.

I regret to say that I only hear how we can avoid having such a debate. So my colleagues—Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and myself—we introduced this concurrent resolution because we strongly believe that Congress has to step up to the plate and carry out its responsibilities when our servicemen and -women are once again being sent into harm's way.

The time for debate is now, not when the first body bag comes home from Iraq, not when the first U.S. airstrikes or bombs fall on Iraq, not when we are embedded with Iraqi troops trying to back an ISIL-held town, and worst-case scenario, not when our troops are shooting their way out of an overtaken Baghdad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate our new engagement in Iraq—before the heat of the moment—when we can weigh the pros and cons of supporting the Maliki government or whatever government is cobbled together should Maliki be forced to step down—now, before we are forced to take sides in a religious and sectarian war; now, before the next addition of more troops takes place—make no mistake, I firmly believe we will continue to send more troops and more military assets into this crisis—now, Mr. Speaker, before we are forced to fire our first shots, launch our first missiles, or drop our first bombs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is when the House should debate and vote on this very serious matter. For those who say it is too early, too premature for this debate, I respectfully disagree. The administration has tacitly signaled when it notified Congress that our troops have been sent to a place where the threat of hostilities is imminent.

The longer we put off carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, the easier it becomes to just drift along, and this is what Congress has done over and over. We just kind of drift along, and it has to end. It has to end, Mr. Speaker. Congress must speak. Congress must act.

This resolution, should it pass, would direct the President to bring our troops home from Iraq within 30 days—or should the President determine that such a rapid withdrawal would pose a security question, then no later than by the end of the year, nearly 6 months from now.

It would not require those troops that have been deployed to safeguard the security of our diplomatic facilities and personnel from withdrawing. They could remain and carry out their crucial roles of protecting our civilian personnel on the ground in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take up this resolution. We need to debate our military engagement in this latest war in Iraq. We need to have a clean up-or-down vote, whether we stay in Iraq or whether we bring our troops home.

We owe that much to our troops and their families. We owe that much to the American people, and we owe at least that much to our own democracy and democratic institutions that require Congress to be the final arbiter on whether our troops are sent into hostilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield to the conscience of this Congress on issues of war, a man I have great admiration for, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to thank him for being a leader on bringing to the floor of the House not only this resolution asking for a vote about bringing our troops home from Iraq, but also the way that he speaks about the fact that 17 million American children go home at night hungry. That is another issue, I understand that, but it all ties in.

When we continue to not debate whether we should be sending our young men and women to die, we are shirking our constitutional responsibility that we, in this Congress, have raised our hand to swear that we will uphold the Constitution of the United States, but we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to war, and I blame myself.

In 2003, I bought the lie that was told by the previous administration about the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein had and how he was going to use that against the American people.

That misinformation that was given by the previous administration caused us to go into Iraq, and I voted to give the President at the time—President Bush—the authority to bypass the Constitution.

It is called the AUMF, the Authorization for Use of Military Force, and I regret that and will until the day I die because I gave up my constitutional responsibility to debate and to vote on whether we should go to war or not, and that was the constitutional responsibility of this Congress and of me being a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a funeral. It is a military funeral where a soldier has given his life for this country. His wife is there with her sunglasses on, holding the hand of her little girl who can't quite understand why her daddy is dead, why her daddy is in a flag-draped coffin.

That is why we need to be on this floor, as Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE have said, to debate whether we continue to allow the President—in this case, President Obama—to use the War Powers Act to send our troops into Iraq, and yet, we sit here idle.

We don't even hardly debate the issue of war when we are going to pass millions and billions of dollars to be spent by our military overseas. It does not make any sense.

I want to say about my own side, I regret that my side, the Republican Party, we have become the war party now. It is not so much the Democrats who were the war party during the Vietnam war. Now, it is the Republican Party.

I am a great supporter of Pat Buchanan. I love his position on foreign policy and his many articles. This is from a recent article that he wrote. Pat Buchanan says:

> It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp their war powers to march into Syria and back into Iraq. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

This is what Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE and I are trying to say. It is time that this Congress start speaking out. We listen to the American people when it comes to war, and the American people are tired. They are worn out.

A recent survey actually said that 71 percent of American people said that the first intervention in Iraq was wrong. It was a mistake. It should never have happened, and yet that is why I admire you, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE and the others who are willing to speak out on this.

Just a couple of other points I want to make—people always say those who wrote the Constitution, they maybe really better understood more than we do, and yet they didn't have the sophistication that we have today in the wars that we fight, but that brings me to a letter from George Washington to James Monroe:

> I have always given it as my decided opinion that no nation has a right to meddle into the concerns of another, that everyone has the right to form and adopt whatever government they like best to live under themselves.

That is George Washington in 1796, in a letter to James Monroe. Again, I think about the fact that I, along with other Members of Congress, gave away my constitutional right to declare war when we gave to President Bush the authority to use military force.

That in itself is something, again, being repetitive for just a moment, I will always, always regret.

Another quote, this one by James Madison, and this is Mr. MCGOVERN's point:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.

We are the legislature. It is our responsibility to meet our constitutional duties. Mr. MCGOVERN, I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families in this country since we went into Iraq because I have asked God to forgive me for listening to the misinformation and the distortions by the previous administration to go into Iraq.

That is my pain, and I will live with that pain.

□ 1400

I am on the floor with you today—and Ms. LEE who has already spoken—to say thank you for taking the lead in trying to force this Congress to have a debate.

I am not going to restate what Pat Buchanan has said, but I will say to my own side many times: Why do you sit idly by when you complain about Mr. Obama and spending, spending, and we have already spent $1.5 trillion in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we are still spending money in Afghanistan?

We will for 10 more years because of a bilateral strategic agreement, but what we are trying to do today is to say that we are not going to make another mistake in Iraq.

That is why I am pleased to join with you today in this effort to make the American people aware that we do care. We want the American people to contact the Members of Congress and say join in this concurrent resolution, this privileged resolution, to bring a debate to the floor of the House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I look forward to a continued exchange on this issue with my colleague. I want to thank him for his passion on this issue and for reminding not only our colleagues, but the American people that there are really consequences to war.

One of the things that has frustrated me is that, for too long, we have avoided talking about the wars in this Congress, not just Iraq, but also Afghanistan.

My colleague, Mr. JONES, and I had an amendment to the defense authorization bill a few weeks back, which said that President Obama had mentioned a couple of years ago that we would be out of Afghanistan by 2014. Clearly, that is not going to be the case.

The amendment said that the President had to notify Congress of what our military plans were going to be in Afghanistan and that Congress should consider that and vote up or down on whether we should continue our military involvement in Afghanistan.

That is hardly a radical bill. It is simply a bill that says: Congress do your job, you have an obligation—a constitutional obligation when it comes to war.

This amendment, which was germane, it was in order—on the defense bill, no less—at the last minute, we were told we could not offer it, it would not be made in order because the leadership of this House didn't want that debate, they were afraid it might pass.

Well, that is the way democracy is supposed to work. If a majority in this place does not want to continue an endless war in Afghanistan or does not want to start another war in Iraq, then that ought to mean something.

My criticism right now is not with the White House. I may have some disagreements with the President in terms of what his policy on Iraq might be, but he has done his job, he has notified us, he has sent letters up to Congress that have announced the deployments that he is making, and it says—consistent with the War Powers Resolution, so this is not a complaint about the White House. We may disagree with their policy, but they did what they were supposed to do.

Our complaint is with this institution, that we are not doing what we are supposed to do. The Foreign Affairs Committee, in consultation with other relevant committees, ought to bring a resolution to the floor if they want to authorize the use of additional force in Iraq.

I would vote ''no.'' There are some in this Chamber that would vote ''yes,'' but there ought to be a debate. We ought to go into any new deployment—any new military intervention with our eyes wide open. We have lived through enough deception. We have been lied to over the years too many times. It is time for us to demand some truth when it comes to war. People ought to know what we are getting into.

By the way, one other thing that has troubled me greatly about these wars that we have been involved with is that we don't pay for them. We all complain about the deficit and the debt, and we have to dig ourselves out of this hole of debt. Trillions of dollars of that debt are directly related to these wars. We don't pay for these wars. We put them on a credit card.

I offered a bill a few years ago calling for a war tax, saying that if we are going to go to war, then we ought to pay for it—the American people ought to pay for it, and if the American people don't want to pay for it, maybe we ought not go to war.

This notion of going to war and putting it on a credit card and making believe like it is not a big deal has to stop, has to stop. The first George Bush, when he went to war in Iraq when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait—I wasn't for that war, I wasn't in Congress then—but nonetheless, when he went to war, he got the cooperation of all the Arab states in the region to pitch in to pay for it.

What wasn't paid for, Congress paid for, but it wasn't added to our debt. Now, it has become commonplace, and we don't even question it.

There are huge costs to these wars, not only in terms of blood, but also in terms of treasure. We nitpick on this House floor over whether or not we are going to feed hungry children or make sure people have adequate housing.

We say we don't have enough money, but when it comes to these wars, the sky is the limit—whatever you want, you can get.

Here is the deal: I would argue with you that that money has not been spent wisely. Notwithstanding the incredible service of our men and women, we are in Afghanistan right now propping up one of the most corrupt governments in the world, in the world.

In Iraq, we are now reentering a situation where even our own administration is saying the Maliki government is lousy, and we obviously hate this extremist group called ISIL, so we are going right in the middle, and I worry that we are going to be target practice for both sides.

One other thing—the Iraqi Army, as I mentioned earlier, has been trained by the very best of American military personnel. They have the best equipment, they have the best weaponry you can imagine.

They outnumber, overwhelmingly, these extremist groups that are now attacking Iraq. We read in The Washington Post last week that commanders of the Iraqi Army in areas that come under fire decide to leave—they basically desert—and so do the troops.

If they are not willing to fight after all that we have sacrificed, why the hell are we going back in there and thinking of fighting this? Now, this is the beginning—this is the very beginning of our reentry.

As Mr. JONES and I have said, we hope that it doesn't go any further than this, but this is the time when we ought to have a debate about what might happen and what we are prepared to do.

I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. Mr. MCGOVERN, thank you very much.

I want to pick up on a few things you said just a few minutes ago.

Iraq is in total chaos. It is kind of ironic. In 1983—I found a photograph of Donald Rumsfeld who was a special envoy sent by President Reagan to thank Hussein for what he had done to try to defend Iraq against the Iranians.

That brings me to where we are today and why this resolution that you have sponsored is so important. I have the former Commandant of the Marine Corps who, for the last 6 years, has been my adviser on Afghanistan, simply because I don't have the military

background, and he is a very dear friend of mine.

I emailed him a week ago and asked him:

What do you think about all of these advisers going to Iraq, something you were just talking about?

He emailed me back and he said:

We should not put boots on the ground.

He further stated:

It is a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution, not more troops.

That is why, again, your resolution, and our resolution needs to be debated.

A couple of other points, very quickly—after I found out that I had been misled with the first war in Iraq, I contacted Lieutenant General Greg Newbold because he wrote an article for Time magazine. I want to read just a little bit of it very quickly.

General Greg Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 2000 to 2002 and describes himself as ''a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war''—Mr. MCGOVERN, unnecessary war.

He wrote an insightful editorial for Time in April 2006 titled, ''Why Iraq was a mistake.'' I want to share a paragraph from his article because it is so appropriate of what we are trying to do today and what we are trying to do with this resolution to force Congress to meet its constitutional responsibility about sending our young men and women to die.

In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar anthem ''Won't Get Fooled Again.'' To us, its lyrics invoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.

He further stated:

Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

We were fooled to go into Iraq.

I am with you. I know Mr. Obama came out against the Iraq war—and I want to thank him for doing that—when he was a Senator, but you are right, it is not the administration we are talking about today. It is the role of Congress and our lack of fulfilling our constitutional duty.

One last point, very quickly—four weeks ago, I went to Walter Reed hospital. I was told that two marines from Camp Lejeune in my district had been severely wounded, so I went to Walter Reed hospital.

As I go into the area where they teach them how to walk without legs, on prosthesis—they teach them how to use the artificial limbs to pick up a spoon—I met three Army guys from Fort Bragg, which is not in my district, but in North Carolina. All three had lost one leg each, each one of them.

Then, Mr. MCGOVERN, when I went over to meet the young marine from Camp Lejeune, 23 years of age, and he is on what they call an exercise mat about 3 feet off the floor—he has lost both legs and an arm. I never will forget his father's eyes.

They were the saddest eyes I have ever seen on a man in my life. I saw pain. I saw worry. Here is his son, both legs gone and one arm gone, 23 years of age.

The second marine that I saw from Camp Lejeune had lost both legs by stepping on a 40-pound IED in Afghanistan.

The more that we have troops in Iraq, the longer they stay, there will be someone killed or wounded before it is over.

That is why your resolution—that is why it is necessary for my party, the Republican Party, to stop being the war party and being the party that wants to defend the Constitution. My party needs to allow us to have this debate that you have introduced.

As I leave, I want to thank you for giving me a little bit of this time today. I want to thank you for your friendship. I want to thank you for what you do for America. I want to thank you for what you do for our military. I want to thank you for what you are trying to do for the House of Representatives to say we have an obligation.

No kid should ever die again if the Congress is not willing to follow the Constitution and demand a declaration of war and have that debate and that vote, so I thank you so much for giving me this time, and may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks. I want to associate myself with every single word that he has said.

I believe deep down that the President of the United States does not want to get involved in another endless war in the Middle East, but sometimes things have a way of happening and sometimes things have a way of spinning out of control, and that is why this debate is so important and so timely now.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war has already claimed 4,500 American lives. 4,500 Americans have already been killed in the Iraq war. According to one study, over 500,000 Iraqis have also perished over the past decade of war. The UNHCR states that over 1 million additional people have been displaced in Iraq this year alone.

Linda Blimes, an expert in public finance at Harvard University, estimates that the total cost of the Iraq war for the United States will be $4 trillion when we take into account the long-term costs of health care and benefits for the veterans of that war.

The human and financial costs for us and for the Iraqis have been severe.

Let me just quote a few experts on military and foreign policy about this possibility of reentering the Iraq civil conflict.

Gordon Adams, a former senior White House budget official, said in mid-June:

What is happening in Iraq right now is both a cautionary tale and an unfolding tragedy. The caution is about the blithe American assumption that the United States is omnipotent, and that with enough money, goodwill, expertise, equipment and training, Americans can build foreign forces and bring security to troubled areas around the world. The tragedy is that what the U.S. does, and has done, leads down the road to failure.

Retired U.S. Army Lieutenant General Robert Gard, Jr., stated, on July 6:

The collapse of the Iraqi Army was not due to a shortage of trained Iraqi troops or the inferiority in firepower or equipment. The case was their lack of confidence in, and commitment to, Iraqi national institutions and leadership, both military commanders and political authorities. This intangible but essential element in combat effectiveness depends upon legitimate governance, not admonitions from foreign military advisers.

Retired General Barry McCaffrey, on June 12, said:

At the end of the day, if your army won't fight, it's because they don't trust their incompetence, corrupt generals, they don't trust each other. This is an enduring civil war between the Shi'a, the Sunni, and the Kurds. So I don't think we've got any options, and we'd be ill-advised to start bombing where we really can't sort out the combatants or understand where the civilian population is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the United States should be involving itself militarily in a civil war, a sectarian war, a religious war, a struggle for power that has been going on for generations. We shouldn't be taking sides in this conflict.

I do believe that a region in turmoil is not in the best interest of the United States. But as so many have said, including the President, this requires a political solution and it requires the political will of all the key actors in the region, not just outside actors like the United States and the Europeans, but those in the region. The countries and leaders in the region need to step up to the plate and actually lead on finding a political solution or watch their neighbors go up in flames and hope the fire doesn't jump to their homes and destroy them as well.

This is why we need a full debate on what is happening in Iraq, in the region, what our options are, and whether or not we should keep sending troops to Iraq or not.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the bipartisan Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I cochair with my good friend Congressman FRANK WOLF, held a briefing on the human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq. We had witnesses from the administration, the

U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees Office, and several NGOs.

The situation on the ground in Iraq that they described is horrifying, but it stretches back over a year. The human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq did not begin with ISIL coming back into Iraq, but that certainly has worsened and accelerated the decline in security, protection, and basic rights for the civilian population.

Yesterday, Antonio Guterres, the head of UNHCR said:

There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions.

He urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this is where we should be putting our energy, not trying to find some sort of military path to civility in Iraq, because there is none.

I will enter into the RECORD today's Washington Post article on UNHCR's assessment of the humanitarian crisis in Iraq.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 2014]

REFUGEE CHIEF URGES POLITICAL DEAL IN IRAQ

(By Abigail Hauslohner)

BAGHDAD—The head of the U.N. refugee agency said Wednesday that he was increasingly frustrated with Iraq's skyrocketing number of displaced people—and with governments worldwide that expect humanitarian aid organizations to ''come clean up the mess.''

''There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. There is no humanitarian solution for the Syrian crisis,'' António Guterres, the U.N. high commissioner for refugees, said in a closed briefing with reporters here in the Iraqi capital.

''It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions,'' he said.

Iraq's Political factions are negotiating the key positions in a new government that they hope will guide this fractured nation out of its worst crisis since U.S. troops pulled out in late 2011.

In recent weeks, Iraq has come dangerously close to breaking apart as Sunni militants calling themselves the Islamic State have seized control of a vast swath of territory stretching from Syria to central Iraq.

The Shiite-led government has fought back with the help of militias, raising the specter of sectarian war as violence—including airstrikes, bombings, and executions of Shiites by Sunnis and vice versa—racks many parts of the country.

Iraqi Kurds, meanwhile, are pressing for a referendum on independence in their largely autonomous—and relatively stable—region in the north.

On Wednesday, Guterres urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

He said about 1.1 million Iraqis have been displaced since the start of the year, when serious violence first broke out between government forces and Sunni insurgents in the western province of Anbar.

At least half a million have fled their homes in the past five weeks alone, Guterres added.

During his weekly televised address Wednesday, embattled Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki congratulated the Iraqi parliament on electing a new speaker. The vote Tuesday was a crucial step toward forming the desperately needed new government.

''I hope that they will work in harmony and to agree on running the parliament . . . away from all differences and calculations,'' Maliki said, according to the Associated Press.

But the parliament still needs to vote on a president and a prime minister. Maliki is facing growing pressure to step down, and his reluctance to do so has been the main cause of Iraq's political deadlock.

In his address Wednesday, however, he did not comment on whether he would seek a third term.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have come to this floor because we are worried. We are worried because we have lived through the last many years of war and we have seen how things have gotten out of control.

I remember when the war in Iraq began. Then-Vice President Cheney was on all the news shows saying that it will be over in a few weeks or few months. No big deal. Don't worry. That was in addition to being told that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, which we all know now was a lie.

But the fact of the matter is all those rosy predictions did not come true. We were involved in Iraq for many, many years, and there was a high cost in terms of blood and treasure. Afghanistan, we were told that it would not be an endless conflict, and here we are today still involved in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

I hope that history doesn't repeat itself, and I know President Obama does not want history to repeat itself. I know he deeply wants to find a political solution. I know he does not want to see more troops be involved in the Iraqi civil war, but the fact of the matter is none of us know what is going to happen.

In a couple of weeks, this Congress will adjourn for several weeks of our summer break, and then we come back for only a couple more weeks and we adjourn again for many more weeks for the campaigns. I don't want to come back to a situation and have to react to a situation that is engulfed in an all-out mess, quite frankly.

I think we ought to be debating these issues now. We ought to be debating these issues with open eyes. We ought to have a transparent system, and we ought to live up to our constitutional responsibilities.

What happens when there are the first American casualties in Iraq? What happens? What is the reaction?

Some say maybe we don't have to send military troops; maybe we will just bomb them. We will send drones. We will send missiles.

As military expert Micah Zenko tweeted:

Unless the U.S. has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into Prime Minister Maliki, air strikes in Iraq would be pointless.

And imagine the civilian casualties that would be associated with that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Earlier, you made a statement about there being no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I would respectfully ask the gentleman to maybe rephrase that. There are mass graves in Iraq. As somebody who—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

The Vice President of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of State came to Congress and told us there were weapons of mass destruction, implied there were nuclear weapons of mass destruction. And the deal was, it was a lie.

4,500 Americans died; 5,000 Iraqis died. We need to pay for the war. We didn't pay for the war. The brave men and women who served our country paid, their families paid, and the rest of us were asked to do nothing.

What I am suggesting to everybody in this Chamber now, whether you want to go back into Iraq or not, that is almost beside the point for the purpose of this debate. The issue is we ought to do our job in Congress. We have a constitutional responsibility that we seem to waive, that we seem to ignore.

We are bombing in Pakistan. We are bombing in Yemen. We had a military incursion in Libya. None of that was authorized by Congress. We are relying on these vague AUMFs that were negotiated over a decade ago to justify more military involvements in different parts of the world. What is wrong with debating these issues?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. You have tens of thousands of people in mass graves as a result of chemical weapons in Iraq, killed directly by the regime of Saddam Hussein. When you continue to perpetuate this idea that there were no weapons of mass destruction, WMD includes chemical weapons, biological weapons.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, as the gentleman knows, that is not what the Vice President or the Secretary of State or the head of the National Security Council or the President of the United States were talking about. He knows that.

What was presented to us was not truthful. It was not truthful. We were

deceived. The Vice President of the United States said the war was only going to last a couple of months. He said that on TV, on news shows. That was a lie. It was a lie, and I am sick and tired of being lied to.

One of the lessons that I think we should have learned from our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan is that we need to ask the tough questions before we get involved—not in the midst of a conflict, not later on in the conflict.

We have a responsibility. Read the Constitution of the United States. The notion that the President of the United States—and, again, I don't believe he wants to get involved in a lengthy, unlimited, endless war in Iraq. But there is the notion that we are ramping up the number of troops, and those in Congress here are saying nothing. The leadership in this Congress says nothing. There is no authorization.

I guess it is easy to sit back as an elected official and not have to vote years from now. It is a lot easier. You don't have to take responsibility. If things go well, you can say, ''Hey, that was a good idea.'' If things don't go well, ''Gee, I would have been opposed to that.'' But we are not doing our job here. We are not even paying for these wars.

To my friends on the Republican side who complain about debt, where is the outrage on the fact that we don't even pay for these wars? I can't quite understand why people approach war in this Chamber with such indifference.

My colleague Mr. JONES and I tried to bring an amendment to the floor, as I said earlier, to debate whether we should stay in Afghanistan longer. We were not even allowed a vote. The amendment we offered was germane, was relevant, and the leadership of this House said you can't even debate or vote this.

The defense bill. We are at war. What can be more important than debating whether we should be involved in this war?

So this is the time. What Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and I are saying is that this is the time to debate this, before the first soldier comes home in a body bag.

The major proponents of a new war in Iraq are those who disastrously got us involved in the first place; people like Dick Cheney and John Bolton, Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM.

We were deceived, and we should never let that happen again. We should never let that happen again. We should demand the truth. Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq again.

That is what this privileged resolution that Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have suggested that we vote on. I don't know why that is such a controversial issue, but for some reason in this Congress big issues like that don't ever seem to make their way for debate on the House floor.

This should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. In fact, there are Democrats who disagree with my position. There are some Democrats who believe we ought to continue to send more military aid and potentially more troops to Iraq, and there are Republicans who agree with me that we ought not to. So this is a bipartisan concern.

□ 1430

I will close by simply saying to the Speaker of the House: Give us a vote. Let us debate this issue.

To my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle: Live up to your constitutional responsibility. Demand a vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROVIDING FOR THE CORRECTION OF THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5021

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the Special Order of Mr. MCGOVERN). Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5021) an Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: At the end, add the following and conform the table of contents accordingly:

''TITLE III—TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES

''SEC. 3001. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

''(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

''(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING LOUIS THEODORE GETTERMAN, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, our Nation lost Louis Theodore Getterman, Jr., a veteran, a successful businessman, a dedicated philanthropist, and a legend at Baylor University.

Lovingly known by all as Ted Getterman, he was born on October 1, 1924, in Baltimore, Maryland, and later moved to Waco, Texas, to attend Baylor University and to eventually become an active community leader.

Ted Getterman lived his entire life with excellence. At the age of 18, he volunteered for the Army, and served our Nation for 3½ years during World War II. He was on the beach with his fellow soldiers, preparing to invade Japan, when the atomic bomb was dropped, thus ending the war. Upon his return, he attended Baylor University, where he received both his BBA and J.D. degrees.

Ted Getterman was very dedicated to his alma mater, Baylor University. He upheld the university's mission well—to educate men and women for worldwide leadership and service by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment within a caring community. He was active in various Baylor organizations, and was an honorary member of the Baylor ''B'' Association. Ted was also awarded with the Baylor Athletic Director's Hall of Honor Achievement Award, the Victory with Integrity Award, and the Baylor Founder's Medal. He was also a fellow in the Golden Bear Circle. He was even recognized as a Distinguished Alumnus by the Baylor Hankamer School of Business. The Baylor softball field was even named in his family's honor—Getterman Stadium.

In addition to his love for his university, Ted Getterman was also successful and active as a businessman. He was a partner of the Seven-Up Bottling Company, which owned franchises in 29 Texas counties and bottling plants in the Texas cities of Waco, Bryan, and Austin. Ted also served in the leadership of various business organizations, including having been the chairman of his chapter of the Texas Manufacturers Association and the president of the State Bottlers Association.

As an active community leader, Ted Getterman served on the Waco City Council, and was the mayor of Waco for two terms. He also served tirelessly on various boards and organizations, including the Waco Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club of Waco, the Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center, the Salvation Army, the Family Counseling and Children's Services, the Baylor Stadium Corporation, the Bear Club, the Baylor Development Council, the Ridgewood Country Club, and the McDonald Observatory of Texas. In

fact, Ted was named the Philanthropist of the Year by the Central Texas Chapter of Fund-Raising Executives.

Ted Getterman was a hardworking man who also enjoyed his leisure time with family, friends, and his rescue dog, Noodle. He enjoyed traveling, golfing, and working out at the Ted and Sue Getterman Wellness Center. He was a faithful husband to his loving wife, Sue; a mentoring father to his sons, ''T'' and Holt; and an inspiration to his numerous grandchildren and great grandchildren.

When I was growing up, my dad used to always tell me the same thing each day. Those words were: ''Go make a hand.'' In other words, he was telling me to add value, to make the world a better place. I think all of us in the 17th Congressional District of Texas can unanimously say without reservation that Ted Getterman made a hand.

Before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women, and for our first responders, who serve selflessly to keep us safe and free.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Ted Getterman's. He will be forever remembered as selfless, hardworking, and devoted man of God. He left a legacy of love, dignity, grace, and philanthropy. God bless his family and our community as we mourn his passing.

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

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a festival of charts with me, not because they are pretty, not because they are attractive, but because I have something very important I want to talk about today, and I just can't do it without the direct quotes. I want to talk about the separation of powers.

If you will remember the conversation that the gentleman from Massachusetts had—he was down here on the floor with the gentleman from North Carolina—they were talking about constitutional powers. They were talking about what we need to do in this body to fulfill our constitutional powers. It is hard. I don't envy them at all, Mr. Speaker. I come down here, and folks at home always ask about this time at the end of the day.

They say, What goes on in that time?

I say, Well, they yield time for long periods, about an hour at a time. They will yield Members time to come down here and debate the issues of their choice, but your job of sitting there as the impartial observer while anybody says ''goodness knows what'' down here on the House floor is a hard, hard job—a hard job.

I didn't want to come down here today and try to come up with something that was divisive, that would try to get you out of your chair, that would try to bring your gavel down on me. I wanted to come up with something today that would be something that we could agree on as a people.

Now think about that.

I don't know what your understanding is, Mr. Speaker, of who we are as a people. I was just visiting with some young constituents out in the hallway—ages 6, ages 8, ages 10. What does it mean to be an American? It is a set of ideas. It is a set of values. It is a set of principles. Now, most of those principles, I would argue, are contained in our United States Constitution. It is a pretty simple document. It lays out a vision, a vision that has governed this country well for over 200 years.

Sadly—and I mean, sincerely, I do think it is sad—we have crafted a resolution up in the Rules Committee—and we just had a hearing on it this week—where we are suing the President of the United States over his adherence to the Constitution. Now, I take absolutely no pleasure in that. To be fair, as folks back in their offices know, Mr. Speaker, I am a hardcore Republican from the State of Georgia, but I take no pleasure in suing the President of the United States.

I take no pleasure in it because I represent the article I United States Congress. It is not my power that is in my voting card. It is the power of 650,000 constituents back home in Georgia. It is the people's power that is represented in my voting card. I will tell you that, not just during the time you have been here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and not just during the 3 years that I have been here in Congress, but for a long period of time, the people's power that is represented here in this institution has been slipping and sliding right down Pennsylvania Avenue, behind me, and accumulating in the United States White House. Administrations, both Republicans and Democrats, have been taking one fiber of freedom—one fiber of power at a time—from the people, taking it from the Congress and amassing it down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The reason I say I take no pleasure in the lawsuit, Mr. Speaker, is that I don't want to have to go across the street to the Supreme Court and ask a coequal branch of government—those article III courts—to return to me the people's power that I lost. I should have never lost it to begin with. Now, I wasn't here in Congress when so much of that was going on, Mr. Speaker. You know it has only been 3 years that I have had a voting card, but I feel responsible. Here is what the resolution says:

Resolve: that the Speaker—the Speaker of the House—may initiate or intervene in one or more civil actions on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives in Federal court.

It is saying that we have experienced institutional harm in article I. In article I in the House, we have experienced institutional harm. It authorizes the Speaker to file suit not on his behalf but on our behalf. He is not the Speaker of the Republicans. He is not the Speaker of the Democrats. He is the Speaker of the whole House. It is to file suit on our behalf, and it is a suit on the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. If you have not had a chance to see this resolution, you are thinking, Oh, boy. Here go those Republicans again. They are just filing one more lawsuit to try to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Not true. Not true. This is a lawsuit to require the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

I want you to think about that. That is why we are in this constitutional crisis.

I didn't want the Affordable Care Act. I wasn't here at the time. I didn't have a chance to vote for it. I knew I wasn't going to be able to keep my doctor. I knew I wasn't going to be able to keep my insurance policy. I knew that, if we wanted to take care of the needs of the uninsured, there were better ways, but I didn't get a chance to vote. I wasn't here. The Senate passed it. It got jammed through the House. The President signed it. It turns out it didn't quite work the way the President wanted it to.

So what does he do? He started to implement some of it, and decided not to implement other parts of it.

You don't get to do that.

We have an article I Congress. We pass the law. The President gets to sign it or veto it. The courts decide whether or not it is constitutional. Presidents don't get to decide which laws they like, which laws they don't like, which lines they want to implement, which lines they don't. So this is a lawsuit to require the President to follow the law that he signed.

I wish we would repeal the law. It turns out—and it has been said many times by leaders in this country—that the best way to do away with a bad law is to require its aggressive enforcement. I want you to think about that. The best way to end a bad law is to require its strict enforcement because then the people will make that decision.

I don't mean to pick on the President. Again, the President has a hard job. I was with my mom on Mother's Day at church, Mr. Speaker.

Someone came up, and said, Oh, Ms. Woodall, we just love your son. We hope he will think about running for the White House one day.

My mom looked him in the eye, and said, That is a terrible thing to say about my son.

And it is. It is just awful. It is an awful job, and I am glad we have men and women who are willing to pursue it, but it must be pursued, not as an all powerful executive, but as a caretaker of the constitutional responsibilities invested in that position by article II of our Constitution. Not more than 30 days ago the Supreme Court ruled on that.

This is what I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker. I know you followed the Noel Canning decision, but what the Supreme Court said in a case called Noel Canning v. NLRB not more than 30 days ago—and just to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, you have looked at that Court, haven't you? I mean, there are some hardcore, rock-ribbed conservatives on that Court, and there are some fringe liberals on that Court, too. I suppose, if I were in the other category, I would say there were fringe conservatives and some rock-ribbed liberals. Yet what I am saying is that they don't agree on much in that Chamber. You see it over and over and over again the decisions that come out of there. It is that five of them believe this and that four of them believe that. It is a divided Court, a divided opinion, but not so when it comes to the United States Constitution in this Noel Canning case.

In the Noel Canning case, the Court ruled 9–0—the Court ruled unanimously, Mr. Speaker—that the President of the United States exceeded his constitutional authority in making appointments to positions without consulting the United States Senate. The President made appointments to positions that the Constitution requires that the Senate approve, that the Democratic Senate approve. He made those appointments without Senate approval. He said he thought he could do it. He said it was the right thing to do. He said the ends justified the means. The Supreme Court said, 9–0, no, he can't do it. The Constitution doesn't allow it.

But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker.

The point is that that happened 2 years ago. The President made these appointments 2 years ago, and you have not heard one peep out of that United States Senate. This wasn't a lawsuit that the Senate brought to say, Wait a minute, Mr. President. You are stealing the power of the people out from under article I on Capitol Hill. This wasn't a Senate lawsuit. This was a private sector lawsuit. This was just some company out there across America that said, I have been disadvantaged because the Constitution has been breached, and I am seeking relief from the United States Supreme Court. The Senate did not stand up when the President stole their power.

□ 1445

The only way our system of government works, Mr. Speaker, is when we stand up for the people to preserve their power here in this institution.

This is what the Court said, and I just so identify with this. They said the Recess Appointments Clause—that is what we are talking about.

That was where the President said: I am going to make these appointments because the Senate is not in session. The Senate said: yes, I am in session. The President said: no, you are not, you are mistaken, I am going to make these appointments.

Anyway, the Supreme Court said the Recess Appointments Clause is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. It simply provides a subsidiary method for appointing officials when the Senate is away during a recess.

Here is the money line, Mr. Speaker: ''Here, as in other contexts, friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.''

I happen to have a copy of the Constitution right here, Mr. Speaker. Friction, the Supreme Court says, is ''an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.'' If you don't like friction, you need to rewrite your Constitution because the Constitution creates this friction to create that balance between the article I Congress, the article II executive, the article III courts.

This is not news to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is not news to the country at all.

This is George Washington's farewell address. It was 1796, Mr. Speaker, 1796. This is our unwilling President. President Washington didn't want to be our first President. He was drafted to do the job.

Turns out, some of the best Presidents are the ones who don't want the job, but who have it thrust upon them by the circumstances of history.

President Washington says this—farewell address, 1796, he said:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another.

President George Washington, having fought that Revolutionary War, having given us the benefit that no other nation on the planet had, of self-governance, having been drafted into service after the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to serve as the first President of the United States—in his parting words, in the final wisdom that he tries to pass on to preserve this fledgling Nation that he pledged his life and his fortune to create, he said, it is important, in the habits of thinking in a free country, that those habits should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker, where we are today, where the Supreme Court is ruling unanimously that this President of the United States has overstepped his constitutional bounds, where the House of Representatives is considering a lawsuit against the President of the United States for even more overreaching of his constitutional authority.

From the very beginning of this Nation, our leaders knew that the Nation's success depended on confining each branch of government to its respective constitutional sphere.

Now, I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. You are thinking that was 1797, things change.

Well, let's take a look and see. Here is a quote from Senator Barack Obama, 2007. Senator Barack Obama, 2007, says this—he says: I was a constitutional law professor, which means, unlike the current President, I actually respect the Constitution.

That is pretty powerful. Now, in fairness, there were Presidential campaigns beginning then. People sometimes say inflammatory things during campaigns that they later regret saying, but then-Senator Barack Obama said: This current President, George Bush, he doesn't respect the Constitution. Maybe he doesn't understand it; but I, President Obama, said—then-Senator Obama said: I am a constitutional professor. I understand it. I get it, and I respect it.

Not so, says the Supreme Court this summer, 9–0, that the President overstepped his constitutional bounds. I know what you are thinking, Mr. Speaker. You are saying you have been around this town for a short period of time, and you know how people game these quotes. They go out and they pull the most awful quote out, and they pretend that that represents someone's entire body of thought.

Well, I have gone much further. Here, again, Senator Barack Obama, 2007: These last few years, we have seen an unacceptable abuse of power here at home in America.

He said: We have paid a heavy price for having a President whose priority is expanding his own power. The constitution is treated like a nuisance.

I want to think about that, Mr. Speaker, because I want to come back to that.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, observing what happened in the Bush administration, says: We have paid a heavy price for having a President whose priority is expanding his own power. The Constitution is treated like a nuisance.

Now, what I hope the take-home message is, Mr. Speaker, that you will share with your constituents back home, that I certainly share with mine, is we have just had a debate over constitutional responsibility on the floor of the House, where both our Democratic friend from Massachusetts and

our Republican friend from North Carolina both agreed that we need to stand up more for our article I powers.

I want to associate myself with the comments of Senator Barack Obama in 2007. Had Republicans done a better job—and, again, I wasn't in Congress at the time. You weren't in Congress at the time, Mr. Speaker—had Republicans done a better job reining in the overreach of then-President Bush, we wouldn't be having so many of these conversations today.

Something very destructive is happening in this country, very destructive, where Republicans prioritize protecting Republicans in the White House more than they prioritize protecting the Constitution, where Democrats prioritize protecting the Democrats in the White House more than they prioritize protecting the Constitution.

I don't know how that happened. We had giants in this institution, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the aisle—both sides of the aisle.

Robert Byrd from West Virginia always comes to mind. I couldn't agree with him on many policy issues, but, boy, did I love his affection for the United States of America. Man alive, did I admire his commitment to the Constitution.

The thing of it is, Mr. Speaker, if we don't stand up for it, no one else will. President Obama said he was going to stand up for it. He said we had paid a heavy price under President Bush for treating the Constitution as a nuisance.

Let me go a little more current. President Obama, at a press conference, August 13 of 2013, he is talking about the Affordable Care Act. He is talking about that bill on which the House is getting ready to file a lawsuit.

This is exactly what he said: In a normal political environment—President Obama said—it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker and say, you know what? This is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law.

He is talking about delaying the employer mandate. He is talking about taking that part of the law that says this must happen by this date and deciding it is not going to happen by that date. In fact, it might not happen at all, but it is certainly not going to happen this year.

He says, ordinarily, he would have just called up the Speaker and said, We need to tweak this. He says, Let's make a technical change to the law, would be what he would ordinarily tell the Speaker. He said that would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we are not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare.

We had the executive authority to do what we did, and so we did so.

Our President who, as a Senator, recognized the erosion of power from article I, our President who, as a Senator, wanted to rein in what George Bush was doing—in fact, accused George Bush of considering the Constitution a nuisance, our President, when then a Senator, said he was a constitutional law professor, he understood the nuances of the Constitution.

When he became President, Mr. Speaker, he said: you know what? I understand that what is supposed to happen is that I am supposed to go to Capitol Hill, I am supposed to talk to the Speaker, and I am supposed to get the law changed—but these aren't ordinary times. These aren't times like last year or 2 years ago or 10 years ago or 200 years ago. These are special times, and in these special times, I am just going to do it myself from the White House.

Incredibly dangerous, incredibly dangerous—he could be right, he could be 100 percent right about what he wants to do, but the way he wants to do it is 100 percent wrong.

Don't believe me, listen to the Supreme Court, which said, 9–0, unanimously, the President has overstepped his bounds.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, Mr. Speaker: I taught constitutional law for 10 years, I take the Constitution very seriously.

This is 2008. There is a war ongoing. The economy is collapsing, America is in crisis, and this is what then-Senator Barack Obama says: The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with George Bush trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker. 2008, in the midst of crisis in this country, a Presidential election year, where candidates are telling the American people who they are, what they believe, and what the American people can count on them to do if elected to office.

Looking at that landscape of crisis in this country, President Obama—then-Senator Obama says: The biggest problem that we are facing right now has to do with George Bush trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all.

Here is the money line, Mr. Speaker: That is what I intend to reverse when I am President of the United States of America.

This body is getting ready to file a lawsuit, unprecedented, against the President of the United States for failure to stay within his constitutional lane.

The lawsuits filed by the private sector are coming back from the Supreme Court, 9–0, that the President has exceeded his constitutional lane. He ran on a platform of Presidents are exceeding their constitutional lanes and it is destroying the country. It is among the biggest problems the Nation faces. He pledges to reform it.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, in the 40 years that I have been watching the governance of this Nation, I have never seen it any worse, but to be clear, I have seen it bad. I have seen it bad, and I have seen the failure of this House to stop it. I have seen the failure of the Senate to stop it.

There is plenty of blame to go around. I am not interested in who to blame for it, I am interested in how to solve it, because here is the question that I think all the board of directors of America has to answer.

Now, I gesture to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, as if the board of directors live here. They do not. The board of directors of the United States of America lives at home in Peachtree Corners, Georgia; in Lawrenceville, Georgia; they live in Poughkeepsie; they live in L.A.; they live in New York; they live in Sioux City; they live in New Orleans; they live all across this land.

The board of directors are those people with voter registration cards in their pocket. They are the ones who run this country. They are the ones to whom we are accountable.

The President knows—he knew it when he was in the Senate, he knew when he began his campaign for office, he knew what George Washington told us in his farewell address, which was only a reverence for the division of powers crafted by the Constitution will allow our country to be strong.

He knew it, he campaigned on it, and the pressures of the job—the pressures of this horrible, horrible job, I will tell you, that is President of the United States, have caused him to lose sight of that constitutional mooring; and we, the board of directors, must bring him back.

Now, we are going to try to do it through a lawsuit here in the U.S. House. The private sector has already done it through multiple lawsuits, through the Supreme Court.

The American people need to do it—not at the ballot box because this President will never seek election again. They need to do it through the court of public opinion.

□ 1500

Getting our goals accomplished is important. How we get those goals accomplished may be even more.

Senator Barack Obama in 2008: One of the most important jobs of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch on the power of the other branches. And I think the Chief Justice has been a little bit too willing and eager to give the administration—then the Bush administration—whether it's mine or George Bush's, more power than I think the Constitution originally intended.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is an election year. This is 2008. The President is running to be the President of the United States. He is

being asked about what that separation of powers means. He is being asked whether or not the Constitution matters. He is being asked, how do we continue this great experiment in self-governance that is the United States of America? And he says: One of the most important jobs of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch on the power of the other branches.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen to what is coming out of this White House when we talk about this lawsuit the House is considering filing. Is this what you hear? Is what you hear from President Barack Obama in 2014 the same thing you heard from him as candidate-for-President Barack Obama in 2008?

The most important job of the Supreme Court is to guard against the encroachment of the executive branch?

That is all this House is asking the Court to decide.

And we didn't choose a controversial issue, one that we might disagree with the President on, on whether or not it should be implemented. We chose his own health care bill to say: Mr. President, I know you are proud of this health care bill, and so let's do it. Let's implement it. Let's not pick and choose. Let's do the whole thing exactly the way you signed it, exactly the way the House and Senate passed it. Let's do it that way. You don't get to make those decisions on your own.

The President knew that as a Senator. In fact, he criticizes the Supreme Court. In the same way that today, what I hear coming out of the White House is a criticism of the U.S. House for even going to the Court to try to chasten the President, when he was a Senator, he goes the other direction. He says: I think the Chief Justice has been a little bit too willing and eager to give the administration, whether it's mine or George Bush's, more power than I think the Constitution originally intended.

There is a lot of pressure to get your agenda accomplished. It is not just a Capitol Hill thing. It is not a White House thing. It is a life thing. We have been talking about that since we were kids, Mr. Speaker.

Do the ends justify the means? Does the process matter? I will tell you, if you have a broken process, you are going to end up with a broken product.

We have an opportunity in this Chamber to do exactly what then-Senator Obama asked us to do, which is to stand up for this division of power.

Then-Senator Barack Obama, Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 2008, he says this about the division of power. He does understand it. At least in 2008, he got it. This is what he said. He said: Everybody's got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation, and the President can veto it or sign it. But what George Bush has been doing, as a part of his effort to accumulate more power in the Presidency, is he has been saying, Well, I can basically change what Congress passed by attaching a letter that says I don't agree with this part or that part. He says: What President Bush is doing is saying, I am going to choose to interpret it this way or that way.

But then-Senator Barack Obama goes on to say that is not part of the President's power. He says: This is part of the whole theory of George Bush, that he can make up the law as he goes along. Then-Senator Barack Obama says: I disagree with that.

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter whether you are the most liberal Democrat in this country or the most conservative Republican or anybody in between. There is no question that there is picking and choosing going on in the implementation of laws in this country: I am going to enforce this law because I like it; I am going to ignore this law because I don't like it; I am going to change this law because I would like it better if only it had this instead of that.

The lawsuit this institution is proposing is not to settle any kind of policy dispute; it is to settle a process dispute. It is to say, whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it passed the Senate; whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it passed the House; whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, it was signed into law by the President of the United States and upheld by the Supreme Court; so let's enforce it. Let's enforce it. Let's do what it says. If it says these policies should be outlawed, let's outlaw them. You don't get to choose which ones you think should and shouldn't be outlawed. The law, itself, says outlaw them. No policy shall be sold after this date.

If you believe that the protections of the Affordable Care Act—I don't call them protections. They have done more to destroy health insurance in my district than to protect the uninsured in my district. But if you believe those protections are important for America, implement those. Implement those.

You saw the chaos that was caused in the individual market when that one set was implemented. No more deadlines have been implemented since that time.

The President said: You know what? That wasn't quite what I had intended. It wasn't supposed to work out that way. He says: In ordinary times, I would have gone to the U.S. House of Representatives. I would have called the Speaker. I would have said let's work together to change the law. But these are not ordinary times, so I am going to change it myself, as the Executive of the United States.

You won't find those powers in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker. You won't find them here. You will find a long history of Senators and House Members saying: Mr. President, you can't do that; you will find a long history of the Supreme Court saying: You can't do that; and you will find, in the case of this President in particular, because he had decades as a constitutional scholar, you will find speech after speech, you will find quote after quote, you will find article after article that say to the then-President of the United States, George Bush: Stay in your constitutional lane. Obey that simple document that is our United States Constitution. If you want something done, go to the Congress to get it done. Do not do it by yourself in the White House. Don't pick up your pen. Don't pick up your phone. Get in your car and drive down to the United States Congress.

And every single time then-Senator Barack Obama said that, he was right. And there were far too few Republicans in this Chamber, far too few Republicans in the Senate who stood up and agreed with him.

As Republicans, we had a war on our hands. The Nation was in crisis, a national security crisis. Terrorism was on our shores like we had never seen before. And we thought, you know what—and again, I wasn't here then. I can only imagine what was going on in this body. I can only imagine what those with voting cards were thinking. But I imagine they were thinking: I would hate to criticize my own President in these tough times for America. Maybe it would be better if I looked the other way. Maybe it would be better if I just turned my head just this once, irrespective of what the constitutional guidance requires.

If that was the thought of any man or woman in this Chamber, if that was the thought of any man or woman in the United States Senate, they were 100 percent wrong. I get it. I get how they could feel that way, but they were 100 percent wrong. And if any man or woman in this Chamber or in the United States Senate is thinking today, I must protect my President from the strictures of the Constitution, they are wrong.

The Constitution does not exist to protect the President. The Constitution exists to protect the people. The Constitution is not a document to make sure that government power is preserved. The Constitution is a document to make sure the people's power isn't abrogated. It is not easy.

I hope folks liked to see the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from North Carolina, gentlemen who disagree on so much about policy in this Chamber, gentlemen from different parts of the country, gentlemen from different parties down here agreeing on the constitutional role of this House when it comes to sending our young men and women into harm's way. They were exactly right.

We have to come together to do this, Mr. Speaker. And if we could come together to do this, a lawsuit wouldn't even be necessary.

Again, we used to have giants. We used to have giants in this institution who put the country first and the party a distant, distant second or third or fourth. We have got to bring those traditions back.

President Barack Obama, August 2013, an incredibly popular President sat for reelection, reelected to a second term by the American people. A constitutional scholar, having forewarned the American people for over a decade about the dangers of too much power involved in the executive branch, having warned the American people about the importance of including Congress, having told the Bush White House how absolute power cannot reside there, must have ideas originating from the U.S. House, says: In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to call the Speaker and say, You know what, let's tweak this legislation. That would be the normal thing, and that is what I would prefer to do, but I am not going to do it. We are not in a normal atmosphere around here, he says. I have executive authority, and I used it.

The funny thing about the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, folks always talk about their constitutional rights. They always talk about their constitutional rights. Sometimes the rights they are talking about really are constitutional; sometimes they are not. But the funny thing about this Constitution is it allows the President to do anything he or she wants to do until somebody stands up and says no.

The powers are in the Congress. The powers are in the courts. The Executive's role is to implement those rules, to implement those laws. But if no one stands up and says no, the largest branch in the country is the executive branch, and they continue to operate unfettered.

We don't have an opportunity to say no. We have an obligation to say no. Not to say no to this President, but to say no to the Office of the President. When these powers slip away, these powers that don't belong to this Chamber but belong to the American people, when they slip away, they are hard to get back.

We didn't have a revolution in this country because the executive wasn't powerful enough. We had a revolution in this country because the executive was all powerful, and we thought there was a better way.

The President, speech after speech, article after article, thought there was a better way. But the power of that office, perhaps the burdens of that office, the responsibility of that office, have brought a 180-degree change in the President's view of the Constitution. We are back to where he identified George Bush as being 8 years ago, where the Constitution is treated as a nuisance.

The Constitution is not a nuisance. The Constitution is the only thing standing between the American people and a complete seizure of their freedoms. This is that document.

I am going to end where I began, Mr. Speaker, with the Noel Canning decision, 9–0. The Supreme Court says President Barack Obama had no constitutional authority to do what he did—no constitutional authority. And what the Court observes is friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional form of government.

□ 1515

We can absolutely do away with the friction. We can absolutely get things done. We can absolutely move all the obstacles out of the way. But that would not be America. That would not be our constitutional form of government.

You cannot eliminate the friction without eliminating the Constitution. There is not a constituent in my district back home that would make that choice. We have to embrace the friction. We have to embrace the battles of ideas that is America, and we have to commit ourselves—even when it is inconvenient—to playing by the rules of the United States Constitution. It has protected our freedoms as a self-governing people for 200 years, and it can do it for another 200 years if we don't lose track of our obligation to protect it today.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for being down here with me today, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2244. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of Ohio Army National Guard duty in Columbus, Ohio.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 17, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 697. To provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 18, 2014, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9913-18] (RIN: 2070-AJ53) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0919; A-1-FRL-9810-2] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Latham Pool Adjusted Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0119; FRL-9912-19-Region 5] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0310; FRL-9913-30-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0649; FRL-9913-41-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Control of Commercial Fuel Oil Sulfur Limits for Combustion Units [EPA-

R03-OAR-2013-0241; FRL-9913-26-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6482. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Minor New Source Review [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0789; FRL-9913-42-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6483. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0715; FRL-9913-28-Region 10] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6484. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Flexible Permit Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0542; FRL-9913-48-Region 6] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6485. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Delaware, District of Columbia, and West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0475; FRL-9913-32-Region 3] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0323; FRL-9913-12-Region 9] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6487. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0166; FRL-9910-01] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6488. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Hawaiian Island Commercial Harbors, HI [USCG-2013-0021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6489. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Hudson River Swim for Life; Hudson River, Sleepy Hollow, New York [USCG-2014-0363] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6490. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lady Liberty Sharkfest Swim; Upper New York Bay, Liberty Island, NY [USCG-2014-0117] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6491. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Texas City Channel, Texas City, TX [USCG-2014-0034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6492. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV [USCG-2014-0402] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6493. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Arts Project Cherry Grove Pride Week Fireworks Display; Great South Bay; Cherry Grove, Fire Island, NY [USCG-2014-0180] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; July 4th Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Zone, Miami, FL [USCG-2014-0165] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6495. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0368; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-17851; AD 2014-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6496. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airplanes Originally Manufactured by Lockheed for the Military as Model P-3A and P3A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1073; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-039-AD; Amendment 39-17856; AD 2014-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 645. Resolution requesting that the President of the United States transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Executive Office of the President that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, adversely; (Rept. 113–524). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 647. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, adversely; (Rept. 113–525). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit; with an amendment (Rept. 113–527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3202. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–528). Referred to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3136. A bill to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education; with an amendment (Rept. 113–529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4983. A bill to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4984. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3716. A bill to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4508. A bill to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services (Rept. 113–

534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4527. A bill to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4562. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (Rept. 113–536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4315. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4316. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the disclosure of certain expenditures under that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–540, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4318 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5129. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed for custody and care in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5131. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical providers for the provision of certain hospital care and medical services to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to dispense with the requirement of providing assurance of payment for utility services under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5133. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 11 of the United States Code to improve protections for employees and retirees in municipal bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5134. A bill to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COOK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. REED, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 5135. A bill to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5136. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act under which payment may be made to States for expenditures for medical assistance with respect to substance use disorder treatment services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5137. A bill to modify the treatment of unaccompanied alien children who are in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require consultation with State and local elected officials and a public hearing before awarding grants or contracts for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5139. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5140. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to enable a State to be reimbursed for child welfare training expenditures made by a nonprofit educational institution in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5141. A bill to reduce the amount of foreign assistance to Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador based on the number of unaccompanied alien children who are nationals or citizens of such countries and who in the preceding fiscal year are placed in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 5142. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Jackson Street in Rich Square, North Carolina, as the ''Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 5144. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States which require individuals to present a photo identification as a condition of voting in elections

for Federal office to accept a photo identification presented by a student which is issued by the school the student attends; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 5145. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5146. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 5147. A bill to provide certain uninsured individuals a special enrollment period after tax filing in 2015 for enrollment in qualified health plans offered through an Exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5148. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to exempt certain higher-risk mortgages from property appraisal requirements and to exempt individuals from penalties for failure to report certain appraisers, and to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to exempt certain higher-risk mortgages from property appraisal requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5149. A bill to provide for a smart water management pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5150. A bill to establish a WaterSense program within the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain information be included in loan disclosure statements prior to disbursement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5152. A bill to save the Federal Government money by reducing duplication and increasing efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Act of September 16, 1922, to clarify the responsibility of Federal agencies to remove snow and ice for areas around Federal buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5154. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Administrator of General Services to make rules to streamline and simplify the registration system used by small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5155. A bill to prohibit the National Endowment for the Humanities to provide funds to carry out the Popular Romance Project or any similar project relating to love or romance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5156. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to identify and declare wildlife disease emergencies and to coordinate rapid response to these emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5157. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive certain requirements relating to the approval of programs of education for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 5021; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. HIMES):

H. Res. 673. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 674. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that sedentary lifestyles are a public health issue and supporting the designation of a National Get Vertical Day to recognize the importance of preventing physical inactivity and encouraging adults to live physically active lifestyles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 675. A resolution supporting the Constitutional authority of the Governors of the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to take action to secure the international border of the United States within their States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power ''To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.''

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 5134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 5135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 5136.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.
By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 5137.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the US Constitution
By Mr. OLSON:
H.R. 5138.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4
By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 5139.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:
The Congress shall have Power to...provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States;
By Ms. BASS:
H.R. 5140.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article. I.
Section 1.
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.
By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 5141.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law.
and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: To Establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization;
By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:
H.R. 5142.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CARTER:
H.R. 5143.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CLEAVER:
H.R. 5144.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 5145.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. DOYLE:
H.R. 5146.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.
By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 5147.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, ''The Congress shall have the Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 5148.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.
Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.
By Mr. MCNERNEY:
H.R. 5149.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MCNERNEY:
H.R. 5150.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:
H.R. 5151.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:
H.R. 5152.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 5153.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. PETERS of California:
H.R. 5154.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 5155.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''
By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:
H.R. 5156.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 5157.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. COBLE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 148: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 208: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 217: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 318: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 333: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 519: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 594: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 647: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 789: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 920: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 942: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 956: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1020: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1070: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1179: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1180: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1252: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1362: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1449: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1500: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1527: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1563: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1620: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1627: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1761: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1788: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1801: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1920: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2149: Mr. COOPER and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2283: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2366: Mr. HURT, Mr. BARR, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. REED, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2453: Mr. PERRY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr JOLLY, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 2500: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2510: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2523: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2529: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2536: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2591: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2673: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 2767: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2835: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2852: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2918: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3116: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3136: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 3150: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3374: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3383: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3398: Ms. CHU, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3461: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3486: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3505: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3544: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3556: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3680: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3698: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3740: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3742: Mr. BARTON and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3930: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3999: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4041: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4060: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4086: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4119: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4148: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4156: Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4158: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4190: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4205: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4216: Mr. LOWENTHAL
H.R. 4238: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4271: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4294: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4301: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4336: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4361: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4426: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4432: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4437: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4450: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4521: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4525: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4531: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4576: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4613: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4680: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 4703: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4706: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4727: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4732: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4778: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4792: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 4805: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4857: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4885: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4888: Mr. HOLT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 4900: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4920: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4930: Mr. ROONEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4960: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4980: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4983: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 4984: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 4986: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4989: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 5018: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 5024: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5026: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 5033: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5041: Mr. COOK and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5052: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5054: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5078: Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5079: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 5081: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5083: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 5084: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5095: Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5111: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5113: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5114: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 5119: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COOK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 109: Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 208: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 231: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 281: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 456: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 522: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 612: Mr. YOHO.
H. Res. 644: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H. Res. 649: Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 665: Mr. LAMALFA.

SENATE—*Thursday, July 17, 2014*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, hear and answer our prayers from Your holy hills. We sleep each night in peace, sustained by Your grace and mercy. Arise, O Lord, and use our lawmakers to fulfill Your purposes. Empower them to make the rough places smooth and the crooked places straight. Give them the wisdom to commune with You throughout the day, leaning confidently upon You for wisdom and striving to be responsible stewards of their calling. Keep them from becoming impatient when anything or anyone causes them to wait.

Lift the light of Your countenance upon us all.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2244—an extremely important piece of legislation. There will be 30 minutes for debate on the Coburn amendment, 20 minutes on the Vitter amendment, 10 minutes on the Flake amendment, and 30 minutes on the Tester amendment. Any remaining time until 12 noon will be for general debate on this legislation.

At 12 noon the Senate will proceed to a series of up to five rollcall votes. Rollcall votes are expected in relation to the Coburn and Flake amendments; however, we expect voice votes on the Vitter and Tester amendments. Upon disposition of the amendments, the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote on passage of S. 2244, as amended.

We expect to reach an agreement to vote at 2 p.m. on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 849, the nomination of Julie Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit. Senators will be notified when an agreement is reached.

(Mr. WALSH assumed the Chair.)

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. President, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, who just opened the Senate, has been for many, many years the chair of the foreign operations subcommittee on appropriations. He is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I wanted to note that while he is on the floor.

Over the past 2 weeks poker players have flocked to Las Vegas because there is an annual World Series of Poker there. It is on ESPN. I do not know how athletic it is, but it is on ESPN, and it draws a lot of attention. Poker is a very important and popular game now—a game of chance, and this tournament—the World Series of Poker—is the most prestigious high-stakes tournament in the world, and 2,400 or 2,500 miles away from Las Vegas, here in Washington, DC, some Senate Republicans are playing a high-stakes game of their own with a humanitarian crisis. But instead of poker chips, they are using kids, children.

Last night the junior Senator from Texas upped the ante and announced that any legislation to address the humanitarian crisis in the Rio Grande Valley must also include a termination of President Obama's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. In other words, before Republicans help our Border Patrol agents and all the other personnel who are trying to do something to handle this humanitarian crisis, they want President Obama to deport the DREAMers who are already here. They are legitimately here. These are children. But instead of considering a thoughtful, compassionate solution to a real-life crisis on our border, radical Republicans are trying to hold these kids ransom.

I have heard Senator DURBIN speak here on the floor. He visited one of these centers in Chicago on Monday. There are mothers with little babies there who have been brought, as the law requires, to Chicago to try to unite them with their families.

We have, as we learned last night in a Senators briefing, more than 50,000 of these children who have arrived at the border, and we have to do something to address that. The people who are required by law to take care of these children—some of whom are babies—do not have the resources to do it.

These are not children sneaking over the border. They come to the people in uniform and say: Here we are. We have an obligation by law to do something about it. But it takes a lot of money to take care of this. We cannot do it unless we get added resources, and what the junior Senator from Texas said is that we are not going to do this unless we deport all these children who came here before—the so-called DREAMers.

Once again, we see there are no substantive solutions being offered by today's Republican Party. Instead of doing something about these children who are at the border, they want to deport hundreds of thousands of these people who are already here.

President Obama's deferred action plan, which is widely popular in the country because it is the right thing to do—and, obviously, Republicans want to get rid of it—what this is all about, his deferred action plan, is about keeping families together in America. It grants immigration officials discretion in considering the cases of children who have lived most of their lives as Americans, even though they were brought here illegally.

Let me give you an example of a young woman from Las Vegas. Her name is Astrid Silva. Astrid came to the United States as a little, tiny girl in a boat across the Rio Grande. Her mother was with her. She was in her—I want to get this right—she was in her dress, confirmation dress or whatever it was. She was just a tiny, little girl. She had her rosary beads and a little doll, and she floated across the river.

She knows no other country than the United States of America. Now, because of what happened, because of the President's action, she can now fly in an airplane. She has done that. She is working on getting her education completed—a wonderful, wonderful, involved woman in what is going on in Nevada. And the junior Senator from Texas wants to send her back to a place she does not know—Mexico? Mr. President, Astrid Silva is an American. It is the only country she knows. It would be cruel and unusual to do what the junior Senator from Texas wants done.

The deferred action plan is a positive step forward, and we should not go back, especially not as a ransom for

helping our border personnel to care for desperate children.

I would hope my friend, the Republican leader, can rein in these extreme elements of his caucus so we can achieve a real solution, one worthy of the ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

These children are real—they are little kids—real human beings. They should not be used as pawns in the Republicans' high-stakes game of chicken with President Obama.

AMBASSADORIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, when I first came to the House of Representatives, I had the good fortune of serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was wonderful. I served under Chairman Zablocki from Wisconsin, Chairman Fascell from Florida. It was a wonderful experience to get a view of what was going on in the world, and I enjoyed it very, very much.

But I learned there—and I think we all know; maybe I should have learned it sooner—our national security depends on the qualified men and women who serve as our ambassadors throughout the world.

When I travel overseas, I always make sure I get the staff at these embassies together and tell them how much I appreciate what they do for our country. They are not all ambassadors, of course. There is one per country—we hope.

To apply to be a Foreign Service officer is hard. You have to have really, really good grades. You have to pass a written examination after having graduated from college and maybe with graduate work. Some of them are Ph.D.s. And then, after you pass a written test, you have to pass an oral test. It is very, very difficult.

These are some of the best and brightest in the world, and their ultimate goal—as we had the All-Star Game on Tuesday—is to be an all-star, to be able to play—as they did on Tuesday in Major League Baseball—in the ''all-star game.'' Well, that is what ambassadors are; they are the all stars of the diplomatic corps of this country. Right now, these ambassadors are on the front lines. They are fighting to defend our interests abroad—our security interests, our national interests, and our economic interests. Right now there are gaping holes in our Nation's front lines.

Let's look at who ambassadors really are. Here in the Senate, I had the good fortune to serve with one of the really distinguished ambassadors, Daniel Patrick Moynihan from New York. Prior to coming to the Senate, he was our Ambassador to India. He left his mark on that country. He did a remarkably good job as Ambassador from the United States to India.

The Republican leader and I attended a funeral a week or so ago in Tennessee. The funeral was for Howard Baker, who had been the majority leader in the Senate—a fine man. He married another Senator from Kansas, Nancy Kassebaum. He became, after retiring from the Senate, our Ambassador to Japan. He distinguished himself there again with the remarkably good job he did.

We can go back and look at the beginning of the history of this country. What do we always learn about Thomas Jefferson? We know how smart he was, how he wrote brilliantly. But we also learned in every history lesson about Thomas Jefferson, that he was our Ambassador to France. John Adams was our Ambassador to England. They have set the standard for how important ambassadors are.

Here in the Senate Republicans are stalling ambassadors. Twenty-five percent of all the ambassadorships to the continent of Africa—unfilled. There are gaping holes in our Nation's front lines. Approximately 30 ambassadors are waiting to be confirmed—and waiting and waiting and waiting.

Senate Republicans, who have been so quick to accuse this administration of poor leadership on world issues, are obstructing the confirmation of ambassadors who are desperately needed at embassies all around the world. Republicans are abdicating the Senate's constitutional role to confirm ambassadors.

In previous years ambassadors were just approved so quickly. Once in a while something controversial would come up, but it was once in a great while. As I said, a quarter of U.S. Embassies in Africa do not have an ambassador. We do not have an ambassador in Bosnia. We do not have an ambassador in Vietnam—on and on. Can't we all agree that it is important that American interests be represented in these places? The answer: We cannot agree. The Republicans do not want these ambassadorships filled.

When can these people who want to play in the ''all-star game'' be able to play in the ''all-star game'' and represent the interests of this country? They work in careers that are very difficult. They do not start out as ambassadors. Rarely does that happen.

Each day that goes by more ambassadorships are unfilled. All the ambassador nominees were passed out of committee unanimously. With rare exception they are noncontroversial. I am talking about career ambassadors. These are not political appointees. I am talking about career ambassadors.

What does that mean when I say career ambassadors, career diplomats? These are good men and women who have worked for decades for the U.S. State Department. In most cases these diplomats started working at the lowest levels, processing visa applications, asylum requests, and then became an economic officer, a political officer. By working hard and requiring the necessary expertise, these career diplomats have readied themselves to be ambassadors. It is hard.

Career diplomats do not represent political parties, they represent our country. These long-time professionals have worked for both Democrats and Republicans. They worked for several different administrations. It does not matter, if someone is a Foreign Service officer, whether the President is a Democrat or Republican, they do their job for the country.

Now these professionals are needed to fill vital ambassadorial posts in some of the most volatile regions in the world. Republicans have slammed the brakes on these nominations. At the very least the Senate should confirm these noncontroversial career diplomats. If they want to play games with the political appointees, they can do that, but these career diplomats are not political appointees. They are qualified diplomats who have performed admirably for the State Department for a long time. We need their experience, we need their expertise at embassies all over the world.

Some Senate observers say Republicans are stalling these nominations as a payback for rules changes instituted by the Senate. Let's see if I can try to figure this one out. Republicans are stalling Executive nominees vital to our national interests to get back at Democrats, to get back at me. How is that? Stalling these nominees is jeopardizing America's interests abroad. It is damaging our Nation's role in global affairs. It is damaging our national security. Is this conjured-up political retribution worth harming the United States? Of course not.

There was a New York Times article within the last 48 hours where Secretary of State John Kerry said: I have 52 important State Department officials who are waiting to be confirmed in the Senate—52. I was stunned to read in that same article a quote from the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee over here, the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Here is what he said: ''Rather than filling vacant embassies to alleviate the national security concerns raised by Secretary Kerry and others, the majority leader—

Listen to this one.

—who controls the Senate floor—has chosen to spend this week on a sportsman's bill and previous weeks confirming judges.

Why criticize me for bringing up the sportsmen's bill? This bill was sponsored by a majority of the Republicans. Twenty-six Republicans cosponsored that legislation. The junior Senator from Tennessee is complaining that I brought that up. I guess he is also complaining that I brought up raising the minimum wage, which the Republicans filibustered. Maybe he is also complaining that we have student debt in this country—about $1.3 trillion—and

we brought that up to alleviate the pain to families in America with student debt.

Maybe he is complaining because we brought up on the Senate floor something extremely important; that is, that if a woman does the same work as a man, she should get paid the same amount of money—not different work, the same work. She should get the same money. I guess he is complaining because we brought up something that addresses the needs that Americans have; that is, the Hobby Lobby decision from the Supreme Court. We think that is wrong. Women in America, families in America, with some exception, believe that is wrong.

So I agree with the junior Senator from Tennessee. There is an urgent need to fill these diplomatic posts as soon as possible, but for heaven's sake, how could he complain about the substantive legislation which is so important to America that I have just run through?

Then he complains about judges, we are confirming judges. I have been here a while in the Senate. Until Obama became President, with some exception, these nominations went through on unanimous consent. We were not holding up ambassadors. There would be a spat on a judge here and there but not holding up all of the judges. The reason it is taking so long is we have, under the rules of the Senate, what we call postcloture time. That time was originally set up so after we got on a piece of legislation or on a nomination, we could think about it for a little bit. They think about it a lot and do nothing.

Thirty hours on a lot of nominations postcloture, 8 hours on others, judges only 2 hours. We have been able to go through a lot of judges because of that rule change that we made. I thought it was an urgent need 4 months ago when I came to the Senate floor to talk about the growing logjam of our ambassadorial corps around the country. But Senator CORKER's reasoning that these ambassadorial confirmations were delayed unnecessarily by legislation and judicial confirmations is a little weird, a little strange. It is strange and weird for a number of reasons.

I take issue with the notion that the Senate somehow wasted time by legislating and confirming judicial nominees. These are our constitutional duties. We are going to confirm, in the next few days, a post in Georgia. We have two to be filled there. One of them has been waiting for more than 1,000 days. So I think it is important we do this. Why? Because it is our constitutional duty.

We only have so much time to confirm judges, because as I indicated, filibustering nominees, they do it to everybody. We are working through the judges quickly because we changed the rules. Thank goodness we did. The Senate did consider Senator HAGAN's sportsmen's legislation last week. I repeat. That important bill affects—the one that the junior Senator from Tennessee said we should not have brought up—affects 40 million Americans who hunt and fish.

Somebody I used to practice law with has a place in Montana. He took his grandson there and had a wonderful time fishing—no hunting but fishing. This place he has, a little stream goes by there. He said it was the best time he ever had with his grandchild. That is what 40 million people do. That is what we brought up. That is what the junior Senator from Tennessee said was such a bad idea. Twenty-six Republicans cosponsored that legislation. It contributes $200 billion annually to our Nation's economy.

My friend from Tennessee thinks it is a waste of time; we should not have done that. The junior Senator from Tennessee was a cosponsor of the legislation. He is going to go back and tell the people in Tennessee that he made a mistake, he should not have been a cosponsor.

Earlier, he voted to proceed so we could work on the legislation. Then he voted to filibuster it. This is the same tactic we have seen so much over the past 6 years. Republicans obstruct. When asked why they are not accomplishing anything, they blame Democrats. They blame me. The truth is Senate Democrats have continued to press for more and more ambassadorial confirmations while also introducing legislation that helps working families.

As I came to the floor in March to highlight the backlog of ambassadorial confirmations, the Senate has considered an increase in the minimum wage, equal pay for women, student loan refinancing, extension of tax cuts, cost-cutting energy legislation, and a number of other items. These are all important bills to give working Americans a fair shot at a measure of prosperity. Republican filibusters blocked every one of them.

Another issue I have with the Senator from Tennessee is that undoubtedly he knows the Senate traditionally does much of its business through unanimous consent—in fact most of our business. If Republicans agree there is an urgent need to get these nominations done and give their consent, we could confirm all of these ambassadors in a single afternoon. It would only take a few hours in the afternoon. We could do it today.

But it is clearly not a priority for Republicans; otherwise, they would expedite these confirmations. Their behavior on these ambassadorial nominations reminds me of a quote by Gandhi: ''Action expresses priorities.'' Republicans' lack of action on this matter illustrates that they have no priorities in this regard.

So enough with the stalling and enough with retribution. The Senate standoff is not good for this body, and it is hurting American interests abroad. Let's get these ambassador posts filled. Our national security depends on it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 2 p.m. today the Senate vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 849, Carnes; further, that if cloture is invoked, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 21, 2014, the Senate resume executive session and all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; further, that following the 2 p.m. cloture vote, the Senate proceed to the consideration and vote on Executive Calendar Nos. 709, Shear, and 834, Mader; further, that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with this agreement, we expect one rollcall vote beginning at 2 p.m. and two additional voice votes as I have mentioned. I apologize to the Republican leader for taking so much time.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CITIZEN VICTORIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the American people actually scored a victory in the ongoing battle against government overreach. They literally rose, spoke out, and they forced the Obama administration to withdraw the latest gem from the ''department of terrible ideas'' over at the Environmental Protection Agency.

They showed two things in the process; first, the need for constant vigilance when it comes to protecting our liberties, especially with the current crowd down at the White House; and, second, the impact ordinary citizens can actually have.

The proposal in question was a uniquely awful idea. The goal was for the EPA to grant itself the authority to garnish the wages of private citizens without even giving them a day in court. Imagine. You received a letter from the government accusing you of violating some obscure regulation, a regulation most likely you never heard of and did not even know you were violating. The government then hits you with massive fines, sometimes on the

order of tens of thousands of dollars a day, as you weigh your legal options and whether to fight it in court.

If you cannot or will not pay these fines in the meantime, too bad. Bureaucrats in Washington will take them out of your paycheck anyway—out of our paycheck anyway—without even the option of contesting the government's actions in court for it. This is certainly government overreach at its very worst. That is why I joined Senators THUNE, VITTER, and BARRASSO in speaking out against it. That is why we developed a resolution of disapproval to block it.

But the real key to our success was the action of the American people themselves. They got our help, but they did not sit back and wait. They let their outrage be known. They fought back against this brazen power grab. Thanks to all of those efforts, the administration finally literally threw in the towel yesterday. Certainly we were glad to see it.

But look, the fact that the Obama administration's EPA even introduced this rule in the first place should concern all of us. It was truly outrageous, but it is also not surprising because this is the same administration that just proposed a so-called waters of the U.S. regulation that would expand the government's authority so broadly that the Agency could regulate and fine almost every pothole and ditch in our backyards.

This is the same administration that has been waging a costly war on coal jobs in my State through similarly onerous and arbitrary regulations aimed at pleasing hard-core activists in Washington without any regard for real-world consequences.

It is as though these distant elites in Washington view their mission as ideological warfare. They do not seem the least bit concerned about the casualties they leave behind in the process. I have tried to get some of these bureaucratic foot soldiers down to Kentucky to see the impact of their efforts firsthand, but of course they are not interested. They are not interested in people such as the 32-year-old unemployed miner who walked into a Pikeville pregnancy center to ask for baby clothes. An employee at the center wrote to tell me what this miner had to say.

Here is what he said:

I don't come from a family that has ever had to ask for help. I feel humiliated, but my baby is suffering.

That pregnancy center employee wrote that the look on his face broke her heart. She wrote: ''[But] this is the plight of many of our families in Eastern Kentucky, their livelihood is being taken away by the War on Coal.''

These are the people whom distant bureaucrats in Washington should be forced to meet before they draft their rules. This guy just wants to put food on the table, to keep the lights on, and to give his kids a better life. But the war on coal jobs is taking away more than just his livelihood and that of so many others. It is taking away his dignity as well. Maybe that is why the administration doesn't want to meet Kentuckians like him. Maybe that is why they don't want to look my constituents in the eye. It is a big problem, and that is why I am so proud of the people who stood up to this latest ominous regulation.

Yesterday the EPA confirmed that it won't hold a single hearing within hours of my State as it works to finalize national energy tax regulations that could devastate the lives of tens of thousands of Kentuckians. They don't care, and they are not listening.

Well, I care. I see these folks when I go home. I hear their stories. My heart breaks for them. I am going to keep fighting. I am going to keep fighting against the Obama administration's various power grabs and its regulatory overreach. I am going to keep fighting against the national energy tax. I am going to keep fighting for practical ideas that aim to help struggling families for once—a marked departure from the administration's constant attacks against them—ideas such as the Coal Country Protection Act and the Saving Coal Jobs Act.

These proposals are common sense. If the majority leader would stop blocking them, we could deliver some relief to middle-class families for once. So he should know I am not going to let up and neither are the American people who won this important victory yesterday on another subject over the EPA's latest power grab because, as we also saw with the administration's recent withdrawal of an IRS regulation aimed at restricting free speech, the people can still win with enough determination. Civic involvement works—and given the pattern of abuse we keep seeing with this administration, it is absolutely critical.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of S. 2244, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 2244

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2021''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting ''and beginning **[**in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014**]** *on January 1, 2016,* shall decrease by **[**1 percent**]** *1 percentage point* per calendar year until equal to 80 percent'' after ''85 percent''.

SEC. 4. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through subparagraph (E) and inserting **[**''shall be $27,500,000,000 and beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.''; and**]** *''shall be the lesser of—*

''(A) $27,500,000,000, as such amount is adjusted pursuant to this paragraph; and

''(B) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year,

provided that beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A) shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.'';

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph **6** *(6)*''; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''for such period'';

[(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''for any period referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and

(ii) by striking ''for such period'';**]**

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) [Reserved.]'';

[(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and**]**

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A)

through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent'' and inserting '', terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 135.5 percent''; and

(ii) by inserting ''as calculated under subparagraph (A)'' after ''mandatory recoupment amount''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019'';

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(III) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(II) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''An entity has'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity has''; and

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

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have 'control' over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having 'control' under subparagraph (A).'';

(**[**A**]***B*) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

''(A) the value of an insurer's direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year'' and inserting ''notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year''; and

(II) by striking ''Period or Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(**[**B**]***C*) by striking paragraph (11); and

(**[**C**]***D*) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), as previously amended by section 3—

(aa) by striking ''the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''each calendar year'';

(bb) by striking the comma after ''80 percent''; and

(cc) by striking ''such Transition Period or such Program Year'' and inserting ''such calendar year''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''exceed'' and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting ''exceed $100,000,000 with respect to such insured losses occurring in the calendar year.'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''a calendar year''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year'' and inserting ''any calendar year''; and

(C) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking ''the Transition Period or a Program Year'' each place that term appears and inserting ''the calendar year'';

(ii) by striking ''such period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''; and

(iii) by striking ''that period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''.

SEC. 6. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''act of terrorism'' has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term ''certification process'' means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 6 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including any timeline applicable to any certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY ON UPFRONT PREMIUMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) How the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program.

(2) How the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums.

(3) How the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program.

(4) How the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

(5) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small.

(6) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance.

(7) The size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program's current post-event recoupment structure.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the committee-reported amendments are agreed to, and the bill, as amended, is considered as original text for purposes of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. I ask to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my good friend from Florida for his heartfelt and his always articulate words. We are now going to debate, finally, the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

Senator CRAPO and I have opening statements, but Senator TESTER, who has added an extremely important amendment to this legislation, has a markup shortly, so we are going to accede and let him speak about his amendment first, and then we will get on with our opening statements. I thank Senator TESTER for his hard work on this issue as well as his ability to compromise to get something done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3552

Mr. REID. I call up amendment No. 3552, ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask that Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator PRYOR be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER] for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR and Mr. PRYOR, proposes an amendment numbered 3552.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. TESTER. I thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO and Senators SCHUMER and HELLER for their hard work on helping me on the TRIA bill and for helping me on this amendment, as well as Senator SCHUMER and Senator HELLER for their hard work not only on the TRIA legislation but also on the NARAB amendment, which I am going to talk about in a moment. I also wish to give a special thank-you to Senator JOHANNS, who is a cosponsor on this amendment and somebody with whom I have worked very closely to get this amendment to the point it is today.

The Tester-Johanns amendment is the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Act, otherwise known as NARAB. NARAB is a bill Senator JOHANNS and I introduced last year. It was reported out of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee on a voice vote.

Our amendment creates a nonprofit association to provide one-stop licensing for insurance agents and brokers operating outside of their home State. This arrangement would fully preserve the authority of State insurance regulators to supervise these markets.

Currently, an insurance agent or broker seeking to operate in multiple States must meet different State-specific licensing requirements and seek approval from each State's insurance commissioner. This process is time consuming, it is costly, it is redundant, and it is sometimes contradictory—without providing any greater consumer protection. That is a big disincentive for smaller agents and brokers to grow their businesses.

This is not a new issue for the insurance industry. Congress recognized the need for a forum to reform the insurance licensing system in 1999 when it incorporated the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Act subtitle into the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. Unfortunately, at that time Congress did not immediately establish NARAB. As a result, Gramm-Leach-Bliley did not achieve the level of reciprocity and uniformity Congress expected and these efforts to streamline cross-state insurance licensing never took hold. That is why this important amendment is before the Senate today.

Senator JOHANNS' and my amendment would provide insurance agents and brokers with the option of becoming a member of NARAB provided that they meet the professional standards set by the association and undergo a criminal background check.

NARAB will streamline the licensing process for agents and brokers, enabling them to be licensed under one single, strong national licensing standard rather than following different State standards, thereby saving time and money.

In addition to setting rigorous professional standards, the association will let agents and brokers renew their licenses all at once and fully preserve the abilities of regulators to protect consumers and supervise and discipline agents and brokers.

Currently, on average, insurance agents sell their products in eight States, with many serving even more. A one-stop licensing compliance mechanism will benefit all agents and brokers but particularly the smaller folks who must spend time and money dealing with different standards in different States.

A one-stop shop for insurance licensing will help smaller players compete against the bigger competitors. That is good for business, and it is good for consumers.

NARAB represents a decade of effort, and I am pleased we will finally achieve the goals laid out in Gramm-Leach-Bliley. Some feared NARAB would diminish States rights. As a former State legislator, when folks start talking about States rights issues, I pay attention, but in this case I believe they are wrong.

I wish to take a minute and talk about how this amendment protects States rights. Under this amendment, States would retain all authority to license their own resident agents and brokers. The association would be required to notify States when agents and brokers apply for membership, letting the States notify NARAB of any reason membership should not be granted to the producer.

States will also have significant control over NARAB. The nonprofit association would be governed by a board of directors dominated by State insurance regulators and chaired by a State insurance regulator. Most importantly, NARAB deals only with marketplace entry and would not impact the day-to-day regulation of insurance. States will maintain exclusive control of the regulation of marketplace activities, consumer protection requirements, unfair trade practices, and other important areas.

Under this bill, under this amendment, we will preserve the authority of States to supervise insurance producers. Any agent or broker who obtains the authority to operate in a jurisdiction through NARAB is still subject to the full regulatory authority of that State and must comply with all marketplace requirements. Under our amendment, States will continue to receive insurance licensing fees, which will be collected by NARAB and remitted to the States.

This legislation is supported by the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisers, the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, and the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America. It is also supported by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which has expressed its full support for this bill and the final TRIA bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the Tester-Johanns amendment. It is truly a commonsense amendment that helps not only the industry but also the consumers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I will begin today by acknowledging the good work of the good Senator from Montana. This bill has been around for a long time, and it is our hope that we will get to a point today where we can say that finally we have solved the problems.

The Senator from Montana has done an excellent job of laying out what this bill is all about and what it is not about, and I don't feel a need today to repeat what he has said, but let me just make a couple of points.

First, the partnership we had in working on this bill was excellent, and that is why it is this far along. It was a bipartisan effort.

This legislation is long overdue, and it does benefit consumers and businesses all across this great country. It is exactly what we look for. It reduces redtape, it encourages competition and protects State law, and it promotes consumer choice. For these reasons, it is my hope the entire Senate unanimously supports the amendment.

I might mention that we passed this legislation out of the banking committee about a year ago. That was after working on this for about 10 years. The House passed this bill last

year by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 397 to 6. So I am pleased we can advance this legislation today as part of the terrorism risk insurance bill, which I also support and will vote yes on.

Frankly, it is refreshing to finally be allowed to vote on amendments on the Senate floor. I hope this is a sign of things to come. I thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator CRAPO for their work in bringing us to this point. Without their work, TRIA would not be where it is today.

I urge the adoption of the amendment. I hope we can move the legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Montana and Nebraska for their hard work on not only this legislation but their very important amendment—long overdue. I certainly thank Senators JOHNSON and CRAPO, without whose leadership we couldn't be here to pass this bill. I thank my original cosponsors, Senator KIRK from Illinois who is here, Senator JACK REED, Senator HELLER, Senator MURPHY, Senator JOHANNS, Senator WARNER, Senator BLUNT, and Senator MENENDEZ, all of whom recognized the importance of having this incredibly important program reauthorized.

As author of the original TRIA legislation, I have watched this evolution closely. I could not be more convinced of the necessity to reauthorize the program for the long haul.

I remember the dark days right after 9/11. I was there. The worst thing was the loss of life—people we had all known. I know people who were lost—a guy I played basketball with in high school, a businessman who helped me on the way up, a firefighter with whom I did blood drives. But there was also the economic worry. People thought southern Manhattan would not come back. People thought businesses would flee New York—that New York's greatest days were behind us. And of course the people of New York, with their resiliency, backed up by everyone in this country—including President Bush, very strongly—did come back. But the uncertainty we faced in the immediate aftermath was that there would be no building in southern Manhattan or Manhattan at all. And we have some history.

One of the things that greatly stood in the way was the private sector did not offer any sufficient coverage to protect against the threat of terrorism. No one knew when there might be another terrorist incident. Insurance companies, knowing how large the losses were, figured it was better not to underwrite insurance than write it for such an astronomical sum that the building would not be even economically feasible.

We have some colleagues who said this should be a private sector endeavor. Well, we have history. The private sector was unable, because of the potential economic losses if, God forbid, there was another terrorist attack, whether it be conventional, nuclear, or chemical, to provide terrorism insurance. When that occurs, banks would not finance buildings, knowing there was no insurance backup, and we would have been in huge trouble. That is why we devised the terrorism insurance bill.

For those who say let the private sector do it, we have an experiment. We have what the scientists would call a controlled experiment. When there was no terrorism insurance after 9/11, the private sector would not offer insurance. We even find to this day, as the existing bill expires, fewer people underwrite terrorism insurance and fewer buildings are financed.

So we can do one of two things: We can sit back and let the market handle this on its own and lose millions—literally millions—of jobs, lose economic stability, safety, prosperity, and growth or we can renew this legislation. We can come up with a smart, responsible, risk-sharing system where the private sector is paying upfront. But if, God forbid, there is another serious incident beyond the capability of the private sector to shoulder, the Federal Government can step in and provide a backstop. That is what we have done.

The TRIA Program is a shining example of the government partnering with the private sector to solve problems that neither can solve on its own.

Let me underline, first, the importance to my city of New York. The redevelopment of downtown Manhattan is booming there. People are flocking to live there and work there. It is the hot area of New York again—not just with financial services but with law and advertising and high-tech. It serves as a reminder of the role the Federal Government can and should play in helping facilitate the stability and growth of cities across the country.

This bill will not lessen the impact of a terrorist attack but will help ensure that our cities throughout the country are less vulnerable to the economic devastation that would follow such a horrific event.

But this bill is hardly just focused on New York City. It not only affects every large city—my good friend from Nebraska spoke—it affects the football stadium and any renovations that might occur there in Lincoln. I have been there for a Nebraska-Oklahoma game. It was an amazing experience. It affects any city that has large gatherings of people and buildings—shopping centers, athletic facilities, colleges. So it affects almost every State. That is one of the reasons we have come together and gotten such broad bipartisan support.

We must make sure that every reauthorization of the program provides the certainty lenders and developers need to make the kind of long-term investment our country and large projects need to stimulate job growth and economic growth, and this bill does just that. That is why it was passed out of the banking committee unanimously.

Again, I thank my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle. As Senator JOHANNS said—and we say it on each bill where there is some bipartisan support—this one has overwhelming support. Maybe this bill can be a model that at least on many issues we can work together.

Time is of the essence. Insurance policies for 2015 are already being written. Each day that goes by without a TRIA Program causes great uncertainty in the market and holds back the potential for more development, more construction, more jobs, and more economic growth.

I will talk about the amendments later, but I urge my colleagues, both here in the Senate and in the House, to move as quickly as possible because our economy is greatly affected by it. It is one of those that ''runs quiet, runs deep.'' It is a quiet policy but a policy that greatly affects lots of things that go on.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Senator CRAPO for his good and hard work, as well as Senator JOHNSON and my cosponsors.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I am appreciative of Senator SCHUMER and the work we have been able to do together to move this legislation forward.

I rise today to speak in favor of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA, program. As a cosponsor of this bill, I recognize Senator SCHUMER, Senator KIRK, Senator HELLER, Senator REED, and others for helping to put this bipartisan piece of legislation together.

Chairman JOHNSON and his staff also deserve a great amount of thanks for their strong efforts in moving this bill forward.

Working together, we developed a balanced bipartisan product that was literally unanimously supported in the banking committee 22 to 0. This bill we have put together allows the private insurance industry to absorb and cover the losses of all but the largest acts of terror—ones in which the Federal Government would likely be forced to step in, in any event, if the program were not there. Taxpayer protections have been increased in this reauthorization by moving more of the responsibility for losses on to private insurers.

For those who are not familiar with the program, TRIA was initially passed as a response to the unavailability of terrorism insurance in the wake of 9/11.

The private market had already retreated in response to those terrorist attacks. It was then thought that a temporary program would allow the market time to develop products that would allow policyholders to protect themselves from terrorism losses.

More than a decade after the tragic events of 9/11, the temporary inability to insure against terrorism has abated, and private capital is better positioned to take on more exposure to terrorism.

When the banking committee held its first hearing on TRIA's reauthorization last year, we discussed the ability of the private insurance market to step in to provide terrorism insurance if the TRIA Program expired. In that hearing, and in subsequent meetings with providers, policyholders, and stakeholders, we recognized on a bipartisan basis the continued difficulties associated with providing terrorism insurance required that we look again at extending the act.

Terrorism is difficult to predict. Therefore, the ability to develop products to insure against terrorism is very difficult to do. The size, severity, and frequency of attacks are hard to model. Also, attacks may be highly correlated, making it difficult for private insurers to diversify their risks.

Having TRIA in place was determined to be important. But if the market is too heavily reliant on Federal support, we may deter private companies from coming up with cost-effective solutions. That is why, instead of a straight reauthorization, I and others pushed for reforms to maintain the program and increase protections for taxpayers.

In order to do that, we examined each of the policy levers in the program. The bill marked up by the banking committee would increase the insurance industry's aggregate retention level and the company coinsurance levels. As the program stands today, the Federal Government would recoup any TRIA payments it makes up to $27.5 billion through post-event payments. This industry retention level allows the taxpayer to recover TRIA payments through an industrywide assessment on property-casualty policies. This aspect of the bill was last changed in the 2005 reauthorization. The bill before us today increases that recoupment level by $2 billion a year, to an overall level of $37.5 billion—an additional $10 billion. This is a significant reduction in the potential exposure and cost to taxpayers.

In addition, the bill increases the company coinsurance level from 15 percent to 20 percent over 5 years. This means that before the backstop is reached, each company will take on a greater portion of the losses above their deductible.

In order to get more private capital in the marketplace, Senator FLAKE has an amendment to create an advisory committee to promote the creation and development of private sector risk-sharing mechanisms. I support the addition of the Flake amendment and believe the advisory committee will find private sector solutions that will allow us to further decrease the program in future reauthorizations.

Before I conclude, I have a handful of letters in my possession here from groups across the country strongly supporting and encouraging that we adopt this legislation.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has listed this as a key vote. The Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism, which represents dozens and dozens of the financial sector interests across this country, recommends and encourages that we support this legislation, and the Mortgage Bankers Association, the National Association of Insurance Companies, the Property Casualty Insurers, the National Apartment Association, the National Multifamily Housing Council, and the American Builders Conference.

These are just a sampling of letters we have received from interests across the Nation that support this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS
AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: on behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), a national construction industry association with 70 chapters representing nearly 21,000 members, I am writing to express our support for S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. The bill, introduced by Sen. Chuck Schumer (D–N.Y.), would extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years beyond the current expiration date of December 14, 2014, ensuring the construction industry will be able to secure sufficient terrorism insurance.

Following the tragic attacks on our country on September 11, 2001, terrorism insurance rates skyrocketed and many contractors were unable to secure insurance, forcing projects to be put on hold, costing jobs and hindering economic development. The attacks had a particularly devastating impact on the construction industry: more than one million jobs were lost and $15 billion in real estate transactions were canceled.

In 2002, President Bush signed TRIA into law, immediately providing much needed assurance to builders and lenders. TRIA acted as a spark to help our economy recover in the face of continued terrorist threats by allowing contractors across the country to secure this commercially necessary product.

Since 2002, TRIA has been reauthorized twice in overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and has continued to act as a public-private partnership to ensure the stability of the terrorism insurance marketplace. The seven year extension contained in S. 2244 would provide a long term backstop that is necessary to ensure the construction industry's future success. Without the extension, banks will be less inclined to lend necessary funds to new construction projects and companies may be forced out of the industry because of financial risks, costing jobs and putting a roadblock in our nation's drive to economic recovery.

In the wake of a recession in which our industry faced a 27.2 percent unemployment rate, the construction economy cannot sustain the uncertainty and disruption that the expiration of TRIA would trigger.

ABC and its members fully support the extension of TRIA, and urges all Senators to support S. 2244.

Sincerely,

GEOFFREY BURR,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

NATIONAL MULTIFAMILY HOUSING
COUNCIL, NATIONAL APARTMENT
ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: This week the U.S. Senate is scheduled to consider a bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA). We commend Chairman Johnson and Ranking Member Crapo for their good work on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2014. It represents a bipartisan, balanced approach to maintaining the necessary program elements of TRIA while enhancing taxpayer protections. TRIA was first enacted after the events of 9–11 creating a federal backstop so that affordable terrorism coverage would be available and affordable for commercial policyholders across the country, including apartment property owners, developers and managers. The program has been a successful public/private partnership and is fiscally sound.

On behalf of the National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC) and the National Apartment Association (NAA), we urge your support of S. 2244. As policyholders, our members are anxious to advance legislation in a swift manner to eliminate the uncertainty associated with the year-end program expiration.

NMHC/NAA represent the nation's leading firms participating in the multifamily rental housing industry. Our combined memberships engage in all aspects of the apartment industry, including ownership, development, management and finance. NMHC represents the principal officers of the apartment industry's largest and most prominent firms. NAA is a federation of 170 state and local apartment associations comprised of approximately 64,000 multifamily housing companies representing nearly 7.5 million apartment homes throughout the United States and Canada.

TRIA and subsequent extensions of the program have been the mechanism that provides ready access to affordable insurance coverage. Terrorism risk does not resemble other commercial risks. Unlike natural disasters in which insurers have had significant experiences and data to project the risk of damage, terrorism remains unpredictable and therefore largely uninsurable. The impact of an event can be enormous, and insurance modeling for such risks is still not reliable, thus underscoring the importance of continued federal involvement.

In 2012 data collected from our members relative to their cost of insurance, take up rates for terrorism coverage was 91%. This is not insignificant and demonstrates that certainty offered by TRIA in costs and coverage limits are critical components in a multifamily property owner's continued ability to offer safe and affordable housing.

We thank you for your support of this measure and appreciate your taking steps to

move this important legislation one step closer to enactment before the December 2014 expiration.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS M. BIBBY,
PRESIDENT,
National Multi Housing Council.
DOUGLAS S. CULKIN, CAE,
PRESIDENT,
National Apartment Association.

PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
July 16, 2014.

Contact: Eileen Gilligan
Phone: 202–639–0497
Email: Eileen.Gilligan@pciaa.net

PCI URGES THE SENATE TO SUPPORT THE TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Washington—Nat Wienecke, senior vice president, federal government relations of the Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI) issued the following statement in regards to the Senate's upcoming consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014.

''PCI strongly supports passage of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, and commends the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for unanimously passing this legislation and sending it to the full Senate for a vote,'' said Wienecke. ''TRIA is a critical part of the fabric of our national response plan for terrorist attacks. Ensuring America's economic resiliency to terrorist attacks is a solemn responsibility and we call on the members of the Senate to vote aye and move this legislation one step closer to the president's desk.''

PCI is composed of more than 1,000 member companies, representing the broadest crosssection of insurers of any national trade association. PCI members write over $195 billion in annual premium, 39 percent of the nation's property casualty insurance. Member companies write 46 percent of the U.S. automobile insurance market, 32 percent of the homeowners market, 37 percent of the commercial property and liability market, and 41 percent of the private workers compensation market.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES,
July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: as the Senate completes floor consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies respectfully urges you to vote ''yes'' on this critical piece of legislation. A long-term reauthorization of the TRIA program ensures a vital piece of the nation's economic national security infrastructure will continue to encourage private sector involvement in the terrorism insurance marketplace—thereby protecting and promoting our nation's finances, security, and economic strength.

NAMIC is the largest and most diverse property/casualty trade association in the country, with 1,400 regional and local mutual insurance member companies on main streets across America joining many of the country's largest national insurers who also call NAMIC their home. Member companies serve more than 135 million auto, home and business policyholders, writing in excess of $196 billion in annual premiums that account for 50 percent of the automobile/ homeowners market and 31 percent of the business insurance market. More than 200,000 people are employed by NAMIC member companies.

NAMIC appreciates the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Banking Committee in reporting legislation by a unanimous vote which both increases taxpayer protections and which will maintain a robust terrorism insurance market for consumers and companies of all sizes. In particular, we applaud the crafters of S. 2244 for recognizing that raising the ''trigger level'' could make it impossible for many small to medium-sized insurers to continue to write terrorism and other business coverages without ultimately doing anything to reduce taxpayer exposure.

As it is, we are encouraging you to pass this compromise legislation to reauthorize a program that has protected the economic security of the United States since its creation following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. GRANDE,
SVP—Federal and Political Affairs, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies.

MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
July 14, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER REID AND LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA), I am writing to urge the Senate to pass S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, which was unanimously approved by the Senate Banking Committee last month. With the year-end expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) looming closer, it is critical that Congress take action to pass a long-term extension of the terrorism risk insurance program.

MBA's paramount objective for TRIA reauthorization is for terrorism risk insurance to remain both available and affordable, in the long-term, for commercial real estate and multifamily properties. The clearest path to this objective is a long-term TRIA extension without modifications. If changes to the program are inevitable, our perspective on TRIA reauthorization legislation is then guided by its potential impact on the availability and affordability of terrorism risk insurance. By introducing a limited number of incremental programmatic modifications, S. 2244 is consistent with past reauthorization efforts that MBA has supported.

A long-term extension of TRIA is essential to the health and vitality of the $2.5 trillion commercial and multifamily real estate finance sector and the nation as a whole. The absence of available and affordable terrorism risk insurance would not only impact the commercial real estate finance center, but would ripple through the economy as buildings became more difficult and costly to finance and purchase.

Any changes to TRIA should be incremental, at most, and implemented over the course of a long-term reauthorization period in order to avoid unintended consequences. Past reauthorization efforts for the program have introduced gradual changes that did not negatively impact the availability and affordability of terrorism risk insurance. A departure from this approach could result in price and availability shocks for terrorism risk insurance. We are pleased the Senate is placing a high priority on TRIA reauthorization.

Regarding S. 2244, MBA offers the following observations:

Long-Term Extension—MBA strongly supports the seven-year extension period because it will allow for extended market certainty that a terrorism risk insurance program will be in place.

Increased Recoupment—The federal government's potential recoupment is increased from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion over a five-year period. The five-year adjustment period ($2 billion per year) represents an incremental approach to an important element of the program.

Increased Insurance Company Co-Pay—After the initial deductible, the insurance company co-pay will be increased by one percent a year for five years until the co-pay increases from 15 percent to 20 percent. This also represents an incremental change to another important element of the program. TRIA reauthorization should take into consideration the potential impacts on small property insurance companies.

MBA urges all members of the Senate to vote in favor of S. 2244 and to oppose amendments that would weaken the TRIA program. We look forward to working with Congress, other policymakers, and engaged stakeholders to ensure the long-term reauthorization of the TRIA program as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

DAVID H. STEVENS,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

COALITION TO INSURE AGAINST TERRORISM,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: The Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism (CIAT) strongly urges you to support S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. S. 2244 would extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years.

CIAT represents a wide range of businesses and organizations throughout the transportation, real estate, manufacturing, construction, energy, education, entertainment and retail sectors that regularly must obtain insurance against terrorism. We know firsthand that, as part of its economic national security, America needs a stable, reliable terrorism competitive insurance market so employers can invest in assets and create jobs without assuming the risk and liabilities of a terrorist attack.

Again, we urge you to support S. 2244 and we thank you for your consideration of CIAT's concerns on this vital issue.

Sincerely,

THE COALITION TO INSURE AGAINST TERRORISM.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the over one-million members of the National Association of REALTORS (NAR), I urge you to support S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' when the Senate votes on it on Thursday, July 17th. This bipartisan legislation, unanimously approved by the Senate Banking Committee in June, extends the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years and makes minimal changes to a program that has worked since its inception in 2002 at virtually no cost to taxpayers.

NAR's membership includes commercial practitioners and brokers who work with clients that would be adversely affected if TRIA is allowed to expire at the end of 2014, or if it is renewed in a manner that constricts the ability of private insurers to make terrorism coverage available and affordable throughout the country. The current TRIA program continues to be a success, keeping private terrorism insurance coverage available and affordable while protecting taxpayers and limiting the federal government's exposure to only the most extreme events. Though we do have concerns that provisions in S. 2244 to increase the mandatory recoupment amount (from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion) could adversely impact the economy in the wake of a terrorist attack, overall we are pleased that the bill received unanimous bipartisan support from the Banking Committee. NAR urges the full Senate to approve it today.

Please give your support to S. 2244 when it reaches the Senate floor. TRIA provides a crucial framework for economic recovery in the wake of a catastrophic terrorist attack, and allows the United States to maintain a stable terrorism insurance market so employers can invest in properties and create jobs without assuming the risk and liabilities of a terrorist attack. Your support of this extension bill will aid in preventing market uncertainty for years to come.

Sincerely,

STEVE BROWN,
2014 President,
National Association of REALTORS®.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE FINANCE COUNCIL,

July 8, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: The undersigned organizations respectfully request quick action on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. This bipartisan legislation was reported last month with a unanimous vote by the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and is essential to retain the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program that has protected U.S. national and economic security since its creation following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. To date, a quarter of the Senators have cosponsored S. 2244.

The TRIA program is a vital piece of the nation's economic national security infrastructure. The federal government plays an important and appropriate role in encouraging private sector involvement in the terrorism insurance marketplace—thereby protecting and promoting our nation's finances, security, and economic strength. The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program has been a remarkable success in achieving its primary mission to ''protect consumers by addressing market disruptions and ensure the continued widespread availability and affordability of property and casualty insurance for terrorism risk.''

The undersigned parties are very appreciative of the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Banking Committee in reporting legislation that increases taxpayer protections while retaining broad support of consumer groups and the marketplace. Working together, Sens. Johnson and Crapo and members of the Committee achieved consensus agreement on a bipartisan piece of legislation. The bill reauthorizes the TRIA program for seven years, a period of time that will bring longer-term certainty to the market and facilitate economic development, and increases the ultimate private sector share of the responsibility for insured losses, thereby reducing any potential burden on the taxpayer.

We are particularly appreciative that the Senate consensus bill largely maintains the current thresholds that facilitate broad private participation in the terrorism insurance market. For example, the bill maintains the current $100 million ''trigger''—the minimum size of a terrorist event required to trigger any Federal involvement. An excessive trigger could make it impossible for many small to medium-sized insurers to continue to write terrorism and other business coverages. If insurers are forced out of the market, the result is expected to be less availability of coverage and less competition. That would be antithetical to TRIA's stated purposes. Small and medium-sized insurers represent almost 98 percent of all insurers writing TRIA coverage and almost half of all TRIA-related premiums. Small and medium-sized insurers are a critical source of terrorism coverage as well as other lines of insurance meeting all of needs of American businesses large and small. The primary impact of raising the trigger would be on smaller, regional, and niche insurers whose deductible—and even total exposure—is less than the amount of an elevated trigger level that has been set too high. We applaud the crafters of S. 2244 for recognizing this important fact.

We urge the Senate to take up S. 2244 as quickly as possible. Consumers are already having to purchase terrorism insurance coverage that extends beyond TRIA's current December 31, 2014 expiration without any certainty regarding the levels of protection TRIA will provide. Many newly issued policies contain conditional terrorism exclusions, which could result in no protection for consumers if Congress fails to act in a timely manner. While most stakeholders prefer a straight extension of TRIA with no changes, we recognize and appreciate the bipartisan leadership of the committee in moving S.2224 forward and hope that you can reach agreement to bring this legislation to the Senate floor as soon as possible where we believe it will have overwhelming support.

Given the broad support this bill has already attracted, we would encourage the full Senate to consider this legislation as soon as possible with minimal revisions, and in particular, no amendments to raise the trigger from its current $100 million level. We believe that the current version of the legislation will help maintain a vital program that has succeeded in fostering a robust terrorism insurance market for consumers and companies of all sizes, at virtually no cost to the federal government.

Sincerely,

National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Commercial Real Estate Finance Council.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' and applauds the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for reporting out this important bill with unanimous support.

In the months following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the inability for insurance policyholders to secure terrorism risk insurance contributed to a paralysis in the economy, especially in the construction, travel and tourism, and real estate finance sectors. Since its initial enactment in 2002, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) has served as a vital public-private risk sharing mechanism, ensuring that private terrorism risk insurance coverage remains commercially available and that the U.S. economy could more swiftly recover in the event of a terrorist attack.

Catastrophic terrorism remains an uninsurable risk because its frequency and location cannot be accurately predicted, and its potential scale could be economically devastating. TRIA continues to promote long-term availability of terrorism risk insurance for catastrophic terror events and provides a standard of stability for financial markets and recovery after such an attack.

The Chamber strongly urges you to support S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' and may consider votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. CRAPO. Getting terrorism risk insurance right is important in order to protect taxpayers and to limit economic and physical impacts of any future terrorist attacks on the United States. This bill will help us maintain a properly balanced terrorism risk insurance program that increases the Nation's economic resilience to terrorism. Again, I thank Chairman JOHNSON and Senators SCHUMER, KIRK, REED, and HELLER for their partnership in bringing this bill forward and encourage its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I haven't spoken that much in this Chamber since I suffered that stroke. I so strongly believe in this legislation to make it happen.

Behind me is a representation of the world's tallest buildings, the 10 tallest buildings in the world. Only one is in the U.S.A. Look over at that tallest one. That still distresses me, the Burj Khalifa, which is right now the tallest building in the world. I believe as the Senator representing Chicagoland, the city that invented the skyscraper, that Chicagoland citizens have a right to grow up in the shadow of the world's tallest buildings. Unless we quantify the risk for building one of these buildings through the TRIA legislation, we will not return skyscrapers to the country that invented skyscrapers.

With that I yield back the remainder of my time.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Senator CRAPO listed some letters and asked that they be put in the RECORD for some groups supporting our legislation.

We have a very long list, and I ask unanimous consent that list be added to the RECORD, the supporters of the legislation.

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

SUPPORT S. 2244, THE BIPARTISAN TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

On April 10th, following two Banking Committee hearings on the need for Congress to reauthorize TRIA, Senators Schumer (D-NY), Kirk (R-IL), Reed (D-RI), Heller (R-NV), Murphy (D-CT), Johanns (R-NE), Warner (D-VA), Blunt (R-MO) and Menendez (D-NJ) introduced the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. The sponsors, working with Banking Committee Chairman Johnson and Crapo, crafted a bipartisan compromise with the following key features:

Long-term extension that will promote national security, economic growth and market certainty

7 year extension of TRIA until December 31, 2021.

Improve existing taxpayer protections

Gradually raise the insurer co-payment from 15% to 20% over 5 years.

Gradually raise the mandatory recoupment threshold from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion over 5 years.

When considering S. 2244, the Banking Committee made several improvements to the bill offered by both Republican and Democratic Committee Members, including requiring a study and rulemaking by the Treasury Department to improve the TRIA certification process to provide better guidance and certainty following events that may qualify to be certified as ''acts of terror'' under the program.

Broad support for S. 2244 and extending TRIA

Unanimous, Bipartisan Support in Committee: By a unanimous and bipartisan vote of 22-0, the Banking Committee voted on June 3, 2014, to report S. 2244 to the Senate floor.

Quarter of the Senate are Cosponsors: A quarter of the Senate is now cosponsors of S. 2244, including the original sponsors and Senators Blumenthal (D-CT), Booker (D-NJ), Cardin (D-MD), Chambliss (R-GA), Crapo (R-ID), Donnelly (D-IN), Durbin (D-IL), Franken (D-MN), Gillibrand (D-NY), Isakson (R-GA), Johnson (D-SD), Klobuchar (D-MN), Markey (D-MA), Merkley (D-OR), Mikulski (D-MD), and Tester (D-MT).

Strong Support from a Wide Range of Stakeholders Across the Country: A large number of businesses and organizations have called on Congress to extend TRIA and support S. 2244, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Hotel and Lodging Association, Real Estate Roundtable, Realtors, Mortgage Bankers Association, MLB's Office of the Commissioner, NBA, NCAA, NFL and NHL.

S. 2244 is strongly supported by a wide range of organizations, including:

American Association of Port Authorities, American Bankers Association, American Bankers Insurance Association, American Bankers Securities Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Gaming Association, American Hotel and Lodging Association, American Insurance Association, American Land Title Association, American Public Gas Association, American Public Power Association, American Resort Development Association, American Society of Association Executives, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Association of Art Museum Directors, Building Owners and Managers Association International, Boston Properties, Campbell Soup Company.

Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism, Cornerstone Real Estate Advisers, LLC, CRE Finance Council, CSX Corporation, Emerson, Financial Services Roundtable, Food Marketing Institute, Helicopter Association International, Hilton Worldwide, Host Hotels & Resorts, Inc., Institute of Real Estate Management, InterContinental Hotel Group, International Council of Shopping Centers, International Franchise Association, International Safety Equipment Association, International Speedway Corporation, Long Island Import Export Association, Marriott International, Mortgage Bankers Association, NAIOP.

National Apartment Association, National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC), National Association of REALTORS, National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), National Association of Waterfront Employers, National Basketball Association, National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Football League, National Hockey League, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, New England Council.

Partnership for NYC, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI), Public Sector Alliance, Public Utilities Risk Management Association, Office of the Commissioner of Baseball, The Real Estate Board of New York, The Real Estate Roundtable, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Self-Insurance Institute of America, Inc., Starwood Hotels and Resorts, Tenaska, Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, UJA-Federation of New York, United Airlines, Union Pacific, University Risk Management and Insurance Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Travel Association.

Mr. SCHUMER. Now I would like to discuss the amendment process to preview it for my colleagues a little bit.

I would also ask unanimous consent that quorum calls be counted equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. As was mentioned, I believe by some of my colleagues, the give-and-take on this bill was ideally how things should work. First, a bipartisan group of Senators got together and crafted the legislation. As Senator CRAPO noted, there was some push and pull, what should be the balance between government and the private sector, and we did move a little bit more in giving greater responsibility to the private sector. People should note that at the end of the day the private sector will pay back all the money the government would lay out if, God forbid, there is a terrorist incident, but it would be over a period of time of course.

But we had Democrats and Republicans come together and we came up with a bill. The chairman and ranking member agreed that the bill was a good idea, held hearings, and then we moved forward with the legislation.

Then always comes the even greater morass. We do get some bills passed out of this place with bipartisan support and many of them are significant bills, but then we go to the floor and we wonder what is going to happen now. We have the age-old dispute about how many amendments, what type of amendments, should they be relevant. In this case we asked colleagues on both sides of the aisle who would want amendments.

The amendments that came back were reasonable. Most—not all—were related to terrorism insurance. Those that weren't, such as by Senator TESTER and Senator VITTER, were in the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee, so they at least had some relationship. We did not get a flurry of amendments from all over the place on issues that naturally divide the parties.

Then we had to do some negotiating, but we allowed—Senator CRAPO and Senator JOHNSON allowed every amendment, that any author who wanted to offer an amendment could. We worked out some compromises on the Tester amendment. Senator COBURN had objections, and a compromise was worked out there. Some were withdrawn, but at the end of the day anyone who wanted an amendment got it. Both sides showed restraint, and I think that is what brought us to this position.

So the good news for my colleagues, we have a very limited number of amendments, and we intend to dispose of the entire bill before lunch this morning.

Let me briefly go over the amendments.

Senator COBURN will offer an amendment on recoupment timing. The Coburn amendment would give the Treasury Secretary the ability to extend the recoupment period of up to 10 years following an attack. The problem is the way Senator COBURN had drafted his amendment, it would create a significant score. He offered in it the Banking Committee and it failed on a bipartisan vote, the majority of both parties, I believe, voting against it. But he wanted to offer it on the floor, and so he will.

There is a point of order, a pay-go point of order that will be raised against the Coburn amendment, and I

will raise that because it does break the budget. It doesn't have a pay-for in exchange for it. So Chairman JOHNSON and I believe the sponsors of the legislation recommend a ''no'' vote on waiving pay-go against the Coburn amendment.

The Tester amendment, as modified by Senator COBURN, I believe will be voice-voted. Senator TESTER and Senator JOHANNS described that adequately, but it is something long overdue that would create a National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers and make the whole brokerage business work more smoothly. It has very broad support in this body.

Senator VITTER will offer an amendment that would require the President to nominate at least one individual with primary experience working in or supervising community banks on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. I am sure he will come to the floor to explain his amendment. We expect this amendment, which we will all agree to, will be approved by voice vote, and Chairman JOHNSON has recommended a voice vote to the Members on our side.

Finally, there is a Flake amendment that would create an advisory committee on risk-sharing mechanisms. Again, I think Senator FLAKE will come down at some point and explain his amendment. There will be a recorded vote on this at least as planned now, and I will be supportive and I know Chairman JOHNSON again has recommended a ''yes'' vote on the Flake amendment.

With that, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3551

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment 3551, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE] proposes an amendment numbered 3551.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish the Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms)

On page 13, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 8. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the ''Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms'' (referred to in this subsection as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer this amendment. I thank my colleagues, the ranking member of the Banking Committee, and the senior Senator from New York for working with my office to make this possible.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act before us extends for 7 years the Federal loss sharing program developed in response to the market destructions that were caused by 9/11. Created in 2002, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program was intended to be just a 3-year program. This program has since been extended twice, and the bill before us would extend its life through December 31, 2021.

Given the longevity of the program, I think it would be prudent for us to focus some attention on the growing private market reinsurance capability and capacity.

My amendment simply establishes an advisory committee composed of members of the insurance industry to provide recommendations to accelerate the creation and development of private nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms for terrorism losses. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking this modest step toward developing a functioning private-run market for terrorism risk insurance, thereby reducing dependency on the Federal Government in this regard.

I yield the floor and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to make comments on a couple of the amendments that have been or will be presented to the bill.

First, with regard to the amendment presented by Senator FLAKE. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I support this amendment. One of the issues we deal with in the reauthorization of TRIA each time we face it is the correct balance and the level of government protection and support that needs to be in place to help the market deal with major catastrophic events in the United States and the level of requirement we insist there be from the private sector and how they will step in and deal with these risks on an insurance basis rather than requiring the taxpayers to be the ultimate backstop.

Ultimately our objective should be and must be that the taxpayer be relieved of this kind of burden and that the private sector step in and cover the risks through our private sector insurance markets. I think we have a pretty broad consensus that we are not at the level yet where we can get there, but each time we have reauthorized TRIA, we have moved it closer to that objective, and this legislation itself moves it closer.

As I said in my introductory remarks, we have increased the retention level—in other words, the amount of money the private sector must pay back to the Treasury if the taxpayer is ultimately required to step in and backstop a catastrophic terrorist attack. This legislation will increase that amount by another $10 billion—from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion. We are also increasing the amount of money which the private sector insurance industry must put up upfront before the government steps in and provides a backstop. We are increasing that from a 15-percent copay to 20-percent copay.

We are taking significant steps in this legislation to get to the ultimate objective of having the private sector fully handle the insurance risk due to a catastrophic terrorist attack.

Senator FLAKE has provided an amendment, which I support, that would help us create an advisory committee that will focus on this specific issue and help us to find private sector solutions to allow us to further decrease the program in the future reauthorizations. I think this is an incredibly important amendment, and I believe there is strong bipartisan support for it. It allows us to have advice and support from this advisory committee

that would be created under his amendment to take further and more important steps toward achieving the ultimate objective of having to be able to eliminate the need for taxpayer involvement in dealing with catastrophic events such as a terrorist attack.

I strongly support the addition of the Flake amendment. I believe the advisory committee he proposes will find private sector solutions which will allow us to further decrease and ultimately eliminate the program in future reauthorizations.

Another amendment that has been discussed on the floor today by Senator TESTER of Montana and Senator JOHANNS of Nebraska is the NARAB amendment, which is an amendment that will be added to this legislation. This is also an important piece of legislation from the banking committee and it is called the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, or NARAB. Again, it is a bipartisan piece of legislation that has strong support across the United States in various industries to try to allow our registered agents and brokers to have a more efficient and effective system in which to obtain necessary authorization to conduct their business nationwide.

I am an original cosponsor of this language because it simplifies the process of agent licensing across State lines while preserving the authority of State insurance regulators. This bill has broad support from the insurance community, including the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisers, and the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers.

The creation of NARAB will allow agents and brokers to focus on their responsibilities to their clients and spend less time dealing with redtape. By reducing costs and increasing competition among insurance producers, we will generate lower costs and better service for consumers. Importantly, NARAB II deals specifically with marketplace entry and would not impact the States' jurisdiction over day-to-day authority in the insurance marketplace. This is a very critical point because I believe one of the biggest issues relating to this legislation is preserving and protecting States rights and State jurisdiction with regard to regulation of the insurance marketplace.

Insurance commissioners of the States will be able to better catch bad actors who, after losing a license in one State, move quickly to enter into another State. State regulators will serve on the board of NARAB with the same objectives they have as insurance commissioners—to protect the public interest by promoting the fair and equitable treatment of insurance consumers.

The idea for NARAB is now 14 years old. We have literally been working on it for that long, and I am hoping we can get this legislation across the finish line today.

These are two important amendments that will come forward today with regard to the TRIA legislation, and there are several more. As we move forward today I am hopeful we will make the kind of progress on these important and critical issues that will enable us to not only pass this legislation but to do so with a strong vote here in the Senate and then get us into a conference with the House so we can put this important legislation, which has been developed on a bipartisan basis, on the President's desk.

Far too often we are seeing gridlock in this Chamber. We have two pieces of legislation today where we have a bipartisan agreement and bipartisan support, and I think it is a good day for the Senate to see this kind of legislation moving forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. President. Let me join my friend Senator CRAPO in congratulating the leadership on both the Republican and Democratic side and the leadership on the banking committee for bringing this bill before us this morning. It is, unfortunately, all too rare when we can bring a piece of legislation to the floor that has been worked on by both sides of the aisle and has broad agreement on both sides of the aisle. Of course, as the Senator from Idaho knows, there is nothing partisan about the effects of not reauthorizing TRIA. This is going to affect every part of the country. Republicans and Democrats, people of liberal and conservative persuasions, will ultimately be paying a lot more and losing a lot more because of our failure to get this bill done. So let me again thank Senator CRAPO and Senator JOHNSON for all the work they have done. I was one of the original cointroducers of this bill, along with Senator SCHUMER and Senator REID, as well as Senators MENENDEZ, WARNER, KIRK, HELLER, JOHANNS, and BLUNT.

Ultimately, we were educated by what happened in the weeks and months following September 11. In that period of time, the real estate market in large parts of this country—certainly in my part of the country surrounding New York City—collapsed. As a result, $15 billion worth of projects stalled overnight, and we lost about 300,000 construction jobs that were planned to come online—all because the insurance industry decided, with justification, that they could no longer insure for the risk of terrorism. Prior to September 11 we got coverage for terrorism essentially at no cost. But after September 11, again, for good reason, for good cause, insurers, without knowing what their exposure was going to be should there be another attack, decided they could no longer insure for that risk. So, in this sense, it logically fell to the Federal Government to provide that assurance that no matter where one is—whether in Idaho or Nebraska or Connecticut or New Jersey—if a person is building a project and they were the subject of terrorism, they would get a backstop of protection for those losses.

Some said at the time: Why don't we treat insurance, when it comes to protecting for terrorism, the same as we protect against other disasters? Of course, we see these threats as fundamentally different. We can make a decision as to whether we want to live in a part of the country that may be subject to greater risk from floods or hurricanes. So we have grown to accept the fact that we are going to pay a little bit more if we are going to have a house or a business right on the water. And we have a program here by which we mitigate that risk so that it is not extraordinarily different, understanding there is still good reason why people have to congregate in those spaces. But a terrorist attack, frankly, whether it happens in New York City right on the precipice of Connecticut, or in Los Angeles or in a rural environment in the Midwest, is an attack on the United States of America. That is an attack on all of us, no matter what specific geography in which it happens to be located. So that is why we made the decision as a Nation to help backstop those localities that may feel the initial burden of having to reconstruct after a terrorism attack, because we believe it is a national responsibility.

So for the practical reason that there was no longer an ability for the insurance industry to calculate how on Earth they would assess a premium based on the enormous potential loss of a terrorist event, and because of the fact that as Americans we felt as though we should come together and insure against this risk, we passed TRIA initially. Over time we have come together as Republicans and Democrats to reauthorize it.

Now, as time has gone on, we have had a conversation about how to best share this responsibility between the public sector and the private sector, because we expect that private insurers still should, as is their business, pick up some of this cost. So this version of the bill continues along the line of transferring some of this responsibility from the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayers to private insurers. For instance, the underlying legislation continues to have a 20-percent deductible. But after that 20-percent deductible is met, under the previous version of the bill the insurer was responsible for picking up 15 percent of the cost. Under this bill they are going to pick up 20 percent of the cost. So

there is a little bit more responsibility built in for the cost of paying out claims after a terrorist attack is picked up by insurers.

There is a provision in the bill which says the Federal Treasury will recoup the costs from insurers of any claims it pays out. It can do that over a long period of time. Previously, it was mandatory to recoup all of that money for claims under $27 billion. Now that number is $37 billion. So we now have a mandatory return to the Treasury of any claims under $37 billion, which is an additional protection for taxpayers as well as an additional responsibility for insurers now because we will collect from the insurers for losses up to a higher amount than the previous law. I think all of this is pretty reasonable.

I wish there were more days such as this and weeks such as this—although maybe TRIA isn't infused with the same kind of politics that other issues such as immigration reform and energy reform and criminal justice reform can be—but this was made possible by some really hard work by a number of people who knew this was right to do for the country. Speaking as a Senator from a State that has a big stake in the reauthorization of TRIA, I say thank you to all of the people who made this possible and give an advanced shout-out to the House of Representatives which we hope will pass this bipartisan bill in an expeditious manner. Connecticut cares about this because we were, as I said, on the edge of the attack of September 11. We lost dozens and dozens of Connecticut residents in that attack. Our economy was effectively shut down because of the inability to assess this risk throughout the real estate sector surrounding New York City. But we also are home to some of the biggest and, frankly, most responsible property and casualty insurers. The Hartford and Travelers, in particular, have been a big part of trying to figure out a public-private partnership to solve this problem, and this certainly helps them to be able to provide more of a very important product to the rest of the country.

So, again, my thanks to all of those who made this piece of legislation possible. My hope is we get a big vote later today across the aisle, sending a message to the House of Representatives that they can take this bipartisan piece of legislation, pass it, and then get it to the President's desk. Then we can, once again, give some sense of surety to our insurance markets and our real estate market that the United States of America is, once again, going to step up and decide that terrorism, no matter where it happens—whether it is in New York City or in Topeka—is not going to get this country back.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3550

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 3550, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3550.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision)

On page 13, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 8. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than $10,000,000,000 in total assets.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about this amendment which I look forward to being adopted on this important terrorism risk insurance reauthorization bill. It is a commonsense amendment. It is about the Federal Reserve Board, and it says at least one member of that important Board should have significant experience as a community banker or a community bank supervisor.

This used to be commonplace because community banks—smaller institutions—were and are an important part of our financial system. In fact, these days it is one part of our financial system that sets us apart from many others, such as Canada and Europe, which are far more dominated by mega-institutions. Of course, the United States has some very big institutions, and they serve an important role and they have an important place, but smaller institutions, so-called community banks, serve a vital role as well and particularly in smaller communities and in more rural areas they serve those communities in a way megabanks simply do not.

I have been looking at this trend on the Federal Reserve, and unfortunately there is an unmistakable trend away from having adequate representation from folks with community bank experience; that same trend has been toward having the Federal Reserve Board completely dominated by academics and folks with megabank and academic economist experience.

This chart I have in the Chamber shows that trend. From 1936 until the present, it goes decade by decade. The chart is a little busy, and we have this color coding here, but basically we can see this huge growth in the domination of this red category: folks with pure academic economic experience. Folks with community bank experience, which used to actually dominate the Federal Reserve Board several decades ago, are now very limited.

Look, there is nothing wrong with folks with academic experience, but it should not be so dominant on the Federal Reserve and we should have regular representation from community banks or community bank supervisors because that is a vital part of our banking system.

My amendment is therefore very simple. It would mandate that at least one member of the Federal Reserve Board have that experience, have direct community bank experience or have direct experience as a community bank supervisor. Specifically, we are talking about institutions with less than $10 billion in total assets.

This bill follows a letter several of my colleagues joined me in sending to President Obama. We were asking him to nominate an individual with that sort of experience, and I thank the cosigners on that letter: Senators TESTER, MORAN, MERKLEY, COBURN, and JOHANNS on the committee; and noncommittee Members Senators HIRONO, KING, FRANKEN, BALDWIN, BEGICH, LANDRIEU, HEINRICH, and UDALL.

We seem to be making progress in that regard. There is widespread reporting that the White House is considering a list of candidates for the Federal Reserve with community banking experience. But this specific mandate—just one member, a very modest mandate—would help ensure that happens and would help ensure that regularly happens into the future to reverse this trend, to get more balance on the Federal Reserve Board.

This is very important in the context of the too-big-to-fail debate. Too big to fail helped lead to the crisis several years ago in the banking industry. It helped lead to the massive bailouts of mega-institutions, and unfortunately I am one who believes—and there are many others—that too big to fail is

alive and well today, and in some ways Dodd-Frank institutionalized too big to fail. It did not end too big to fail in any way.

We need to do a number of things to even the playing field, to make it fairer for smaller institutions, community banks that serve our smaller communities in rural areas, particularly on the Federal Reserve Board, which is such a significant governing and supervisory board in our banking industry.

I specifically thank the ranking member of the committee, Senator CRAPO, for his support of this concept, his support in negotiations of this amendment, and his very active involvement in getting this amendment accepted on to the TRIA bill.

I think the ranking member may have a few words about this and other matters. I will relinquish the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I will just take a moment to speak about Senator VITTER's amendment, which I strongly support.

During Dr. Yellen's nomination hearing, I noted the need to fill additional vacancies at the Federal Reserve Board with individuals bringing balanced viewpoints. The President should nominate someone with community bank experience to the Board to fill at least one of the remaining vacancies.

Community banks play an important role in their local economies and face a disproportionate burden from our existing regulations. We should ensure that the perspective of these banks is represented in policymaking. That is what this amendment does, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, just one final wrapup issue. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of support for this amendment from ICBA, the Independent Community Bankers of America.

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

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Independent Community Bankers of America and the more than 6,500 community banks nationwide, I write to urge you to vote YES on Amendment 3550, offered by Senator David Vitter, to the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (S. 2244). This amendment would ensure at least one member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve (the Board) has experience as a community banker or as a supervisor of community banks. The Board not only plays a key role in our economy by promoting employment and stable prices, but is also an important regulatory body for the U.S. and global financial system. A broad range of representation on the Board is critical to its effectiveness.

Community banks are vitally important to the nation's economy, particularly with respect to small business lending and providing banking services in small and rural communities. These banks and the communities they serve have vital interests at stake in the economic, banking, and payment system issues that come before the Board. The Board must consider how best to tier regulation to meet regulatory objectives without disproportionately impacting community banks. Expertise is also required to ensure that regulations intended for the largest banks do not unintentionally sweep in community banks. The unexpected compliance problems associated with the December 2013 Volcker Rule vividly illustrate this risk.

By requiring community bank representation on the Board, Senator Vitter's amendment will help secure the future of the community banking industry and the customers and communities that depend on it. Again, ICBA urges you to vote YES on this important amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CAMDEN R. FINE,
President and CEO.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 3549

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and my amendment No. 3549 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 3549.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary to extend the deadline for collecting terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums if the mandatory recoupment is morethan $1,000,000,000)

On page 4, line 21, strike ''(i)''.

On page 4, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(i) in clause (i)—

On page 4, line 22, strike ''(i)'' and insert ''(I)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 4, line 23, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)''and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 1, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 3, strike ''(ii)'' and insert ''(II)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 4, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 6, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 8, strike ''(III)'' and insert ''(cc)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 10, strike ''(iii)'' and insert ''(III)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 11, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 13, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) DEADLINE EXTENSIONS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If the mandatory recoupment amount under subparagraph (A) is more than $1,000,000,000 in any given calendar year, the Secretary may extend the applicable deadline for collecting terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums under clause (i) for a period not to exceed more than 10 years after the date on which such act of terrorism occurred.

''(II) DETERMINATION.—Any determination by the Secretary to grant an extension under subclause (I) shall be based on—

''(aa) the economic conditions in the commercial marketplace, including the capitalization, profitability, and investment returns of the insurance industry and the current cycle of the insurance markets;

''(bb) the affordability of commercial insurance for small- and medium-sized businesses; and

''(cc) such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(III) REPORT.—If the Secretary grants an extension under subclause (I), the Secretary shall promptly submit to Congress a report—

''(aa) justifying the reason for such extension; and

''(bb) detailing a plan for the collection of the required terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums.''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we have before us a bill where unfortunately we do not believe in markets. We are told markets will not work, so we have a terrorism risk insurance bill. That means the Federal Government is going to be the insurer of last resort. There have been some improvements over what we have put forward in the past, and I agree with those improvements if in fact we have to do this. I am not convinced we have to do it, but we are going to do it, and I understand that. I think the work of the committee, of which I am a member, has been very good.

But there is one real problem with this bill, and it is about smoke and mirrors, it is about not being honest with the American people. This bill was designed so it would have no score. It was not designed to do the best we can for America should we have a tragedy, and it was not designed to create the flexibility that would be necessary if we do have a tragedy.

Let me outline this for you. The way this bill is set up is that we could have a significant tragedy, God forbid, in this country from a terrorist attack, and the bill will mandate spikes in casualty and property insurance far above what will need to happen because we passed the bill to pass a CBO score. So what could happen is we would have to collect billions of dollars over an 18-month period through premium increases on everybody in the country,

not just where we had the problem—everybody in the country—because we have designed a bill that will in fact mandate that or at least could mandate that.

I have been around this place for 10 years. I know exactly what is going to happen if that comes about through this TRIA bill. The first thing that will happen is the Senate and the House will pass an elimination of this requirement. So what will happen is the American taxpayer will get stuck with all this. They all know that. Everybody agrees they designed the bill to meet CBO. So what I put in was an amendment that would give flexibility to the Treasury so we do not, after one tragedy, create another tragedy with markedly elevated casualty and property rates. We still recoup the money, but we do it over a longer period of time, if it is necessary, and we give the Secretary of the Treasury the ability to do that.

My friend from New York says there is a budget point of order that lies against it. It does according to CBO. I agree, it does. But the difference between this and most budget points of order is my amendment will not increase the deficit one penny—not one penny.

I would also note that my colleague from New York has voted to override budget points of order every time they have been offered this year. So it is going to be curious to me to all of a sudden have a budget point of order raised by someone who has voted to override the budget point of order every time it has been offered in the Senate this session, and it goes to why we should not pass this bill without common sense in terms of how we collect the recoupment.

I understand the constraints of CBO, but I also understand common sense. So we are going to play the game on the constraints, and we are ultimately going to pass on—rather than recoup—we are ultimately going to pass it on to the American taxpayer, which hollows out the whole purpose of the bill.

So this has a billion-dollar score, on which we are going to have a point of order, which I am sure I will lose. But when you vote for this bill, know you are not voting for what the bill says it is going to do because it is going to do something completely different than what it says, if we were to have one of these catastrophies.

The political pressure to not have these massive increases in property and casualty insurance—this place will fall, and so will the House, and we will change this, and we will have the score then. We will have the score then, and ultimately your children will pay for the cost of this terrorism risk insurance, not the people who are owning the property today, not the insurance company. We will just kick the can down the road, just as we have on everything else.

It would seem to me that we would want to do something that works along the parameters of this bill, and we ought to build in flexibility to this bill so that—it may be 10 years that we get on one of these because the bill is divided up to meet the score so it does not score in any one period. So over an 18-month period we could have to recoup it all and people could not tolerate those kinds of rate increases in their businesses or their homes. They would not be able to tolerate it and we would change it. Just as I am asking for us to change it now and be honest with the American people, we are going to change it if that happens.

We will change this, and we will delay the onset of the collection of this recoupment. Everybody knows that will happen. So why not be honest about it and put it in the bill now and waive the budget point of order because it does not change the deficit one penny. It changes when we collect it, but we still collect it against the risk of not collecting it at all.

That is what I ask my colleagues. I do not expect to win the amendment, but it is another confirmation to the American people that we are not about truth, we are not about doing commonsense things; we are about playing games and we are about satisfying the demands of the industry over which this applies.

Nobody knows what could happen in this country in terms of terrorism, but everybody knows I am right about this issue.

All I am saying is: Fess up. Be honest, colleagues. Let's build the flexibility in this so we do not have to address it, and the Treasury Secretary, no matter whether it is a Democrat or Republican administration, can use common sense to guide about how fast this recoupment will come; otherwise, you have not done anything to improve this bill if, in fact, this is not accepted.

I will be leaving here at the end of the year. Hopefully, we never see another terrorism event in this country. But if we do, it will be a sweet irony when you all say: Oops, time out. We are not going to do what we said we were going to do in that bill because the country cannot take it. What you will do is put one tragic event on top of another. You will not do that. So what will happen? You will change this bill. You will get that score. You will call it an emergency. You will do it anyway.

All I am asking is, be honest about what is going to ultimately happen on this should we have an event and it fall within one of these close parameters, based on what we said in the bill, because we are running the bill according to what CBO says, not as to what common sense is.

I look forward to having a vote on this amendment. I understand my likelihood of being successful. But I also understand the lack of honesty in dealing with the American people if we do not accept this amendment.

I yield the floor.

TERRORIST ATTACKS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues to speak about S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, TRIA, which I have cosponsored.

First, I commend Banking Committee Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO for their leadership on this important issue. Their efforts, along with those of the sponsors and cosponsors of the bill, led to a unanimous committee vote of 22 to 0 to report the legislation favorably to the full Senate. It is heartening to see legislation like this come together on such a strong bipartisan basis.

Reauthorizing TRIA is vital and not just from a Banking Committee perspective. I also have the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee. It is through this dual lens, and from what we know of the significant terrorist threats our Nation still faces, that compels me to believe that we need to reauthorize TRIA as soon as possible.

We must keep markets effectively and efficiently operating in light of these threats. We must continue to have policies in place to make sure our economy stays on track in the event of another attack on our Nation.

In short, reauthorizing TRIA is not only a matter of economic security; it is also a matter of national security. And so, I again thank the chairman for his leadership on this vital issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank Senator REED for his valuable contributions to the work of the Banking Committee. I also thank him for working with me on this matter and for his continued efforts to bolster our national security.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman. I would like to clarify one point. While TRIA is silent on whether a nuclear, chemical, biological, or radiological related terrorist attack or any kind of cyber-related attack are covered, I believe our intent with S. 2244 is that these attacks would continue to fall within the scope of TRIA's covered lines, as they do today, provided that statutory prerequisites are met. Does the chairman agree with this assessment?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes. The Committee makes this point clear in the Committee Report for S. 2244, and I thank the Senator again for his work on this issue.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman again, and I look forward to swift passage of this legislation here in the Senate, and hopefully in the House as well.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I commend my colleagues for a strong bipartisan vote in favor of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act.

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA, helped stabilize the commercial property market. This has allowed for continued commercial property development and real estate lending for office buildings, hotels, malls, and tourist attractions across the United States. In Florida, TRIA has been particularly important for continued development in the tourism sector—which is a critical part of the economy.

The passage of S. 2244 today illustrates the widespread, continued support for TRIA and the need for a backstop to guarantee sufficient capacity for businesses to insure against catastrophic terrorist events, including coverage for events involving a nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological element. At the same time, S. 2244 also ensures that taxpayers are a top priority and includes a recoupment mechanism to guarantee that taxpayers are made whole if the backstop is triggered.

I now hope that the House of Representatives will take quick action on S. 2244 so that the President can sign this legislation and assure continued stability in the commercial property and insurance market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to support S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. Congress first enacted TRIA into law in 2002 after the commercial property sector saw major disruptions in the ability to obtain financing and terrorism risk insurance following the September 11 terrorist attacks.

TRIA stabilized the markets and provided a government backstop to these unique markets, allowing commercial property development and real estate lending to continue for everything from hotels, stadiums, malls, to tourist attractions across the country. Experts and stakeholders testified at several banking committee hearings that there remains a clear and longstanding need for the kind of government backstop TRIA provides.

We also learned the private insurance market for terrorism risk exists because of TRIA, not in spite of it.

The long-term 7-year extension this bipartisan bill provides will promote national security, economic growth, and market certainty. While many Members in this Chamber would be fine with extending TRIA in its current form, this tough compromise has two additional changes that will further protect taxpayers: gradually raising both the insurer copayment from 15 percent to 20 percent, and the mandatory recoupment threshold from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion.

We were careful, however, in reaching this compromise not to raise the trigger, which would drive small insurers out of the market and reduce the availability and affordability of coverage for businesses nationwide. This bipartisan bill also does not pick what modes of terrorist attacks should get preferential treatment over other forms of attacks.

The entire Senate banking committee voted to report the bill to the floor by a unanimous and bipartisan 22-to-0 vote. Stakeholders across the board strongly support the Senate's bipartisan approach to extending TRIA, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Hotel and Lodging Association, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, and the Real Estate Roundtable, to name just a few.

Let me commend Senators SCHUMER, CRAPO, KIRK, REED, HELLER, and others from both sides of the aisle for their leadership on this issue. I thank them as well as their staffs for working with Ranking Member CRAPO and me and our staffs to craft this bipartisan compromise to extend TRIA for another 7 years. We would not be here today without all of their efforts.

TRIA must be renewed soon, given the program expires at the end of the year, and policyholders have increasingly reported challenges in renewing contracts for 2015. To that end, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2244.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. This is a bill I have worked on closely with my colleagues Senators SCHUMER, KIRK, and REED from Rhode Island. I also want to thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO, who have been instrumental in getting this bill to this point. Without their leadership, we would not be here today.

The terrorist attacks on September 11 caused a sudden and dramatic shock in the domestic market for terrorism insurance. After the attack there was a tremendous amount of uncertainty about the frequency and potential size of future attacks. Insurers quickly withdrew from the terrorist coverage market, and a new threat to our economy emerged.

In response, Congress passed TRIA, to provide a Federal insurance backstop for terrorism coverage. Since the passage in 2002, TRIA has helped ensure the widespread availability of affordable insurance against terrorism. This helped spur new development and protected existing real estate throughout our country.

TRIA was reauthorized in 2005 and reauthorized again in 2007. It is currently set to expire at the end of this year unless Congress acts. Unfortunately, the tragic bombing in Boston last year has shown that even years after September 11, the threat of terrorism still exists and we must continue our efforts to prevent, respond, and recover from any possible attacks in the future.

I wish to remind my colleagues that terrorism is not only an issue for big cities in New Jersey, on the east coast, in the Midwest, Chicago, terrorism is a real threat in both rural and urban areas, north, south, east, and west. That is why I have been so involved in trying to get TRIA extended.

In my home State, Las Vegas is considered one of the leading international business and tourism destination cities in the world. Southern Nevada welcomes almost 40 million tourists annually and has a population of nearly 2 million people. We have 35 major hotels along the Las Vegas strip. Many of them could have up to 15,000 occupants at any given time. According to the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, in 2013, the total economic impact of tourism was $45.2 billion, supporting 47 percent of the region's gross product, and 383,000 jobs, nearly half of the total workforce in southern Nevada.

My point in citing these statistics is if a terrorist attack were to occur in Las Vegas, our entire State economy would be devastated without TRIA.

It is not just about Las Vegas. In northern Nevada, our tourism and gaming industry is the largest private employer in Washoe County, which also includes Reno. They know that unless they have access to affordable terrorism coverage, they will have difficulty starting new capital projects and creating new jobs.

You will find similar stories across our Nation in every State. Currently, there is no evidence that the terrorism risk insurance market is prepared to provide coverage without TRIA. Without TRIA, most developments would halt because businesses would not be able to access and afford the necessary insurance that is often required to secure a loan.

TRIA has helped many hotels, hospitals, office complexes, shopping centers, colleges, and universities have access to terrorism insurance coverage.

The bill before us today is truly a bipartisan bill. It received a unanimous 22-to-0 vote in the banking committee. Such a strong vote only reinforces the bipartisan work that went into crafting this legislation.

I, along with my colleagues on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, agreed to several key reforms that would increase the insurance industry's aggregate retention level and coinsurance levels, which will significantly reduce the potential cost to taxpayers.

It is my hope that we can easily pass this important legislation with a strong bipartisan vote and send this bill to the House as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and let's not wait until the end of the year to extend this critical program.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, as we near the votes on this bill, I wish to take one more opportunity to speak in favor of the TRIA reauthorization legislation.

Again, I thank Senators SCHUMER, HELLER, and KIRK and their staffs and Senator REED for all their hard work in bringing forward this legislation.

I also thank Chairman JOHNSON and his staff for moving forward so quickly and aggressively on this legislation. Together, we were able to put together a bill that allows the program to continue to function while increasing the movement toward ultimate taxpayer protection.

As I mentioned before, we were able to approve this bill out of committee with a 22-to-0 unanimous vote. The agreement of all the members of the banking committee that we should move this bill forward speaks to the importance of this critical legislation and to the level of the added taxpayer protections we were able to build into it.

Our bill increases the level of losses that the private sector will absorb before reaching the Federal backstop. We do that by increasing the coinsurance level of any company participating in TRIA so that each company will shoulder a greater percentage of the losses. We also increase by $10 billion the level of mandatory post-event recoupments to $37.5 billion, which means that the taxpayer will ultimately recover all TRIA losses except in the most extreme events.

This bill will continue a program that reduces our economic vulnerability to terrorism, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

One last time, I thank Senator JOHNSON and Senator SCHUMER for their strong support and for our ability to work together and break the mold, if you will, by having a bipartisan movement forward on this important and critical legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Once again I thank the chair and the ranking member of the banking committee, TIM JOHNSON and MIKE CRAPO, for their great work.

I say to my colleagues, this is a very good example of much cooperation—bipartisan cooperation, Democrat and Republican—a 22-to-0 unanimous vote out of the committee. It is also cooperation between private industry and the government. Industry, insurance, and others knew they had to shoulder a greater share of the load as we move on after 9/11 but that only government could be the backstop at the end of the day.

Again, this is an economic development issue above anything else. It is not out of whose pocket what money comes. If the greatest problem America faces is good-paying jobs—well, if we were not to renew terrorism insurance, we would lose many good-paying jobs.

This amendment will allow those jobs to continue and grow. People will not build major edifices, major complexes—whether they be skyscrapers in Chicago or New York, whether they be football stadiums in Idaho or South Carolina or major shopping centers in South Dakota—unless they know there is a backstop, because insurers will not insure if they think terrorism could just totally wipe them out. And that means we wouldn't get financing for these projects.

It is an outstanding piece of legislation. My hope, in conclusion, is that the House would pass our bill. We know there are some concerns in the House, but there is a bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans who really favor the approach we have taken. I know there are some in the House who don't believe government should be involved here, but that is, with all due respect, a purist view.

We have cut back on some of the government's obligations. MIKE CRAPO and many of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle made that happen. But at the same time, without the government backstop, we would do real harm to our economy.

I hope we can get a very large vote in the Senate—bipartisan—because if we do, it should importune the House to perhaps pass our legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple points on the Coburn amendment, and then I will raise a point of order.

The current bill, S. 2244, is budget neutral, as the past TRIA bills have been. On the other hand, CBO has said Senator COBURN's amendment is not fully paid for, violating the Senate's PAYGO rule.

Basically, the amendment—even though I know the sponsor does not intend it that way—is a killer amendment. CBO has said the amendment would cause S. 2244 to increase the Federal deficit in both the 5-year and 10-year budget windows.

Senator COBURN offered this amendment in committee. It was roundly defeated by a bipartisan vote of 16 to 6 against it.

I appreciate Senator COBURN's effort to provide more flexibility to the timeframe for recoupment by the government in case of a terrorist attack, but in fact the banking committee, led by Senator JOHNSON, and my office have worked with CBO for a number of months to determine whether there could be more flexibility in the recoupment process. Unfortunately, CBO has yet to identify a way to provide more flexibility in the recoupment period while still ensuring the program remains budget neutral as it is now.

It is also important to note that if recoupment by the government poses any unforeseen challenge after a future attack, nothing would stop the Treasury Secretary from asking the Congress then to provide that flexibility.

The bottom line is that TRIA is too important to allow this amendment and nonreauthorization of the program because it is not budget neutral. We don't want to give anybody an excuse.

I am hopeful Senator COBURN will support TRIA's final passage, even if his amendment isn't agreed to, as he did in committee. But for those of us whose priority is to reauthorize this program, I urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the budget point of order and oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2008.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All debate time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shaheen
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Hagan	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48 and the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected and the amendment falls.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 229, I was present and voted aye. The official record has me listed as absent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the official record be corrected to accurately reflect my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3550

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to Vitter amendment No. 3550.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3550) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to Flake amendment No. 3551.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. This is a good amendment and will be supported by Chairman JOHNSON and myself.

I yield back all time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Heller	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Risch
Boxer	Hoeven	Roberts
Brown	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Burr	Isakson	Rubio
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Markey	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Moran	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The amendment (No. 3551) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3552

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the Tester amendment No. 3552.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to Tester amendment No. 3552.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Baldwin	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Begich	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Hatch	Nelson
Blunt	Heinrich	Paul
Booker	Heitkamp	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Pryor
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Hoeven	Reid
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Cantwell	Isakson	Rockefeller
Cardin	Johanns	Sanders
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Corker	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Levin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Manchin	Vitter
Durbin	Markey	Walsh
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warren
Fischer	McConnell	Whitehouse
Flake	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—4

Coburn	Rubio	
Roberts	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The bill (S. 2244), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2244

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2021''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting ''and beginning on January 1, 2016, shall decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year until equal to 80 percent'' after ''85 percent''.

SEC. 4. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through subparagraph (E) and inserting ''shall be the lesser of—

''(A) $27,500,000,000, as such amount is adjusted pursuant to this paragraph; and

''(B) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year,

provided that beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A) shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.'';

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''for such period'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) [Reserved.]'';

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent'' and inserting '', terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 135.5 percent''; and

(ii) by inserting ''as calculated under subparagraph (A)'' after ''mandatory recoupment amount''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019'';

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(III) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(II) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''An entity has'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity has''; and

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

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have 'control' over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having 'control' under subparagraph (A).'';

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

''(A) the value of an insurer's direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year'' and inserting ''notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year''; and

(II) by striking ''Period or Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(C) by striking paragraph (11); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), as previously amended by section 3—

(aa) by striking ''the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''each calendar year'';

(bb) by striking the comma after ''80 percent''; and

(cc) by striking ''such Transition Period or such Program Year'' and inserting ''such calendar year''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''exceed'' and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting ''exceed $100,000,000 with respect to such insured losses occurring in the calendar year.'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''a calendar year''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year'' and inserting ''any calendar year''; and

(C) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking ''the Transition Period or a Program Year'' each place that term appears and inserting ''the calendar year'';

(ii) by striking ''such period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''; and

(iii) by striking ''that period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''.

SEC. 6. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''act of terrorism'' has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term ''certification process'' means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 6 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including any timeline applicable to any certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY ON UPFRONT PREMIUMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine,

but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) How the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program.

(2) How the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums.

(3) How the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program.

(4) How the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

(5) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small.

(6) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance.

(7) The size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program's current post-event recoupment structure.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 8. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than $10,000,000,000 in total assets.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

SEC. 9. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the ''Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms'' (referred to in this subsection as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

''SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Association').

''(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

''(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

''(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

''(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

''(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

''SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

''The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other nonresident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

''(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

''(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

''(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

''(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

''(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

''SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

''(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

''(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

''(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

''(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

''(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

''(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Board') shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

''(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

''(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines

appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

''(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

''(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

''(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

''(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

''(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than $50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

''(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

''(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

''(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

''(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

''(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

''(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

''(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

''(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

''(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

''(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

''(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

''(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'criminal history record check' means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

''(2) BUSINESS ENTITIES.—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, rules, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

''(3) CATEGORIES.—

''(A) SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

''(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

''(d) MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the 'NAIC') Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

''(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

''(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

''(ii) the Association to receive the information.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

''(4) DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

''(e) EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.—Membership in the Association shall—

''(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

''(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

''(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

''(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(4) NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

''(B) ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

''(5) PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or

other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

''(B) PRESERVED REGULATIONS.—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

''(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

''(ii) establish consumer protections; or

''(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

''(f) BIENNIAL RENEWAL.—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

''(g) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

''(2) STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

''(3) RECIPROCITY.—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

''(4) LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

''(h) PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—

''(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

''(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

''(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

''(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

''(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(2) VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

''(i) CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall—

''(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

''(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

''(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

''(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

''(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

''(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referenced in paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

''(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

''(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

''(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

''(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

''(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014; and

''(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

''SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

''(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

''(c) COMPOSITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

''(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

''(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

''(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

''(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

''(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

''(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

''(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

''(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

''(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State insurance commissioner' means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

''(d) TERMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

''(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under

paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

''(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

''(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

''(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

''(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

''(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

''(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014.

''(f) MEETINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

''(A) at the call of the chairperson;

''(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

''(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

''(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

''(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

''(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

''(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

''(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

''(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

''(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

''(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

''(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

''(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

''(i) COMPENSATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

''(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

''SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

''(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

''(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

''(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

''(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a 'disciplinary action') or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

''(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

''(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

''(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

''(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

''(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

''(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

''(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

''SEC. 326. POWERS.

''In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

''(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

''(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

''(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

''(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

''(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

''(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

''(7) borrow money; and

''(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

''SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

''(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

''SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

''(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

''SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

''(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the

112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

''(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

''(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

''SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

''(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

''(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

''(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

''(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

''(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

''(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

''(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

''(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

''(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

''SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

''The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

''SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

''(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

''(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

''SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

''The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

''SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term 'business entity' means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

''(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term 'depository institution' has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

''(3) HOME STATE.—The term 'home State' means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

''(4) INSURANCE.—The term 'insurance' means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

''(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term 'insurance producer' means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

''(6) INSURER.—The term 'insurer' has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

''(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term 'principal place of business' means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

''(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal place of residence' means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

''(9) STATE.—The term 'State' includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(10) STATE LAW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'State law' includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

''(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.

''SEC. 335. SUNSET.

''The provisions of this subtitle, and any program or authorities established or granted therein or derived therefrom, shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Association approves its first member pursuant to section 323.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

''Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

''Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.
''Sec. 322. Purpose.
''Sec. 323. Membership.
''Sec. 324. Board of directors.
''Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.
''Sec. 326. Powers.
''Sec. 327. Report by the Association.
''Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.
''Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.
''Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.
''Sec. 331. Coordination with Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.
''Sec. 332. Right of action.
''Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.
''Sec. 334. Definitions.
''Sec. 335. Sunset.''.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote with respect to the Carnes nomination now occur at 1:45 p.m. today, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, it is my understanding later today we are going to have an opportunity to approve a resolution that was voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that deals with the tragic events in the Middle East between Israel and Hamas. I just want to

read part of that resolution, the action part of the resolution, because I hope it expresses the views of each Member of the Senate.

It reaffirms the Senate's support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel. It condemns the unprovoked rocket fire at Israel. It calls on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel. It calls upon the Palestinian Authority of President Abbas to dissolve the unity governing arrangement with Hamas and condemn the attacks on Israel.

We all are very concerned about the tragic consequences of the conflict between Israel and Hamas. Our strongest desire is that we can end the attacks and the missiles and that we can get Israel and the Palestinians to negotiate a peace agreement, a lasting agreement for two states living side-by-side, the Jewish State of Israel and a Palestinian State.

But the recent military action taken by the Israel Defense Forces in Gaza is a direct response to Hamas's barrage of rockets and mortar attacks against civilian targets in Israel. Labeled as a terrorist organization, Hamas is directly responsible for the innocent loss of life of both Israelis and Palestinians. It is very tragic what Israel is doing it is doing so to defend its civilian population from the incoming rockets.

What Hamas is doing is indiscriminately sending missiles into Israel, targeting innocent populations. Hamas's actions to extend its reach deeper into Israel and its failure to end continuing attacks undermine efforts to attain peace and security in the region.

The Israel Defense Forces began Operation Protective Edge Tuesday, July 8, with one goal, one goal in mind; that is, to stop Hamas's continued rocket attacks against Israel's civilians. Since the start of the operation, there have been over 1,000 rockets that have been launched into Israel. Most of those rockets hit targets. Fortunately, they were not major population centers because of Iron Dome. I thank the policy of this country, the United States, in providing Israel the Iron Dome missile defense system, which has been responsible for bringing down approximately 200 of the rockets that otherwise would have hit population centers in Israel.

Earlier this week, Egypt proposed an immediate cease-fire, followed by a series of meetings in Cairo with high-level delegations from both sides. Israel accepted that cease-fire immediately. They said: Fine. Let's do it. We want to stop the attacks of rockets into our country. We want to have a discussion for peace. They did it immediately. For 6 hours the IDF suspended operations against Hamas, but during this time Hamas fired 50 rockets into Israel. So the Israel Defense Forces were ordered to resume attacks against terrorist targets following continued inbound rockets and Hamas's official statement that it rejected the cease-fire.

I think what Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said on CBS's ''Face the Nation'' on Sunday sums it up best. I am quoting from the Prime Minister: The difference between us is that we are using missiles to protect our civilians and they are using their civilians to protect their missiles.

In other words, what Hamas is doing is putting its missile locations in population centers, in schools, in hospitals, in mosques, in a direct way to use human shields. What a difference. Israel is trying to protect its civilian population. Hamas is putting their civilian population at great risk.

Hamas must end its rocket and mortar attacks, recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, and honor all past agreements to peacefully move toward a two-state solution. That is what we want to see. I strongly support Israel's right to defend its citizens against threats to its security and existence. Hamas must end. It must be marginalized. It cannot be allowed to continue its terrorist activities. We must find a way to advance a stable and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinian people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I would like to concur with the comments of my friend, the Senator from Maryland, on the tragedy in Israel and the Middle East. I also want to say a special thanks to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, for allowing me to jump in line for a moment.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2265

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise to say that I think it is abhorrent and I think most American people would be greatly distressed to know that some of their money could be sent to terrorist organizations, that some of their money could be sent to Hamas.

Hamas has now joined a unity government with the Palestinian Authority. We give several hundred million dollars a year to the Palestinian Authority. I am appalled to think we could be somehow indirectly paying for missiles that Hamas is launching on Israel. I support the resolution that will shortly come forward condemning Hamas's activities.

I want more teeth in this. I would like to see legislation that says: You know what. If Hamas wants to come out of the cold, they want to recognize Israel and renounce terror, maybe. But if they are going to continue to say, as one of their leaders said recently, that our path is resistance and a rifle, our choice is jihad, if Hamas is going to continue to laugh and to cheer with glee with the killing of three teenage Israeli citizens, one of whom was an American citizen, Hamas should not—and we should guarantee that Hamas should not—get any of our money. So I will ask for unanimous consent to pass a bill to guarantee that Hamas will not receive any of our foreign aid.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2265 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I know the Senator from Kentucky tried to have this bill heard this week in a business meeting. I know the Senator knows I supported that effort to cause this bill to be marked up in the Foreign Relations Committee, which is where it should be dealt with.

I thank him for his concern about foreign aid. I think he has brought a voice to the Senate which has raised many concerns about how we are spending taxpayer money. I thank him for raising some of the issues he has brought forth. As it relates to the bill itself, I have spoken to officials from Israel. I know one of the goals is to do something that complements Israel and helps Israel.

I know they have some concerns with the way it is constructed and actually, in many ways if this bill were to become law, it would create a heightened security problem for Israel. So we have had a constructive conversation I think on the floor. I would like to talk with the Senator a little bit further about some potential changes to the legislation. I think that would be more appropriate than passing it by unanimous consent. I thank him again for his nature, the way he works with all of us. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. GRAHAM. I know the Senator is supposed to be chairing a hearing here in a moment. But the Senator is the ranking member on Foreign Relations. I wish to compliment the Senator from Tennessee and Senator MENENDEZ. The Senators have been a very effective team. The subject matter is Iran. July 20 will be here shortly.

I ask Senator CORKER, what is his view of where we stand with the Iranian nuclear program and what are his concerns?

Mr. CORKER. First of all, no one has taken a more important role in our foreign policy and security issues than

the Senator from South Carolina. I thank him for that. I know on my last trip to Afghanistan, he was there serving his Reserve duty. I thank the Senator for the many contributions to all of these debates. I want to say that I think, similar to many in this body, when the initial agreement was put forth and it had a 6-month extension on it, there was a lot of concern. What I am concerned about, and the Senator from South Carolina I think may share some of this, is that what we are going to end up with are a series of rolling interim agreements.

What we have is Iran doing everything they can to evade sanctions that have been put in place. We have countries that see the opportunity possibly for Iran to come out from under being a rogue state. I am worried we are putting ourselves in a situation where we are losing all of the leverage Congress, working with the administration, but Congress led on in putting these sanctions in place.

We are coming up on July 20. I was very disappointed that, in essence in March, the administration agreed to the fact that Iran would be able to have centrifuges to enrich uranium. It was something that, to me, at the beginning of a negotiation, to give one of the biggest things one can possibly give to a country such as Iran on the front end, put us in a very bad position.

But here is my concern: It is July 17. This agreement ends on July 20. I believe we are losing the leverage that all of us worked so hard to put in place. I am worried the coalition we have is dissipating. It feels to me as though Iran is rope-a-doping us on this agreement.

What I hope is going to happen—I know the Senator and I are going to be in a briefing later today. I hope the administration is going to share with us, very clearly, what the gaps are between where they are and where Iran is.

It is my hope that gap is going to be very narrow. I do not think that is going to be the case. My sense is the administration is going to ask for an extension over the next few days. That concerns me. Here is what I hope Congress will do: I hope Congress somehow will have the ability, through the majority leader's efforts and all of us on the floor, to weigh in on any final agreement that is put in place. I think that is very important. I know the Senator tried to produce legislation to make that happen. I have done the same thing.

Secondly, I hope the administration will agree there will be no more extensions, period. I am pretty sure they are going to be asking for one. It is unfortunate. When you put in place an agreement on the front end that you have that ability, it then creates the essence that it does not create the focus, if you will, that is necessary to bring this to a conclusion.

Again, what I hope will happen is that Congress will have a final say on any removal of sanctions—any removal of sanctions. But my hope is that before any type of sanctions relief takes place, Congress will have the opportunity to weigh in. I had a long conversation yesterday with our lead negotiator. I shared these same concerns, that I just feel the moment slipping away from us. I think all of us want to see a diplomatic solution. I do not think there is anybody on this floor that wants to see anything less than a great result diplomatically.

But I think many of us are concerned we are losing our leverage, time is slipping away, the coalition is dissipating. Some of the parties, as the Senator knows, have differing interests now. We have had some conflicts arise over the course of time where we are at significant odds with some of our partners in these negotiations.

With Russia we have the issue in Ukraine and Crimea. With China we have issues in the South and East China Sea. So all of this is making me very concerned about our ability to reach a diplomatic solution, even though I want more than anything—on this issue, more than anything, I want us to have a solid diplomatic solution that allows us to go forward and know that Iran does not have the ability to break out and become a nuclear threat to the region, to the world, and certainly create instability.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his leadership. We are working together. We hope to make this bipartisan. If there is an agreement reached with the Iranians—and I agree, I hope there will be, that Congress can have a say about that agreement.

President Obama felt as though he needed to come to Congress to get approval to enter into Syria. The Senator led the effort to pass the resolution in the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator and Senator MENENDEZ working together. The Senator from Tennessee delivered Republican votes to try to help the President. He drew a red line and nothing happened.

So if he believes he needs input from the Congress about going to Syria, I hope the President will understand that the Congress wants input when it comes to the Iranian nuclear program. As a matter of fact, I hope we will demand it, because of all the decisions President Obama will make in his two terms as President, on the foreign policy front this is the most consequential.

Why do I say this? The Iranian regime with a nuclear capability is a nightmare for the world.

Does Senator CORKER agree with me, based on his travels in the region, that if we allowed the Iranians to have a robust enrichment capability—and what am I talking about is taking uranium and enriching it to the point where they can use it for commercial fuel to run a nuclear power reactor. The problem with enrichment is you can go beyond making commercial grade fuel. You can actually use that process to make a bomb. Without enrichment capability you can't make the bomb.

So they are demanding the right to enrich and it was given away in March. It was a huge mistake.

If you made a list of countries you would not trust to enrich uranium—based on their behavior and disruptive nature—I would put Iran on the top of the list. My fear is that we are about to do with the Iranians what we did with the North Koreans—that you have a deal on paper that gives them an enrichment capability to be contained by U.N. inspection. And in North Korea the rest is history.

When it comes to the Iranians, I am not going to turn our fate over, as a nation, to a bunch of U.N. inspectors trying to contain their uranium enrichment program. I know Israel will not.

But this is the ripple effect. Does the Senator agree with me that any right to enrich we give to the Shia Persians in Iran, the Sunni Arabs are going to insist on an equivalent right?

Mr. CORKER. The Senator is exactly right. I was in the region this year, and there is tremendous concern about, obviously, Iran breaking out in this regard. Candidly, there are many conversations about ways for them to compensate for that because they obviously want a counter to Iran's being a nuclear-armed country.

As you know, with some of the proliferation that takes place, there are ways of buying those capabilities without even developing them yourself. So, yes, that is a major concern.

Our friend, Senator MENENDEZ, on the other side of the aisle—with whom you work so closely—I certainly don't want to speak for him, but I use a frame of reference that he has used on so many occasions; that is, it is one thing to dismantle their ability to enrich and produce a nuclear weapon and it is a whole different thing to just mothball.

What I fear is that we are creating a situation where, again, we have these countries that come together, we have the sanctions that are in place, and we let those sanctions dissipate. Then all of a sudden—and I think the Senator knows already—the economy in Iran is picking up and inflation has dropped if you allow those to dissipate.

It took a lot of effort to put these sanctions in place. Again, there are a lot of differing interests today that didn't exist when these were put in place. Then all of a sudden we have a situation where they break out again because they have those capabilities. They have mothballed; they have not been dismantled. Not to speak of the

fact that we don't know what is going on in Parchin—we don't know what may happen with the Arak facility.

Again, I hope the administration will be very clear about the gaps that exist today. My sense is they are going to extend and, again, I have grave concerns about what that is going to mean relative to getting to a good end.

Mr. GRAHAM. Along those lines, Senator MENENDEZ has been one of the leading voices in the Senate and in the Nation about having a cautious eye toward Iran.

They have an enrichment capability. Over the last decade it has grown moderately.

This idea of moderate voices in Iran—the President of Iran was elected as a moderate. I don't believe that dichotomy really exists. This whole game of good cop/bad cop is going on in front of our eyes—in this case good president/bad ayatollah.

The ayatollah, the Supreme Leader of Iran, weighed in a few days ago talking about centrifuges 10 times greater than they have today. I am sure what he is trying to do is become the bad guy. When he puts out the number 190,000 and you wind up with 15 or 20, it is like a good deal.

I can promise you one centrifuge in the hands of the Iranians is a risk. Thousands of centrifuges in the hands of Iranians is stupid. We would be crazy to let that happen.

If they want a nuclear power program for peaceful purposes, sign me up.

As a matter of fact, as far as any deal, I would put in the deal the ability for the international community—Russia, the United States, and China working together or separately—to build a powerplant inside of Iran to give them nuclear power as long as we control the fuel cycle.

Fifteen nations have nuclear power programs that do not enrich. Canada and Mexico have nuclear power programs, but they don't enrich uranium.

As a matter of fact, we are telling our friends in South Korea: Don't begin to enrich. We are telling our friends in the United Arab Emirates: You can have nuclear power, but don't enrich.

I would find it incredible for us to tell allies that we trust them not to enrich because it could set off unintended consequences, but we are agreeing to let one of the enemies of mankind have that capability because they are demanding it.

I hope and I pray a deal can come about that will neuter the nuclear ambitions of the Iranians and give them what they claim to want—a peaceful nuclear power program. But I don't believe that is what they want. I don't think they would be doing all the things they have been doing—lying, cheating, and building plants under a mountain—if all they wanted was a peaceful nuclear power program.

As a matter of fact, our intelligence community tells us the program they have today has been put to military use. They denied that, but we can't get to the bottom of it.

What is the Senator's view about the likelihood of the Iranians lying about the fact that they have tried to militarize their program?

Mr. CORKER. I think, based on past behavior, that would be one's expectation. Again, we know there are facilities that are operating, and we haven't been able to get into those facilities.

When you look at the facts, one of the things that is not even being addressed is the whole delivery system—their ability to deliver the weaponry. None of this discussion thus far, to my knowledge, has anything to do with their developing capabilities to actually deliver a nuclear weapon.

What I am concerned about—the Senator focused on the centrifuges and it is the central issue—no question. I think the Senator has wisely pointed out how the Supreme Leader has tried to move the goalpost so far down the field that just getting to the 30- or 40-yard line looks good to us. But we also did the same on the front end of the deal by acknowledging in the preamble or the four-page agreement that enrichment certainly could occur.

But here is what is happening, I fear. On every other single portion—not just the centrifuge—the goal posts are being moved. In other words, the things that we thought were going to take place on the front end—whether it was the Arak facility and what was going to occur there or what was going to happen in other pieces of the deal—all of that adds up to very important elements or a final deal. I am afraid what is happening is the goalpost is moving on all of those as time goes on.

Mr. GRAHAM. I couldn't agree more. As a matter of fact, dismantling has become something new. They have a big stockpile of highly enriched uranium. We are talking about diluting it, but the U.N. resolution called for its removal, so this deal is to the left of the U.N. resolution. As a matter of fact, this whole agreement is getting to the left of what the United Nations has been.

What about this scenario? It is one thing to have fissile material in the hands of the ayatollah and they could make a bomb, but they still have a lot of highly enriched uranium still inside of Iran. What is the possibility of a dirty bomb, where they turn that highly enriched uranium over to a terrorist organization and it makes its way here without their fingerprints being on it?

Mr. CORKER. One of the ways that Iran has destabilized the region has been through proxies that it funds.

Let's face it. Until they became involved in Syria—as the Senator has talked about on the floor—through their proxy, Hezbollah, actually the moderate in the opposition was gaining ground. So their utilization of terrorist groups to achieve their end, obviously, is their normal mode of operation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, continue.

Mr. CORKER. So when you think about the possibilities of their being able to create, as the Senator mentioned, a dirty bomb—which would create tremendous terror wherever it might have been implemented—that is something I think is frightening—more than frightening.

It would be something that would be not quite as destabilizing as, obviously, having a full-blown nuclear weapon, but something that would be very damaging to world security.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know we are going to have a vote in a second, but we will end our thoughts.

The reason 3,000 Americans were killed on 9/11 and not 3 million is that the terrorist groups that wish us harm could not find capabilities beyond the airplanes. They are trying. They are trying to get weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, highly enriched uranium, fissile material.

My fear is that if a regime such as Iran is given the capability to enrich, it will become a North Korea where they break out.

I will not turn the fate of the United States over, with my vote, to a bunch of U.N. inspectors—where the only hope of a breakout is a bunch of U.N. inspectors.

The whole real goal for me is to have a capability that is very small, face-saving in nature, that can't lead to a breakout. Don't have something robust that can lead to a breakout and expect the U.N. to protect us because they can't. They didn't do it in North Korea.

At the end of the day I think the decision we are going to make as a nation—through our President—hopefully with direction and input, will be the biggest decision we have made as a nation on the foreign policy front in decades, because, if we get this wrong, if we allow the Iranian ayatollah to achieve a new nuclear capability, every Sunni Arab is going to want like capability, and we are on the road to Armageddon.

Look at the Middle East and ask yourselves: Is this a good place to give people nuclear capability? Would they use it?

Hamas is firing every rocket in its inventory, and they could care less where it lands; they hate Israel that much.

The Sunni Arabs feel more threatened by the Shia Persians than they do by the Israelis.

It is commonly believed that Israelis have a nuclear capability. Not one Sunni nation has tried to procure a weapon of their own to counter that presumed capability. Every Sunni Arab state has told me, you, and everybody else who will listen, that if the Shia Persians get a capability they are going to match that capability because they see that threat as existential.

Israel sees the threat in Iran—with a nuclear capability in Iranian hands—as existential.

I see it as existential to the United States. We have an opportunity here for negotiations to end this well. But what I hope we will not do is, through negotiations, create a scenario where they break out like the North Koreans.

If I have the choice between a bad deal through negotiations that will lead to a nuclear Iran over time and military force—as distasteful as that might be—I am going to pick military force because we have to stop their ambitions to become a nuclear nation.

If we don't stop them, it would be similar, in my view, to have let Hitler have the bomb when we could have done something about it.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator again for his tremendous contributions to this body and every foreign policy debate that we have.

The President did seek congressional approval on the authorization of the use of military force in Syria. It was not something he had to do, but he sought it, and I am pleased that he did.

I was proud to be a part of writing that agreement with our chairman and other members of the committee to give him the power to do that. And actually, to be candid, I regret that things took the course they took, but the President elected to do that.

As the Senator mentioned, a nuclear-armed Iran is a whole different scale. What I hope will happen is that the President will agree there will be no more extensions if they ask for one in the next few days, and I am almost certain that is what is going to happen.

No. 2, I hope you will commit to letting Congress weigh in on the final decision. I actually think that will be useful for them in the negotiation. I really do think that having a backstop would be useful to them, but if the President doesn't agree to that, I hope we, on our own, will pass legislation which ensures that is the case.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. I concur, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CARING FOR REFUGEES

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, in the last year I have been to Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon to visit Syrian refugees and the organizations that work with them. I have seen the effects of refugees fleeing violence on these nations. Lebanon has 4 million people. They are having to care for 1 million refugees from Syria—one in four members of their population.

These countries, especially Jordan and Lebanon, are small—much smaller than the United States. They are much poorer than the United States. Jordan has very little water for their own citizens, much less refugees, but they have shown a real sense of compassion and hospitality in treating these Syrian refugees who are fleeing violence and coming over their border. Lebanese citizens even run double school shifts—their own kids in the morning and Syrian refugees in the afternoon.

When I have been in the Middle East in these countries, I have wondered what would happen if refugees fleeing violence in other countries came to the United States. I wonder if we would show the same compassion to refugees that is being shown by these poorer nations.

I wish to say a few words about the crisis at the border now because we are now faced with that question—refugees fleeing violence and coming to the United States.

Who are the children coming to the United States? They are overwhelmingly refugees from three Central American countries—52,000 just this year. They are not just coming to the United States; they are also flooding into Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

Senator MENENDEZ held a hearing this morning, and we had testimony. What is the reason they are coming? And the testimony was this: The reason they are coming is overwhelmingly the violence in the neighborhoods where they live that forces their parents to decide that to keep them safe, they should leave.

What is the source of the violence? Again, overwhelmingly, the testimony is that the source of the violence is the drug trade that has corrupted the neighborhoods and made them dangerous. The kids are fleeing violence driven by the drug trade.

Here is the sort of sad punch line: Where does the drug trade originate? The drug trade is originating because of the significant demand in the United States for illegal drugs, especially cocaine.

So these kids are fleeing to the United States because Americans are buying illegal drugs in such numbers and the dollars being shipped south are creating conditions for gang warfare and cartels, turning these nations into transit points for drugs.

I know these children, and I know their neighborhoods. I lived in El Progreso, Honduras, in 1980 and 1981. Six hundred kids from El Progreso have already come to the United States as unaccompanied refugees this year.

Honduras, a beautiful country with beautiful people, a longtime ally of the United States, is now the murder capital of the world. There are more people murdered in Honduras than in any other country. El Salvador is No. 4 in the world, and Guatemala is No. 5 in the world.

I recently met with President Hernandez of Honduras to talk about what we can do. So what should we do? Let's get to the prescription. What should we do?

First, we have to stop blaming the kids or assuming they are bad people. They are not. We need to show the same compassion for refugees fleeing violence and coming to the United States as nations such as Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan show to refugees fleeing violence and coming to their nations.

Secondly, we need to work on our legal process and the resources the President asked for. I have some criticisms of exactly how those dollars will be spent and the particular protections these refugees need when they arrive. Remember, it is a 2008 law we are dealing with that was passed unanimously by Congress and signed by President Bush.

We need to do immigration reform. The fact that we haven't done it for so long creates a sense of confusion. If we can clearly elaborate what our immigration policy is, it will dispel myths.

More support for security in Central America is critical. We need to interdict more drugs. General Kelly, the head of SOUTHCOM, says we let 75 percent of the drugs that come into the United States go by us. We know where they are, but we haven't put the military resources in place to interdict them.

Finally, we have to tackle the U.S. demand for drugs because that is what is driving the violence in the neighborhoods which is causing kids to flee.

In conclusion, this year is the 75th anniversary of a very shameful event—the voyage of the St. Louis. The St. Louis was a ship that left Germany in 1939 with hundreds of Jews onboard. These Jews were fleeing violence and antisemitism to come to the new world. They were not allowed to disembark in Cuba, they were not allowed to disembark in the United States, and they were not allowed to disembark in Canada. Eventually, the ship had to be routed back to Europe, where, research shows, hundreds of those Jews who had to get back off in Europe died in the Holocaust.

The testimony this morning was that if we, without due process, send these children home, many will die as a result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KAINE. That lesson of the St. Louis should stick with us, and there are many things we can do to avert this crisis and to show our good hearts as Americans.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Ayotte	Franken	Manchin
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Markey
Bennet	Graham	McCain
Blumenthal	Hagan	McCaskill
Booker	Harkin	Menendez
Boxer	Hatch	Merkley
Brown	Heinrich	Mikulski
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cardin	Hirono	Murphy
Carper	Inhofe	Murray
Casey	Isakson	Nelson
Chambliss	Johanns	Portman
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Cochran	Kaine	Reed
Collins	King	Reid
Donnelly	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Durbin	Landrieu	Schumer
Feinstein	Leahy	Sessions
Flake	Levin	Shaheen
Shelby	Udall (NM)	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Walsh	Wicker
Tester	Warner	Wyden
Udall (CO)	Warren	

NAYS—23

Barrasso	Enzi	McConnell
Blunt	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Scott
Corker	Hoeven	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Coons	Roberts
Begich	Moran	Sanders
Coburn	Paul	Schatz

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 68, the nays are 23. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

NOMINATION OF DAVID B. SHEAR TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and David B. Shear, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David B. Shear, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF DAVID ARTHUR MADER TO BE CONTROLLER, OFFICE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Arthur Mader, of Virginia, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Arthur Mader, of Virginia, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

BRING JOBS BACK HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to reiterate my opposition to legislation that would impose new tax burdens on businesses in New Hampshire and I believe would have a serious impact on our economy.

Earlier this week Majority Leader REID started a fast-track process to bring a bill to the floor that includes the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. This is legislation that would for the first time allow States to collect sales taxes from businesses in New Hampshire. As a result, this bill would impose significant new tax compliance burdens on entrepreneurs in New Hampshire—the same entrepreneurs who are trying to grow their businesses and create jobs on the Internet.

In New Hampshire we don't have a sales tax, so our businesses are not used to collecting one. That is why New Hampshire businesses are so concerned that if this bill passes, they will be forced to collect sales taxes from not just 1 State but 46 other States and 9,600 taxing jurisdictions across the country. The redtape would be a nightmare for small companies with only a few employees.

I heard from one small business owner in Hudson, NH. His business is about to reach $1 million in revenue, but his company has only six employees. Under the legislation, the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, his company might be considered a large business. The company has plans to grow, but it would be forced to reconsider as it approaches this arbitrary threshold and then is covered under the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act.

E-commerce has been a real boon to small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country. It has helped companies find new markets for their products and new revenues. But for companies looking to grow through online sales, this legislation represents an artificial ceiling for creating jobs and expanding jobs through e-commerce.

I will raise a few concerns about what this legislation would mean for

small business. First, each State has different sales and use taxes, so businesses would need new software to figure out how to collect and remit those taxes. Small businesses would also need to collect personal information from each buyer to make sure they are complying with all State and local sales taxes. These small businesses might then have to deal with audit and enforcement actions from other States, and the same businesses might have to answer to taxing authorities in places where they have no representation whatsoever. As States and localities consider new taxes, these small businesses would have no voice in that process because they have no representation in those jurisdictions.

These are just a few examples of the many unintended consequences this legislation would create. These burdens on small businesses will stifle e-commerce. That is why it was so disappointing to learn that the sponsors of the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act have attached it to another measure that is meant to encourage e-commerce, the Internet Tax Freedom Act. That legislation bans taxes on Internet access.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act has broad bipartisan support. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. Since 1998 the Internet Tax Freedom Act has kept the Internet free of new taxation, which has helped the Internet flourish and become the driver of economic activity it is today.

Unfortunately, this ban on new Internet access taxes expires this November, and Congress must take action to keep the Internet tax-free. I strongly support keeping the Internet tax-free, and the vast majority of Congress supports it. In fact, just this week the House voted to make this ban on Internet taxation permanent. The Internet Tax Freedom Act could pass the Senate and the House today with strong bipartisan support. Yet based on the action earlier this week, the Senate may be asked to consider a bill that includes new tax burdens on small businesses. That is right. It doesn't make sense, but on a bill that is meant to keep the Internet free from taxation, there is now an effort to impose new tax collection burdens on Internet retailers, and that not only doesn't make sense, I think it is just wrong.

Just yesterday I sent a letter with a bipartisan group of our colleagues urging leadership to bring a clean Internet Tax Freedom Act bill to the floor. I was joined by Senators CRUZ, AYOTTE, TESTER, MERKLEY, and PAUL. We believe the Internet should be tax-free and that we should pass this noncontroversial legislation as soon as possible.

We also think it is wrong to use a critical, must-pass extension of this law to keep the Internet tax-free as a vehicle to pass a fundamental shift in how e-commerce operates. Combining these two very different issues into one bill does nothing to protect New Hampshire's small businesses from the flawed so-called Marketplace Fairness Act.

We should keep this Internet sales tax legislation from moving forward, the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. We should do that because it is bad for New Hampshire and the other States that have no sales taxes that are in the same position as New Hampshire. It is bad for small businesses and it is bad for our economy.

Thank you very much, Madam President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, who I think has come to the floor to also express her concerns about the commingling of the Internet Tax Freedom Act with the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. She will be speaking from her perspective about the concerns it places on New Hampshire's small businesses. I am very pleased to see my colleague from New Hampshire here to also express her concern about what is happening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I certainly wish to thank my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN.

As she has stated, New Hampshire doesn't have a sales tax. There is absolutely nothing fair about the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, especially for a State such as New Hampshire. It should be more appropriately named the Internet sales tax collection act, because that is what it is—the Internet sales tax collection act. I certainly appreciate the work I have done with my colleague, both of us fighting the Marketplace Fairness Act, because there is nothing fair about it for New Hampshire and, frankly, nothing fair about it for online businesses across this country.

This act would ask our online businesses that have been thriving and growing—many people have started these businesses from their homes and we have seen those businesses flourish in our home State of New Hampshire—to become tax collectors for States that are greedy for revenue, and it would trample on the decision of a State such as New Hampshire not to have a sales tax. What it would mean for online businesses is they would have to become the tax collector not just for the 50 States, but they would actually have to become a tax collector for over 9,000 taxed jurisdictions in this country. Talk about a bureaucratic nightmare for an online business. Talk about an act that is going to put onerous burdens on an area of commerce that we have seen such great growth in. Talk about an act that is totally misnamed because there is nothing fair about it; it really is an Internet sales tax collection act.

In my home State of New Hampshire I have had so many online businesses write me about how this act—this MFA act—is going to hurt their business and is going to place onerous requirements on our businesses. Not only would they be forced to collect taxes for these other jurisdictions—over 9,000—but can we imagine what will happen once one of those jurisdictions—a municipality that is allowed to tax—changes their tax amount? Then, suddenly, they have to update their collection method. Guess what. If they get it wrong, they are subject to being sued in some other State, some other jurisdiction.

This is going to hurt the development of more online businesses because it creates a big bureaucracy. It is totally inappropriate. Why are we asking these thriving online businesses to become the tax collectors for States? The reason we have over 9,000 jurisdictions they have to collect for is because it is not just States; in some States even the municipal level has its own sales tax that can be collected. What a mess.

Then we see what is happening in Washington. The majority leader rule XIV'd a bill, and what he did is he attached the Marketplace Fairness Act, which I prefer to call the Internet sales tax collection act, to what was just passed in the House of Representatives: the Internet Tax Freedom Act. Talk about ironic. The Internet Tax Freedom Act is legislation I strongly support. This legislation is going to prevent taxes over the Internet, taxing the Internet that could hit all of us in some way, so that we can protect the freedom of the Internet and the growth we have seen on the Internet. It is widely supported on both sides of the aisle, as my colleague from New Hampshire said.

So the irony is that here we have an act that is so widely supported—the Internet Tax Freedom Act—providing a tax-free Internet—and the majority leader decides to attach to it the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, which is really the Internet sales tax collection act. That legislation creates new onerous burdens on online businesses to become the tax collectors for over 9,000 tax jurisdictions. We can see the irony of it. Here we have bipartisan support for freedom from taxes on the Internet that should be extended to allow the Internet to thrive and grow and continue to grow, and the majority

leader, without a hearing—because when he rule XIV's it, there is no committee hearing. It doesn't go through the committee process where we can have hearings on the burdens this will place on online commerce and on online businesses not only in my home State of New Hampshire but in other businesses across the country. There was no hearing for this. It is an issue both sides of the aisle agree with: Let's keep the Internet tax-free. Then the majority leader attaches onto it with no hearing, under rule XIV, this onerous requirement which I like to call the Internet sales tax collection act. Of course, in Washington, they always name these acts to make us think it sounds good, so they call it the Marketplace Fairness Act. That is the irony. Only in Washington would we have rammed this through this process, without a committee hearing—legislation that protects Internet freedom, that has strong bipartisan support, attached with it new onerous burdens on Internet businesses to become the sales tax collectors for the Nation.

I join in what my colleague from New Hampshire just said. I think it is wrong that this bill is being pushed forward with the Internet Tax Freedom Act that has such strong support, that should be brought to this body as a stand-alone bill, not with these new burdensome requirements that are set forth in the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, otherwise known as the Internet sales tax collection act. The people of this country deserve to have a free, tax-free Internet. The online businesses of this country that are thriving and growing shouldn't become the tax collectors for States and municipalities that are greedy for more revenue. It is their job to collect their taxes. It shouldn't be an online business's job to collect taxes for over 9,000 jurisdictions, because we can only imagine how many changes will happen and what kind of paperwork nightmare that will create for those businesses. I have heard it from our businesses firsthand.

I hope this body will oppose any effort to vote for a bill that connects Internet tax freedom with Internet sales tax collection, because the two are antithetical. One works against the other. One ensures the freedom of the Internet to be tax-free and the other one creates new burdensome requirements on online businesses and actually works against, in my view, the thriving commerce we see over the Internet and has resulted in more choice for all of us as consumers in this country.

MALAYSIAN AIRLINES CRASH

Madam President, we all learned today, very shockingly, that there was a Malaysian Airlines flight shot down over Eastern Ukraine and that, reportedly, 295 people lost their lives in that incident. Reportedly, 23 Americans were listed on the manifest. I wish to offer my thoughts and prayers to the families of the victims of that plane that went down over Eastern Ukraine, and I want them to know they are in our thoughts and in our prayers.

I wish to raise the issue as following: There is an investigation going on. We don't know yet who is responsible or if anyone is responsible. The facts will come forward as to why this plane went down. But it has been widely reported that the plane was, in fact, shot down. Some of the reports have said it was done by a medium-range surface-to-air missile system.

We know that most recently there has been tremendous violence in Eastern Ukraine. If the investigation of this plane going down reveals that either Russia or Russian agents are responsible or indirectly responsible for shooting down this civilian airliner, there should be serious consequences.

What we know is that Vladimir Putin and the Russians have been responsible in fomenting the situation that has occurred in Eastern Ukraine where there has been violence, there has been recruiting, training, and funding of Russians and Russian agents, sending them to Eastern Ukraine to fight the Ukrainian Government, interfering with the sovereignty of Ukraine. This was following the illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea, the territory of Ukraine, by the Russian Government, and the Russians have taken over that portion of Ukraine.

We will wait to see what the investigation reveals for the downing of this plane. Our prayers are with the families who have lost loved ones. But I believe there should be serious consequences if we find out it was either Russian agents, Russian equipment, or Russia directly that was responsible for this airliner going down.

Yesterday the administration announced it would impose and was imposing greater sanctions on Russia for their activities of fomenting violence in Eastern Ukraine.

I want to thank the administration for finally coming forward and putting forth more serious sanctions against Vladimir Putin, against the Russian Government, for what they have done to interfere with the sovereignty of Ukraine.

It is an important step forward, and I hope Vladimir Putin understands there are even greater sanctions that can be imposed if the sanctions that were announced yesterday by the administration that involve some sectoral sanctions against major industries in Russia and individuals—if they do not heed the warning that is coming from those sanctions, I hope Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government understand there are much tougher sanctions that can also be imposed if they do not heed the sanctions that were put in place yesterday and stop fueling the violence in Eastern Ukraine.

We need to understand the context of what we have seen happen in Eastern Ukraine. The separatists, the so-called separatists, in Eastern Ukraine are funded, equipped, and supported by the Kremlin. Vladimir Putin could end the violence in Eastern Ukraine tomorrow if he chose to. He essentially has operational control of what these violent separatists are doing to interfere with the sovereignty in Ukraine. He is responsible for the violence, and I would call on him to end that violence, to stop funding these separatists, to stop providing them with equipment that is being used against the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian military, and to allow the people of Ukraine to determine their future. That is what they want.

I had the privilege of going to Ukraine for their Presidential election, and I was inspired by the people who went to the polls. I will never forget being there at the first polling station that day in the Presidential election and an older gentleman came to the polls and cast his ballot and said: For democracy.

The people of Ukraine want to determine their own future, just as we determine our future in this country. Vladimir Putin and Russia should allow the people of Ukraine to decide their future. They should stop interfering with the sovereignty of Ukraine.

This is not a Ukrainian uprising of disenfranchised Russian-speaking Ukrainians. What is happening in Eastern Ukraine is a Kremlin-instigated, armed, funded, trained, and fueled aggression against the people of Ukraine and their duly elected government.

This is cynical and blatant aggression by Putin against Ukraine, and Putin continues to undermine Ukrainian sovereignty and security by arming these separatist rebels, massing Russian troops at the border of Eastern Ukraine in a very threatening way, and also threatening to increase further coercive measures against Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine need our help. The Ukrainian people are willing to risk their lives and have been risking their lives to defend the sovereignty of their country against President Putin's aggression, but the Ukrainian Government desperately needs our assistance.

In particular, the prior administration of Ukraine that left—President Yanukovych was very aligned with Russia—gutted their military and much of the equipment they need to be able to defend themselves.

Let me say, they have gone there and bravely defended themselves, even without having some of the equipment they need that was really lost by their military because of the prior administration and neglect of the Ukrainian military.

Ukrainians need assistance—and not only the sanctions the administration has issued, which could get tougher but

they need military assistance from our country.

We have to keep in mind the Ukrainians gave up their nuclear weapons under the Budapest Memorandum. In return—our country, the Russians, were signatories to the Budapest Memorandum—in return for security assurances, the least we can do for them is give them the means to defend themselves.

I know the Ukrainian Government has asked us for antitank weapons, antiaircraft weapons, small arms, the sharing of intelligence so they can defend their own border. It is the least we can do for them, given that they gave up their nuclear weapons.

What country is going to give up their nuclear weapons again if we will not even give them some basic military assistance so they can defend themselves? They are not asking us to send our troops in. They are not asking for things like that. They are willing to defend themselves and they need our help to do so.

Finally, President Obama said in his June 4 speech in Poland: ''Our free nations will stand united so that further Russian provocations will only mean more isolation and costs for Russia.'' I call on the President to continue to take action and to stand by those words. Those words meant a lot to the Ukrainian people, and it is important that we follow through on those words because it is in the national security interests of the United States to stand with the people of Ukraine and their legitimately elected government as they seek to protect their sovereignty.

If we are not willing in these circumstances to stand by giving them some basic military support they have asked for, after having given up their nuclear weapons, then what lessons will other actors in the region and around the world take from that?

I think lesson No. 1 is: Why would you ever give up your nuclear weapons? In a world where we are hoping to reduce proliferation, this is not a good message for us to send.

No. 2: What will our allies in the region think if we will not stand against Russian aggression under these circumstances?

You have already seen concerns, of course, by the countries in the region that can be impacted by Russian aggression, whether it is Georgia, Moldova—concerns we have seen for further support from Poland, important allies in the region.

To put it in perspective of why we need to give this military support—in addition, we do not know what happened, but we will find out, with the downing of this commercial passenger plane and the tragic loss of 295 individuals. Over the last month, we have seen that on June 14 pro-Russian separatists shot down a Ukrainian military transport, killing all 49 people on board; on June 16, Gazprom—Russia's giant state-controlled gas company—announced they are cutting off gas supplies to Ukraine.

Just this Monday, a Ukrainian cargo plane was shot down and Ukrainian officials believe it was shot down by missiles fired from Russia.

Last night, a Ukrainian fighter jet was shot down. Ukrainians also believe the Russians were involved in shooting down that fighter jet.

We will find out what happened to this passenger plane but it was in airspace where there have been instances of Russian agents directly involved in shooting down Ukrainian planes.

So it is important that we give the Ukrainian people the capacity to defend themselves under those circumstances. It is the least we can do, given that they are willing to stand up for their own sovereignty, that they are strong friends of the United States of America. If our allies in the region think we will not stand with the sovereignty of Ukraine under these situations, it is going to create a situation where our allies will not feel they can rely on the United States of America.

It also creates a situation where allies, friends, rivals, bullies, potential adversaries take the wrong message from it. For example, thinking about what is happening right now with the negotiations with Iran, if we are a country not willing to follow through to assist our friends—under circumstances where, for example, Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons—with some basic military support, what kind of message will that send to the negotiations going on with Iran right now as to why they should give up their nuclear program?

So this is a very important moment for the United States of America. I again want to say that the steps the administration took to impose additional sanctions this week are a very important step. I support those. I hope Vladimir Putin and Russia heed what those sanctions mean. Those sanctions will have an impact on the Russian economy, but we can impose even stronger sanctions against Russia if they do not stop funding and causing the violence in Eastern Ukraine and interfering with the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people.

The people of Ukraine have our respect. They have stood for themselves. They had a free and fair election that I was able to observe. They elected their President, and now they want to determine their own future, and they want Russia to respect the sovereignty of their country—what any country in this world should be able to expect: that another country will respect their sovereignty.

Unfortunately, Vladimir Putin has been a bully in all of this and has not respected the sovereignty of Ukraine. He should understand the sanctions that were issued this week are a message to him to stop what he is doing in Eastern Ukraine, and we can issue even tougher sanctions—and should issue tougher sanctions—if he continues to act like a bully who thinks he can go into other countries, take their territory, and push people around in those countries, as we have seen in Ukraine.

This matters to the world because we cannot have people like Putin thinking they can invade another country without consequences.

Finally, I would hope we would provide more support to the Ukrainian military, given that they have been willing to stand for their own defense, to secure their own border, to stand for their own sovereignty, but it is very difficult for them to do so when they are facing Russian-supported separatists, Russian tanks, Russian antiaircraft equipment, and more sophisticated technology than they have at the moment.

We can help them by ensuring that they have the equipment to protect themselves, to protect their border, and to let Russia know there will be consequences if they continue to interfere with the sovereignty of Ukraine or any other country.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STEM JOBS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, three of our greatest 'masters of the universe'—as I like to refer to them—have joined in an op-ed in the New York Times just last week to share their wisdom from on high and to tell us in Congress how to do our business and to conduct immigration reform they think should be pleasing to them. I am sure other super billionaires would be glad to join with these three super billionaires and could agree on legislation that would be acceptable to them.

Sheldon Adelson, Las Vegas casino magnet and Republican supporter; Warren Buffett, the master investor; and Bill Gates, the master founder of Microsoft computer systems, all super billionaires, apparently aren't happy. They don't have much respect for Congress and, by indirection, the people who elect people to Congress, it appears from the tone of their article—you know, American people, that great unwashed group; nativists, narrow-minded patriots, possessors of middle-class values. They just don't understand as we know, we great executives and entrepreneurs.

So they declare we need to import more foreign workers in computer

science, technology, and engineering, because the country is ''badly in need of their services.'' They say we are badly in need of importing large numbers of STEM graduates. That is something we have all heard and many of us have perhaps assumed is an accurate thing.

These three individuals, all generous men, have contributed to a lot of causes, and I am teasing them a lit bit. They didn't mind sticking it to Congress, so I just tease them and push back a little bit.

They particularly praised the Senate for its elimination of any limits on the number of work visas that could be awarded to immigrants who have a degree in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and have a job offer.

This is the op-ed in the New York Times last Thursday: ''Sheldon Adelson, Warren Buffett, and Bill Gates on Immigration Reform.''

What did we see in the newspaper today? News from Microsoft—was it that they are having to raise wages to try to get enough good, quality engineers to do the work? Are they expanding or are they hiring? No, that is not what the news was, unfortunately. Not at all.

This is the headline in USA Today: ''Microsoft to cut up to 18,000 jobs over next year.''

Microsoft confirmed it will cut up to 18,000 jobs over the next year, part of the tech titan's efforts to streamline its business under a new CEO . . .

That is a significant action. Indeed, Microsoft employs about 125,000 people, and they are laying off 18,000. The company laid off 5,000 in 2009. Yet their founder and former leader, Mr. Gates, says we have to have more and more people come into our country to take those kinds of jobs.

It is pretty interesting, really. We need to be thinking about what it all means and ask ourselves: What is the situation today for American graduates of STEM degrees and technology degrees? Do we have enough? And do we need to have people come to our country to take those jobs? Or, indeed, do we not have a shortage of workers, and do we have difficulty of people finding jobs?

These are some of the facts I think we should look at. President Obama, Senate Democrats, and House Democrats have endorsed a proposal, a bill that passed the Senate, that would double the H–1B foreign workers that come into America for one reason—not to be a citizen, not to stay indefinitely, but to take a job, double the number, to come to take a job for several years. The great majority of these guest workers are not farm workers. They take jobs throughout the economy.

So how should we think about this? The U.S. Census Bureau reports that three-fourths of American with STEM degrees—science, technology, engineering, mathematics—don't have jobs in STEM fields. According to a recent newspaper from the Economic Policy Institute:

''Guestworkers may be filling as many as half of all new information technology jobs each year.''

It goes on. ''IT workers earn the same today as they did, generally, 14 years ago.'' Wages aren't going up, and in many cases they are going down. That is an absolute refutation, I think—if you believe in the free market—of any contention that we have a shortage of engineering, science, and STEM graduates.

The paper further says: ''Currently, only one of every two STEM college graduates is hired in a STEM job each year.'' So only half of them find a job in the profession they trained for.

Another finding of the paper: ''Policies that expand the supply of guest workers will discourage U.S. students from going into STEM fields, and into IT in particular.''

Get that. Is that not common sense? If anybody would dispute that, I would like to hear it. The policies that expand the supply of eligible workers in any field will tend to discourage people, particularly in science and engineering, if they feel like they are going to have a difficult time finding a job. That is common sense, and that is what the paper found.

Now, Mr. Hal Salzman—I am familiar with his work. He is a professor at Rutgers University and a labor specialist. He has done a good bit of work in this area. And what do his findings show? He determined: ''For the 180,000 or so openings annually, U.S. colleges and universities supply 500,000 graduates.''

More than twice as many people graduate in STEM fields as jobs are available in America for them to take.

Bob Charette, at the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, writes: ''Wages for U.S. workers in computer and math fields have largely stagnated since 2000.''

That is 14 years ago.

Even as the Great Recession slowly recedes, STEM workers at every stage of the career pipeline, from freshly minted grads to mid- and late-career Ph.D.s, still struggle to find employment.

In total, Charette reports that there are more than 11 million Americans with STEM degrees who don't have STEM jobs.

Harvard Professor Michael Teitelbaum has recently written a book. He explained:

Far from offering expanding attractive career opportunities, it seems that many, but not all, science and engineering careers are headed in the opposite direction: unstable careers, slow-growing wages, and high risk of jobs moving offshore or being filled by temporary workers from abroad.

Michael Anft, with the Johns Hopkins Magazine, observed:

You're a biologist, chemist, electrical engineer, manufacturing worker, mechanical engineer, or physicist, you've most likely seen your paycheck remain flat at best. If you're a recent grad in those fields looking for a job, good luck. A National Academies report suggests a glut of life scientists, lab workers, and physical scientists, owing in part to over-recruitment of science-Ph.D. candidates by universities. And postdocs, many of whom are waiting longer for academic spots, are opting out of science careers at higher rates, according to the National Science Foundation.

This is serious. There is a policy question, and he questions whether Members of Congress who don't pass laws like he wants on immigration are honoring their duty to the 300 million Americans whom we collectively represent.

I feel a deep duty to the millions of Alabamians I represent and the whole country, and I do my best every day to ask what is in their interests. As far as I am concerned, so far as I can see, those three billionaires have three votes. An individual who works stocking the shelves at the grocery store, the barber, the doctor, the lawyer, the cleaners, the operator, and the person who picks up our garbage are every bit as valuable as they are. I know who I represent. I represent the citizens of the United States of America, and I am trying to do what is in their best interests. And just as it is not always true what is good for General Motors is good for America, likewise, what may be good for Mr. Adelson and Mr. Microsoft and Mr. Buffett is not always in accord with what is good for the American people. I know that. They are free to express their opinion, but I am going to push back.

How many people come into our country each year as guest workers? We have discussed that. The Senate bill which Senator REID maneuvered through the Senate not too many weeks ago would double the number of guest workers. How many is that? The Associated Press wrote:

Although no one tracks exactly how many H–1B guest workers come to take jobs these are visas for jobs in fields like computers and technology—how many of these are in the United States? The AP says ''experts estimate there are at least 600,000 at any one time.''

That is a lot. These are individuals not on a citizenship path. They are in addition to the 1 million who come to America each year lawfully to become citizens of America. They simply come in at the behest of some business to take a job for a limited period of time. That is important. There are other visas these businesses can get too, but H–1B is one of the largest. A paper for the Economic Policy Institute explained the annual inflow of guest workers for the computer industry in particular is massive.

We estimate that during fiscal 2011, 372,516 high-skill guest workers were issued visas to enter the U.S. labor market, and, of these workers, between 134,000 and 228,000 were available for IT employment.

That is information technology.

The supply of IT guest workers appears to be growing dramatically despite stagnant or even declining wages.

But Microsoft and its allies want more.

Here is an excerpt from a report issued by the Partnership for a New American Economy. This is the front group for the pro-immigration crowd. It is co-headed by Steve Ballmer, a recent Microsoft CEO. He left Microsoft in February, but he is the co-head of this group and is lobbying for more H–1B guest workers to come to take jobs. They say: ''In many STEM occupations, unemployment is virtually nonexistent.''

This is not so. They declare it to be so. They say:

There is no evidence that foreign-born STEM workers adversely affect the wages of American workers by providing a less expensive alternative source of labor.

What planet are they on? Wages are declining. Median income in America today—well, according to the Wall Street Journal, it was approximately $55,000 for a family in 2007. It is now closer to $50,000. It dropped roughly $5,000. Somebody needs to talk about that.

Is unemployment in these industries ''virtually non-existent''? That is what they are telling us. They are spending millions of dollars even running TV ads to promote bringing in more workers than the 600,000 we have today. They want to double that number. I am not talking about the 1 million who already come lawfully every year through immigration in America. We have one of the most generous immigration policies in the world. These guest workers are in addition to the 1 million we let in each year on a permanent basis.

Look at these recent headlines.

Today: ''Microsoft To Cut Workforce By 18,000 This Year, 'Moving Now' To Cut First 13,000.''

How about this headline: ''[Google-owned] Motorola To Cut 10% Of Workforce After Laying Off 20% Last Year.''

''Panasonic To Cut 10K More Workers In The Next 5 Months.''

''[Online media and advertising company] CityGrid Lays Off 15% Of Its Employees.''

''Hewlett-Packard: 27,000 Job Cuts to Save Up To $3.5B By 2014.''

I would say things aren't going as well as some would suggest, and the demand out there for workers ought to be met from our current supply.

Byron York, an excellent writer at the Washington Examiner, wrote about this late last year in the Washington Examiner. The headline is: ''Companies lay off thousands, then demand immigration reform for new labor.''

On Tuesday, the chief human resource officers of more than 100 large corporations sent a letter to House Speaker John Boehner and Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi urging quick passage of a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Don't read it, don't worry about it, just pass it. It gives us more workers, and we need those workers, is essentially what they have been saying. ''The officials who signed the letter represent companies with a vast array of business interests: General Electric, Marriott International, Hilton Worldwide, Hyatt Hotels Corporation, McDonald's, Wendy's, The Cheesecake Factory, Johnson & Johnson, Hewlett-Packard, General Mills, and many more.'' All of them ''want to see increases in immigration levels for low-skill as well as high-skill workers in addition to a path to full citizenship for the millions of immigrants in the United States currently illegally.'' That is their agenda.

The article goes on to say: ''a new immigration law, the corporate officers say, 'would be a long overdue step toward aligning our nation's immigration policies with its workforce needs at all skill levels . . . ' ''

I would say at a time of high unemployment we need to be careful. The article goes on to say, ''at the . . . time the corporate officers seek higher numbers of immigrants, both low-skill and high-skill, many of their companies are laying off thousands of workers.''

So he did a little research. All these companies in need of workers. What about Hewlett-Packard? They signed the letter demanding more workers. I will quote from the article.

For example, Hewlett-Packard, whose Executive Vice President for Human Resources Tracy Keogh signed the letter, laid off 29,000 employees in 2012. In August of this year, Cisco Systems, whose Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer Kathleen Weslock signed the letter, announced plans to lay off 4,000—in addition to 8,000 cut in the last two years. United Technologies, whose Senior Vice President for Human Resources and Organization Elizabeth B. Amato signed the letter, announced layoffs of 3,000 this year.

American Express, whose Chief Human Resources Officer L. Kevin Cox signed the letter, cut 5,400 jobs this year. Proctor & Gamble, whose Chief Human Resources Officer Mark F. Biegger signed the letter, announced plans to cut 5,700 jobs in 2012.

Those are a just few of the layoffs at companies, the article said, whose officers signed the letter.

A few more: T-Mobile announced 2,250 layoffs in 2012. Archer-Daniels-Midland laid off 1,200. Texas Instruments, nearly 2,000. Cigna 1,300. Verizon sought to cut 1,700 jobs . . . Marriott announced 'hundreds' of layoffs this year. International Paper has closed plants and laid off dozens.

—including an old, big plant with 1,000 workers or so in north Alabama—

And General Mills, in what the Minneapolis Star-Tribune called a 'rare mass layoff,' laid off 850 people last year.

''There are more still.'' I am quoting here from Mr. Byron York's article:

In all, it's fair to say a large number of corporate signers of the letter demanding more labor from abroad have actually laid off workers at home in recent years. Together their actions have a significant effect on the economy. According to a recent Reuters report, U.S. employers announced 50,462 layoffs in August, up 34 percent from the previous month and up 57 percent from August 2012.

This is last August. I am quoting from the article:

''It is difficult to understand how these companies can feel justified in demanding the importation of cheap labor with a straight face at a time when tens of millions of Americans are unemployed,'' writes the Center for Immigration Studies, which strongly opposes the Senate Gang of Eight bill. . . . The companies claim the bill is an ''opportunity to level the playing field for U.S. employers' but it is more of an effort to level the wages of American citizens.''

Mr. York goes on to say this in his next article. The next month, he writes another article on the subject.

This week, the pharmaceutical giant Merck announced it would cut 8,500 jobs in an effort to remain competitive in a rapidly changing drug industry. Earlier this year Merck announced plans to cut 7,500 jobs, bringing the total of workers let go to 16,000. In all, Merck intends to lay off one out of every five of its employees.

Well, what is Merck, this great corporation, doing politically about the situation?

I will quote from the article. This is what they are doing politically:

At the same time, top Merck officials are urging Congress to loosen the nation's immigration laws to allow more foreign workers into the United States. In a Sept. 10 letter—

—this is last September—

—to House Speaker John Boehner and Majority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Merck Executive Vice President for Human Resources Mirian Graddick-Weir urged that the U.S. admit more high- and low-skilled immigrants to ''address the reality that there is a global war for talent'' and to ''align our nation's immigration policies with its workforce needs at all skill levels to ensure U.S. global competitiveness.''

Well, we have too many people unemployed. The number of people unemployed in our country is not accurately reflected by the simple unemployment data we get. When you look at the number of people in the actual workforce, you find we have the lowest workplace participation, the lowest number of workers as a percentage of the population at any time since the 1970s. It has been declining steadily. It is a fact. Everybody knows it. It is not disputed. If anybody wants to dispute that, come to the floor and tell me where I am wrong. And they won't because it is well accepted and Democrats and Republicans are talking openly about it, because it is a serious challenge for America. We don't have enough people working. We have got too many people living off the government and relying on federal aid and assistance. We need to create jobs for Americans first before we bring in foreign workers to take those jobs. We are going to help our people sustain their

life. We make sure they have food and housing and aid if they are unable to work and don't have enough to live on, and we provide health care for them and education for their children. But we need to help them find work first before we bring somebody else to the country.

I would say to my free market business friends, I don't think you can win the argument that we have a shortage of labor, because wages are down. I know you believe in free markets. I know you believe that things will balance out in a competitive world. If wages are down, that indicates we have a loose labor market, not a tight labor market. Wages go up when there are not enough employees, and businesses have to pay more to get good employees. Family income has gone down from 2007, as I said, from approximately $55,000 median household income to $50,000, adjusted for inflation. This is a very unusual decline. I am not sure we have seen anything like quite this before, at least since the Great Depression. This is a matter we need to talk about. ''Watching firms fire American workers while appealing for more immigration is a disheartening spectacle'', Mr. Byron York says. And I think that is true.

This is another Associated Press article: ''Backlash Stirs in US Against Foreign Worker Visas.''

But amid calls for expanding the so-called H–1B visa program, there is a growing pushback from Americans who argue that the program has been hijacked by staffing companies that import cheaper, lower-level workers to replace more expensive U.S. workers—or keep them from being hired in the first place.

''It's getting pretty frustrating when you can't compete on salary for a skilled job,'' said Rich Hajinlian, a veteran computer programmer from the Boston area. ''You hear references all the time that these big companies . . . can't find skilled workers. I am a skilled worker.''

How about this? They say there is a STEM crisis—which is Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics. They say there are not enough STEM graduates to fill vacant jobs.

This article says: ''The STEM Crisis Is a Myth.'' This is a paper by Robert Charette, contributing editor for the Industrial Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers magazine. He says:

Companies would rather not pay STEM professionals high salaries with lavish benefits, offer them training on the job, or guarantee them decades of stable employment. So having an oversupply of workers, whether domestically educated or imported, is to their benefit.

That is in part because it helps keep wages in check.

Viewed another way, about 15 million U.S. residents hold at least a bachelor's degree in a STEM discipline, but three-fourths of them—11.4 million—work outside of STEM.

If there is in fact a STEM worker shortage, wouldn't you expect more workers with STEM degrees to be filling those jobs?''

I think that is correct.

What about the people who immigrate to America? They can't get a job because somebody else was brought in to take that job from them. What are they going to do?

The economy can absorb a certain number, but in this low job-wage low-job creation economy we are in today, and have been in for a number of years, you simply cannot justify these huge increases in the number of workers we have brought into the country, especially when wages are falling.

Here is another article: ''The Myth of the Science and Engineering Shortage.'' It is an op-ed by Michael Teitelbaum, a senior research associate at Harvard Law School.

A compelling body of research is now available, from many leading academic researchers and from respected research organizations such as the National Bureau of Economic Research, the RAND Corporation, and the Urban Institute.

No one has been able to find any evidence indicating current widespread labor market shortages or hiring difficulties in science and engineering occupations . . .

He goes on to write, as I read before:

From offering expanding attractive career opportunities, it seems that many, but not all science and engineering careers are headed in the opposite direction: unstable careers, slow-growing wages, and high risk of jobs moving offshore or being filled by temporary workers from abroad.

I am afraid that is the undisputed reality. I wish it were not so. I wish we had a growing economy that would create a lot of jobs and a lot more high-tech workers and that wages were going up. But it is just not so.

Here is an article from July 11, in CNNMoney. The headline is: ''Businesses Want Immigration Reform. Why? Because they can't find enough workers.'' That is what they say the answer is.

This article notes the complaints of various business lobbyists. For instance:

The tech industry faces a backlog of working visas for high skilled workers. The long wait for green cards at top universities means the U.S. is losing [talent]. . . . Microsoft founder Bill Gates and others CEOs like Yahoo's Marissa Mayer and Facebook's Mark Zuckerburg, have all pressed Washington leaders for an immigration [reform].

CNN also includes this statement from another group demanding Congress provide more workers:

Two-thirds of construction companies have reported labor shortages according to the Associated General Contractors of America, who is pushing for immigration reform.

So two-thirds of construction companies reported labor shortages. Well, what do we know about that?

Here is a May 5 article from Economic Policy Institute by Ross Eisenbrey. They cite an in-depth study about the labor market.

The headline says: ''There are Seven Unemployed Construction Workers for Every Job Opening.''

There is a chart showing the drop in wages. This isn't some promoter, some lobbyist or some media consultant putting out a self-serving statement claiming we have a shortage of workers. This is an academic study. Again, what does it say? ''No Sign of Labor Shortages in Construction: There are Seven Unemployed Construction Workers for Every Job Opening.''

That is where we are. What we need, as a Nation, is to construct an immigration policy that serves the interests of the American people.

Professor Borjas at Harvard is perhaps the most astute and renowned expert on labor and immigration of anybody in the entire world and has written a number of books on this. He did a comprehensive study using census data and Department of Labor data and concluded that from 1980 to 2000, as a result of America's high immigration levels, the wages of lower-skilled US workers declined by 7.4 percent.

The impact of this large flow of immigration from 1980 to 2000 reduced wages. We already bring in a million people a year, plus hundreds thousands more guest workers. I am not against immigration. What I am opposed to, however, is an immigration policy that fails to serve the needs of the people living here today. The myth is we have this great shortage of labor. It is just not so. If he allowed the labor market to tighten, wages would increase, more Americans would take some of these jobs and be able to raise a family, buy an automobile, and maybe even buy a house and educate their children.

Today I am going to issue a challenge to Majority Leader REID, and every single one of our 55 Senate Democrats, who voted unanimously for this Gang of 8 bill.

With Microsoft laying off 18,000 workers, come down to the Senate floor and tell me there is a shortage of qualified Americans to fill STEM jobs. Come down and tell us. Do you stand with Mr. Bill Gates or do you stand with our American constituents?

It is long past time we had an immigration policy that truly served the needs of the American people. That is the group to whom we owe our loyalty and duty and first responsibility. That is who elected us, and that is in our constitutional system, which ultimately judges us on our performance.

The United States let in 40 million new immigrants legal and illegal—since 1970. There are many wonderful people in that group. But Washington actually hurts both our immigrant workers and US-born workers alike when we continue to bring in record numbers of new workers to compete for jobs. The share of the population today that is foreign-born has quadrupled. It has gone up four-fold in forty years. After four decades of large-scale immigration, is it not time, colleagues, that we slow down a bit, allowed wages to

rise, assimilation to occur, and the middle class to be restored?

I thank the chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CELEBRATING GOVERNOR PHIL HOFF'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we come to the floor oftentimes to discuss issues of portent to the Nation, but the distinguished Senator from Vermont and I wish to speak about one of the most significant people Vermont has ever known.

I wish to yield to my distinguished colleague from Vermont and we will go back and forth.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator LEAHY for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, every now and then there are figures who come along who play a profound and transformative role in the period in which they are living. Phil Hoff is one of those people. We are here to celebrate his 90th birthday and the work he has done in Vermont and around the country and the life he and his wife Joan have lived, both of whom have done so much for the people of the State of Vermont.

Phil Hoff was the 73rd Governor of the State of Vermont. He was in many ways the founder of progressive politics in our State. It is now recognized—and we say this proudly, although not everybody necessarily is as proud of it as we are—but Vermont is now one of the more progressive States in the United States of America. We have been a leader for the rights of working people, for the environment, for women's rights, for gay rights, for kids, and we are proud of that, but none of that would have happened—we would not be where we are today—if it had not been for the work of Phil Hoff, who was Governor of our State and was elected in 1962.

I am going to yield to my colleague Senator LEAHY now. I have a lot more I wish to say, but let me begin the discussion by saying that we in Vermont are extraordinarily fortunate that one of the great Governors of his time is a real visionary, a man who led the beginning of making profound changes in the State of Vermont.

I yield back to the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Vermont is absolutely right. Vermont changed remarkably when Governor Phil Hoff was elected. Prior to that time, the governorship of Vermont was basically a part-time office—seen now and then when the legislature was there but not so much otherwise—and things went along almost on autopilot. Governor Hoff changed that and brought Vermont into the 20th century, I think because the two are somewhat intertwined.

I was a volunteer for the Presidential campaign of then-Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960. I volunteered on his campaign, but I wasn't old enough to vote for him. But I remember the first election I was able to vote in was the Vermont Governor's race in 1962, and I cast my first vote for Philip Henderson Hoff. My family was thrilled when he won that election. He became the first Democratic Governor elected in Vermont in over a century.

My parents and Marcelle's parents were so fond of Phil Hoff and his wife Joan. They thought the world of them. I was happy the other day in seeing both Phil and Joan at his birthday celebration. They talked about my parents and Marcelle's parents, but I told them I wouldn't be where I am today without Governor Hoff.

I was a young lawyer in his office. There had been a real problem in the State's attorney's office in Chittenden County, VT, which is about one-quarter of our State's population. The State's attorney announced he was leaving and Governor Hoff called me to his home on Friday afternoon and said: I want you to be State's attorney on Monday morning.

I gulped, and I said: Yes, sir.

He said: Clean up the backlog of cases that have accumulated in the office.

I said: Yes, sir.

He said: Do that for 1 year and then come on back to our firm.

And I said: Yes, sir.

The one thing I didn't do is I didn't come back to the firm; I enjoyed being there so much, I stayed there. I stayed there, though, with admiration for Phil Hoff because he had changed the State of Vermont. He made it exciting to be in government in Vermont. He made it exciting to be part of the fabric of Vermont. I have always appreciated that. I have always appreciated my time with him but especially the mentoring he offered me. If it had not been for him, I can tell my colleagues, I would not be standing here today as the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate.

I yield back to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, way back in 1968 as a young man, I got a job at the Department of Taxation in a small building on State Street across the street from the statehouse, working for the administration, then-Governor Hoff, and that was a very important experience for me and helped me shape some of my views which I carry today.

Phil Hoff's career of public service began during World War II when he put his studies on hold and joined the Navy, eventually joining the submarine service. He served on the USS *Sea Dog* in the Pacific theater, going on a number of combat tours in the dangerous waters near the main islands of Japan.

While in naval training in New London, CT, a friend of his set up a blind date with a Connecticut college student. Her name was Joan Brower, and she and Phil would be married after the war—a marriage that was to last for six rich decades.

I know Senator LEAHY and his wife, as well as myself and my wife Jane, know the Hoffs very well. We know Joan and know of her years of dedication to the people of the State of Vermont, especially in the area of education. So she in her own right has been a very important figure in our State.

After Phil Hoff's graduation from Cornell Law School, he and Joan moved to Burlington, VT, in 1951. Deeply committed to social justice, he became involved in Democratic Party politics and did that despite the fact that he grew up in a Republican family.

Senator LEAHY will remember that way back then, there was a group of what they called the Young Turks—younger Democrats who came into a very conservative Republican legislature. Most of them were under 40. Many of them were veterans of World War II. They moved forward to try to bring about some long needed change in the State.

Their experience in the legislature motivated Phil Hoff to run for Governor in 1962. As Senator LEAHY indicated, if my memory is correct, he was the first Democrat elected Governor since the Civil War; is that right?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my colleague is absolutely correct. It was a cataclysmic change in the political landscape of Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. For more than 100 years—I think many people don't know this—the Republican Party dominated Vermont politics, controlling both Houses of the legislature and the Governor's office.

This is a funny story. Even in the landslide Presidential election of 1936, when FDR—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—won a huge landslide victory, Vermont joined Maine as the only State in the country to vote against Roosevelt and vote for Alfred Landon, and thus came the well-known expression: ''As goes Maine, so goes Vermont.'' What Phil Hoff helped do is

lead Vermont out of a one-party State, badly in need of reforms, and brought that State in many significant ways into the second half of the 20th century.

I yield back to the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont. He and I share so much affection for Phil and Joan Hoff, and I can tell hundreds of stories. He made a difference by enthusiastically bringing people together in our State, with the realization that we needed to catch up with the rest of the country in so many ways—such as bringing high-tech industry into Vermont and working so hard to make sure everybody had a good education no matter what part of the State they lived in.

Then there are the personal anecdotes. I was excited as a young State's attorney one day getting a call from the Governor's office that one of the old-line politicians in Burlington had died—a wonderful man of French Canadian descent. They were going to have a mass for him at the Cathedral, and the Governor wanted me to ride with him to the mass.

I got into the car, and I said, Governor, you know I have only been State's attorney for a very short while and I can't tell you what an honor it is to be with you. He said, An honor? Honor has nothing to do with it. He said, I am an Episcopalian, you are a Catholic. They put me in the front row. I never know when I am supposed to stand or where I am supposed to sit, so you are going to make sure I do it right. I had been an altar boy for years, and I was in sheer panic when I walked in the church that I might have the Governor do something wrong, but we made it through.

More importantly, Vermont had issues, and they became very serious, affecting the reputation of our State. Phil Hoff and great people together across the political spectrum would sit in his office and he would say, how do we make things better for Vermont—never for him, it was for Vermont.

I think of the changes in our State, and I remember my parents and Marcelle's parents talking about the amount of changes—changes for the better—and every time they would go back to one name: Phil Hoff.

I was so glad to hear Senator SANDERS speak of Joan Brower Hoff and their wonderful daughters. She truly was Vermont's First Lady. She was almost as recognizable—in fact, in many places, more recognizable than her husband—highly respected. People—men and women—wanted to be able to model their careers and their nature after her. I am glad the two are still together. They are still healthy, they are still the best of Vermont, and I feel honored to be able to speak of them here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator LEAHY talked about the influence Governor Hoff had on the State. Let me give some examples of what he did.

Senator LEAHY will remember in the early 1960s we had the situation in Vermont where the Vermont State House of Representatives, people were represented by every town. I lived for a while in the town of Stannard, VT, which has maybe 100, 150 people, and they had the same vote in the legislature as Burlington, VT, the largest city in the State, which has 40,000 people. Under Phil Hoff, what we moved to in the State—and with the Supreme Court ruling dealing with proper apportionment—was person, one vote, so the house began to reflect the population locations of the State and not just every town.

In addition to that, when Phil Hoff was Governor of the State, he successfully insisted on repealing Vermont's poll tax. Now we think that is ancient history. What the poll tax said is that in order to vote, you have to pay a certain amount of money, which, obviously, is discriminatory to lower income people. That was repealed under Hoff's era as Governor.

He understood and his wife understood the importance of education. What Governor Hoff did was he quadrupled State aid to public schools and organized the three State teachers colleges into a new, revitalized State college system that better met the needs of Vermont's students. That system endures to this day. We have a very strong system of State colleges in Vermont, and that began under the Hoff era.

Under Governor Hoff's leadership, Vermont's judicial system was modernized. Always a path breaker and an advocate for justice, Phil Hoff led the way to Vermont becoming one of the first States in the country to abolish the death penalty.

No aspect of State government was beneath his notice, and he took Vermont forward in many ways, including terminating the outdated ''overseer of the poor'' system. That was something he changed as well. He established the Vermont district court State court system, the Judicial Nominating Board, the Vermont State Housing Authority, and the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation—a program which today plays a very vital role in making sure young people in Vermont can get a college education.

What was also—and Senator LEAHY knows this better than I—rather extraordinary about Phil Hoff is he understood that positive change could not take place in Vermont unless change was taking place throughout the country. In that area, being the Governor of one of the smallest States in the country, this man showed extraordinary courage, and he said: Do you know what. That war in Vietnam is not good for Vermont, it is not good for America.

He was one of the first public officials, as I recall, I say to Senator LEAHY, to speak out. That took a whole lot of courage, to speak out against the war in Vietnam. He took it a step further. Here you had Lyndon Johnson at that time—who I think will go down in history, except for that war in Vietnam, as one of our great Presidents—and Phil Hoff said: Do you know what. Maybe we need a change in the White House, and maybe we should be looking at somebody like Bobby Kennedy rather than Lyndon Johnson.

But, I say to Senator LEAHY, I know he was involved in some of that as a young man.

Mr. LEAHY. I was. And I recall, when Phil Hoff came out against the war in Vietnam—and he was in the minority on that—no member of the Vermont congressional delegation had voted against the war in Vietnam. They voted for all the increases in it. He was in some ways a lonely voice, but he did come out against it. It angered Lyndon Johnson, who was then President. But then he supported Robert Kennedy, as did I.

I remember the two of us meeting Senator Edward Kennedy—one of the Presiding Officer's predecessors—on the runway at the airport in Burlington, VT. He and Governor Hoff and myself and others were going to speak to a group on behalf of Robert Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. I remember the look of sorrow on Governor Hoff's face as he stood as one of the honorary pallbearers at Robert Kennedy's funeral. But even after that, he continued to push to make Vermont a better State.

I think—and I realize we have others waiting for the floor—but I just want to say again that Vermont is a wonderful State. It is a beautiful State. It is a progressive State. As Senator SANDERS and I have both said, it would not be what it is today were it not for Phil Hoff. We have all tried to follow in those footsteps, but he lit the way. That sometimes is an overused expression, but in this case I think every historian would agree with us.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me concur with Senator LEAHY. We take this opportunity to wish Governor Hoff a very happy 90th birthday. Jane and I see him quite often, and we just bumped into Phil and Joan recently. We look forward to continuing that relationship.

The bottom line is, as Senator LEAHY said, we are very proud that Vermont is a leader in so many areas in terms of social justice, in terms of environmental sanity, in terms of protecting the needs of ordinary people. That transformation and those efforts did not come about by accident, and certainly one of the great leaders in moving us in that direction was the man

we honor today; that is, Philip H. Hoff. We wish him the very, very best in the years to come.

Mr. LEAHY. We wish a happy birthday to a true giant of our State.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a bill I have introduced. It is S. 1596. It is the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.

I wish to thank my cosponsors on this legislation. It is a bipartisan bill. Senator JOE MANCHIN and I have introduced this together, and I am grateful to Senators MCCONNELL and INHOFE for their cosponsorship.

This bill was inspired by a terrible story. It is the story of Jeremy Bell, and it begins at a school in Delaware County, PA. One of the schoolteachers molested several boys and raped one of them. Prosecutors decided they did not have enough evidence to bring a case, but the school was aware of what happened, so they dismissed the teacher for this outrageous behavior. But then, amazingly, the school also decided that they would help this teacher get another job at another school so they could be rid of him. And they did exactly that, in fact, passing along a letter of recommendation, helping this predator get a job at a school in West Virginia.

The story ends in 1997 when that teacher—by then a school principal—raped and murdered 12-year-old Jeremy Bell in West Virginia. Justice finally caught up with that teacher, and he is now in jail serving a life sentence for the murder, but for Jeremy Bell that justice came too late.

The very sad truth is that Jeremy Bell is not alone. Every day seems to bring a new report of a child robbed of his or her innocence by someone they should have been able to trust, someone their parents told them they should obey. The numbers are absolutely terrifying, and, worse still, the numbers are growing.

On April 10 of this year, I came to this floor and spoke about the need to pass this legislation to protect our kids from predators in the classroom. I explained then that since January 1 of this year, at that point, 130 teachers had been arrested across America for sexual misconduct with children. Well, here we are just over 3 months later and that number has more than doubled. Since January 1 of this year, 275 teachers have been arrested in America for sexual misconduct with children—275. These are teachers. That is more than one per day so far this year.

Let's be honest. These are the ones whom we have caught. These are the ones who have actually been arrested. These are the ones against whom there is enough evidence that they have actually been arrested. How many more are out there who have not been caught or for whom the evidence is not yet sufficiently clear?

The damage these predators are doing is enormous. It is far beyond what any numbers or my words can express. So I want to let some of the victims speak for themselves.

I will tell you a brief story from Shannon. Shannon is from Nevada. She was raped by a teacher. The teacher was later convicted of sexual assault and sentenced to life in prison. Nine years later, this is what Shannon wrote:

> When I was a senior in high school, Mr. Peterson approached me and said I would need to go to night school if I wanted enough credits to graduate on time. And, of course, he taught one of those courses—a computer class. I was 17, and he raped me 4 times over the course of a year. He said he would fail me if I ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn't. I held it in for a year and a half.
>
> In the end, 66 people offered to testify against Peterson. His first victim dated back to the year I was born. Some of those who spoke up were parents. Their daughters had complained at the time, but nothing was done. That made me very angry. It still does. I learned that a handful of teachers, and two principals, knew about him. And his teaching license had been revoked in Michigan years before, and no one knew why.
>
> I'm different [now] because of what happened. I have to watch people all the time, analyze them. I can't be carefree. Now I have a seven-year-old son and two daughters, ages three and one. I will home-school my girls.

So when you see the number 275, remember Shannon, and remember that so far this year there are 275 others like her.

Gary of South Carolina is one of at least 29 boys abused by a teacher named Mr. Fisher over that teacher's 37-year career. Now the teacher is serving 20 years in prison. Two school principals were sued for allegedly covering up the abuse. Here is what Gary wrote about his experience:

> I was nine when it started. The abuse was frequent and long-term—till I went to college. I knew there were others, too, but until it all came out, I never knew how many.
>
> You feel so guilty, so ashamed. It's frightening now to look back and see how calculating Fisher was. I did everything I could to get kicked out of school. I was in the guidance counselor's office all the time. Finally, in tenth grade, I got myself kicked out for cheating. By the time I went to college, I was drinking all the time. I was terrified to quit because then I'd have to feel. But I couldn't drink and do school, so I entered rehab. I was 18. It took me a year and a half, and I've been sober since.
>
> My life is good now, for the first time. You can survive it, but you have to deal with it. I always felt that what the school did was far worse than what Fisher did. Fisher was sick, an evil monster. But [the school] just calculated the damage to its public relations. We kids were disposable, which is a whole other category of evil.

So when you see the number 275, remember Gary, and remember that there are 275 others like him that we know of already this year alone.

So what can we do? Well, my bill is a first step at addressing this problem. It is called the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act. It is pretty simple, really. It requires a mandatory background check for existing and prospective employees, and it requires that those checks be periodically repeated. There are five States that do no background checks.

The second thing my bill would do is it would apply to all employees of a school—employees or contractors who have unsupervised access to children, not just teachers. So it would include bus drivers and coaches. There are 12 States that currently do no checks at all on contractors.

The legislation would also require more thorough background checks. It would require that school districts check four major databases, both State and Federal. In my own State of Pennsylvania, for instance, if an employee has been a resident of my State for 2 years or more, then only the State database is checked. We just do not find out what this person might have done in another State at a different time.

The legislation also would prohibit what has—tragically, it has developed its own name; the name is ''passing the trash.'' This is the phenomenon of when a school knowingly recommends one of these predators to another school. As outrageous as that sounds, it actually happens. Some of these school and school districts so want to be rid of this problem, this embarrassment, that they actually facilitate the person moving on to some other place, where, of course, this predator just strikes again against some other children. That would be banned under this legislation.

In addition, there would be a prohibition against hiring these kinds of predators. Schools would not be able to hire a person who has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual crime against a child—if they were convicted of a violent or sexual crime against a child. There are a number of other felonies that would also preclude someone from being hired by a school if they are going to have access to children. Those would include homicide, child abuse or neglect, crimes against children, including pornography, rape, or sexual assault, kidnapping.

In addition, a person who has been convicted within the past 5 years of a felony physical assault or battery or a felony drug-related offense—for 5 years from the time at which those crimes were committed, the person would be precluded from being hired in a position, in a capacity where they would have supervisory responsibility over children.

The enforcement for all of this is the only way the Federal Government can

or should enforce policies such as this on school districts and schools; that is, if a State refuses to adopt these provisions, then they would lose the funding they get from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is one of many—but an important one—of the Federal Government funding streams for K–12 education. No State wants to lose that source of funding, so I think States would respond by adopting this very commonsense series of measures to protect their children.

I should say this is a bill with very broad support—so broad, in fact, that in the House the companion legislation passed unanimously. There was not a single dissenting vote. They voted last year, and it passed unanimously.

We have bipartisan support here in the Senate, as I mentioned. I am joined by Senators MANCHIN, MCCONNELL, and INHOFE.

It is supported by child advocacy groups. The National Children's Alliance, the Children's Defense Fund, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children all strongly support this legislation. I appreciate their support.

It is also supported by prosecutors—the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association. As a matter of fact, there were five district attorneys from southeastern Pennsylvania alone, from different political parties, who wrote an op-ed—a very persuasive op-ed—arguing why this bill is necessary based on what they see every day in their jobs as prosecutors. I wish to thank those district attorneys. Risa Ferman from Montgomery County, Seth Williams from Philadelphia County, Tom Hogan from Chester County, David Heckler from Bucks County, and Jack Whelan from Delaware County all weighed in in favor of this legislation.

Finally, there are teacher groups that support this as well. The American Federation of Teachers supports this legislation. The Pennsylvania School Boards Association does as well.

I do not think I would be going far out on a limb to suggest that probably a huge majority of Americans support this legislation because one thing I know for sure as a parent of three young kids—my kids are 14, 12, and 4. There is one thing that is most important to most parents I know; that is, that our children be safe and secure. When you put your kid on a schoolbus, you expect that child will be in a safe environment all day long—on the ride to school, while they are in school, and on the way back home. Frankly, we owe it to parents as well as to their children to do all we can to ensure that they do, in fact, have a safe environment—as safe as we can make it—for their kids.

Two hundred seventy-five is the number. That is the number that should give us all pause. It marks 275 tragedies that we know of already this year—275 childhoods that are shattered, 275 families torn by grief, betrayal, self-blame. It marks a failure on our part. This kind of child abuse can be prevented. We have the tools to prevent it and to prevent so many children from harm.

Again, last year the House acted unanimously to protect children from these sexual predators. This is something we could have done a long time ago. We certainly should not be letting a new school year begin—really in a matter of weeks—without doing something about this shameful number and without making sure this number does not continue to grow.

I hope we will be able to bring this bill to the Senate floor. I hope we will have very broad bipartisan support for it here in the Senate, as we already have in the House.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAELI CONFLICT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the fact that I believe the body has come to agreement on my resolution, along with Senator MENENDEZ, standing behind Israel in its conflict with Hamas.

As I speak, apparently there is a ground action going on by the Israelis in Gaza. From my point of view, do what you have to do to defend yourself.

I can't believe they have actually waited this long. I can't imagine what the American response would have been. If one rocket had come from our neighboring nations toward our country, we would not be so restrained.

A two-state solution seems to be a very reasonable approach. The problem is, as the Presiding Officer knows, Hamas doesn't recognize Israel as an entity. It is pretty hard to negotiate with somebody who doesn't recognize you exist and tells their schoolchildren you don't exist. The hatred that comes from Hamas in their schools toward Israel is not conducive to peace.

The resolution passed unanimously by the Senate the very night Israel decided to use ground force I think is appropriate and very symbolic. The Senate does not see a moral equivalency.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: Israel uses missiles, in collaboration with the United States, to produce the technology called Iron Dome to defend civilians. Hamas uses civilians to cover their missile program, making human shields of their own people.

That says all we need to know.

So I am pleased that in a bipartisan fashion, unanimous in nature, the U.S. Senate is on record supporting the State of Israel in this conflict, understanding their justification for defending themselves and that there is no moral equivalency here.

To my Israeli friends and allies, we wish you well. I expect that you will continue to defend yourselves against a terrorist organization.

To the Palestinians who have formed a unity government, you need to break away from Hamas. There will never be peace until you marginalize the terrorist organization called Hamas, until you reject what they stand for and the way they have behaved.

Finally, to those who wish for Israel to give up land and withdraw from territories, please remember, that is exactly what Israel did in Gaza. They withdrew all their forces, and what have they gotten in return? Tens of thousands of rockets.

So to those who are pushing a peace plan in the Middle East between the Palestinians and the Israelis, I hope you remember security for Israel has to be the centerpiece of any peace deal. How can you obtain peace when one of the members of the Palestinian Government—Hamas—has fired thousands of rockets, caring less where they fall? They couldn't care less if it falls on a kindergarten or a military base. They just care to kill Israelis. Israelis have killed civilians, but they go the extra mile in time of war and conflict to minimize casualties. They tell them: We are going to bomb you. They pass out leaflets. They tell people to leave. That says a lot about the Israelis.

So the Senate is in Israel's camp in a bipartisan fashion.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. GRAHAM. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to continue on this topic.

In the last few hours, we have now had word of the potential for ground operations occurring in Gaza.

This is addressed to those who are watching Florida or will watch this message in Florida about what has happened.

I know the world has become a messy place over the last few hours. We have an incident that occurred over the skies of Ukraine with the Malaysian aircraft, and we don't know all the details of what had occurred there. We should reserve judgment until we do. Suffice it to say, that may further complicate our view of the world in

this Chamber over the next few weeks, but let me address for a moment what is happening in the Middle East.

When I was elected to the Senate, a few days later, the first trip I took was to Israel. It was a country I had long admired, with strong links to the United States and to Florida in particular. In fact, the current Israeli Ambassador to the United States is from Florida. His brother was the mayor of Miami Beach. So there are strong links between Florida and Israel. I was amazed on that trip by how far that country has come—a nation that doesn't have oil or the kind of massive resources from an energy perspective that other countries in the region do, yet a country that is flourishing because of their investment in technology and innovation.

There is a book called ''Start-Up Nation,'' which chronicles the amazing miracle of Israel and what they have achieved. The one thing that strikes you about Israel as you fly over is how narrow it is. At its narrowest point, it is only 9 miles wide.

This is a country that was forged, by the way, in the aftermath of the Holocaust, with the notion that never again will the Jewish people not have a place to go in the world to call their own. That still remains the guiding principle behind the country and behind its defense forces, and we should view it within that context as we view what is occurring now in that region and part of the world.

Literally, Israel is surrounded by enemies. Certainly they have had the stability in the last two decades of peace agreements with Jordan and Egypt. But look everywhere around Israel and you see them surrounded by people who are intent on their destruction. We know that is the case in Gaza. We know that is the case in Samaria and Judea or what is commonly called the West Bank by some. We know that is the case with Assad and Syria, and many of the elements fighting within Syria. We know that is the case with Hezbollah and Lebanon. We know that is the case with Iran and its weapons programs and its long-term ambitions. This is a country surrounded by elements that want to destroy it.

It is in that context, by the way, that this government in Israel was involved in an intensive process of negotiation brokered and led by the United States with the Palestinian President Abbas regarding a potential peace deal, some way of forging a solution, an answer to the conundrum of what to do with Palestinian populations that would allow them to live peacefully, coexist side by side with a Jewish State. They entered into this conversation despite the fact that it was never clear that Abbas was able or had the power or the influence to make the sort of tough decisions that were going to be required for peace.

In fact, they entered into the negotiation knowing they would not even speak for all Palestinians, given the fact that Hamas controlled the Gaza Strip. They entered into this negotiation nonetheless. They entered into this negotiation despite the chaos surrounding them in Lebanon and Syria. Despite the fact that Iran continues to pursue nuclear weapons to destroy Israel, potentially, they entered into these negotiations. Because I say this to you unequivocally: I know of no nation on Earth that wants peace more than Israel. So they entered into these negotiations.

And what happened? What happens is what always happens with these negotiations. What happened is Abbas eventually withdrew. He once again took himself out of the talks and he tried once again to seek membership—Palestinian membership—into all these sorts of national organisms of the state, as a country of its own, knowing that was a deal breaker and knowing if that occurred, there could be no peace negotiation. That is the route he chose, nonetheless.

But then he did what I believe has triggered this latest round of violence against Israel, and that is deciding to form a power-sharing government with a terrorist group by the name of Hamas that to this day continues to deny Israel's right to even exist.

I want you to think about that for a moment. How could you possibly ever enter into a peace agreement with an organization with its very purpose being your destruction? And yet that is what Israel was being asked to do.

Tragically, within several weeks of that new government being formed, three teenagers, including an American citizen, were kidnapped and they were murdered. Then on July 7 Hamas once again started raining down rockets on Israel. Today more than 1,300 of them have been fired. The good news is that Israel has invested heavily in an air defense system which I was able to see during my second visit to Israel in the early part of 2013. But 1,300 rockets is an extraordinary number, and that is what Israel has faced.

As American policymakers, you ask what is our interest there? And I think it begins with the unique relationship that exists between the United States and Israel. It is the only vibrant democracy in that part of the world. Its alliance with the United States is unquestionable, not just in international forums but all over this planet. Israel is consistently on America's side time and again, in every one of our challenges. The cooperation between our countries is extraordinary, not to mention that Israel as a nation stands for everything that we as a nation believe in: freedom, the ability to speak out. They have a vibrant democratic process. Anyone who is familiar with Israeli politics knows how vibrant their democracy is and how much they engage in open and public debate in bringing their government together to govern the country. So we have this extraordinary alliance with Israel of incredible importance, and that is why we care. That is the political reason.

There is a moral reason behind it, and that is the right of the Jewish people to have a country they can live in peacefully; that truly never again will we face a time when Jews have nowhere to go. This is the commitment we have made to Israel and that we must keep.

I must say that I am and have been deeply troubled at the attitude this administration has adopted toward Israel. Let me be clear. I don't come here today to create this into a partisan issue. I don't want it to be a partisan issue. In fact, one of the great successes of American foreign policy with Israel has been the strong bipartisan support that Israel enjoys in the House and the Senate from almost every American President since Israel's founding at the conclusion of World War II.

But I am concerned about the position this administration is taking. I was concerned about the amount of pressure the Secretary of State was placing on the Israelis to enter into a negotiation with the Palestinian Authority which didn't have the authority or power to reach a peace agreement they could possibly enforce much less deliver on. I was concerned that pressure was being put on them at a time when Israel faced so many other challenges, No. 1 being the ambitions that Iran has to acquire nuclear weapons and long-range rockets that could strike Israel and eventually the mainland of the United States.

I think it is safe to say the relationship of the Israeli Government has never been worse toward an American President for more than 2 decades. And that has an impact on this region, and unfortunately it has had an impact here.

I have also been concerned about some of this moral equivalence that is going on in the press and some of the email I have been getting and some of the public statements I am hearing some make in some corridors—not in the Senate but some other places. The idea that both sides are to blame is an interesting concept, but it isn't true.

It is tragic, unfortunately, that civilians are dying in Gaza, but the reasons why civilians are dying is 100 percent Hamas's fault. This is an organization that puts rockets and military installations right next to nurseries and hospitals and civilian population centers. Why would they do that? Do you know why they do that? They do that because they know when they launch a rocket Israel will respond by hitting that rocket launcher, and when that rocket launcher is destroyed, so are the

areas around it. Then they can get the cameras to go in there and say: ''Look what Israel did. They wiped out a nursery or apartment building.''

They do that on purpose. They know exactly what they are doing. They are doing it so they can get the kind of coverage that unfortunately even some American press outlets are buying into now.

Here is the bottom line—and Senator GRAHAM was alluding to this a moment ago. Israel does extraordinary things with regard to this. They drop leaflets into population centers warning: We are going to have to conduct a military operation in your region. Please evacuate. Please go elsewhere where you will be safe.

Hamas doesn't do that. In fact, Hamas deliberately targets population centers to terrorize the people of Israel, and we should condemn it for what it is. There is no moral equivalency.

So now the situation has continued to spiral out of control and it has reached a point where the news today now is that Israel has begun to conduct ground operations and these ground operations they are conducting as early as this morning have to do with a tunnel network in Gaza which was used by Hamas to try to infiltrate terrorists through those tunnels into Israel to conduct terrorist activity and kill Israelis.

Put yourself in the position of this country, small and geographically isolated, surrounded by terrorist groups and some unfriendly countries, threatened by the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon and being hit by 1,300 rockets in just the last week. They have no choice but to defend themselves using all the power at their disposal. They have no choice. Not only should no one here be criticizing that, but we should be supporting it and aligning ourselves 100 percent on their side, because what they are fighting for here is not some dispute over borders. This is not some geopolitical dispute about who owns what territory. Israel is fighting for its very survival.

On the other side of this conflict is a terrorist organization bent on their destruction. On the other side of this conflict is a terrorist organization in Hamas and, truth be told, the Palestinian Authority, whose schools teach children not just to hate Israel but to hate Jews.

How could you possibly say you are for peace when your schools are actively teaching your children to hate another people? That is what is on the other side of this conflict.

And so Israel has no choice. They are fighting for their very survival, and I think that now more than ever what they need from this country is a President and a U.S. Government that aligns itself squarely on their side—no doubletalk, no fancy diplomatic language that you could read between the lines on—a very clear statement: In this conflict we are on Israel's side and we will support them with anything they need to ensure their stability and their survival—very clear language that makes it unequivocal.

Hamas is a terrorist organization, not a legitimate representative of the aspirations of the Palestinian people, but a terrorist organization designed for the very purpose of destroying the Jewish state. We need to make these things abundantly clear, because otherwise we are going to see more of this in the years to come.

If there is any daylight between the United States and Israel, it emboldens Israel's enemies. I would say as bad as this situation is—and it is terrible—the biggest danger facing Israel today is not just 1,300 rockets that have come over from Hamas, it is the threat of a nuclear Iran. It is interesting that while we are having this conversation here today about the attack Israel is under, this administration is trying to get an extension of these talks with the Iranian regime.

I hope you clearly understand. I said this before and I want to come here and reiterate: If Iran is allowed to retain the ability of enriching uranium or reprocessing plutonium, they will build a nuclear weapon with that capacity. Let me put it in plain English. If you let them keep the machines they use to reprocess and enrich, they may not reprocess and enrich to weapons grade right away, but the fact they have the ability to do it I guarantee you eventually means they will.

Do you know how I know that? One reason is all you have to do is hear the speeches they give. The second reason why we know that is the other issue no one is talking about: Iran isn't just spinning centrifuges, they are not just enriching uranium and reprocessing plutonium. Iran is building rockets—long-range rockets, intercontinental missiles. And there is only one purpose for those missiles. The only purpose they have is to put a warhead on them with a nuclear payload. That is the only reason why you build missiles such as that. These types of missiles are not built to deliver a conventional weapon; they are built for purposes of a nuclear capability.

Additionally, these rockets they want to build aren't just rockets that can reach Jerusalem or Tel Aviv. These are rockets that can reach Washington, DC, and my hometown of Miami, and New York City, and the mainland of the United States. So if they build these missiles with that range and they develop the ability to enrich and reprocess, they are one step away, a half step away from becoming a nuclear power, able to hold our country hostage and to carry out their ambitions of destroying Israel. That is the single greatest threat. As great as this threat is with Hamas, and needs to be dealt with decisively, that is the single greatest security threat facing Israel.

It is ironic to me that even as we are focused on this issue and what is happening, this administration is off in Geneva trying to cut a deal with Iran that allows them to retain an acknowledged right to enrich and reprocess, and that is going to prove to be disastrous.

It is my opinion those negotiations will lead to nothing, because Iran has entered into these negotiations believing they entered from a position of strength. They believe this President so badly wants a deal that they don't have to give on anything. By the way, I don't know how you do a meaningful deal with Iran on nuclear weapons that doesn't involve a conversation about these long-range rockets. Yet that is exactly what they are doing with little to no consultation with the Senate or any other policymakers.

I came to the floor to reiterate my personal support for Israel but to also reiterate how strongly I believe virtually every Member of this body supports the State of Israel, supports Israel's right to defend itself, supports the United States alliance with Israel, supports everything we must and can do to help Israel defend herself. I think that is an important message to send out.

Finally, I would say this: I would ask those who have watched this speech or who will hear these words later to take the time over the next few days to pray for Israel. They need our support there as well, that God will provide her the safety and security of her people, now and in the years to come.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 849, Carnes, on Monday, July 21, the Senate remain in executive session to consider Calendar No. 789, Lawson, and Calendar No. 537, Reddick; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we expect nominations considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding Rule XXII, on Tuesday, July 22, at 10:45 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 851, Birotte, 852, Rosenberg, and 854, deGravelles, in the order listed; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 2:15 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; that all rollcall votes after the first in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING CHARLIE SEEMANN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Charlie Seemann. Mr. Seemann is a talented folklorist who is dedicated to sharing western arts and culture with communities throughout Nevada. At the end of the month, he will be retiring from his position as executive director of the Western Folklife Center in Elko, NV.

After serving as the deputy director of the Country Music Foundation in Nashville, TN, for 12 years, and later working as the program director at the Fund for Folk Culture in Santa Fe, NM, Nevada was fortunate to have Mr. Seemann dedicate his efforts to sharing the cultural heritage of the American West with communities throughout our great State.

In 1998, Mr. Seemann brought his masters of folklife studies, decades of experience, and his accomplished musical knowledge to the Western Folklife Center in Nevada. During his 16-year tenure, he has strengthened the arts throughout his community by investing in literary and scholarship programs that have helped foster artistic development and brought new artists to Western Folklife's most notable event, the National Cowboy Poetry Gathering. Since 1986, Mr. Seemann participated in the annual National Cowboy Poetry Gathering, formerly the Elko Cowboy Poetry Gathering. This event was renamed in 2000, after Mr. Seemann worked with Members of Congress to pass a United States Senate Resolution designating the poetry gathering in Elko as a nationally recognized event.

Mr. Seeman is not only a strong advocate for western arts and culture, but he is a nationally renowned folklorist. Prior to coming to the Western Folklife Center, he received the Western Heritage Wrangler Award from the National Cowboy and Western Heritage Museum, as well as a Grammy nomination for the New World Records anthology Back in the Saddle Again: American Cowboy Songs. Mr. Seemann also received a Wrangler Award in 2003, for his production work on a joint project between the Western Folklife Center and Smithsonian Folkways Recordings, Buck Ramsey: Hittin' the Trail. In 2006, Mr. Seeman was appointed by Congress to the Board of Trustees for the American Folklife Center. This Center is housed at the Library of Congress and works to archive and preserve American's unique culture. It was a tribute to Mr. Seeman's reputation that he was selected for this Federal board, and he represented Nevada well in this role.

Mr. Seemann will be missed by the many individuals he works with at the Western Folklife Center, but his contributions to western folklore will continue. I wish him well in his retirement and all the best in his future endeavors.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. NELSON. The administration sent several Cabinet Secretaries and high-ranking appointees to brief all Senators last evening on the crisis of the children on the border, and it appears they are getting their arms around addressing the problem of the children and the humanitarian crisis on the border. However, it is the opinion of this Senator that they do not recognize the root cause of the problem. If the administration would listen to their four-star general, the head of the United States Southern Command, General Kelly, and the testimony he has already given to the Armed Services Committee of what is the problem, then we could get to the root cause of the problem and stop these future humanitarian crises.

The problem simply is that we are not devoting the time and the resources—the money—to the interdiction of the big drug shipments coming out of South America into Central America. They come in big shipments from Colombia through Venezuela by air or sea on the eastern side, from Colombia through Ecuador or originating in Ecuador out on the western side, coming into three Central American countries—Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. As a result, their drug lords have completely taken over those countries. As a result, the violence is the highest. Honduras is now the murder capital of the world. As a result of that drug violence—and there is very little law and order—the whole system is corrupted. For parents with children, it is logical that they would want to send their children to a safer environment.

The administration has to address this issue with regard to going back to what we did so successfully in Plan Colombia—interdict the drug traffic before it gets to those Central American countries because once it does in the big shipments, they then break it down into smaller packages and it goes north.

CYPRUS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the island of Cyprus. Today, Cyprus remains a divided island, with a third of the territory still occupied by Turkish forces.

I am proud to stand with the people of Cyprus and call for an immediate end to the Turkish occupation of their country. On numerous occasions, United Nations resolutions have called for the respect of the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Cyprus and for an immediate end to the Turkish occupation. The Republic of Cyprus continues to demonstrate full commitment to a peaceful process that will reunify the island in accordance with these resolutions.

Over the past year, the Republic of Cyprus has taken significant steps to lay the groundwork for peaceful negotiations, including proposals that would bring the two sides together to build confidence, strengthen ties, and integrate the Turkish-Cypriot community. It is clear that the government and people of Cyprus stand ready to make the hard decisions needed to achieve peace.

Continued unrest that threatens the security and stability of the region further underscores the importance of supporting the Republic of Cyprus. A peaceful agreement that reunifies Cyprus would signal that just and fair resolutions can be achieved to end decades long confrontations. We must continue to stand with them to fight for a fair and responsible agreement—one

that safeguards basic freedoms and human rights for all Cypriots. During his visit in May of this year, Vice President BIDEN reiterated the need for Cyprus to be reunited.

The Republic of Cyprus is a strong and trusted friend of the United States. I am proud of the strategic partnership we have developed over the years. The Government of Cyprus currently hosts the joint mission responsible for carrying out the removal and destruction of Syria's chemical weapons as well as providing maritime cooperation to facilitate the process. The role of Cyprus demonstrates the island's important strategic location and critical international engagement efforts.

I am encouraged by renewed efforts to reach a comprehensive and fair solution to reunify Cyprus. I urge the government of Turkey to cooperate with negotiations and I applaud the people of Cyprus for their steadfast commitment to securing a peaceful and prosperous future.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the division of Cyprus, which began on July 20, 1974.

On July 20, 1974, Turkey began its brutal invasion of the island of Cyprus. By August 25, 1974, Turkish forces controlled more than one-third of the island. To this day, Cyprus remains divided.

Forty years later, it is long past time for a permanent solution that results in a free and unified Cyprus.

For decades, numerous rounds of negotiations have attempted to achieve a settlement. For too long, these efforts have failed to yield meaningful progress. However, a new round of talks began in February of this year. I am deeply hopeful that these negotiations will result in a fair and durable solution for all Cypriots.

A secure and stable Republic of Cyprus will strengthen the friendship and alliance between the United States and Cyprus. This relationship is based on our long history and our mutual goals and values, including a commitment to democracy, opportunity for all, and human rights.

Lasting peace in Cyprus will also reinforce Cyprus's role as a force for peace, prosperity, and stability in the region.

That is why we must continue to do everything possible to help Cyprus resolve the decades-long illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus by Turkey.

As Vice President BIDEN said in May during his historic visit to Cyprus, ''For the sake of the boys and girls born on this island who deserve the possibility that only peace can bring, let's finally make hope and history rhyme together.''

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT ANDREW R. LOONEY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Andrew R. Looney who died on June 21, 2010 serving our Nation in Lar Sholtan Village, Afghanistan. Sergeant Looney and Army PFC David T. Miller died of wounds sustained when a suicide bomber attacked their traffic control checkpoint.

Andrew was born June 26, 1987 and grew up in Owasso, OK where he graduated from Owasso High School in 2005. His father, Richard, said as a teen his son developed an avid interest in the military, and he was further inspired by military movies, in particular the HBO series ''Band of Brothers.'' He grew up respecting authority, was ''very compliable'' and took things in stride which made military life a good fit for him. Therefore, it was a natural for him to enlist in the Army immediately after high school.

While deployed to Iraq in August 2007, he was severely wounded from an improvised explosive device and lost part of his right foot. After nearly a year of grueling rehabilitation and receiving a prosthetic at Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, TX he felt a deep sense of patriotism and a burning desire to serve and get back to where he felt he was needed. In 2009 he was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY where on April 24, 2010 he deployed to Afghanistan.

The last time the family saw him in April 2009 ''he was looking forward to his assignment in Afghanistan,'' his father said. He thought he ''was making a difference in the war, and was much needed.''

On June 28, 2010, with hundreds of friends in attendance, the family remembered Andrew at Owasso Public School's Mary Glass Performing Arts Center. Before and throughout the service, hundreds of people lined the streets holding up flags in solemn tribute to Andrew.

In 2012, Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin signed Senate Bill 1320 designating the section of highway from 96th Street North to 106th Street North as ''Sergeant Andrew R. Looney Memorial Highway.''

Andrew was posthumously promoted to Sergeant and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, VA.

SGT Looney is survived by his parents Martha and Cleo Looney, sister Joanna, and brother, Steven who completed a tour in the Navy in December 2009.

Today we remember Army SGT Andrew R. Looney, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST JARED C. PLUNK

Mr. President, I also wish to remember a true American hero, Army SPC Jared C. Plunk who died on June 25, 2010 serving our Nation in Konar, Afghanistan. SPC Plunk and Army SPC Blair D. Thompson died of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked their unit using rocket-propelled grenades and small-arms fire.

Jared was born August 26, 1982 in Liberal, KS. He grew up in the Oklahoma Panhandle town of Turpin where he played football and graduated high school in 2001 before taking college classes at Seward County Community College.

After relocating to Stillwater, OK, Jared and his brother Justin enlisted in the Army in August 2006 where they were bunkmates once again in basic military training. After graduation, he married his wife Lindsay and was assigned to 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.

Jared's funeral was held July 4, 2010 at the Turpin High School auditorium. Reverend Stan Lehnart remembered him saying ''He was not the valedictorian of Turpin. He was not the star of the football team. He was not the boy the girls wanted to sit next to at assemblies in this auditorium. He is the one who gave his life for us to sit here today. He is the one that served his country. He is a hero.''

Interment was in the Liberal City Cemetery in Liberal, KS.

Preceded in death by his father, Glen ''Tiny'' Plunk, Jared is survived by his wife Lindsay, and two sons, 5-year-old Noah and baby Kason, mother Glenda Willard and her husband Gerald of Maryville, TN, brother Justin Plunk and his wife Caitlin of Norman, Oklahoma, brother Jordan Plunk of Maryville, TN, sister Ranee Massoni and her husband Jordon and their son Gavin of Maryville, TN, and sister Michelle Plunk of Maryville, TN.

Today we remember Army SPC Jared C. Plunk, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ARMY STAFF SERGEANT TRAVIS M. TOMPKINS

Mr. President, I would also like to pay tribute to Army SSG Travis M. Tompkins. Travis tragically died on March 16, 2011 of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked his unit with a rocket propelled grenade in Logar Province, Afghanistan.

Travis was born November 26, 1979 at Fort Sill, OK to Leland and Vickie Tompkins. An active Boy Scout, he graduated from MacArthur High School in 1999 and enlisted in the Army in January 2000.

He was carrying on a tradition of service in his family that dates back to World War I. His father, Leland Tompkins served for more than two decades in an Army career that began during the Vietnam war and ended in the closing days of the Cold War. ''He was a working soldier,'' Leland said. ''He was a working leader. He cared about his soldiers. He volunteered for everything.''

Moving frequently, Travis' assignments included Fort Sill, OK, Fort Leonardwood, MO, Fort Carson, CO, and Allied Joint Force Command in Brunssum, the Netherlands. He married Candice Brown on March 1, 2001 at Fort Carson, CO and was quickly deployed to Saudi Arabia from September 2001 to March 2002.

He arrived at Fort Polk, LA in June 2009 and was assigned to Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division. In October 2011 he deployed to Afghanistan with his unit as a military policeman with the Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division.

The couple had recently renewed their vows on their 10th anniversary when he was home on leave. ''It was the most perfect day,'' Candy wrote. ''He was a wonderful man, an excellent soldier and above all the best father and husband and son and brother. I don't know how I'll ever live without him. He was our world.''

A loving husband, father and son, Travis is survived by his wife Candice, two children, Madison and Gianna, parents Leland and Vickie Tompkins of Lawton, OK, sister Jenny Meek and her husband Troy of Fletcher, OK, niece and nephew Megan Meek and Dillon Meek, and his mother and father-in-law Wendy and Tim Brown of Lawton, OK.

His mother Vickie said that the main thing she wanted people who never met him to know is what a great son he was to her and what a wonderful husband he was to his wife Candy, and their children.

Private family funeral services and interment with full military honors were conducted at the Fort Sill National Cemetery, Elgin, OK. Travis was posthumously promoted to Staff Sergeant.

Today we remember Army SSG Travis M. Tompkins, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

TRIBUTE TO TRAVIS MOLLOHAN

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I want to thank a longtime and dedicated member of my staff, Travis Mollohan, and to wish him the best on his next professional venture—as director of State, corporate and community relations for West Virginia University.

Raised by caring parents, Todd and Brenda Mollohan, in the geographic heart of our State, Braxton County, Travis learned from a young age the value of being involved in his community and the importance of being a team player. As a proud Braxton County Eagle, Travis was a member of the high school's award-winning band, speech and debate team and president of the National Honor Society. Travis even volunteered for me during my unsuccessful 1996 gubernatorial run.

Travis graduated from Braxton County High School in 2000 and then attended college at West Virginia University. There, he was treasurer of the WVU Young Democrats, head of the Student Government Association's campus safety committee and studied abroad at Dublin City University in Ireland. Travis volunteered during my successful campaign for Governor in 2004 and began working for me in 2005 as deputy scheduler.

From my first days as the 34th Governor of the great State of West Virginia, my top priority was to deliver excellent customer service to our fellow West Virginians. Travis was ideally suited for my team—he was hard-working, smart and always there to lend a helping hand to those in need.

Travis served my gubernatorial administration in various capacities, and whether it was through tragedy or triumph, Travis represented my office with the utmost distinction.

After winning the unexpired term for the U.S. Senate in 2010, I asked Travis to help me bring our commonsense West Virginia values to Washington. He served as my director of scheduling in 2011, before returning to my State operations as director of outreach. He did an amazing job visiting the beautiful communities of the Mountain State and listening to our citizens' ideas and concerns.

Recently, I asked Travis to serve as my director of constituent services. I was confident yet again that he could do the job because Travis truly understands what West Virginians need—someone who is compassionate, thoughtful and knowledgeable about our state and the complexities of government.

Not a day passes that Travis is not dedicated to making West Virginia a better place to live, work and raise a family.

I am sad to see Travis leave my office, but I am so excited for his future. He has accepted a position with his alma mater, West Virginia University—our State's flagship university. No one is better suited for the task ahead of him than Travis.

WVU has made a significant and positive impact on the Mountain State. It offers a first-class learning experience and its graduates are spread around the world making a difference. But it is more than just an incredible institution of higher learning. WVU's programs and services improve the lives of our citizens and our communities. In our daily lives, we can always do more, and I am so proud to know that Travis will be helping WVU reach the next level.

It is very difficult to imagine my office without Travis, but I know he will bring the same level of excitement, energy, and dedication to his new position as he brought to my office for more than 9 years. He is a responsive, critical thinker who truly cares about our State and fellow citizens. He is a West Virginian through and through and a proud Mountaineer.

Travis has a bright future ahead of him, and I am pleased to say that very soon he will be marrying the love of his life, Lindsey Bennett—from my hometown of Fairmont—who is a beautiful and intelligent young lady. I know that they will have a long and happy life together, and I am proud to say that they will always remain a part of the Manchin family.

THE FIGHT AGAINST ALS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this Fourth of July marked the 75th anniversary of the muggy summer afternoon the great Henry Louis Gehrig bid farewell to baseball and introduced Americans to the illness that would become known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

Lou Gehrig was the only surviving child of a sheet metal worker and a maid—immigrants from Germany. Gehrig brought his family's humble work ethic and steadfastness to his own job, playing first base for the New York Yankees. His career was one that even a Red Sox fan can admire. On June 1, 1925, 4 days before his 20th birthday, he pinch-hit for Pee Wee Wanninger. On June 2, he broke into the starting lineup for good. He would play every single regular and postseason Yankees game until May 2, 1939—2,130 in a row.

''The Iron Horse,'' as Gehrig was known, didn't just play a lot of baseball, he played superb baseball. He racked up more than 2,700 hits, for a lifetime batting average of .340 and close to 2,000 runs batted in. He had 493 career home runs. His No. 4 jersey, known as ''the Hard Number'' by the American League pitchers who had to try to get the ball past him, was the first ever retired from Major League Baseball.

Despite his exceptional play, Gehrig was happy to leave the spotlight to teammate Babe Ruth, or later, Joe DiMaggio. ''I'm not a headline guy,'' he once said. ''As long as I was following Ruth to the plate, I could have stood on my head and no one would have known the difference.''

Lou Gehrig wasn't just great. He was always great. And his competitive spirit inspired Americans during the long years of the Great Depression. But for some unknown reason, his numbers fell off sharply in the 1938 season. He had trouble gripping the bat, running, even walking and sitting. So on the first Tuesday of May 1939, eight games into the season, the Yankee captain took his name off the lineup card. ''I'm benching myself, Joe,'' he told manager Joe McCarthy, ''for the good of the team.''

A series of tests at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN, would reveal that

amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, a disease that causes nerve cells to stop working and die, was robbing Gehrig's swing of its fabled power.

ALS attacks neurons responsible for controlling voluntary muscles and progresses rapidly. The brain and spinal cord lose the ability to send messages to the muscles of the body, which weaken and atrophy. ALS can impair speaking, swallowing, and breathing. As Gehrig biographer Jonathan Eig explains, the progression of ALS is like ''shutting down the body's functions one by one, like a night watchman switching off the factory-floor lights.''

Yet on that humid 1939 Independence Day, between the legs of a doubleheader against the Washington Senators, Lou Gehrig stood before a tangle of microphones at homeplate, bowed more by humility at the adulation of 62,000 Yankee fans, teammates, ball boys, and groundskeepers than by his disease. Clenching his cap in two hands, the man sportswriter Jim Murray once described as a ''Gibraltar in cleats'' spoke 278 simple words that still echo in the ears of those of us not even born at the time they were uttered.

''Fans,'' he began, ''for the past two weeks you have been reading about a bad break I got. Yet today I consider myself the luckiest man on the face of the earth.''

Although there is still much we have to learn about the causes of ALS, we have made great strides in research and treatment since Lou Gehrig took himself out of the game. With the help of Federal grants, advances in genetic research have opened the door to insights about the disease's hereditary nature, and drugs and assistive technology are improving dramatically.

Kreg Palko of Barrington, RI, recently underwent a pioneering surgery to transplant millions of stem cells into his spinal cord, in hopes of undoing the paralyzing effects of his ALS. Until Kreg discovered he had ALS just last year, he was always on the move—as a speedy defensive back at the Air Force Academy, Gulf War pilot—or active skier and surfer. ALS has dampened his mobility but not his competitive spirit. Kreg has volunteered for every clinical trial he can, and whether or not these treatments heal Kreg, he and his wife Elizabeth know this research will benefit future patients.

The heart of the movement for a cure is the dedicated community of advocates, researchers, physicians, and ALS patients. When members of the Rhode Island chapter of the ALS Association visited my office this May, they brought along baseball cards featuring Rhode Islanders living with ALS. I saw in each face courage and dignity equal to Lou Gehrig's.

Senator Jacob Javits of New York, who worked for years after his 1979 ALS diagnosis to improve long-term care and end-of-life policies, said:

Life does not stop with terminal illness. Only the patient stops if he doesn't have the will to go forward with life.

Brian Dickinson refused to let ALS stop him. Editor of the Providence Journal's editorial page and a prize-winning columnist, he had an indomitable spirit. This was the man who once sang ''The Battle Hymn of the Republic'' outside KGB headquarters on a tour of Soviet Moscow. And although ALS silenced his voice, Brian continued to tap out his column for a number of years, with the help of a special computer in his home. His profound, optimistic observations inspired his readers. ''I do believe,'' he once assured us, ''that the capacity for hope can help us meet stiff challenges.''

Brian finally lost his battle with ALS in 2002. Last month, the ALS Association Rhode Island Chapter presented the Brian Dickinson Courage Award to Kreg Palko.

As we look back to the day Lou Gehrig reminded us he had ''an awful lot to live for,'' we should renew our own will to go forward, with workmanlike determination, toward a cure.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING HAROLD LEONARD ''LENNY'' KAUFER

● Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I recognize the life and legacy of New Jerseyan Lenny Kaufer, who passed away on July 13 at the age of 92. Lenny was a dear friend and inspiration to me at the very dawn of my career in public service. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

Harold Leonard Kaufer was born on August 25, 1921, in Newark, NJ, where he was raised with his 10 siblings in the Roseville neighborhood by his parents, Abraham and Gussie. As a son of Newark, a graduate of its schools, and a New Jersey small business owner, Lenny cared passionately about New Jersey and its future, cheering the revival of its largest city and keeping track of the news ''back home.'' He considered Newark and New Jersey to be at the very core of his identity, and even though his retirement took him to California, he kept a book of historic photos of Newark on his bedside table until the day he died. Lenny never forgot where he came from.

I had the great fortune to get to know Lenny during my time on the Newark City Council and as mayor. I consider him to have been one of the more gentle, kind souls I have ever met, and I appreciated his sound perspective and sage advice. I treasure the conversations we shared, as well as his undeterred love of Newark, and I will miss his wisdom.

Above all else, Lenny was devoted to his family. In 2012, he and his wife Shirley celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary, and they found great pleasure in the time spent with their daughter, three grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. Lenny always gave loved ones a kiss for the road. As a man of faith, after moving to California, he maintained a membership at his temple in New Jersey, just so he could ensure that his family there would always have a home for the High Holidays.

Lenny is mourned by his wife Shirley, his daughter Jacqueline, sisters Madeline and Helga, brother Irwin, three grandchildren, two great-grandchildren, a large extended family, and his many friends and neighbors. Lenny touched so many lives over his 92 years. He was an American treasure. He demonstrated the truth that so often the biggest thing you can do in any day is a small act of kindness, decency, or love. Lenny lived every day with constant kindness, unyielding decency, and a remarkable love for others. I ask that the Senate join me in honoring him and remembering his extraordinary life.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL MARIAMNE R. M. OKRZESIK

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor and pay tribute to an exceptional leader, Col. Mariamne R. Okrzesik. After a lifetime of service to our Nation, Colonel Okrzesik is retiring from the U.S. Air Force and her current position as Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, United States Central Command, at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, FL. On this occasion I believe it is fitting to recognize Colonel Okrzesik's extraordinary dedication to duty and selfless service to the United States of America.

Colonel Okrzesik has served at all levels in the Air Force. Her career began when she received her commission in 1986 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of Maryland. Colonel Okrzesik's distinguished military service has taken her all over the world in defense of our Nation. Her career has included assignments and duties across a wide variety of command, intelligence, and staff positions throughout Europe, the Pacific, and the United States. Colonel Okrzesik has served as an intelligence flight commander; director of operations; executive officer; Major Command; Headquarters Air Force and Secretary of the Air Force staff officer; squadron commander; and Joint Combatant Command staff officer. Colonel Okrzesik has received numerous awards during her career, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Meritorious Service Medal with six oak leaf clusters, the Joint Commendation Medal, and Air Force Commendation Medal.

It is a pleasure to recognize Colonel Okrzesik's long and decorated career today and also the great benefit to the Nation she has provided as a senior leader for the U.S. Air Force and Department of Defense. Colonel Okrzesik has always achieved excellence during her career. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Colonel Okrzesik for a lifetime of service to her country. For all she has given and continues to give to our country we are in her debt. As Colonel Okrzesik retires to Lothian, MD, we express our gratitude for her faithful and dedicated service and wish her our sincerest best wishes upon her retirement.●

REMEMBERING JOHN V. EVANS

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life of former Idaho Governor John Victor Evans. Governor Evans will be missed, but his impact on Idaho and his legacy of dedicated service will endure.

Governor Evans and his family were Idaho pioneers. He was born and raised in Malad, ID. He attended Idaho State University, and like so many of his generation, he went to serve as an infantryman in World War II. After returning from the war, he earned a degree in business and economics from Stanford University.

John dedicated much of his life to public service. He served in the Idaho State Senate where he rose to the positions of majority leader and minority leader. He was mayor of Malad, the town he grew up in. In 1974, he was elected Lieutenant Governor before his terms as Idaho's 27th Governor from 1977 to 1987. He led Idaho through a number of challenging times: the historic settlement of water rights, the closure of the Bunker Hill Mine, and the difficult economic times much of the Nation saw in the 1980s. He also contributed to the national dialogue, having served in leadership positions in the Western Governors Association and National Governor's Association.

He was dedicated to community service and supported numerous efforts and organizations. He was a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and the Rotary Club, and he was a Mason. He also held a number of leadership positions for the Independent Community Bankers Association.

Following his retirement from public office in 1987, he became president of D.L. Evans Bank in Burley, ID. During his tenure, the bank grew from two banks to 21 banks, assisting thousands of Idaho residents and businesses.

Idahoans benefited greatly from his steady leadership in public office and in business. He was known for his open-door policy, strong work ethic and always taking the time to meet with fellow Idahoans. I extend my condolences to his wife Lola, brother Don, children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and many other family members and friends. He will be greatly missed.●

WINNEBAGO COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Winnebago County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Winnebago County worth over $1.2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $28 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the success that the county has had in securing over $9.4 million funds for the Heartland Power Cooperative through programs I fought for at the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in past farm bills.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Winnebago County has received $1,083,026 in Harkin grants.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Winnebago County has received over $8.2 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Winnebago County has received more than $19 million from a variety of farm bill loan and grant programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Winnebago County's fire departments have received over $623,971 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase

funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Winnebago County has recognized this important issue by securing $120,000 for community wellness activities.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Winnebago County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Winnebago County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Winnebago County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

ALLAMAKEE COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Allamakee County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $26 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the community's success in obtaining funding for school construction, fire safety, technology, and other improvements through Harkin school construction grants, the Star Schools program, and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funds.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Allamakee County has received $1,792,068 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Allamakee County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $59,494. Finally, Allamakee schools received more than $280,000 through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for academic and learning support.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Allamakee County has received more than $1.3 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Allamakee County's fire departments have received over $900,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Allamakee County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Allamakee County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the

State and local level, including in Allamakee County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

CONGRATULATING COLONEL JAMES WALKER

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate COL James Walker of Las Vegas, Nevada on his upcoming retirement from the Nevada Army National Guard. I am proud to honor a Nevadan who has dedicated his life to serving our country.

Born and raised in Las Vegas, NV, Colonel Walker's desire to serve came when he was studying psychology in college. On scholarship for soccer at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, he decided he wanted to enlist and become a combat medic. Upon joining the Army in 1979, Colonel Walker rose through the ranks and eventually became the highest ranking African-American Army National Guard officer in Nevada history. Colonel Walker's career from private to colonel over the course of 35 years is both commendable and admirable.

Throughout his career, Colonel Walker continued to pursue all of the educational training that the Army National Guard had to offer. With the support of his wife Doris, Colonel Walker decided to pursue three NCO professional development schools, earning him the prestigious NCO Ribbon. Colonel Walker also participated in an Officer Candidate School at Clear Creek near Carson City and was a pioneering student in the Nevada primary leadership development course, graduating at the top of his class with honors. After his success there, he served as a training officer for the next graduating class. His ability to give back to the National Guard and his community was also exemplified during his 3 years of teaching ROTC at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Upon his retirement from the National Guard, Colonel Walker plans to continue working for National Security Technologies as the company's facility manager at Nellis Air Force Base in Las Vegas.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Colonel Walker for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

Throughout his tenure, Colonel Walker has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Army National Guard. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing COL James Walker for all of his accomplishments and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

USS ''NEVADA'' CENTENNIAL

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the commissioning of the USS *Nevada* Battleship. I am proud to be able to honor Nevada's namesake battleship today and all of the Americans that served aboard her.

The anniversary of the battleship USS *Nevada* comes on the heels of Nevada celebrating its 150th year of statehood. Through her years of service, the *Nevada* suffered many blows and casualties, but remained dedicated to defending her country. The crew that served aboard her have all earned a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. I, along with my fellow Nevadans, feel a great sense of pride that our State has been chosen as the namesake for this ship that is arguably one of the greatest of our navy or of any Navy.

Launched on July 11, 1914, at the Fore River Shipbuilding Corporation in Quincy, MA, the USS *Nevada* was the most-advanced battleship in the U.S. Navy at the time. The USS *Nevada* saw both World Wars during her time in active service. During the final months of World War I, she was based in Bantry Bay, County Cork, Ireland, to ensure that the supply convoys that were sailing to and from Great Britain were protected. In World War II, she was the only ship to get underway during the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. After receiving one torpedo hit and several bomb hits, the USS *Nevada* had to be beached, but after vigorous salvage work, repairs and improvements, she was able to return to combat. Highly decorated for the numerous battles that she was a part of, the USS *Nevada* was present at the Attu landings against the Japanese, fired against German defenses during the Normandy landings, and supported operations in Iwo Jima and Okinawa. After over 30 years of service, the USS *Nevada* was deemed too old for retention and was assigned to serve as a target in the atomic bomb tests at Bikini Atoll. The experience left her radioactive and badly damaged, leading to her being decommissioned and eventually sunk during naval gunfire practice.

It is an honor to be able to commemorate this day on behalf of my fellow Nevadans as we remember those who have risked their lives to defend freedom. Our Navy's commitment to this country, as well as their dedication to their families and communities, exemplified why the legacy of all veterans must be preserved for generations to come. These heroes selflessly served not for recognition, but because it was the right thing to do. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals, but to ensure they are cared for after their return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

I ask that we recognize the commissioning of the USS *Nevada* and honor all that sailed aboard her. I am both humbled and honored to commemorate the brave men and women who dedicated their lives to serving our country and recognize them here today. May we never forget the legacy of this great battleship and her gallant crew.●

REMEMBERING MATTIE STEPANEK

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the life of Matthew Joseph Thaddeus Stepanek, best known as Mattie, who passed away 10 years ago at the age of 13 from complications due to his rare form of muscular dystrophy. Though his death was a tragedy, his life was a triumph. He was a gifted author and noted peacemaker. He took a personal challenge and turned it into a tool of inspiration for all of us. Mattie once said, ''I want my message to live beyond me,'' and it does. His message of peace and hope has reached millions around the world.

When Mattie was born in 1990 in Upper Marlboro, MD, doctors did not expect him to live longer than 24 hours. Mattie suffered from the same rare form of muscular dystrophy as his mother, his two brothers, and sister. His siblings all died before the age of 4. Though the disease eventually rendered him unable to walk and breathe on his own, Mattie was a survivor. He began writing poetry at the age of 3. He wrote poems about hope and peace. His philosophy was, ''Remember to play after every storm,'' and he did.

Mattie believed that wishes can come true. He had three. The first was to talk peace with Jimmy Carter. They spoke several times through email correspondence. His second was to have his poems published in a book. He wrote the most successful volumes of poetry in the last 30 years and became a seven-time New York Times best-selling author. His last was to see his

poetry read on Oprah. He appeared on Oprah's show several times and became her good friend.

In September 2001, Mattie faced a setback. He was so sick that his doctors warned a laugh could cause his damaged windpipe to collapse. But that did not stop Mattie from a spectacular recovery. His doctors could not explain his comeback from this brush with death, but Mattie knew what it was. It was hope, prayer, and just one in a series of miracles in a miraculous life.

After the chaos and confusion of September 11 and the anthrax attacks on the Capitol, I was very grief stricken. I saw a little boy on TV reading poetry, offering hope and healing. Mattie comforted me and lifted my spirits. I contacted him through his hospital and visited with him and his mother in his home. In 2002, I presented Mattie with the Children's Hope Medal of Honor. This medal is given to young heroes who have shown valiant effort and courage in facing life's daily challenges. No one was more deserving of that medal than Mattie Stepanek.

Today we must also remember Mattie's mother Jeni Stepanek. Like Mattie, she suffers physical challenges, but her heart, mind, and spirit remain strong. Without Jeni, Mattie would never have been able to share his beautiful, inspiring words with us. Mattie got his knack for public speaking from his mom. She writes and talks about children with disabilities. He also got his love of life from her. Jeni continues to inspire us all with her life, with Mattie's words, and most importantly, a message of peace and hope.

In his poem entitled ''The Daily Gift,'' Mattie wrote:

You know what?
Tomorrow is a new day.
And today is a new day.
Actually, every day is a new day.
Thank you, God,
For all of these special and new days.

This is how Mattie Stepanek lived his life—with appreciation, inspiration, and energy. That is why I wish to say: Thank you, God, for blessing us with the gift of Mattie Stepanek and his heart of songs.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5016. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 5021.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5016. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 4870. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–211).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 517, a bill to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–212).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES—WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014

The following material was omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 2014 on page 12202:

Financial Campaign Contributions Report for Leslie Ann Bassett:

Nominee: Leslie Bassett.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Paraguay.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: 0.

2. Spouse: N/A

3. Children and Spouses: Nadia Jean Bassett (minor-no spouse): 0.

4. Parents: Carole G. Bassett (deceased), Kimbrough Stone Bassett: 0.

5. Grandparents: Albert E. Bassett (deceased), Elizabeth Stone Bassett (deceased), Mabel Moran Gilchrist (deceased), Gen. John R. Gilchrist (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Kimbrough Stone Bassett (brother): 9/30/09, Alan Grayson, Congress/House, $40.00, ActBlue.com; 2010, Jack Conway, Congress/Senate, $20.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date; 2012, Elizabeth Warren, Congress/Senate, $40.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date; 11/2/12, Barack Obama, President, $100.00, Obama For America; 11/3/12, Carol Shea-Porter, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Betty Sue Sutton, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Ami Bera, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12 Ann McLane Kuster, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Manan Trivedi, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Patrick Murphy, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Pat Kreitlow, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Lois Frankel, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Mark Takano, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, David Gill, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Rick Nolan, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Jose Hernandez, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Alan Lowenthal, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Kathryn Boockvar, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Sean Patrick Maloney, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Joe Garcia, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Jim Graves, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/12/12, Barack Obama, President, $100.00, Obama For America; 2013, Elizabeth Colbert Busch, Congress/House, $20.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date.

Zan Sterling (sister-in-law): 6/3/2010, 100, Friends of Barbara, Barbara Boxer; 8/21/2010,

105, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 8/22/2010, 25, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 10/1/2010, 50, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 10/8/2010, 100, DNC, Barack Obama; 10/8/2010, 50, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 10/29/2010, 35, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Nancy Pelosi; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Jerry McNerney; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Debra Bowen; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Bill Hedrick; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Beth Krom; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Dave Jones; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Steve Pougnet; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Jerry Brown; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 4/27/2011, 25, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 8/17/2011, 25, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 7/29/2011, 5, Dem Sen Cmp Dirct; 8/26/2011, 5, direct payment, Al Franken; 2/18/2012, 22, Actblue; 5/19/2012, 20, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 8/1/2012, 26, Actblue; 8/8/2012, 26, Actblue; 9/6/2012, 35, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 10/9/2012, 26, Actblue; 10/9/2012, 26, Actblue; 9/30/2013, 5, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 9/30/2013, 5, Actblue, Terry McAuliffe; 10/7/2013, 3, Actblue, DCCC; 11/9/2013, 15, Organizing for Action; 11/14/2013, 15, Organizing for Action.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Diane Moran Bassett (sister), 0, Dennis Murray, (brother-in-law) 0.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE—TREATIES

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 113–4: The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain (Ex. Rept. 113–10); and

Treaty Doc. 113–5: Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland (Ex. Rept. 113–11)

The text of the committee-recommended resolutions of advice and consent to ratification are as follows:

[Treaty Doc. 113–4 The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion With Respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, and a related Memorandum of Understanding signed on January 14, 2013, at Madrid, together with correcting notes dated July 23, 2013, and January 31, 2014 (the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 113–4), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions of section 3.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Protocol is self-executing.

Section 3. Conditions

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a IN determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109–20) (the ''2006 German Protocol'');

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the ''Belgium Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 110–3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the ''2007 Canada Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 110–15); or

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the ''2009 France Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 111–4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

[Treaty Doc. 113–5 Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland]

Section I. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 13, 2013, at Warsaw (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 113–5), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2619. A bill to prevent organized human smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2620. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the reliability of the electric transmission grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2621. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2622. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2623. A bill to prohibit land management modifications relating to the Lesser Prairie Chicken; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 2624. A bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2625. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2626. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, to expand the payment in lieu of taxes program to include payments for secure rural schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHANNS:

S. 2628. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2629. A bill to require employers to notify employees and prospective employees of exemptions from otherwise required coverage of health services under group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2630. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2632. A bill to provide for the expedited processing of unaccompanied alien children illegally entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 505. A resolution congratulating the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff (GLASS) Caucus association on the 10-year anniversary of the association; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 506. A resolution recognizing the patriotism and contributions of auxiliaries of veterans service organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 507. A resolution designating August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 508. A resolution commemorating the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2234

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs.

S. 2254

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2440

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2440, a bill to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of

the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. 2529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2529, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 2570

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2570, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2593, a bill to amend the FLAME Act of 2009 to provide for additional wildfire suppression activities, to provide for the conduct of certain forest treatment projects, and for other purposes.

S. 2608

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2608, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. RES. 500

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

AMENDMENT NO. 3552

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3552 proposed to S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2622. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, despite significant progress in the diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer, this continues to be the second leading cause of cancer death for women, affecting one of every 8 women in the United States.

Women with dense breast tissue may receive a normal mammogram report even if cancer is present. Dense breast tissue makes it harder to catch cancer early because it can obscure cancer in the mammogram image. This is why, for some women, additional screening is so important in catching breast cancer early.

Despite this risk for cancer being missed, when women receive their mammogram report there is no Federal standard for them to be told if they have dense tissue—even though this is already noted by the radiologist reading their mammogram.

This bill simply requires that women be informed if they have dense tissue, and that they may want to talk with their doctor if they have questions and to find out if they might benefit from additional screening. Early detection is the key to survival. Withholding this kind of information from women just doesn't make sense.

This bill sets a minimum Federal standard, so any state that wants to have additional reporting requirements may do so. The bill also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to focus on research regarding dense breast tissue, and better screening tools. Early detection is the key to beating cancer and patients deserve access to information that might just save their life.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator AYOTTE and me in supporting the Breast Density and Mammography Reporting Act. This commonsense bill increases transparency in medicine by improving patients' access to their own health information and is supported by organizations including the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Are You Dense Advocacy, Breast Cancer Fund, and Susan G. Komen for the Cure.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2625. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce with nineteen of my colleagues the Access to Birth Control Act of 2014, ABC Act, which protects an individual's right to birth control by requiring pharmacies to fill a valid prescription for birth control in a timely manner.

Family planning is central to women's basic health care. Studies show that 99 percent of women will use contraception at some point in their lives. Yet, despite the prevalence of contraceptive use, women in at least 24 States across the country have reported incidents where pharmacists have refused to fill prescriptions for birth control or provide emergency contraception to individuals who do not require a prescription. Furthermore, 6 States permit refusals without patient protections, such as requirements to refer or transfer prescriptions, and 7 States allow refusals but prohibit pharmacists from obstructing patient access to medication. It is unbelievable to me that in 2014 we are still debating a woman's right to make responsible and personal decisions about her own health.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, insurance plans are required to cover preventive services, including birth control without a copay. Congress has an obligation to see that the intent of the Affordable Care Act to make preventive health care affordable and accessible comes to fruition and act to make sure that the pharmacy counter does not come between women and timely access to contraception.

The ABC Act would ensure women's timely access to basic, preventative health care and ensures that women of age will not be denied birth control or emergency contraception by their pharmacist. The bill requires pharmacies to help a woman obtain medication by her preferred method if the requested product is not in stock and protects women from being intimidated when requesting contraception.

Denying contraception to women represents an erosion of a woman's right to access to contraception and a threat to women's access to basic health care. Access is especially important for low-income women who may lack the resources to find an alternative pharmacy in the appropriate time frame and women living in rural areas who may not have multiple pharmacies near them. When women are seeking emergency contraception, a pharmacist's denial can be an unsurmountable obstacle to access within the limited timeframe.

Under the ABC Act, if a requested product is not in stock, but the pharmacy stocks other forms of contraception, the pharmacy must help the woman obtain the medication without delay by the method of her preference: order, referral, or a transferred prescription. By placing the burden on the pharmacy—not the individual pharmacist—the ABC Act strikes a balance between the rights of individual pharmacists who might have personal religious objections to contraception and the rights of women to receive their validly prescribed medication.

The idea that women would still have to fight for access to birth control is astonishing. It should be clear: personal health care decisions should be between women and their doctors. I'm proud to join with my colleagues in putting forward this legislation that will protect woman's right to access contraception throughout the country. A woman's rights must not be dependent on her zip code or State.

I also want to acknowledge the late Senator Frank R. Lautenberg, who introduced a version of this legislation 5 times in the past. I am proud to build on Senator Lautenberg's leadership in defending a woman's right to make responsible and personal decisions about her own health.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to build support for this bill.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2629. A bill to require employers to notify employees and prospective employees of exemptions from otherwise required coverage of health services under group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

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

S. 2629

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Preventive Care Coverage Notification Act''.

SEC. 2. PROVIDING INFORMATION TO EMPLOYEES AND PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—With respect to an employer (other than an organization that is organized and operates as a nonprofit entity and is referred to in section 6033(a)(3)(A)(i) or (iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that establishes or maintains a group health plan (other than a grandfathered health plan as defined in section 1251 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18011)) for its employees, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly develop standards that require the employer to provide notice to current and prospective employees if the employer is exempted or excepted from covering health services otherwise required to be covered pursuant to title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (including preventive health services required under section 2713 of such Act). Such notice shall include a description of the specific items and services that are not covered under such plan as a result of such exemption or exception. Such standards shall require that any notice provided under this subsection be provided by the employer to employees and prospective employees in a timely and easily understandable manner.

(b) INFORMING EMPLOYEES OF LIMITATIONS ON COVERAGE.—With respect to the notice required under subsection (a), an employer shall be deemed to be in compliance with the requirements of such section if the employer is an eligible organization as defined in, and provides for the notice in accordance with, regulations issued pursuant to section 2713 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–13).

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this section shall apply to employers acting as plan sponsors, group health plans, and health insurance issuers as if enacted in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Any failure by an employer acting as a plan sponsor, a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer to comply with the provisions of this Act shall be subject to enforcement through part 5 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), section 2723 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–22), and section 4980D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to plan years beginning on or after July 1, 2014.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 505—CONGRATULATING THE GAY, LESBIAN, AND ALLIES SENATE STAFF (GLASS) CAUCUS ASSOCIATION ON THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 505

Whereas on April 23, 2004, several Senate staffers joined to form a first-of-its-kind staff association for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this preamble as ''LGBT'') Senate staff and their allies;

Whereas the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff Caucus association (referred to in this preamble as the ''GLASS Caucus association'') continues to serve the Senate community by raising awareness of issues affecting the LGBT community;

Whereas the GLASS Caucus association continues to promote the welfare and dignity of LGBT Senate employees; and

Whereas the GLASS Caucus association continues to provide a safe environment for social interaction and professional development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff Caucus association (referred to in this resolution as the ''GLASS Caucus association'') on the momentous occasion of the association's 10th anniversary;

(2) commends the late Senator Frank Raleigh Lautenberg of New Jersey for the critical role he played in the formation of the GLASS Caucus association and for his stalwart support for equality; and

(3) recognizes inaugural GLASS Caucus Steering Committee members Lynden Armstrong, Brett Bearce, Jeffrey Levensaler, Josh Brekenfeld, Jason Knapp, John Fossum, Kelsey Phipps, and Mat Young for their vision and hard work in establishing the GLASS Caucus association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 506—RECOGNIZING THE PATRIOTISM AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUXILIARIES OF VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 506

Whereas, for nearly a century, auxiliaries have served as a complementary and integral part of veterans service organizations, supporting members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families;

Whereas, since their inception, auxiliary units have proudly supported members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and the families of those who have served, volunteering hundreds of thousands of hours and raising billions of dollars;

Whereas auxiliaries have representatives in all 50 States and abroad;

Whereas auxiliaries have more than 1,000,000 members and are composed of wives, widows, mothers, grandmothers, daughters, and granddaughters of veterans, as well as veterans themselves;

Whereas auxiliary units have raised money to aid and enhance the lives of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families through financial support—providing assistance with essentials such as rent, child care, utilities, and food;

Whereas auxiliary units host ''stand-downs'' that focus on providing vital health and support services to homeless veterans;

Whereas auxiliary units strengthen their local communities by conducting food drives, visiting hospitals, and providing scholarships to youth;

Whereas auxiliary units serve as advocates for veterans and their families;

Whereas auxiliary units conduct welcome home and send-off events for members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of auxiliaries selflessly volunteer their services at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs throughout the country to enhance the lives of veterans and their families; and

Whereas, each year, auxiliary units raise millions of dollars for cancer research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the patriotism and countless contributions to the United States by generations of women in the auxiliaries of veterans service organizations;

(2) commends members of auxiliaries in the United States and abroad for their dedicated service to and support of members of the Armed Forces and veterans as well as their families and communities;

(3) encourages the people of the United States to promote awareness of the contributions and dedication of members of auxiliaries to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families; and

(4) calls on the people of the United States to follow the noble example of the auxiliaries of veterans service organizations and volunteer support and services to those who have selflessly served the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 507—DESIGNATING AUGUST 7, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY''

Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 507

Whereas August 7, 2014, marks the 225th anniversary of the signing by President George Washington of the Act entitled ''An Act for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers'', approved August 7, 1789 (commonly known as the ''Lighthouse Act of 1789'') (1 Stat. 53, chapter 9);

Whereas in 1789, the ninth Act of the first Congress, established a Federal role in the support, maintenance, and repair of all lighthouses, beacon buoys, and public piers necessary for safe navigation, commissioned the first Federal lighthouse, and represented the first public works act in the young United States;

Whereas the establishment of the United States system of navigational aids set the United States on a path to the forefront of international maritime prominence and established lighthouses that played an integral role in the rich maritime history of the United States, as that history spread from the Atlantic coast through the Great Lakes and the Gulf coast and Pacific States;

Whereas those iconic structures, standing at the margins of land and water, sometimes for as long as 2 centuries, have symbolized safety, security, heroism, duty, and faithfulness;

Whereas architects, designers, engineers, builders, and keepers devoted, and in some cases jeopardized, their lives for the safety of others during centuries of light tending by the United States Lighthouse Service and the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas the automation of the light system exposed the historic lighthouse towers to the ravages of time and vandalism and yet, at the same time, opened an opportunity for citizen involvement in efforts to save and restore those beacons that mark the evolving maritime history of the United States and its coastal communities;

Whereas the national lighthouse preservation movement has gained momentum over the past half century and is making major contributions to the preservation of maritime history and heritage and, through the development and enhancement of cultural tourism, to the economies of coastal communities in the United States;

Whereas the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 470w-7 et seq.), enacted on October 24, 2000, with the aid of the lighthouse preservation community, provides an effective process administered by the General Services Administration and the National Park Service for transferring lighthouses to the best possible stewardship groups;

Whereas 2014 is the 200th anniversary of the August 24, 1814, rescue of the original copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the United States Constitution, and many irreplaceable original government documents and books from destruction when the British burned Washington, D.C. during the War of 1812 by Stephen Pleasonton, who later served as General Superintendent of Lighthouses for 32 years;

Whereas 2014 is also the 75th anniversary of when Congress dissolved the United States Lighthouse Service and turned all of its duties over to the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas although the United States Coast Guard was created in 1915 with the merger of the United States Life Saving Service and the United States Revenue Marine Service, the United States Coast Guard uses the United States Revenue Marine founding date of 1790 as its anniversary year, and thus, August 7, 2014, is also the 225th anniversary of the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas 2014 also marks the 250th anniversary of the Sandy Hook Lighthouse in New Jersey, the oldest standing lighthouse tower in the United States, which was built before the United States was a country and was still part of the British colonies;

Whereas for the past several decades, regional and national groups have formed within the lighthouse preservation community to promote lighthouse heritage through research, education, tourism, and publications;

Whereas despite progress, many lighthouses in the United States remain threatened by erosion, neglect, vandalism, and deterioration by the elements; and

Whereas the many completed, ongoing, or planned private and public efforts to preserve lighthouses demonstrate the public support for those historic structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day'';

(2) encourages lighthouse grounds to be opened to the general public to the extent feasible; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 508—COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 508

Whereas, in 1914, Congress recognized the need for greater assistance and established a reference unit within the Library of Congress to support an informed and independent legislature;

Whereas the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 28 et seq.) transformed the Legislative Reference Service into the Congressional Research Service, expanding its size and analytic capacity;

Whereas the Congressional Research Service is housed within the Library of Congress and benefits from the unparalleled collections of the Library of Congress to complete research and analysis and to disseminate information and materials to assist Congress;

Whereas Congressional Research Service products are the result of collaboration between a diverse workforce consisting of analysts, attorneys, information professionals, and support staff;

Whereas the Congressional Research Service strives to provide accurate and objective assistance to all members and committees at all stages of the legislative process, and in a timely, confidential, and non-partisan manner; and

Whereas the Congressional Research Service provides Congress with analysis and information on legislative and oversight issues in reports, memoranda, seminars, and briefings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service and commends the employees of the Congressional Research Service for their service to Congress and the people of the United States; and

(2) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Librarian of Congress; and

(B) the Director of the Congressional Research Service.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3564. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust

Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3565. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3566. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3567. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3568. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3569. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3564. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10___. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, or bridge that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

SA 3565. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MODIFICATION AND PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE INCENTIVES TO REINVEST FOREIGN EARNINGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REPATRIATION SUBJECT TO 5 PERCENT TAX RATE.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''85.7 percent''.

(2) PERMANENT EXTENSION TO ELECT REPATRIATION.—Subsection (f) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ELECTION.—The taxpayer may elect to apply this section to any taxable year only if made on or before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for such taxable year.''.

(3) REPATRIATION INCLUDES CURRENT AND ACCUMULATED FOREIGN EARNINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 965(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of dividends taken into account under subsection (a) shall not exceed the sum of the current and accumulated earnings and profits described in section 959(c)(3) for the year a deduction is claimed under subsection (a), without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the election year, for all controlled foreign corporations of the United States shareholder.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 965(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (4) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(ii) Section 965(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(iii) Paragraph (3) of section 965(c) of such Code, as redesignated by clause (ii), is amended to read as follows:

''(3) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—All United States shareholders which are members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return under section 1501 shall be treated as one United States shareholder.''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The heading for section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''**TEMPORARY**''.

(B) The table of sections for subpart F of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking ''Temporary dividends'' and inserting ''Dividends''.

(b) TRANSFERS OF REVENUE TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REVENUES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTIONS .—There are hereby appropriated to the Highway Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the revenue derived from the amendments made by section _____(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3566. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MULTI-STATE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES.

(a) LIST.—The Secretary of Transportation (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), in consultation with representative sample of State and local government transportation officials, shall compile a prioritized list of transportation projects, which shall guide the allocation of funding to States for multi-State transportation projects.

(b) CRITERIA.—In compiling the list under subsection (a), the Secretary, in addition to other criteria established by the Secretary, shall rank priorities in descending order, beginning with—

(1) the extent of the positive impact the project will have on 1 or more interstate highways;

(2) whether the project will repair or replace a road or bridge that—

(A) has been determined to be structurally or functionally obsolete; and

(B) poses a risk to public safety;

(3) the extent of the positive impact of the project on interstate commerce, as demonstrated by an examination of economic indicators, including—

(A) the impact of the project on shipping and trucking commerce;

(B) the nexus of the project to other States; and

(C) the availability of alternative routes;

(4) the difference between—

(A) the estimated volume of traffic that uses the road or bridge after the project is completed; and

(B) the volume of traffic that the existing road or bridge was designed to accommodate;

(5) the national significance (rather than the regional significance) of the project; and

(6) the ability of the applicable State or local government to provide additional funding for the project.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a prioritized list of multi-State transportation projects; and

(2) a description of the criteria used to establish the list referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) QUARTERLY UPDATES.—Not less frequently than 4 times each year, the Secretary shall—

(1) update the report submitted pursuant to subsection (c);

(2) transmit a copy of the report to Congress; and

(3) make copy of the report available to the public through the Department of Transportation website.

SA 3567. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 101 the following:

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UH–72 LIGHT UTILITY HELICOPTER HEALTH AND USAGE MONITORING SYSTEM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a health and usage monitoring system for the UH–72 Lakota Light Utility Helicopter (LUH) that provides early warning for failing systems may reduce costly emergency maintenance, improve maintenance schedules, and increase fleet readiness; and

(2) the Department of the Army should consider establishing LUH health and usage monitoring system requirements that comply with Federal Aviation Administration standards for certification and are based on the condition-based maintenance needs of the Army, provided that any decision to proceed with a program of record will be done using full and open competition in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

SA 3568. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

SEC. 151. PLAN FOR MODERNIZATION OR REPLACEMENT OF DIGITAL AVIONIC EQUIPMENT.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment, including use of commercial-off-the-shelf digital avionics equipment, to meet the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of the requirements imposed on Department of Defense aircraft by the FAA transition to the NextGen program, including—

(A) an identification of the type and number of aircraft that the Department will need to upgrade;

(B) a definition of the upgrades needed for such aircraft; and

(C) the schedule required for the Department to make such upgrades in time to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(2) A description of options for—

(A) acquiring new equipment, including—

(i) new procurement; and

(ii) leasing equipment and installation and other services, including the use of public-private partnerships; and

(B) modernizing existing equipment.

(3) An evaluation of the ability of each option to meet future operational requirements and to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(4) Estimated timeline to modernize or replace the digital avionics equipment across the Department of Defense.

(5) Estimated costs of options to modernize or replace the avionics equipment across the Department in order to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

SA 3569. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1069. REPORT ON PHYSICAL SECURITY AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense reviewed security standards at Department of Defense facilities following both the November 2009 shootings at Fort Hood, Texas, and the September 2013 shootings at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, which included an assessment of the ability of the Department to detect, prevent, and respond to future incidents at such facilities.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a summary of the actions taken by the Department of Defense to respond to the recommendations resulting from the reviews of security standards described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) Summary of the recommendations described in paragraph (1).

(B) A description of the actions taken on each recommendation.

(C) An assessment of current and planned physical security capabilities at Department facilities, and their ability to meet Department physical security requirements.

(D) An identification and assessment of known and potential physical security shortfalls at Department facilities.

(E) An assessment of the ability of the Department to eliminate or mitigate shortfalls in physical security at Department facilities, including recommendations on means to increase physical security at such facilities and the funding required to implement such means.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Coal Miners' Struggle for Justice: How Unethical Legal and Medical Practices Stack the Deck Against Black Lung Claimants.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sindey Holcomb of the committee staff on (202) 228–1455.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark up H.R. 2083, Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act; S. 315, Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education, MD–CARE, Amendments of 2013; S. 2154, Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014; S. 531, Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans Act; S. 2405, Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act; S. 2406, Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014; S. 2539, Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014; S. 2511, A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224–5375.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Role of States in Higher Education.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Aissa Canchola of the committee staff on (202) 224–2009.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining Accountability and Corporate Culture in Wake of the GM Recalls.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and

Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Federal Research Portfolio: Capitalizing on Investments in R&D.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Role of Trade and Technology in 21st Century Manufacturing.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Dangerous Passage: Central America in Crisis and the Exodus of Unaccompanied Minors.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without any objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without any objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''More Than 1,000 Preventable Deaths a Day Is Too Many: The Need to Improve Patient Safety.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without any objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without any objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without any objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING U.S. SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 469, S. Res. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 498) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 498) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, July 16, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 488.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 488) designating July 26, 2014, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 488) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 26, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 507.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 507) designating August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 507) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) commemorating the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this Wednesday—July 16, 2014—marks the centennial of the Congressional Research Service, CRS. On this exact date 100 years ago, our oldest legislative support agency was created. But the idea for such an organization to provide objective information and analysis to legislators goes back to the start of our Republic. As Thomas Jefferson said 200 years ago, ''There is, in fact, no subject to which a member of Congress may not have occasion to refer.'' Jefferson's view gained adherents over time, especially at the State level first and then during the progressive era. Two Members of Congress during that early 1900s era—Senator Robert LaFollette and Representative John Nelson, both of Wisconsin—both championed legislation that authorized the Librarian of Congress to establish a legislative reference service composed of ''competent persons to prepare such indexes, digests and compilations of law as may be required for Congress and other official use.'' President Woodrow Wilson signed the legislation—the fiscal year 1915 appropriations bill for the Library of Congress—into law on July 16, 1914. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam established the Legislative Reference Service, LRS, in the Library of Congress by administrative order on July 18, 1914. The reference service's location in the Library of Congress—the library both of Congress and the American people—provided researchers then and now with a treasure trove of books, materials, and collections of various sorts

to answer and address the questions and inquiries that emanate from the legislative branch. The LRS was renamed the CRS in 1970.

Today, the responsibilities and roles of CRS have grown enormously. To meet the hundreds of thousands of requests made annually by Members and staff of the legislative branch, CRS employs over 600 total staff. Among the occupations represented at CRS are reference librarians, lawyers, political scientists, economists, budget analysts, scientists, engineers, and public administrators. The titles of its five interdisciplinary research divisions underscore the wide range of expertise housed in CRS: American Law; Domestic Social Policy; Foreign Affairs, Defense & Trade; Government & Finance; and Resources, Science & Industry. In addition, CRS has a Knowledge Services Group made up of research and information specialists who provide support services to CRS analysts and attorneys. In fiscal year 2013, Members and committees received information and analysis from CRS in more than 636,000 responses that took the form of 67,000 requests for custom analysis and research, 9,000 congressional participations in 350 seminars, and over half a million instances of Web site services.

At the heart of CRS's charter is that it serves both the majority and minority parties and Members of Congress elected as Independents or with a third-party affiliation. This bedrock nonpartisan principle suffuses all of CRS's endeavors, which makes it unlike the many partisan interest groups and ''think tanks'' that populate the Nation's capital. CRS's straightforward mission statement says it all: ''The Congressional Research Service serves the Congress throughout the legislative process by providing comprehensive and reliable legislative research and analysis that are timely, objective, authoritative, and confidential, thereby contributing to an informed national legislature.''

Former Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan said: ''People are entitled to their own opinions, but not their own facts.'' CRS provides the facts. Providing unbiased, objective facts is an invaluable service not just to Congress but to the Nation. In my considered judgment, CRS has served Congress exceptionally well during the past 100 years and I am confident that it will continue to perform at the highest level in the years and decades ahead. No one can fully predict the challenges we will face. But I am confident that the in-depth knowledge and expertise housed in CRS will enable Members of Congress and their staff to better understand and address an increasingly complex array of domestic and global issues. I congratulate CRS and its outstanding and dedicated staff on the occasion of its 100th birthday.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I was honored today to join my colleague, Senator CARDIN, in submitting a resolution to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service, CRS. This is a historic milestone for CRS and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter I recently wrote to Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and Dr. Mary Mazanec, the Director of the Congressional Research Service, be printed the RECORD.

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

JULY 16, 2014.

Hon. JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
Librarian of Congress,
Dr. MARY B. MAZANEC,
Director of the Congressional Research Service.

DEAR DRS. BILLINGTON AND MAZANEC: On behalf of the Joint Committee on the Library and a grateful Congress, I'd like to congratulate you, the dedicated public servants of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), and the entire extended CRS family on this historic 100th Anniversary. You have a great deal to celebrate today at your ''The First Branch: Challenges of Governance in a Global Era'' symposium.

For a century now, CRS professionals have made enormous contributions to our public discourse and provided invaluable expertise to lawmakers challenged with developing legislation and policies to guide our nation in times of increasing complexity and rapid change.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude to all of you and to those legislators, led by Senator Robert M. La Follette and Representative John M. Nelson, who foresaw a need for your skills at the beginning of the 20th Century. As a New Yorker, I'm also proud that the legislation to create CRS was partly inspired by efforts in the Empire State undertaken by the New York State Library in addition to reforms carried out in Wisconsin, the home of Senator La Follette and Representative Nelson.

In 1914, no one could have envisioned the breadth of the challenges that would confront Congress over the following 100 years—issues of war and peace, profound social change and challenge, and revolutionary scientific and technological advancement. Yet through it all, CRS helped Congress make more informed decisions to the benefit of the American people and libraries all over the world.

We may have little idea today what Congress will be facing in the decades to come, but we know beyond any doubt that the Congressional Research Service will be there, providing Congress with the very best information possible on legislative, policy, and oversight matters, every step of the way.

Congratulations on this historic milestone, and we're looking forward to the next 100 years.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCHUMER.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration with oversight of the Congressional Research Service, I offer my congratulations on the occasion of its centennial.

While it began in 1914 as a modest reference service, today it is an organization of nearly 600 analysts, attorneys, information professionals, and support staff with the core mission of providing timely and authoritative research and analysis on legislative issues of interest to Congress.

These highly trained and professional experts are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress in an objective, unbiased, and nonpartisan manner.

Congratulations to the Congressional Research Service for 100 years of excellent service to the Congress.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2631

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2631 is at the desk and due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2631) to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, July 17, through Monday, July 21, Senators REED of Rhode Island and ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 21, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak

therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 849 as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, there will be votes on the confirmation of the following nominations: Carnes, Lawson, and Reddick. We expect rollcall votes on the Carnes nomination and voice votes on the Lawson and Reddick nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 21, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHARLES C. ADAMS, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

MATTHEW VINCENT MASTERSON, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2017, VICE GINEEN BRESSO BEACH, TERM EXPIRED.

CHRISTY A. MCCORMICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2015, VICE DONETTA DAVIDSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CLARENCE ERVIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES L. GABLE

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN L. DANNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL PATRICIA M. ANSLOW
BRIGADIER GENERAL ELIZABETH D. AUSTIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL MATTHEW P. BEEVERS
BRIGADIER GENERAL ERIC C. BUSH
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER E. FOUNTAIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD J. GALLANT
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT A. GRONEWALD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY H. HOLMES
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER T. LORD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHNNY R. MILLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL GLEN E. MOORE
BRIGADIER GENERAL LESTER SIMPSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL REX A. SPITLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROY S. WEBB
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID E. WILMOT
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID C. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK W. PALZER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 1211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. NEAL G. LOIDOLT

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS P. BUMP
COL. MARTA CARCANA
COL. JEFFREY E. IRELAND
COL. ISABELO RIVERA
COL. WALLACE N. TURNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. ULSES

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY S. PAUL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GLENN A. GODDARD

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL GREGREY C. BACON
COLONEL DARYL D. JASCHEN
COLONEL DAVID S. WERNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. HOWELL, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KERRY M. METZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GENE F. PRICE
CAPT. LINNEA J. SOMMERWEDDINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAWN E. CUTLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JONATHAN ACKLEY
THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD
BRADLEY A. AMYS
BRYANT OWEN BAIR
GRAHAM H. BERNSTEIN
DAVID CHARLES BLOMGREN
JOHN H. BONE
ELIJAH FRANCIS BROWN
MARK CLIFFORD BRUEGGER
TANIA C. M. BRYANT
BRIAN CHARLES CALL
SARAH WILLIAMS CARLSON
SARA JOY CARRASCO
RICHARD PIN CHEN
DAVID L. CHEWNING
JONATHAN ROY COMPTON
ELIZABETH ANNA CRANE
JEFFREY ALLAN DAVIS
BERTHA A. DIAZ
EVAN ALLEN EPSTEIN
CHAD THOMAS EVANS
JAVIER A. FARFAN
KENITRA I. FEWELL
ELIZABETH ANNA FITZGERALD
JASON E. GAMMONS
JEFFREY BEVAN GARBER
SEAN THOMAS GARNER
TIMOTHY GOINES
MARK ANDREW GOLDEN
DUSTIN L. GRANT
DAVID R. GROENDYK
JASON H. GUNNELL
GRETHE KRISTINA HAHN
BENJAMIN RUSSELL HENLEY
NATHANIEL GLENN HIMERT
IAN S. HOLZHAUER
ELGIN D. HORNE
DAPHNE LASALLE JACKSON
ISAAC C. KENNEN
WILLIAM JESSE LADUKE
TEAH LAMBRIGHT
JUSTIN PAUL LONERGAN
MARC PHILLIP MALLONE
GEORGE MATHEW
NATHAN H. MAYENSCHEIN
ERIC M. MCCUTCHEN
BRETT RICHARD MILLBURN
JENNIFER DELL MULLINS
MATTHEW JOSHUA NEIL
JOSHUA BRYAN NETTINGA
MIKAL CARL NUHN
ADAM NICHOLAS OLSEN
SALEEM SYED RAZVI
NICKLAUS JAMES REED
KEVIN YAMASHITA REINHOLZ
BRETT A. ROBINSON
MEGAN N. SCHMID
AMY KATE SIAK
THOMAS ANDREW SMITH
JOHN ROBERTS SOKOHL
MEREDITH LAURALINDLE STEER
DUSTIN MARCELLUS TIPLING
NICHOLE MARIE TORRES
KENNETH LEWIS VAUGHT
ANNA ELEANOR VIRDELL
LEAH ECCLES WATSON
BRANT FREDERICK WHIPPLE
JOSHUA CURTIS WILLIAMS
AARON ALLEN WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD EDWARD ALFORD
TAMONA L. BRIGHT
KEVIN D. CATRON
LINDSAY E. CONTOVEROS
ROYAL A. DAVIS
WILLIAM D. DEITCH
JAMES R. DORMAN
SHELLY M. FRANK
LANCE E. FREEMAN
ANDREW D. GILLMAN
PATRICIA A. GRUEN
CHARLES J. HEBNER
JENNIFER C. HOLMES
MATTHEW T. KING
ERIKA E. LYNCH
CHARLTON J. MEGINLEY
ETIENNE J. MISZCZAK
TIAUNDRA D. MONCRIEF
LISA D. MOSELEY
AIRON A. MOTHERSHED
SONDRA BELL NENSALA
GARY MATTHEW OSBORN
BRENT F. OSGOOD
STERLING C. PENDLETON
KEIRA A. POELLET
MICHELLE A. QUITUGUA
DREW G. ROBERTS
DAVID F.X. ROUTHIER
LEE F. SANDERSON
MATTHEW G. SCHWARTZ
DAMON P. SCOTT
MULGHETTA A. SIUM
DARRIN M. SKOUSEN
TIFFANY M. WAGNER
PAUL E. WELLING
ROBERT C. WILDER
DYLAN B. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM J. ANNEXSTAD

THOMAS L. CLUFF, JR.
GAIL E. CRAWFORD
ANDREA M. DECAMARA
PATRICK J. DOLAN
PATRICK W. FRANZESE
KYLE W. GREEN
BRANDON L. HART
JAMES H. KENNEDY III
JAMES E. KEY III
AMY L. MOMBER
KATHERINE E. OLER
THOMAS M. RODRIGUES
ELIZABETH L. SCHUCHSGOPAUL
MICHAEL W. TAYLOR
OWEN W. TULLOS
JEREMY S. WEBER
DAVID J. WESTERN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ALEKSANDR BARON
DMITRY BARON
TED M. BEAUCHAMP
IVETTE BLANCOPADILLA
JAROM R. BURBANK
TYLER R. BURNINGHAM
JONATHAN D. CASO
SACHIYO K. CHAMBERS
HYUNSEOK C. CHI
VU H. DO
KATIE A. EGBERT
KONRAD D. FERGUSON
ANDREW A. GUTIERREZ
MITCHELL J. HERNANDEZ
SERGIO HERNANDEZ
KENNETH M. HUSSEY
HANANE JAMGHILI
JUSTIN JARISCH
MICHAEL L. JOHNSON
KEVIN C. JOHNSTUN
JAE H. KIM
JASON KIM
JEREMY J. KOPPENHAVER
JOHN C. LAKE, JR.
PHILLIP O. LANCE
JONATHAN Y. LEE
TIFFANY C. LOVELACE
TROY K. LUNDELL
STEVEN K. MARK
ANDRES M. MENDOZA
MORGAN K. MONCAYO
SERGIO MUNOZ
FRANCIS S. NAHM
JENNA M. NAKANISHI
JESSE B. NORRIS
MEGHAN K. OCONNELL
SONNY R. PORTER
SAMUEL PYO
DONALD G. RICE
CORY D. RICHARDS
GIOVANNI A. SAFDARI
BRIAN C. SLIGHLY
RYAN D. SWISS
ISAO F. TAKII
SHANI O. THOMPSON
JORGE E. VALDES
RODGER I. VOLTIN
ERIK P. WATZ
KYLE A. WILSON
JOHN D. WISE
RYAN D. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

CARLO J. ALPHONSO
RYAN J. ALTENBURG
ROHUL AMIN
WILLIAM C. ARNETT
MICHAEL I. ARNOLD
MARIA C. ARTIGAS
JEFFERY C. ASHBURN
WESLEY L. BABER
JONATHAN D. BAILEY
JOSHUA R. BAKER
BRAD R. BALLARD
WAGNER BAPTISTE
ANTHONY M. BARCIA
HARRISON B. BAUCOM
ANDREW B. BEEGHLY
JENNIFER A. BENINCASA
SCOTT E. BEVANS
HUSAIN M. BHARMAL
NATHAN J. BORDEN
CHAD P. BOUCHARD
JAMES D. BOWSHER
DANIEL B. BRILLHART
MICHAEL V. BROWN
PATRICK J. BROWN
SIDNEY D. BRUCE
HEATHER J. BURCH
PAMELA L. BURGESS
DANIELLE E. CAFASSO
BARRETT H. CAMPBELL
ELIZABETH A. CAMPBELL
RONALD J. CARAS
TERRI L. CARLSON
STEPHEN M. CARROLL
JOSEPH D. CARUSO
BRIAN S. CHEN
RYAN M. CHIARELLA
DANIEL P. CHILES
JOSEPH S. CHRISTIANSEN
SOYEUN CHU
JESSIKA S. CHUMAK
JONATHAN D. CLAASSEN
STEPHANIE L. CLAASSEN
PAUL A. CLARK
JOHN P. CODY
SARAH S. COLE
JOANIE M. COLUMBIA
JAY B. COOK
JENNIFER A. COOPER
JUSTIN L. COSTA
JENNIFER L. CREAMER
SCOTT E. CUNNINGHAM
SHAUNETTE DAVEY
BENJAMIN T. DAXON
ERIC C. DELACRUZ
HEATHER D. DELUCA
BRADLEY A. DENGLER
JEANNIE S. DIAS
CHRISTOPHER M. DIPIRO
JENNIFER S. DOMINGO
MICHAEL J. DONOFRIO
KEVIN J. DOWNING
NICHOLAS D. P. DRAKOS
JASON R. DUTTON
JAMES S. EBERTOWSKI
JUSTIN C. EISENMAN
DAVID M. EVANS
AARON R. FARMER
JAMES S. FARRELL
MICHAEL G. FAZIO
DAMON A. FORBES
SHANNON N. FOSTER
BRIAN C. FULLER
JESSE V. GABRIEL
WENDRA J. GALFAND
JOSEPH W. GALVIN
EDWIN GANDIA
ALISSA R. GARCIA
JADE V. GAREEDEXTER
ANNELIESE GERMAIN
LAUREN M. GIULITTO
GEOFFREY P. GLEBUS
JEREMY D. GOINS
GENS P. GOODMAN
COLIN M. GRANT
ROLAND H. GREEN
BRENDAN D. GRIFFIS
RHIANON M. GROOM
CHRISTOPHER J. HAGEN
GREGORY C. HAHN
PAUL S. HAHN
DIANE F. HALE
ROBERT D. HALES
PATRICK S. HALL
SAMUEL J. HAN
JAMES A. HARRIS
MONIQUE O. HASSAN
EMILY N. HATHAWAY
ELISABETH M. HESSE
RICHARD W. HILLIARD, JR.
SHANA L. HIRCHERT
GALE J. HOBSON
ANDREW J. HOLDAWAY
SAMUEL L. HOLMES
STEVEN S. HONG
KRISTOPHER G. HOOTEN
MOLLY D. HOUSE
JEFFERSON T. HUNT
AARON M. JACKSON
CATHERINE JACOB
MARK D. JEFFORDS
CHRISTOPHER K. JENSEN
TODD E. JENSEN
ANTHONY W. JONES
CHRISTINA L. JONES
JAMES P. JONES
JOSEPH S. JONES
KYLE R. JUDKINS
MATTHEW C. KASPRENSKI
CHRISTOPHER D. KENNY
MARY E. KERN
SEAN Q. KERN
ROBERT G. KIRTLEY
KRISTEN E. KOENIG
KRISTIN D. KREIDER
CHAD A. KRUEGER
KEVIN P. KRUL
KELLY L. LANGAN
JUSTIN J. LAPOLLO
GARY L. LEGAULT
KEITH P. LEITZEN
ADAM B. LEWIS
DAVID L. LINDEMANN
THERESA M. LORKOWSKI
JOSEPH G. LOUDEN
DAVID R. LOWERY
MARESA LUGO
CORY A. LUNDBERG
RYAN J. MACDONALD
HOWARD W. MACLENNAN
JASON J. MADEY
JOHN R. MAGERA
CARLOS G. MALAVEMARRERO
MONICA J. S. MANN
DANIEL J. MARINO
HEATHER M. MASCIO
CHRISTOPHER R. MATTSON
CALEB M. MAY
KASEY J. MAYCLIN
KRISTA Z. L. MCBAYNE
JILL A. MCCAULLEY
DANIEL P. MCGUIRE
BRANDON W. MCNALLY
DEREK P. MCVAY
CODY D. MEAD
JEFFERY M. MEADOWS
CRAIG D. MEGGITT
ARTHUR R. MIELKE
CHRISTOPHER J. MIEREK
JESS R. MILLER
KYONG S. MIN
MELANIE A. S. MINALGA
RAUL A. MIRZA
HEATHER S. MITCHELL
EDWIN E. MORALES
MACKENZIE K. MORGAN
RYAN P. MORTON
COREY M. MOSSOP
AMY J. MOYER
HAPU T. MSONDA
CHRISTOPHER J. MULDER
BECKY T. MULDOON
ERICA L. MURRAY
MATTHEW A. NAPIERALA
DANIEL W. NELSON
JAMES H. NELSON
PATRICIA C. NELSON
STEPHANIE B. W. NG
LONG T. NGUYENDO
MELODY R. NOLAN
MICHAEL J. NORTON
YULIYA A. OGAI
CHRISTINA S. OHARA
STEPHEN M. OVERHOLSER
MATTHEW H. PARK
SAMIT A. PATEL
RACHAEL A. PAZ
BRET K. PEARCE
ERIKA PETRIK
SARAH K. PETTEYS
ELIZABETH M. POLFER
CHRISTOPHER R. PORTA
MATTHEW T. PORTER
TASHA R. POWELL
AARON W. PUMERANTZ
ELIZABETH A. PUNTENNEY
JOHN G. QUILES
DANIEL P. RABOIN
CIARA N. RAKESTRAW
SAMUEL A. RALSTON
NESTOR R. RAMOS
SEAN S. RAY
DAVID E. REECE
CHRISTOPHER J. RENAUD
CHRISTINA M. RIOJAS
PRESTON W. ROBERTS
JACQUELINE F. ROSENTHAL
JENNIFER L. ROWLAND
DOUGLAS S. RUHL
TITUS J. RUND
DANIEL H. RUSSELL
ABRAHAM E. SABERSKY
JENNIFER M. SABINO
SAW K. SAN
ADAM R. SASSO
KEVIN E. SCHLICKSUP
MARK N. SCHWENDIMAN
JOSHUA A. SCOTT
WITZARD SEIDE
JOSE A. SERRANO
BRIAN T. SHAHAN
REBECCA L. G. SHERIDAN
CREIGHTON E. SHUTE
ERIC R. SIGMON
JOSHUA R. SIMMONS
ABHAY A. SINGH
NICKLESH N. SINGH
LEIGHANNE L. SLACK
ASHLEY E. SMITH
CARIN J. SMITH
MICHAEL P. SMITH
BRIAN L. SNYDER
PRESTON J. SPARKS
RYAN W. SPEIR
GREGORY M. SPROWL
ANDREW R. STEIN
BRIAN J. STOUT
AMY N. STRATTON
TYLER E. STRATTON
STEPHEN B. STRINGHAM
CANDACE R. M. TALCOTT
PAMELA S. TIPLER
JOSEPH J. TRIPLET
ADAM M. TRITSCH
DAVID T. UM
CHARLES J. USSERY
VANEESHA VALLABHPATEL
DAVID W. VANWYCK
JAVIER M. VAZQUEZORTIZ
LUIS X. VELEZCOLON
HUMBERTO G. VILLARREAL
DIANA L. VILLAZANAKRETZER
KELLEY A. VONELTEN
TIMOTHY J. VREELAND

VANYA D. WAGLER
KEVIN B. WALDREP
AVERY S. WALKER
JESSICA L. WALSH
RYAN M. WALSH
KYLE C. WARD
WENDY S. WARREN
EZELLA N. WASHINGTON
BRIT C. D. WATERS
ROBERT E. WATTS
DEWAYNE L. WEAVER
DOUGLAS R. WEBER
JENNIFER M. WELTY
DAVID J. WILSON
WILLIAM R. WILSON, JR.
JONATHAN R. WOOD
EKAPHOL WOODEN
JINSONG WU
CHRISTOPHER G. YHEULON
JORDAN E. YOKLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DESIREE S. DIRIGE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOHN I. ACTKINSON
IAN P. ADAMS
ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON
ALLEN M. AGOR
BRANDON S. ALAMO
MATTHEW R. ALBRIGHT
TRAVIS M. ALEXANDER
NICHOLAS E. ALFANO
EDDIE C. ALLEN
JOHN R. ALLEN
EMILY C. ALLERT
MIKAEL M. ALLERT
TRAVIS S. AMERINE
ANGELA C. ANDERSON
ROBERT W. ANDERSON IV
TRAVIS S. ANDERSON
GIEORAG M. ANDREWS
ALEXANDER S. ANGELO
KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI
AARON S. ARKY
SERGIO A. ARMAS, JR.
ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG
ROBERT H. ARNDT III
ALBERT E. ARNOLD IV
ROBERT J. BAGLEY
MICHAEL BAILEY
KATHLEEN R. BALL
COREY D. BARKSDALE
ROBERT C. BARNETT
DAVID H. BARNHILL
JESSICA M. BARRIENTOS
CHARLES S. BARRS III
JOHN G. BARRY
CHAD D. BARTKUS
MICHAEL J. BARTOLF
JEREMY D. BARTOWITZ
WILLIAM T. BAUER
MATTHEW E. BAYER
DAVID R. BEAM
JOHN M. BEAR
BENJAMIN M. BEARMAN
CLAYTON C. BEAS
JAMES R. BEATY
DIANA L. BEAUFORD
JOHN P. BECKER
MATTHEW A. BECKER
TIMOTHY J. BEEBE
MICHAEL J. BEER
JUSTIN J. BENCH
CHRISTOPHER L. BENTON
AARON G. BERGER
MARK A. BERGLUND
DANIEL J. BERRY
MASON W. BERRY
MATTHEW T. BERRY
ALEXA J. BESTOSO
DYLAN C. BEYER
BRENDA W. BEZNOSKA
TIMOTHY W. BIERBACH
RYAN L. BIRKELBACH
ZACHARY A. BITTNER
JONATHAN M. BLACK
CYNTHIA BLACKMAN
ROBERT C. BLACKWOOD
GARTH J. BLAKELY
CHRISTOPHER H. BLAND
CHRISTIAN W. BLASY
MARK A. BLASZCZYK
CARL R. BLAZEK
NIKOLAUS J. BOCHETTE
THOMAS R. BOCK
DUSTIN L. BOEDING
BRETT A. BOOTHE
ROBERT H. BOWER
MATTHEW D. BOYCE
MARSHALL T. BOYD
SAMUEL C. BOYD
EDWARD H. BOYDSTON
JASON M. BRADLEY
RICHARD T. BRANNEN
JEREMY D. BRAUN
DOUGLAS A. BRAYTON
WALTER R. BRINKLEY, JR.
KYLE T. BRIZAN
JOSHUA L. BROADBENT
RYAN P. BRODERICK
MATTHEW P. BROUILLARD
ANDREW M. BROWN
DAVID M. BROWN
LUKE A. BROWN
RYAN A. BROWN
NATHAN J. BROWNE
AMANDA G. BROWNING
ADAM L. BRYAN
GRANT T. BRYAN
JOSEPH BUBULKA
RALPH T. BUCKLES
MICHAEL J. BUCKLEY
PETER M. BUGLER
WILLIAM W. BUHL
JAMES A. BURKETT III
BENJAMIN J. BURNHAM
CLINTON F. BURR
STEVEN M. BURROWS
ADAM R. BUSH
ZACHARY D. BUTALA
ADAM R. CADOVIUS
ADAM M. CALHOUN
JOSHUA C. CALHOUN
KYLE F. CALTON
ALBERT F. CALUAG
LEONARD CALVERT IV
TIMOTHY L. CAMPBELL
DAVID B. CANNADY
BENJAMIN R. CANTU
BENJAMIN C. CARLSON
AIDAN CARRIGG
WILLIAM J. CARROLL
CHRISTOPHER B. CARSON
GRANT F. CARTER
KEVIN J. CARTER
MARIO G. CASTELLANOS
MICHAEL O. CASTILLO
AARON J. CHANDLER
MATTHEW E. CHANG
JAMES M. CHARAPICH
NATHANIEL J. CHASE
MICHAEL R. CHESNUT
JEFFREY T. CHEWNING
SCOTT F. CHIRGWIN
SVEN R. CHRISMAN
ADAM K. CHRISTENSEN
CLINTON J. CHRISTOFK
JONATHAN D. CIRILLO
ROBERT A. CIZEK
JOHN P. CLARK
MATTHEW R. CLARK
MICHAEL R. CLEES
SCOTT W. CLEVELAND
CHRISTOPHER W. CLEVENGER
JOSEPH M. CLUNIE
JASON E. COATES
BRANDON J. COBB
ADAM COHEN
JORDAN M. COHEN
MATTHEW D. COLLINSWORTH
RANDY S. CONANT
BRIAN X. CONLAN
JASON A. CONLEY
ERIN N. CONNOR
BRADLEY M. CONROY
JOHN M. COOMBS
CHARLES T. COOPER
SEAN N. COOPER
WILLIAM R. COOPER
PETER E. CORNETT
LESLIE E. CORNWALL, JR.
LAUREN B. COSGRAVE
WILLIAM G. COULTER
BENJAMEN L. COVERT
SHAUN A. COX
KELLY N. CRAFT
FREDERICK D. CRAYTON
JASON C. CREWS
MATTHEW T. CRONAUER
ANDREW C. CROUSE
EDWARD L. CRUZMATOS
JEFFREY K. CUMMINGS
CHARLES M. CUNNINGHAM II
GABRIELLE D. CUNNINGHAM
LUCIAN J. CZARNECKI II
JOSHUA W. DAFFRON
RYAN S. DAHLMAN
JASON H. DAO
DAVID L. DAUPHINAIS
BENJAMIN S. DAVIDSON
AARON B. DAVIS
KEVIN J. DAVIS
CONSTANCIA A. DEAN
MATTHEW B. DEBAUN
JOHN P. DEBBINK
BRANT N. DEBOER
MATTHEW H. DECOITO
CHRISTOPHER T. DELAGRANGE
LUCAS D. DENNISON
CHRISTOPHER M. DESCOVICH
GREGORY L. DESCOVICH
JAMES P. DEWITT
MATTHEW T. DIEDERICH
GRAIG T. DIEFENDERFER
THOMAS E. DIGAN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER C. DIKE
RYAN F. DILLON
MICHAEL F. DIMMITT
EMIL D. DINNOCENZO
SETH DINOLA
THOMAS T. DIXON
DANIEL B. DOLAN
MANUEL J. DOMINGUEZ
MATTHEW S. DOMINICK
CONOR P. DONAHUE
JAMES J. DONCHEZ
KEVIN M. DORE
RICHARD A. DORSEY II
SEAN W. DOUGHERTY
CAMERON A. DOUGLAS
RYAN R. DOWNING
JAMES E. DRENNAN
JOSEPH M. DUGAN
JARRETT P. DUNN
PATRICK M. DURNIN
JAMES W. DUVALL
FRANCIS E. ECLEVIA, JR.
JOHN H. EDWARDS
LUCAS R. EDWARDS
BRANDON S. ELLIOTT
NICHOLAS D. ELLIOTT
ERIN L. ELLIOTTCARRICO
CARL A. ELLSWORTH, JR.
EVERETTE T. ERVIN
HENRY P. ESHENOUR
FREDERICK K. ESPY
ERIC M. ETHERTON
RIAN Q. EVERETT
BRADLEY W. FAIRFAX
ROBERT S. FAIRLIE
JEFFREY C. FALLAT
CHARLES R. FARLOW III
BILLIE J. FARRELL
DAVID E. FARRELL
LUKE P. FARRELL
JACQUELYN M. FELBER
MICHAEL R. FELBER
JESS B. FELDON
JACOB D. FERRARI
LEE R. FIKE
SEAN D. FINNER
KELLY J. FITZPATRICK
JASON A. FLANAGAN
CHRISTIANA M. FLOECK
CHRISTOPHER D. FLORES
PETER C. FLYNN
WARREN H. FOGLER
NICKOLAS R. FORAN
ALEXA O. FORSYTH
JOSEPH M. FOSTER
LANDON B. FOSTER
TIMOTHY A. FOX
ALEXANDER J. FRANZ
DANIEL R. FREE
WINDSOR S. H. FRINELL
JEFFREY R. FROST
CAMERON L. FULRATH
RITARSHA Y. FURQAN
AARON J. GALL
NICHOLAS J. GALL
BRYAN M. GALLANT
ROWDY A. GARCIA
JEFFREY A. GARDNER
SCOTT A. GARLINGTON
JONATHAN R. GARNER
PHILIP M. GARROW
BRANDON B. GASSER
SHAFER B. GASTON
KENT A. GEBICKE
BENJAMIN C. GEIB
TOMMY J. GETTY
ZACHARY J. GIBBONS
WILLIAM A. GIBSON
BRANDON R. GILESSUMMERS
GRAHAM C. GILL
MEGAN H. GILL
ROBERT A. GILL
ROBERT J. GILLIS, JR.
BENJAMIN J. GLASER
CARL R. GLASS
JOHN M. GLEASON
DEREK M. GOEBEL
JUSTIN L. GOLSON
ANGELA D. GONZALES
JOSHUA P. GOODIN
JASON A. GORDAN
JAMES J. GORMLEY III
IAN W. GORSKI
ERICH E. GRAWUNDER
DARBY R. GRAY
JOHN E. GRAY
JAMES N. GROSE
JUSTIN R. GROVER
JEFFREY M. GRZEBIN
LEIF E. GUNDERSON
ERIK H. GUSTAFSON
ALEJANDRO L. GUTIERREZ
CHRISTIAN X. GUTIERREZ
SOPHIA M. HABERMAN
DOUGLAS G. HAGENBUCH
STEPHEN L. HAGGARD
JAMES H. HAISLOP
JAMES A. HALL
STACEY L. HALL
STEVEN A. HALLE
ERIK L. HALVORSON

JOSEPH S. HAMILTON
JUSTIN C. HAMILTON
JAMES T. HANNIFY
JUSTIN R. HARDY
NICHOLAS J. HARGRAVES
HENRY D. HARGROVE
DANIEL W. HARKINS, JR.
NATHAN A. HARRELL
KEVIN M. HARRINGTON
RYAN N. HARRIS
TRAVIS J. HARTMAN
NATHAN L. HARVEY
STEFANIE J. HASEMAN
KARL HASSENFRATZ
CHRISTOPHER S. HATHAWAY
JOSHUA R. HATTERY
JOSHUA A. HAUSBACH
JOHN E. HEDRICK
CONOR L. HEELY
JOSHUA B. HEISLER
ADAM R. HELLER
BENJAMIN N. HERRING
GRIFFIN HETRICK
JOSEPH A. HEYNE
LAWRENCE HEYWORTH IV
KYLE R. HICKMAN
DAVID P. HICKS
JONATHAN T. HINES
MARC W. HINES
KYLE W. HISCOCK
JOSHUA J. HODGE
NICHOLAS C. HODGE
ROBERT H. HODGES, JR.
NICHOLAS A. HOFFMANN
JEFFREY R. HOGAN
JEREMY D. HOLCOMB
MATTHEW P. HOLLADAY
CHRISTOPHER D. HOLLAND
DANIEL K. HOLLINGSHEAD
BRADLEY C. HOLMES
DEVIN M. HOLMES
RICHARD J. HOLT
JOHN E. HOLTHAUS
BENJAMIN J. HORN
GARETT T. HOUSTON
WILLIAM J. HOWEY III
MICHAEL J. HUBER
SCOTT T. HUCHTON
CLAYTON J. HUGHEY
BRIAN A. HUMPHREYS
CHRISTINA L. HUMPHRIES
ERIC W. HUNG
JAMES P. HUNT
MICHAEL A. HURBAN
DAVID T. HURST
DREW A. HUSTON
LUKE J. HUSTON
IAN P. HUTTER
KATHERINE A. HUTTER
JOSEPH A. HYDE
KENJI IGAWA
LEWIS S. IM
LUKE H. I. IM
PATRICK J. IMHOFF
ELY O. INFANTE
ISAIABENETTE E. INFANTE
KENNETH C. INGLE
CAMERON A. INGRAM
ROBERT B. INMAN
ROBERT D. IRELAND
BRIAN M. IRISH
JERRY W. IRONS
JAMES J. IRRGANG, JR.
JUSTIN E. IVANCIC
JOHN C. IVEY
MATTHEW J. IWANCZUK
DOMINIQUE A. JACKSON
JOHN R. JACKSON
MICHAEL JACKSON
ALLEN W. JACOB
JOEL W. JACOBS
CARL D. JAPPERT
TIMOTHY N. JENSEN
ALLAN JESPERSEN
JOSEPH G. JINDRICH
BJORN A. JOHNSON
BRETT P. JOHNSON
KEITH A. JOHNSON
LAUREN M. JOHNSON
MATTHEW P. JOHNSON, JR.
PHILLIP C. JOLLEY
BRANDON K. JONES
JARAD T. JONES
KEVIN A. JONES
PHILLIP J. JONES
RUSSELL W. JONES
WILLIAM P. JONES
KACEE L. JOSSIS
KRISTOFER W. KALSTAD
BRAD W. KASENBERG
THERESA L. KAYLOR
JOHN W. KEEFE
MATTHEW T. KEEFE
CHRISTOPHER J. KEEN
CHRISTOPHER J. KEITHLEY
TROY L. KELLY
WILLIAM R. KELLY
LUKE E. KELVINGTON
MICHAEL L. KENDEL
HENRY J. KENNEDY
KEVIN J. KENNEDY
WESLEY G. KENNERLY
PAUL M. KEPNER
JAMES H. KEPPER IV
KRISTEN M. KERNS
JOSHUA M. KERSTING
MICHAEL W. KESSLER
SAMEER KHANNA
SCOTT O. KILGORE
LUCIAN D. KINS
DAVID E. KISER
LEANDRA N. KISSINGER
REED A. KITCHEN
RYAN J. KLAMPER
KEITH F. KLOSTERMAN
BRYAN J. KNICK
MICHAEL A. KNICKERBOCKER
NICHOLAS J. KOETTER
LUCAS R. KORAN
MICHAEL J. KOS
JASON N. KRAHNKE
DOMINIC J. KRAMER
BRYAN W. KRONCKE
MARK K. KROZEL
SETH R. KRUEGER
DANIEL L. KURATKO
GAIL A. LAMPING
ANDREW A. LAMSON
NICKOLAS LANCASTER
GEORGE A. LANE
NATHAN J. LASSAS
STEPHANIE E. LATHAM
AARON J. LEE
DAVID J. LEISENRING
BRANDON S. LENHART
CLIFTON G. LENNON
RANDALL J. LESLIE
TROY A. LEVERON
CHARLES A. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER J. LEWIS
CALEB A. LINDH
SCOTT D. LIPPINCOTT
CARNE M. LIVINGSTON
ALFRED W. LONG, JR.
WILLIS M. LONG
JOSEPH O. LOPICCOLO
JUNIOR C. LORAH
CORRY W. LOUGEE
STEPHEN C. LOVELACE
ROBERT A. LOW
JOHN J. LOWERY
MICHAEL R. LUEBKERT
RALPH P. LUFKIN
KATIE J. LUNSER
MAXCY C. LYNN III
BLAKE A. LYON
ANTHONY D. MACALUSO
JARAD W. MAHANNA
DAVID D. MAHONEY
PATRICK T. MAHONEY
PAUL J. MAHONEY
KERRY M. MAJOR
ZUBIN J. MAJOR
WILLIAM G. MANGAN
LUDWIG MANN III
RYAN B. MANN
MATTHEW P. MAPLES
MICHAEL C. MARSH
BENJAMIN L. MARTINEZ
NATHAN W. MARTINEZ
JAMES G. MASSIE III
JORDAN A. MAYO
KRISTOPHER M. MCABEE
FRANK A. MCBRIDE
CASEY D. MCCAIN
JARED B. MCCALEB
PATRICK A. MCCARTHY
KEVIN K. MCCLELLAN
JOHN P. MCCRAY
CHRISTOPHER J. MCDONALD
SEAN R. MCELHANNON
ROBERT P. MCFALL
JASON R. MCKAY
KENT M. MCLAUGHLIN
JAMES R. MCMILLAN III
SEAN E. MCMULLEN
KYLE S. MCVAY
JEREMY C. MEDLIN
JON F. MEGAHY
KRISTINA N. MELENDEZ
CHRISTOPHER J. MERGEN
SEAN M. MERRITT
DAVID S. MICELI
NATHANIEL D. MICHAEL
DREW R. MICKLETHWAIT
JUSTIN L. MIDDLEBROOK
ADAM S. MILLER
MICHAEL J. MILLER
TRAVIS W. MILLER
SAMUEL C. MILLS
ELIJAH MOJICA
DOMENICO MONACO
BRANDON R. MONAGHAN
JAMES J. MOORE
RYAN S. MOORE
CHRISTOPHER C. MORAN
MICHAEL G. MORAN II
DOUGLAS M. MOREA
MARCUS V. MORELAND
LAWRENCE A. MORIARITY
JOHN D. MORRIS IV
KENNETH E. MORRIS
THOMAS J. MORRIS
DANIEL P. MORRISON
BRIAN M. MOWRY
LIAM F. MULCAHY
SCOTTY L. MURPHY
KARL N. MURRAY
BRAD W. MUSKOPF
SHAWN M. NAVINSKEY
JONATHAN D. NEW
MITCHELL A. NEWTON
DONALD NICHOLS, JR.
JUSTIN A. NIXON
DAVID L. NOBLES, JR.
MACK T. NOLEN, JR.
JONATHAN I. NORRIS
WILL A. NUSE
DAVIN C. OBRIEN
KYLE N. ODONOHOE
DAVID A. OECHSLEIN
KWAME K. OFORI
LUKE D. OLINGER
ANTHONY OLIPHANT
CHRISTIAN L. OLSEN
SAMANTHA A. ONEIL
SEAN T. ONEILL
BENJAMIN S. ORLOFF
FRANK J. ORNELAS II
DANIEL L. OSBOURN
MATTHEW J. OSTRYE
KENNETH C. PACKARD
JOHN J. PARMA
DANIEL C. PATRICK
NATHAN J. PECK
DANIEL PEEL
FELIX PEREZ
IGNACIO S. PEREZ
ROBERT I. PESIK
DANIEL J. PETERS
CAROLYN K. PETERSON
KORY S. PETERSON
DENNIS R. PHILLIPS
JONATHAN P. PHILLIPS
CHRISTOPHER L. PICKEN
RYAN D. PIERCE
RYAN Z. PINEDA
JEFFREY R. PINKERTON
NICHOLAS R. PINKSTON
RONALD M. PIRAMIDE
ANDREW W. PITTMAN
ANTHONY M. PIUNNO III
ALEXANDER S. PLUMER
MARK K. POBLETE
CHRISTOPHER L. POLNASZEK
CHRISTOPHER P. POLSON
JOSEPH W. POPE
MICAH A. W. PORTER
DANA R. POTAK
JARED D. POWELL
SETH K. POWELL
TRAVIS B. POWELL
EDMUND J. POYNTON
CHRISTOPHER N. PRATT
MATTHEW G. PRATT
COLIN E. PREMDAS
JOSEPH F. PRESTON
JOHN E. PRITCHETT
SARA E. PULLIAM
SEAN E. PURDY
CHRISTOPHER W. PUTRE
NICHOLAS R. QUIHUIS
JOHNNY M. QUILENDERINO
LUKE RADLOWSKI
LIDA P. RAFFEL
ROBERT T. RAGON
TREVIS L. RAINEY
EMORY A. RANK
JEFFREY W. RANSOM
RICHARD A. RASCO
KEVIN M. RAY
TRAVIS J. REAM
JOSEPH F. REARDON
TIMOTHY L. REEDER
JUSTIN D. REEVES
ELAINE D. REID
CURTIS A. REISS
JERARDO J. REYNA
JEREMY B. REYNARD
ERIK S. REYNOLDS
BRANDON L. RICE
PATRICK M. RICE
JASON M. RICHTER
KERRY N. RICKERT
WILLIAM M. RIETVELD
MATTHEW F. RIGLER
TIMOTHY M. RIGLER
MICHAEL P. RILEY
SUZANNE A. RITTER
CHRISTIAN A. RIVERA
NICHOLAS A. ROA
DOUGLAS A. ROBB
TAD J. ROBBINS
DWIGHT D. ROBERTS
JEFFREY R. ROBERTS, JR.
JOHN N. ROBERTS
THOMAS M. ROBERTS
JEREMY D. ROBERTSON
WILLIAM J. ROBESCH
AARON A. ROBINSON
BRENT K. ROBINSON
DAVID A. ROBINSON
MARY H. ROBINSON
CHRISTOPHER W. ROBISON
ALAN M. ROCHE
TIMOTHY W. ROCHHOLZ

MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ
CHRISTOPHER J. ROGERS
JUSTIN A. ROGERS
JASON R. ROGGE
RUSSELL M. ROHRING
ERIC K. ROLFS
PATRICK K. ROLLO
DANIEL C. ROLNICK
NIKOLAS G. RONGERS
CHAD S. RORSTROM
DANIEL E. ROSBOROUGH
CHRISTOPHER W. ROSE
ELI J. ROSENBERGER
RICHARD C. ROSENBUSCH
ADRIENNE L. ROSETI
BRIAN A. ROSS
JOHN H. ROSS
ARON M. ROTKLEIN
CAREY D. ROUSE
KARL K. ROYSTON
ANDREW T. RUCKER
NICHOLAS A. RUEDA
THADDEUS RUSINEK
JOSEPH A. RUSSO
CRAIG T. RYAN
NICHOLAS W. RYAN
ERIC M. RYZIW
SETH D. SAALFELD
JOSEPH H. SANDOVAL
JAMES R. SANTYMIRE
CRYSTAL L. SARGENT
ANDREW D. SCHAAF
MARK M. SCHAFF
BLADE A. SCHALLENBERGER
ZACHARY P. SCHEETZ
BENJAMIN A. SCHEIDEMAN
TIMOTHY R. SCHEIDLER
DAVID M. SCHERR
NATHAN D. SCHILLING
JOSEPH R. SCHIPPERT
RORY J. SCHNEIDER
NICHOLAS J. SCHNETTLER
JASON A. SCHRIMP
ADAM A. SCHROETER
AARON D. SCHUTTE
ERIC M. SCHWAB
STEVEN R. SCHWARZER
JONATHAN P. SCOBO
VANCE D. SCOTT
KAI C. SEGLEM
EDWIN S. SELLERS
MATTHEW L. SEVIER
KEVIN P. SHANNON
MATTHEW S. SHAW
JOHNATHAN E. SHEATER
JASON D. SHELL
DANIAL L. SHERMAN
ANTONIA K. SHEY
RICHARD P. SHIELS
JACK L. SHIS
JAMES E. SHULER
SCOTT J. SIDES
MICHAEL J. SIEDSMA
GREGORY T. SIEGERT
JACKSON M. SIEGLINGER
TYSON K. SILENGO
JASON S. SILTMANN
MICHAEL J. SIMMONS
BRETT A. SIMPSON
JOSEPH B. SIMS
RICHARD W. SKINNELL
GABRIEL M. SLATER
ADAM L. SLONE
RICHARD D. SLYE
ROBERT F. SMAIL, JR.
GLENN J. SMITH
GREGORY L. SMITH
JOHANNES SMITH
JONATHAN D. SMITH
JOSHUA D. SMITH
JUSTIN B. SMITH
KELLEN L. SMITH
JOSEPH P. SNELGROVE
PARINA SOMNHOT
JAVED P. SONDHI
DIRK C. SONNENBERG
CHARLES N. SOUTHARD
CHRISTOPHER J. SPEICHER
JASON W. SPRAY
IAN P. SPRENGER
RANDY M. STACK
DAVID L. STANFORD, JR.
JOHN T. STANLEY
JOSHUA C. STARR
STEVEN P. STASHWICK
PHILLIP A. STASO
DAVID T. STAUBIN
JAMES A. STEELE
JEREMY R. STEFFEN
ADAM M. STEIN
BENJAMIN F. STEIN
STEVEN L. STEINMETZ
MATTHEW R. STENDER
MICHAEL STENGEL
JONATHAN R. STEPHENS
GABRIEL T. STEVENS
TIMOTHY S. STEVENS
MARK P. STINES
ROBERT P. STOCHEL
JEFFREY W. STODOLA
MIRCEA D. STOICA
JEFFREY C. STORER
KALE B. STREETER
JASON M. STROBEL
DAVID R. STROMAN, JR.
NATHAN C. STUHLMACHER
JIMMY J. SUH
JAMES F. SULLIVAN IV
MICHAEL C. SULLIVAN
MARK T. SUMMERLIN
MARK A. SWARTZ
THAD D. TASSO
KEITH J. TATE
DAVID L. TAYLOR
JONATHAN A. TAYLOR
MARK A. TEDROW
DAVID R. TERRY
ANDREW M. THOM
BRADLEY R. THOMPSON
CASEY S. THOMPSON
MATTHEW G. THOMPSON
TREVOR C. THOMPSON
GALEN M. THORP
REEVES THURMAN
FREEMAN B. TIDABACK
JONATHAN D. TIGHE
DAVID K. TIREY
FRANCISCO TOBIO, JR.
DILLON J. TOLMIE
NEIL J. TOOHEY, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. TORRES
DALE R. TOURTELOTTE
SAMUEL K. TRAIN
PAUL R. TRANBARGER
ARTURO TREJO
MICHAEL Q. TREMEL
SEAN H. TROMBLY
BRIAN TRUONG
STEVEN J. TSCHANZ
TERRY L. TURNER II
MICHAEL G. TYREE
TODD P. URKOWITZ
GREGORY M. VALDEZ
CHRISTOPHER W. VANLOENEN
SEANN M. VANOSDEL
GREGORY T. VASILOFF
PAUL VELAZQUEZ
JOSLYN M. VENEY
FRANK P. VERDUCCI III
CHRISTOPHER A. VICTOR
ROBERT W. VILLARREAL
DANIEL J. VIRGETS
DAVID J. VITOLLO
ALEXANDER C. VOELLER
CHRISTOPHER M. VONDERHEIDE
SHAWN M. VRABEL
WILLIAM M. VUILLET
ABRAHAM N. WADSWORTH
NICHOLAS W. WAGNER
BRIAN M. WALINSKI
DESMOND K. WALKER
JAMES A. WALKER
JOHN D. WALKER III
KRISTOPHER WALKER
NATHAN D. WALKER
ADAM P. WALTERS
KENNETH A. WARFORD
JOHN F. WARNER III
HUNTER D. WASHBURN
CHRISTOPHER F. WASKEY
GEORGE B. WATKINS
JAMES N. WATTS
JEREMY M. WEATHERS
JASON J. WEHMEYER
BENJAMIN R. WEISS
JOSHUA D. WEISS
RAYMOND M. WERNIG, JR.
ANDREW P. WHALEY
JONATHAN M. WHELAN
VES W. WHITTEMORE
MICHEAL A. WICKHAM
ANDREW G. WILCOX
GEORGE A. WILKENING
DIMETRI G. WILKER
JAMES T. WILLIAMS
NATHAN M. WILLIAMS
STEPHEN P. WILLIAMS
STEPHEN V. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL J. WILLIS
JARED M. WOLCOTT
MATTHEW W. WOLF
KURTIS K. WONG
TRAVIS L. WOOD
MATTHEW D. WOODS
MICHAEL D. WORRELL
JOSHUA L. WRIGHT
JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR.
DAVID J. WRIGLEY
KARI E. YAKUBISIN
THOMAS F. YALE
CHRISTOPHER P. YOST
TIMOTHY C. YUHAS
ROBERT M. ZABOROWSKI
ANDREA J. ZENN
PETER J. ZETTEL
REBECCA A. ZIAJA
STEVEN ZIELECHOWSKI
ERIC R. ZILBERMAN
KENNETH W. ZILKA
ROBERT E. ZUBECK II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER W. ACOR
ERIK A. ADAMS
BRADLEY W. ADORADOR
THOMAS N. AMANO
MICHAEL J. ANDERSON
URIES S. ANDERSON, JR.
ISIDRO J. C. AQUINO
RAVEN G. ATKINS, JR.
KEVIN M. BACON
WILLIAM M. BARKSDALE
MARK J. BECKER
AARON T. BEHNE
JOHN R. BELCHER
WILLIAM R. BLACKMAN
LARRY D. BLOODSAW, JR.
CLARENCE R. BOSWELL II
SHELLEY E. BRANCH
JOHN J. BURKE
TRAVIS C. BURNETTE
JERRY L. CANNON
ADRIAN C. CASTER
PHILIP A. CASWELL
BRAD A. CLOUSE
JOSEPH T. COCKEREL
WADE A. CONAWAY
ERIC K. CONRAD
VERNON R. COOK
PATRICK G. CORTEZ
WINSTON A. COTTERELL
BRENT E. DILLOW
MICHAEL J. DISCH
CHAD D. DIXON
DOUGLAS A. EVANS
MICHAEL R. FASANO
HOWARD C. FICHTEL
MICHAEL W. FISHER
RYAN A. FISHER
DIEGO L. FLORES
TERRANCE FLOURNOY
LEONARDO R. FRANKLIN
DANIEL D. FUGETT
RODNEY B. FULLINGIM
JAMES B. GALLAGHER
BRIAN T. GARDLER
KEVIN L. GARNER
SEAN M. C. GARRETT
TODD M. GEORGE
EDWIN S. GIBSON, JR.
JOSEPH D. GODWIN
KREGG T. GOSE
EDWARD A. GRANT
JOHNNIE L. GREEN, JR.
JASON K. GREENFIELD
HENRY GUDINO
SELMA GUICE, JR.
FREDRIC P. HACKETT
NEIL HALSTEAD
ERIC E. HAYES
ERVIN L. HENLEY
LENTEISA L. HILL
MICHAEL B. HOCH
RODNEY B. HOOKS
KEVIN L. HUGHES
CHAD R. HUNSUCKER
ELOUISE M. HURST
ADAM R. JARVIS
ERROL C. JOHNSON, JR.
MARK A. JONES
TERRENCE U. JONES
ROBERT L. KETCH, JR.
KEITH W. KING
BRYCE D. KLAPUT
BRIAN K. KULBETH
DAVID A. LAFEVOR
JASON A. LAURION
RONALD F. LEFAVORE, JR.
MARK C. LETOURNEAU
CHARLES A. LONGEWAY
WILLIAM H. LOZIER III
JOHN S. I. LUCAS
DAVID N. MACIAS
RANDALL L. MCATEE
WILLIAM J. MCCAMMON
TERRANCE L. MCCRAY
RICHARD C. MCNEIL
EUGENE MENDEZ
SCOTT MILDENHALL
JEREMY MINER
LOUIS A. MOORE
JOHN T. MOSLEY
MICHAEL R. MURPHY
LEONIDES E. NEPOMUCENO
DIANE E. NICHOLS
CRAIG C. NORMAN
MICHAEL J. NOVAK
WILLIAM M. NOVAK
BRIAN C. NUSS
ANTHONY W. OXENDINE, JR.
ERICH J. PARTSCH
NICHOLAS E. PECCI
JULIO A. PETERSON
ANTONIO PRIESTER, JR.
JAMES T. RATLIFF
ERIK J. REED
DENNIS L. RICHARDSON
ALLEN W. RICHMOND
MARK C. RINSCHLER
SHARIVA A. ROBINSON
GREGORY A. RODRIGUEZ
ERIC T. RYAN

MARLON I. SALES
CHRISTOPHER S. SCHMIDT
STEVEN A. SHEPSKI
PETTIS N. SIMS
JITINDRA W. SIRJOO
DENNIS D. SMITH, JR.
JEFFREY T. SMITH
BRIAN L. SNOOK
DAVID L. STARNES
SCOTT D. SULMAN
ROBERT B. SUTTER
JAMES K. SWE
RILEY E. SWINNEY, JR.
COREY J. SYLVE
DAREN D. TILLER
MARC B. TINAZ
DANIEL J. TRIERWEILER
MARCO R. VIDES
TRAVIS W. WAGNER
TODD M. WILD
DAVID M. WILLIAMS
DAVID T. WRIGHT
RICHARD P. ZABAWA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MATE W. AERANDIR
TONY V. ANDERSON
WILLARD E. BALL
CURTIS A. BELING, JR.
BRANDY D. BENNETT
MATTHEW B. BIELIK
JASON L. BRUEHL
LAJUANA BUHMANN
NEIL J. CURTIS
EDWARD M. DAVID
CYNTHIA R. DUKE
JUSTIN R. FARBER
HEATH C. FLORAY
LAUREN A. GOLDENBERG
WILLIAM L. V. GRENOBLE
CHRISTOPHER D. GUSTAFSON
RYAN F. HEALY
MICHAEL V. HOLLER
SHAWN R. HUGHES
GERALD J. JOHNSON, JR.
WESLEY D. KERR
BRETT T. KIRWAN
ARPAD P. KOROSSY
JOSE L. LEPESUASTEGUI
HEATHER D. MADERIA
TROY M. MCCORMICK
PHILLIP P. MENARD VII
ANDREW T. MICHALOWICZ
CHRISTOPHER M. MICHALSKI
DANIELLE K. MOEN
SHEILA R. MOLINA
KRISTEN M. MURDOCK
CURTIS B. NIEBOER
TOLULOPE E. OBRIEN
JOSEPH L. PRUCE
JESSICA A. REED
SCOTT E. RIFFLE
SERGIUS M. RODRIGUEZ
ADAM D. SEILER
JAMES M. A. SPALL
DAVID J. TEBBE
SARA E. WARYNOVICH
ROLLIE J. WICKS
JONATHAN M. WIENS
JEFFREY A. WILLIAMS
PAUL J. WOOD
ROBERT E. WOODS, JR.
JACQUELINEMAR W. WRONA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN G. ACORD
FRANK P. AGCAOILI
JONATHAN R. ALSTON
MICHAEL J. ASCHE
TIMOTHY S. BLEVINS
MICHAEL S. BROCK
ROBERT A. BUCKLES
ANTHONY C. CAGLE
JASON R. CHAMBERLAIN
JASON E. DION
ISAAC J. DONALDSON
ANTHONY E. ELLIS
CHARLES W. GORNEY
GRANT K. GRAEBER
GLENN S. GREENLEAF
DANIEL J. HANSEN
JASON J. HUGHES
JEREMY J. HULS
BRUCE L. HUNT
CLIFTON E. JACKSON III
MATTHEW T. JOHNSON
KELLY A. KEISER
RICHARD E. KIDDER, JR.
KIRSTEIN S. LEWIS
DANIEL J. MACCABE
CRAIG T. MCLEMORE
THOMAS C. MCLEMORE
CHRISTOPHER J. MULLEN
CARLOS R. PESQUERA
CHRISTOPHER R. PISANI
SANTHOSH K. SHIVASHANKAR
CARLTON B. SUMMERVILLE
ANTHONY O. THOMAS
CHRISTOPHER J. WASEK
JON T. WENDE
JEFFREY A. WHITE
JEFFREY W. WHITSETT
BRIAN P. WORDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

AARON N. AARON
JOSEPH D. ANDERSON
KITAN BAE
KEVIN R. BARRETT
JASON J. BECKER
ANDREW R. BELDING
EHREN J. BITTNER
JOHN J. BOGDAN III
KENNETH W. BROOKS
WILLIAM B. CAMPBELL
ANTHONY J. CANTAFIO, JR.
JOSEPH E. CANTU, JR.
TYLER H. CARR
EREN D. CATALOGLU
NICHOLAS A. COLE
HOLLIE P. CRONLEY
MATTHEW G. DALTON
JOHN K. DOYLE
REGINALD C. FEWELL
ELIAS J. GEORGE
DONNA R. GILBERT
CHRISTOPHER P. HARNED
MARK G. HOFER II
JULIA M. HUBERTZ
ADAM T. HUMPHREY
WILLIAM R. HURD
MARK J. JACOBBI, JR.
CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON
KENYATTA M. JONES
VICTORIA A. KAYE
JOSHUA D. KHOURY
CARSON C. MCABEE
WYLIE MCDADE
CHAD M. MCDOWELL
MICHAEL N. PERKINS II
NICHOLAS J. RAUSCH
NATHANIEL D. RIGHTSELL
JEFFREY E. ROBINSON
DARREN J. ROGERS
JONATHAN J. SAHIM
BRIAN M. SALTER
MICHAEL C. SCHAEFER
ROBERT C. SELLIN
DAVID T. SPALDING
PHILIP J. STARCOVIC
JOSHUA C. STONEHOUSE
TONY V. H. TRAN
BRIAN K. VIDRINE
STEPHEN W. WILLIS
CHELSEY L. ZWICKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIAN F. BRESHEARS
ALEXANDER J. CULLEN
LYNNE H. EDWARDS
KYLE B. FRANKLIN
JAMES R. FRITZ
MARK A. HEBERT
CARTER L. JOHNSTON
COLLEEN M. MCDONALD
THOMAS J. MILLS
KYLE E. OBROCK
MICHAEL J. PAPA
WILLIAM A. SAUER II
JEFFREY D. SCOOLER
DAVID A. TRAMPP
GARY M. VINES
ROBERT D. T. WENDT
WALTER R. YOUNG, JR.
DAVID A. ZIEMBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL J. BRADSHAW
ROY D. CHESSON
JARROD GAZAREK
JOHN S. HANCOCK
JONATHAN S. KIM
EMILIE A. KRAJAN
STEPHANIE C. LASTINGER
JOSEPH F. LEAVITT
TIMOTHY B. LINDSAY
ROSS W. PETERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON
DAVID A. BENNETT
BRETT A. DAWSON
THERESA L. B. DONNELLY
TIMOTHY A. HAWKINS
FREDERICK M. MARTIN
MARISSA N. MYATT
TIMOTHY C. PAGE
SCOTT D. SAGISI
MEGAN M. SHUTKA
RENEE F. SOLTES
TIFFANI B. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES C. BAILEY
MIGUEL A. BERNAL, JR.
KACEY M. BOWMAN
JOSHUA I. CAMPBELL
CHRISTOPHER G. DANIELS
ANTHONY M. ELLERBE
CHARLES L. FISHER, JR.
JOSE R. GARCIA
GAVIN D. GUIDRY
CHAD C. JELSEMA
JAMES M. LANDRY
STEPHANIE R. MACKRIS
COLETTE M. PANAGOS
CHRISTOPHER T. SCHROCK
JASON R. STALEY
TOMMY T. Y. TONG
AMANDA J. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ERIC S. KINZBRUNNER
JUSTIN M. LETWINSKY
MATTHEW M. MCCLURE
JASON T. MOSTACCIO
ERIC M. ZACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JERMAINE A. BAILEY
BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI
ALEXANDER B. BAYNES
TABITHA A. BOOTH
KERRY N. BOSCHE
BRENT A. BOTTOLFSON
JAMES J. COLGARY, JR.
JONATHAN S. CONNELLY
AARON C. DAUSMAN
YEVTTE A. DAVIS
SJAAK A. DEVLAMING
LARIE A. DIXON
AARON T. DOBSON
MICHAEL G. DODSON
SEAN M. DOHERTY
JASON W. DOWNS
MARK A. EWACHIW, JR.
EID F. FAKHOURI
DEREK E. FLETCHER
ETHAN J. JAWORSKI
DAVID P. JOHNSEN
RYAN D. JOHNSON
RAYMOND J. KILWAY II
AMY C. LEES
JAMIE S. MASON
MONIQUA J. MAXIE
MICHAEL P. MCCORMICK
ALEXANDER L. MCGINNIS
ADAM J. MILLS
ADAM M. OSBORN
JARROD M. OZEREKO
CHRISTOPHER J. PANDY
THOMAS E. PILKERTON
BRANDON H. PONTIUS
JAVAN A. RHINEHART
MICHAEL A. SAMMATARO
AMIEL B. SANFIORENZO
MATTHEW B. STROTHER
WILLIAM T. TAFT
SPENCER V. TALLEY
ROBERT D. TUTTLE
JAMES M. UPSHAW
GILBERT P. VIERA III
JAMES W. WALDREP
JOHNATHAN C. WALKER
JEFFREY K. WHITE
JEREMIAH J. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JEMAR R. BALLESTEROS
GINA M. D. BECKER
MAURA G. BETTS
CLINTON T. CERALDE
TESSA M. DENARO
WALTER D. ENOS
ANNETTE M. FELICIANORAMOS
JOSEPH S. FELIX
JOHN B. FIELDS
DANIEL E. FRIAS
ANDREW C. GERLA
BRIAN J. GROW
PATRICE R. HENTZ

SHAINA M. HOGAN
MARK D. JENKINS
ALLEN T. KEYS
EMILY J. KLOSSNER
RICHARD H. LAY, JR.
VIANNY LEMBERTSANTANA
JESSICA K. MORRIS
SABINA D. PAMARAN
SARAH C. M. PETTIT
BRIAN C. RICHARDS
JONATHAN C. RYAN
REYNEL SAA
ASHLEY P. TAYLOR
KAREN J. TEAGUE
NICHOLAS S. TURNER
GIULIANA M. VELLUCCI
ADAM P. WALSKI
ANNE L. ZACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHRISTOPHER A. CEGIELSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI
CHRISTOPHER H. BLAND
MARSHALL T. BOYD
BERRY T. BROWN
TRAVIS C. BURNETTE
JASON CHUMA
MATTHEW B. DEBAUN
SCOTT A. EDMINSTER
BRYAN M. GALLANT
JEFFREY A. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER J. HEINE
DANIEL K. HOLLINGSHEAD
JONATHAN A. HULECKI
LUKE H. I. IM
JEREMY R. JANNEY
DOMINIC J. KRAMER
JAMES C. LEASURE III
ANTHONY D. MACALUSO
SEAN M. MATSON
PATRICK L. MCCLERNON
MICHAEL N. MOWRY
DONALD NICHOLS, JR.
SAMANTHA A. ONEIL
MICHAEL P. ORFINI
TRAVIS B. POWELL
ROBERT RAMIREZ III
SCOTT M. REYNOLDS
SHAYNE J. SCHUMACHER
JEFFREY D. SCHWAMB
JAMES E. SHULER
JEREMIAH S. SMITH
JOSHUA M. SMITH
REID W. SMYTHE
WILLIAM C. STEWART
MATTHEW I. TENNIS
REEVES THURMAN
PAUL R. TRANBARGER
ANDREW J. VALERIUS
CHRISTOPHER W. VANLOENEN
ANDREW J. VINCENT
NELLIE WANG
JOSHUA D. WEISS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

FERDINAND D. ABRIL
JEREMY P. ADAMS
DEAN E. ALLEN
ROSS B. CAMPBELL
FRANK W. CARROLL
SOMCHANH CAVANH
CRAIG A. CLUTTS
CHRIS M. COGGINS
JEREMY B. GATES
JOHN T. JEFFREY
PATRICK C. JORS
IAN M. KELLY
CHARLES B. KUBIC
STEPHEN T. LEPPER
ANDREW L. LITTERAL
PAUL F. MAGOULICK
ANCELMO J. MCCARTHY
JOEL D. MCMILLAN
JOSEPH M. OSULLIVAN
AARON W. PARK
RUSSELL S. PILE
JAMES M. ROCHE
SHAWN M. ROCKWELL
ATIIM D. SENTHILL
ANDREW J. SHINKA
TORBEN T. SMITH
ANDREW J. SONIER
DANIEL A. STOKES
MICHAEL J. WANGER
ALLEN E. WILLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MICHAEL D. AMEDICK
JOHN G. ANDERSON
MICHAEL R. BAKER
MATTHEW K. BERRENS
ROBERT N. BURNS, JR.
ALAN CAMERON
MICHAEL B. CHANEY
STEPHEN M. COATES
DAVID D. DINKINS
RANDALL D. EKSTROM
DANIEL W. HALL
ROBERT W. HALL
HENRY F. HOLCOMBE, JR.
THOMAS A. IANUCCI
JOHN R. LOGAN
ROBERT A. MOORE
WESLEY T. MYHAND
RONALD C. NORDAN
MICHAEL L. PHILLIPS
WILLIAM S. RILEY
RONALD T. RINALDI
RICHARD L. ROE
JAMIE J. STALLRYAN
DARREN L. STENNETT
DENNIS M. WHEELER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KERRY E. BAKER
FORREST D. BAUMHOVER
DANIEL L. BESSMAN
KEVIN L. BORKERT
MARK S. BOWMER
PETER M. BRAENDEHOLM
JOHN H. BREDENKAMP III
MATTHEW J. BRICKHAUS
FREDERICK H. CRAWFORD
KAREN R. DALLAS
ANDRES DIAZ
STEFAN EDWARDS
VINCENT V. ERNO
RICHARD C. GUSTAFSON, JR.
DALE A. HANEY
SHANNON B. HARRELL
BRIAN D. HENDERSON
RONALD L. HOAK II
TARA L. HODGE
JASON G. HOFTIEZER
DEREK P. HOTCHKISS
KELLY W. HOUSE, JR.
ROBERT J. JAMES
THOMAS R. JENKINS
MATTHEW S. JONES
PATRICK J. KELLY
SHANI S. LEBLANC
MICHAEL F. LORRAIN II
VALERIE M. MCCALL
CRAIG A. MIHALIK
JAMES D. OLEARY
STEVEN M. OSBORNE
GILBERTO P. PENSERGA
ALLEN RIVERA
DAVID W. RODEBUSH
SCOTT A. ROSCOE
MICHAEL P. RYAN
BENJAMIN L. SHEINMAN
ELISHA E. SINGLETON
FREDERICK H. SKINNER
TERESA A. STEVENS
CHRISTOPHER M. SWANSON
CHRISTOPHER C. TECMIRE
CHARLES M. TELLIS
JUAN C. URIBE
KRISTEN D. VECHINSKI
KRISTIAN L. WAHLGREN
SHANNON W. WALKER
DARYL M. WILSON
MICHAEL D. WINN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KENNETH R. BASFORD
JOHN G. BROOM
CHERYL L. COTTRELL
WILLIAM G. DANCHANKO
CHARLES E. DICKERSON
KENNETH L. FOLSOM
DAWN E. GALVEZ
JAMESETTA W. GOGGINS
RYAN P. GRISWOLD
ROBERT J. HAAG
SHAWN M. HARRIS
TOD A. HAZLETT
TED W. HERING
CYNTHIA A. HUTCHINSON
COREY A. JAGO
PATRICIA B. JOHNSON
LALON M. KASUSKE
CHRISTOPHER D. KEITH
MATHEW R. LOE
MARK A. LYNCH
HALEY T. MACEK
SUZANNE F. MALDARELLI
JESSICA NICHOLS
CHARLENE R. OHLIGER
HEATHER B. RAY
ROBERT J. ROADFUSS
TIMOTHY R. ROUSSELOW
JARED E. SCOTT
JAMI A. STAKLEY
KELLY E. K. VEGA
JOHN M. WATERS
ANDREW S. WILSON
KENNETH A. WOFFORD
JOHN P. ZALAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR.
BRENT K. FAULKNER
RICHARD E. FEDERICO
DANIELLE M. HIGSON
SHANE E. JOHNSON
ROBERT T. KLINE
DEBORAH M. LOOMIS
JOHN M. MONTGOMERY
GREGORY W. SAYBOLT
HOLLIS N. SIMODYNES
MATTHEW J. SKLEROV
WILLIAM P. SMITH
GRETCHEN D. SOSBEE
IAN P. WOLF
SYLVAINE W. WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KEVIN S. BAILEY
STEVEN M. BAILEY
EDWARD A. BENCHOFF
JOSEPH L. BONVIE
RAYMOND M. BRISTOL
ERIC B. CARLSON
LORI A. CHRISTENSEN
CHRISTOPHER L. COOPER
SHAWN P. CRAWFORD
RODEL H. DIVINA
KARLTON K. DODSON
JUSTIN W. DOWE
GREGORY R. FAIRCHILD
DAWN M. FREEMAN
JOHN D. GARBRECHT
LEAH Y. GEISLINGER
JOHN S. GRIESENBECK
TIMOTHY D. HENNING
DANIELLE V. HICKS
CARY J. ISAACSON
JUSTIN C. LOGAN
KELLIE L. MCMULLEN
RYAN L. MESKIMEN
ROBERT C. MORRISON
JOSE E. NIEVES
OLAITAN F. OJO
EDWARD H. OWENS
JAMES W. PERRY
JACQUELINE L. POLLOCK
CHADWICK E. RAY
SHAWN E. SOUTIERE
HAZELANN K. TEAMER
DENNIS C. TOLENTINO
AMY C. VARNEY
BETH A. VEALEY
ANGELA M. WEBSTER
MATTHEW A. WEINER
LISA A. WHITE
THEODOR A. ZAINAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DAVID L. BELL, JR.
ANDREW A. BOOKWALTER
JASON J. BREZOVIC
WILLIAM J. BURKE, JR.
MATTHEW W. CHANG
HEIDI S. ELLIS
MICHAEL A. GENTILE
CHRISTOPHER N. HANHILA
SUSAN E. HINMAN
KEVIN E. HUDSON
CHRISTOPHER S. KAPLAFKA
KHON H. LIEN
GARIN M. LIU
JOHN W. MCGEHEE, JR.
KEITH R. MERCHANT
JEFFREY D. NEAL
JEROME N. RAGADIO
MARK A. ROMANO
CHERI R. SMILEY
CALVIN B. SUFFRIDGE
JOSE A. SURIS
NATHAN J. WONDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RUBEN D. ACOSTA
JOHN E. ALEX
KAIVON ARFAA
MARCO A. AYALA

ANDREW J. BALDWIN
THOMAS M. BALDWIN
MICHAEL M. BARNA
PATRICK L. BASILE
JARED D. BERNARD
LUKE F. BREMNER
ZACHARY W. BROWN
DAVID I. BRUNER
MICHAEL A. BUCKLEY
WAYNE M. BURR
MICHAEL A. BURT
COREY A. CARTER
KEVIN M. CASEY
WILLIAM K. CHIN
KENNY K. CHOI
ALISON M. CHRISTIE
MATTHEW S. CHRISTMAN
ERIN B. COAN
MICHAEL S. DENT
TODD J. ENDICOTT
RICK L. FISHER
ANDREW S. FLOTTEN
MICHAEL R. FRASER, JR.
JENNIFER C. FREEMAN
JERALD W. FROEHNER
DIANA C. FU
SATYEN M. GADA
ALEXANDER B. GALIFIANAKIS
PHILLIP G. GEIGER
JEFFREY W. GERTNER
CHARLES F. GOULD, JR.
SCOTT E. GRABILL
ADOLFO GRANADOS, JR.
MARION A. GREGG
ERIN A. GRIFFITH
NOA C. HAMMER
SCOTT M. HARLEY
JOSHUA M. HARRISON
BRADLEY W. HICKEY
THOMAS R. HICKS
STEVEN J. HOLLEY
ALEXANDER M. HOLSTON
KERRY A. HUDSON
CRAIG J. HURT
JEFFERY C. JOHNSON
SONOVIA L. JOHNSON
MICKAILA J. JOHNSTON
AHMIK L. JONES
LINDSAY E. JONES
MICHAEL R. KAPLAN
MICHAEL J. KAVANAUGH
BRYAN J. KEENAN
JOSHUA T. KINDELAN
MICHAEL C. KING
BRIAN T. KLEYENSTEUBER
ALAN S. LAM
SHANNON V. LAMB
EDWIN J. LANDAKER
IAN M. LAUGHLIN
RACHEL U. LEE
ELIZABETH A. LEONARD
SEAN P. LEONARD
PHILIP R. LETADA
JASON J. LONGWELL
ROBERT M. MARKS
MATTHEW R. MATIASEK
CARI E. MATTHEWS
DAMON M. MCCLAIN
JAMES M. MCDONALD
MICHAEL R. MELIA
TODD J. MONDZELEWSKI
JOSEPHINE C. NGUYEN
DANIEL G. NICASTRI
THOMAS W. NIPPER II
EMEKA O. OFOBIKE
TIFFANY M. OHTA
SHAUNA F. OSULLIVAN
AUSTIN L. PARKER
DOUGLAS E. PITTNER
TIMOTHY A. PLATZ
TRAVIS M. POLK
ANGELA M. POWELL
SHAWN D. REDDING
KENNETH E. RICHTER
LISA K. RIVERA
ANNE B. ROBERTS
RYAN C. ROCKHILL
GREGG W. SCHELLACK
TAMMY E. SERVIES
COREY A. SHAW
JAMES B. SOLOMON
MICHELE E. SPROSTY
DAVID A. STANECK
MELISSA R. STEGNERWILSON
DANIEL M. STULACK
DANIEL M. SUTTON
GUS THEODOS
DRAKE H. TILLEY
HEATHER J. TRACY
RALPH E. TUTTLE
GINA R. VIRGILIO
CHRISTOPHER M. WATSON
JIBRI M. WIGGINS
RASHAD C. WILKERSON
PAUL J. WISNIEWSKI
JASON A. YODER
DAVID M. YOU

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 17, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID B. SHEAR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DAVID ARTHUR MADER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CONTROLLER, OFFICE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE SISTER CITIES OF OXNARD, CALIFORNIA AND OCOTLÁN, JALISCO, MEXICO

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Cities of Oxnard, California, and Ocotlán, Jalisco, Mexico, as they celebrate fifty years of mutually beneficial cooperation and friendship through the Sister City Program.

Officially chartered by the United States—Mexico Sister Cities Association in 1964, the partnership between Oxnard and Ocotlán is one of the longest continuous Sister City relationships. As we reflect on fifty years of harmonious interaction, it is clear that the cities have been successful in their original mission to promote good will, friendship, and mutual understanding. These many years of welcoming cooperation between the two cities have built a strong foundation of reciprocal admiration and respect between people and communities of different countries.

Throughout the last fifty years, the Sister City program has established strong economic, educational, and cultural bonds, benefitting the people of both Oxnard and Ocotlán alike. The Sister City Committee has facilitated many donations of safety equipment, medical supplies, library books, and even three fire trucks, which provided the City of Ocotlán with the ability to establish its first fire department. When disaster struck Ocotlán after the 1992 earthquake, the City of Oxnard gladly assisted in emergency fundraising efforts.

The Sister City program has also extended many opportunities benefitting students from both cities. Ocotlán students participated in the Oxnard Union High School District's baseball tournaments in 1988 and 1989, and students in the Oxnard High School Band traveled to Ocotlán in 1993 and 1996 to help the city establish its first marching band. The program certainly deserves commendation for the investments it has made in the futures of these students.

I would like to recognize all members of the Oxnard Sister City Committee, including Officers: Mary Anne Rooney, President; Debra Cordes, Vice President; JoAnn Oliveras, Secretary; and Teresa Ramos, Treasurer; and Directors: Allison Cordes; Marsha Cordes; Dorian Guerrero; Priscilla Herrera; Adela L. Lambert; and Ben Wada.

I would also like to recognize all members of the Ocotlán Sister City Committee, including Officers: Jorge Mario Pérez, Presidente; Everardo Santos Ramos, Tesorero; and Jacinto Rodriguez, Rel. Publicas.

I want to congratulate the Cities of Oxnard and Ocotlán on this momentous occasion and look forward to the future accomplishments and successes that this relationship will foster.

INTERACTION

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Amarech Mana is a 28-year old mother living in a small Ethiopian village, hundreds of miles from the capital. She does her best to care for her sick child who is crying out in pain. She knows he needs water to survive, but she worries that the very water she uses to quench his thirst is filled with the very bugs that made him sick in the first place. This story is an all too common one when 884 million people around the world do not have access to clean water.

Coordinating and uniting the action of over 180 organizations, InterAction is helping poor people like Amarech around the world. InterAction is working to encourage transparency on foreign aid projects. InterAction's NGO Map collects project-level information to disseminate to donors, businesses, government, and the public. It is also working to push for new laws that require tougher evaluations of foreign aid projects. If we are not evaluating projects than we do not know what is sustainable or even making a difference over the short term.

InterAction's mission is to uphold human rights and ensure human dignity for the poor. It knows that the best way to accomplish this mission is to focus on sustainability. For example, InterAction not only helps dig wells to give poor people clean water but then teaches individuals how to fix the well when it breaks. This gives them the skills and opportunity to improve their own standard of living, long after InterAction and its partners are gone.

Water, sanitation, and hygiene are just some of the issues that InterAction addresses to improve the quality of life in the world's poorest communities.

At the end of the day, InterAction doesn't just improve the social and economic circumstances of the poor. It gives hope. Amarech Mana once feared for her son's life. Now she can hold him and enjoy the clean water supply provided by Concern Worldwide, a partner in the InterAction nonprofit community. The water supply serves 1,000 households in the area.

Children no longer have to trek for hours to get water before going to school. And they don't have to miss countless days of school due to dehydration or dysentery. InterAction is a testament to the positive change U.S.-based NGO partnerships are making throughout the world. I look forward to working with InterAction to ensure our foreign aid is transparent and rigorously evaluated so our taxpayer dollars can make a meaningful and lasting difference.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF JOYCE STEVENS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the House's attention the wonderful work of a California resident, Joyce Stevens. She is an environmentalist for all seasons and has done more in her quiet manner than any other single person in our community. She was a leading figure in the creation of the Big Sur Land Trust, the Monterey Bay State Seashore, the Fort Ord Beach State Park lands and numerous local parks and sanctuary lands protections. The residents of and visitors to the Monterey Bay region have Joyce to thank in no small way for the natural beauty they enjoy.

Joyce was born in Seattle, Washington in 1927. She graduated from the University of Washington in 1954 with a degree in architecture. Encountering gender discrimination in this ''man's field,'' and looking at the experiences of female civilians working for the government, she decided that she would be happier in that environment. As a single mother, she moved to Carmel, California in 1962 and took a job as Post Engineer at Fort Ord, working there until her retirement more than 20 years later.

One of Joyce's proudest achievements was designing the Post Chapel at Fort Hunter Liggett. It is located near the Hacienda, which was designed by another female California architect, Julia Morgan. She also convinced (pestered, actually) the army into protecting some rare native plant habitat at Fort Ord. Because of her persistence she had the satisfaction of seeing Fort Ord receive ecology awards.

Joyce's commitment to the community is unparalleled. She appointed herself full-time activist to save everything we all love about the Monterey Peninsula. As chair of the Ventana Chapter of the Sierra Club, she was devoted to protecting our local natural setting. She served on the Board of Trustees of Big Sur Land Trust, which is dedicated to preserving the wild lands of Big Sur. Joyce joined Pine Watch to educate people about the significance of our native Monterey Pine Forest, with the goal of creating a Monterey Pine State Park. She also created the Hatton Canyon Coalition to preserve the scenic beauty of Carmel and the canyon. But of all her work, my personal favorite was the time she spent with my father, the late State Senator Fred Farr, in forming the Odello Land Acquisition Fund, or OLAF, to preserve the open space at the mouth of the Carmel River. That land now forms the heart of Carmel River State Park.

For over 20 years Joyce served on the Carmel Area Wastewater District. She became known as the ''Sewer Queen'' for her work to save the Carmel River by encouraging the increased use of treated wastewater and thus

reduce pumping from the river. She formed the Dunes Coalition to save the Monterey Bay shores from development. Eventually this concept grew into the Monterey Bay State Shore.

Joyce Stevens has spent her life ensuring that the quality of life on the Monterey Peninsula be improved through sound land use management. She brings a voice of reason to every debate knowing so well the value aesthetics plays in our communities and the role resource protection adds to its economic value. Through interpretation, the education process is enhanced allowing the political leaders to enact best management practices. For all of us in elected office, her gift is our gain.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of the House we thank her for her leadership, showing one person can make a difference, and wish her the happiest of birthdays.

RECOGNIZING VISIT ORLANDO

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Visit Orlando, the official tourism organization for the Orlando area, on its 30 years of service to our community.

Visit Orlando stands alongside Orange County and its member organizations to represent the Central Florida Hospitality Community and our area's leading industry, which is responsible for an economic impact of more than $54 billion annually. Since July 1984, Visit Orlando has worked with local organizations and assisted greatly in the marketing and advertising endeavors of its member organizations.

Serving as the largest tourism organization in the world, Visit Orlando focuses on maintaining the health of our tourism environment by globally marketing the area as a premier leisure, convention and business destination. Their partnership with Orange County and member companies has played a prominent role in making Orlando a great place to visit and to live.

It is a privilege to recognize Visit Orlando, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank this organization for its commitment to Central Florida and our hospitality industry.

IMMEDIATE END TO THE TURKISH OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for an immediate end to the Turkish occupation of Cyprus. This year we mark the 40th anniversary of Turkey's aggressive and illegal division of the island.

During their forty year occupation, Turkey has taken little action to bring peace and stability to the island. In fact, they have done just the opposite, bringing tens of thousands of settlers from mainland Turkey to live in the homes of Greek Cypriots and further complicate any solution to the Cyprus Problem.

The Turkish government has been complicit in the destruction of Greek churches and the systematic demolition of Greek culture in the northern areas of Cyprus.

Time after time, the Turkish Government has stood in the way of a mutually agreeable resolution. Despite the lack of commitment from the Turkish authorities, Cyprus remains committed to finding a settlement to reunify Cyprus in a manner that respects the rights of all inhabitants of the island. It is far past time for Turkey to seriously work on finding a solution to this problem.

Cyprus is a strong ally of the United States in an area of the world that can be unstable and unpredictable. It is critical that the United States strengthens our relationship with Cyprus, especially on issues such as energy and tourism.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ILLEGAL DIVISION OF CYPRUS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the current situation in Cyprus. This July 20th will mark the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus.

As a result of Turkey's invasion, Cyprus has been divided into two territories. The main part of the Island under control of the Republic of Cyprus, which has de jure sovereignty, and the northern section controlled and occupied by Turkish troops, which the international community does not recognize.

Because of this arbitrary and illegal division, thousands of Greek-Cypriot citizens have been unable to return to their homes, some of which have been confiscated or sold. Additionally, countless thousands of Turkish settlers and troops have inhabited the Northern territory since the Turkish invasion, in violation of UN resolutions and the Geneva Convention, and within the occupied territory, freedom of religion has been curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that progress can be made and diplomacy wins out to allow the reunification of Cyprus. In 2008, a wall that divided portions of Cyprus had been razed. That wall was seen as a symbol of the island's long-standing division. With luck, further headway can be made.

ACKNOWLEDGING KEITH HASKE

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Keith Haske, a storied basketball coach and school administrator from Northern Michigan who has recently been diagnosed with throat cancer.

Mr. Haske served as a head varsity boys' basketball coach in Northern Michigan since moving to the area in 1998. He initially coached at Charlevoix High School, where he compiled a tremendous record of 239 wins and just 78 losses. In these thirteen years he also amassed 10 district titles, 6 regional titles, 4 semi-final appearances, and 2 state runner-up titles. On top of that, he served as coach for the varsity girls program from 2004 to 2006, guiding them to a state title berth of their own.

Following his time at Charlevoix, Keith became the varsity boys coach at Traverse City St. Francis where he continues to find success. He recently led the team to a state runner up title in 2012.

It must be noted that as a coach Keith's impact transcends the wins and awards his teams have amassed over the years. The young women and men he has mentored over the years have looked to him for leadership and guidance, and his impact is seen all over the Northern Michigan community.

As Mr. Haske moves forward on a path to recovery, I would also like to send a heartfelt ''thank you'' and best wishes on behalf of the citizens of Northern Michigan to the Haske family— Barb, Ty, and Chelsey.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July 20th, marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish Invasion of Cyprus.

I would like to express my unwavering support for the reunification of Cyprus. Since 1974, Cyprus has been wrought with conflict and tension between the northern Turkish Cypriot population and the southern Greek Cypriot population. This conflict has left Cyprus divided. Although I am encouraged by the recent support shown for Cyprus by my fellow colleagues in Congress and by Vice President BIDEN, who recently visited Cyprus and helped facilitate dialogue between both sides, only a Cypriot-led resolution can bring lasting peace to the country and region.

Cyprus is an important economic and geopolitical strategic partner for the United States. With its recent discovery of offshore gas reserves in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea, a stable, unified Cyprus can be an important economic and strategic ally for the United States and neighboring European countries. As such, it is important for the United States to continue to express its support for a re-unified Cyprus.

Moving forward, I hope that Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders can peacefully negotiate a just and enduring resolution to this conflict. I know that it won't be simple. I understand that given the situation's complexity, there is no silver bullet to a solution. A sustainable resolution will require patience and a genuine willingness from both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leadership to seek a secure and stable re-unified Cyprus. However, in

spite of these difficult realities, I am confident that a peaceful resolution can and will be achieved.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. JEAN MAE ELIZABETH HASTINGS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the life of Ms. Jean Hastings. Jean, a resident of Long Branch, New Jersey, passed away on July 10, 2014. She was a long time community leader whose memory will live on through all those whose lives she touched.

A graduate of Long Branch High School, Jean was a political activist. She was a Democratic Party Leader, proud of her work for the Schneider Team and President Obama. She worked for the City of Long Branch as a records clerk, was a member of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Guild of Long Branch and served as a Democratic Committeewoman for many years.

Jean leaves behind a loving and adoring family, including her son Harold, daughters Leslie Hill, Julia Hastings, Arlene Perozzi and Tanya Hastings, as well as siblings, grandchildren, great grandchildren, nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Ms. Jean Hastings for her dedication to her family and service to her community.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM SUMMER & THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of Freedom Summer and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of the most important laws enacted in this country. President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 2, 1964, signed this critical piece of legislation into law. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is recognized as one of the most significant turning points in America's political and social development. In a country divided by racism and bigotry, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made discriminatory practices in education, public establishments and by employers, illegal. This historic legislation served as a catalyst for efforts towards equality across the country. In addition, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, along with Freedom Summer marked the climax of intensive voter-registration activities in the South that began in 1961.

Prior to 1962, Mississippi faced significantly low levels of African-American voter registration. In fact, less than 7% of African-Americans were registered to vote within the state. In order to increase those numbers and register voters across the state Freedom Summer was born. While serving as an expanded voter registration project, Freedom Summer also helped to address the issue of the separate and unequal public education system. Efforts enacted during Freedom Summer established over 41 Freedom Schools attended by more than 3,000 young African-American students throughout the state.

Despite major challenges, Freedom Summer left a positive legacy. The well-publicized voter registration drives brought national attention to the subject of black disenfranchisement, leading to the 1965 Voting Rights Act, federal legislation that among other things outlawed the tactics Southern states had used to prevent blacks from voting. Freedom Summer also instilled among African Americans a new consciousness and a new confidence in political action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 50th Anniversary of Freedom Summer and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

RECOGNIZING SPECIAL FORCES SERGEANT RAMON RODRIGUEZ

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a valiant veteran, Special Forces Sergeant Ramon Rodriguez. At the age of 17, Sergeant Ramon Rodriguez began his military career during his junior year at Banning High School and decided to enlist in the Army with the help of the Juvenile Court system and his father's signature. After many years of training and being stationed in Germany, Sergeant Rodriguez was sent to Vietnam to serve his country. Sergeant Rodriguez embarked on dangerous missions and led his platoon through difficult obstacles during a mission in Phu Bai. While leading five soldiers into safety, Sergeant Rodriguez suffered from a bullet that shot him from behind.

In 1967, Sergeant Rodriguez was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for Heroism for his ''fearless action while exposed to intense enemy fire''. He was awarded with a Silver Star three times within a span of 34 days for his courageous service during the Vietnam War. Sergeant Rodriguez was also awarded three Bronze Stars with an Oak Leaf Cluster and five Purple Hearts during his 32 months of service in Vietnam for his heroism and act of valor against hostile enemy forces, and a total of 17 combat medals and awards for his service.

Sergeant Rodriguez attended the United States Ranger School and graduated with distinguished honors. After completing his service in Vietnam, Sergeant Rodriguez led the Special Forces scuba team at Fort Devens, Massachusetts and directed the team on a mission in Panama. Sergeant Rodriguez and his soldiers were responsible for the scuba and ranger training of armed forces from South American countries and established a ranger school in Honduras. In 1981, Sergeant Rodriguez earned the rank of Command Sergeant Major at the United States Sergeant Major Academy at Fort Bliss, Texas.

Sergeant Rodriguez completed two more assignments before officially retiring from the Army in 1983. In 1982, Sergeant Rodriguez was nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor. On June 11, 2008, Sergeant Rodriguez was inducted as a member of the Ranger Hall of Fame. Sergeant Rodriguez is known to be one of the most decorated combat soldiers that served in the Vietnam War.

Sergeant Rodriguez remained in the United States Army for 23 years to serve the United States. Currently, he serves as Chairman of the Veterans and Military Commission for the County of Los Angeles.

It is an absolute honor to recognize Special Forces Sergeant Rodriguez and his years of service to this country. Sergeant Rodriguez and his fellow soldiers are an inspiration for their service, dedication and unending sacrifice. Sergeant Rodriguez's heroism and courageous acts during the call of duty saved the lives of his fellow soldiers and these acts of valor deserve the greatest recognition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, I was absent due to airline delays between California and Washington, DC and was unable to cast my vote for Rollcalls 405 and 406. Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 405—''yes'': To amend chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Federal Register Act), to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes. (386–0)

Rollcall No. 406—''yes'': To provide for the establishment of a body to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the domestic science and technology enterprise and support United States foreign policy goals. (346–41)

HONORING JOSEPH ''BUDDY'' GIGLIOTTI, RECIPIENT OF AGC NYS

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Joseph ''Buddy'' Gigliotti as a recipient of the Associated General Contractors New York State S.I.R. Award.

The S.I.R. Award is AGC of America's highest honor and it recognizes those who exemplify the AGC motto of Skill, Integrity, and Responsibility. In receiving the S.I.R. Award, Mr. Gigliotti joins the ranks of the true greats of AGC NYS and the construction industry in New York—including, most recently, Jeff Zogg; Marty Galasso, Sr.; and Richard Forrestel.

Mr. Gigliotti is a past President of the AGC NYS Chapter, and has become one of the industry's most respected leaders. We are well aware of the significant contributions he has made to the construction industry in New York State.

A lifelong resident of Utica, New York, Mr. Gigliotti joined Allied Chemicals in 1975 as the New York Area manager. After its merger with Barrett Industries, he served as Barrett's Marketing Manager. In his role, Mr. Gigliotti provided strategic consulting and sales strategy development, eventually helping Barrett become a national leader in transportation infrastructure construction. In 1990, Mr. Gigliotti left Barrett and continues to provide strategic consulting to companies under his firm, JGK Associates. He currently works for Lancaster Development, playing a key role in its marketing efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly congratulate Mr. Joseph "Buddy" Gigliotti on this special occasion.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,603,731,782,433.70. We've added $6,976,854,733,520.62 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 380, 382, 383, 384, 386, 387, and 401 I was unavoidably absent.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 418 I mistakenly voted "no" when my intention was to vote "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two rollcall votes on Wednesday, July 16, 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall vote No. 415—Fleming of Louisiana Amendment No. 1—"no," and rollcall vote No. 416—Gosar of Arizona Amendment—"no."

HONORING THE HEROIC SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF INDIANAPOLIS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICER PERRY RENN

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with a burdened heart I rise today to honor the life of a truly outstanding public servant, Officer Perry Renn. For more than three decades Officer Renn served his country and the City of Indianapolis with courage and integrity. Tragically, Officer Renn was killed in the line of duty on July 5, 2014.

Officer Perry Renn protected the citizens of Indianapolis for 21 years as a member of the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department. A career police officer, Renn made the conscious decision every day to place himself in harm's way to make Indianapolis a safer and more prosperous city. It was in this pursuit that he ultimately gave his life. On the night of his passing, Officer Renn was responding to a call of shots being fired in a residential neighborhood.

Day after day, Officer Renn displayed the compassion and integrity of a true public servant. After graduating from East High School in Phoenix, AZ, he began a 10 year enlistment in the United States Army's 82nd Airborne Division. During this time, Renn served his country as a paratrooper and jumpmaster. He served two tours in Korea and also helped to restore constitutional government to the island nation of Grenada during the 1983 liberation of the country, Operation Urgent Fury.

Yet another example of Officer Renn's heroism was shown in 2003 when he received the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department's Medal of Bravery for preventing an armed man from taking his own life. Every single day, Officer Renn displayed his admirable character and passion for helping others.

Few men and women are brave enough to answer the call of duty like Officer Renn. When he pinned on his badge the evening of July 5, no one could have dreamed that he would give his life so selflessly protecting the city he called home. As a former Deputy Mayor of Indianapolis and a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am forever grateful to Officer Renn and to police forces all across the nation who work tirelessly to protect and serve their fellow Americans.

Officer Renn is a hero. His lifetime of service to the United States of America and the City of Indianapolis will never be forgotten. My condolences and well wishes go out to his wife, Lynn, and Officer Renn's entire family during this difficult time. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

HOUSE'S FAILURE TO CONSIDER H.R. 5051: THE PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT (NOT MY BOSS' BUSINESS ACT)

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had told me that at the beginning of my career that I would fight 40 years for the right for contraception, I would never have believed it. We thought Griswold v. Connecticut had settled this, but no. It's been a constant war to control women, which is exactly what this is about.

Now, this audacious Supreme Court, which never fails to surprise, decided that bosses can tell you what kind of healthcare you can have and whether or not you can practice contraception. More specifically, the 5 men on this court decided whether women can have equal access to contraception.

And let's not forget, for male employees of these firms, their wives and daughters who are on their healthcare coverage will also be discriminated against and treated differently.

The stupidity of this Supreme Court decision is that it completely overlooks the fact that 58 percent of the women who get prescription oral contraceptives do it not just for birth control, but for another medical reason, such as endometriosis, ovarian cysts, or Polycystic Ovary Syndrome. Even those women will be out of luck, which means they don't have the same rights as all those men who buy Viagra. That's still covered.

The most dangerous thing that has happened here is that this court has set a precedent for the nearly 48 cases currently working their way through the courts filed by for-profit companies about contraception coverage. Those 48 cases now have this decision as legal precedent.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the idea of blood transfusions, vaccinations, and treatment for HIV/AIDS would no longer be covered. With this court, we are pedaling backward to the 19th century but I've got news for the five men on the court behind this decision: the women of America don't want to go! And this bill helps ensure that we don't.

H.R. 5051, The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act—also called the "Not My Boss's Business Act"—would ensure that an employer that provides a group health plan for its employees does not deny coverage of a specific health care item or service to its employees or covered dependents of employees where that coverage is mandated by Federal law.

The bill specifically states the Religious Freedom Restoration Act does not excuse or relieve this duty, and allows for the existing

exemption for houses of worship and accommodation for religious non-profit organizations that do not wish to provide coverage of contraceptives.

The women of this country don't want a court or anyone else to determine that they are second-class citizens, and this bill would put an end to that. And what we need is a vote. We're all here today to call on Speaker BOEHNER to bring this to the floor. Wouldn't that be something?

Mr. Speaker, the House has been given two opportunities to defeat the previous question: once on Tuesday, and another today. Both times, we offered an amendment to the rule that would have given Members an opportunity to consider reversing the damage done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision. Both times, the House has rejected this measure.

No employer should have the right to limit the health choices of its employees—male or female. It is pure discrimination, when 99 percent of women in this country have used some form of birth control during their lifetime—but now have to literally go to unreasonable measures to simply secure the fundamental health care they need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained from votes due to a conflict. Had I been present on the House floor I would have voted as follows: "no" on rollcall No. 408, H. Res. 669, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

I would have voted as follows on amendments to H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015: "aye" on rollcall No. 409, the Jackson Lee Amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 410, the Roskam Amendment; "aye" on rollcall No. 411, the Moore Amendment; and "aye" on rollcall No. 412, the Waters Amendment.

RECOGNIZING MS. DOROTHY PARKS FOR HER 50 YEARS OF DEDICATED AND FAITHFUL SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dorothy Parks. I had the honor and privilege of working with Ms. Parks in Plattsburgh, NY for more than 30 years. She works hard every day, diligently and happily performing the tasks she is assigned.

This month will mark her 50th year at the firm where we both worked, she having started there on July 13, 1964. During her five decades at the firm, Ms. Parks earned the respect of all who came to trust and depend on her, including myself. She has guided many new staff and young lawyers, teaching us the ropes, if you will, with a smile and a gentle hand.

While working for the firm, Ms. Parks raised four children and now has six loving grandchildren for whom she is a dedicated grandparent.

Ms. Parks' employer, Stafford, Piller, Murnane, Kelleher and Trombley, will be recognizing her successful 50 year career later this month with a celebratory luncheon.

H.R. 5016, "FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT"

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act.

The bill cut too deeply into many important services—including an insane $340 million cut to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). No business cripples its account receivables department and neither should we. The Congressional Budget Office has found that cutting the IRS's ability to enforce tax law ultimately costs more in lost revenue than the money saved in the initial cut. This is simply bad policy that does not save the government money.

I was pleased to see the rejection of an amendment offered by Representative FLEMING, which would have rolled back the Administration's guidance to banks seeking to provide services to state-legal marijuana businesses, and the adoption of an amendment offered by Representative HECK, which will increase access to these services. These were two strong votes to stop forcing state-legal marijuana businesses to operate only in cash, a situation that is unsafe and invites illegal activity. This was a victory for commonsense reform.

This was a rare bright spot, however, in otherwise reckless legislation that slows the enactment of effective financial regulations, reduces our ability to collect much-needed revenue and meddles in the affairs of the D.C. government. It was for these reasons that I opposed this legislation and was disappointed to see it pass.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "PROTECTING EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES IN MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCIES ACT OF 2014"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, when a municipality files for bankruptcy, its employees and retirees who have devoted their lives to public service—such as police officers, firefighters, sanitation workers and office personnel—risk having their hard-earned wages, pensions and health benefits cut or even eliminated.

This is why I am introducing the "Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2014." This legislation strengthens protections for employees and retirees under chapter 9 municipality bankruptcy cases by: (1) clarifying the criteria that a municipality must meet before it can obtain chapter 9 bankruptcy relief; (2) ensuring that the interests of employees and retirees are represented in the chapter 9 case; and (3) imposing heightened standards that a municipality must meet before it may modify any collective bargaining agreement or retiree benefit.

While many municipalities often work to limit the impact of budget cuts on their employees and retirees, as was recently demonstrated in the chapter 9 plan of adjustment recently approved by Detroit's public employees and retirees, other municipalities could try to use current bankruptcy law to set aside collective bargaining agreements and retiree protections.

My legislation addresses this risk by requiring the municipality to engage in meaningful good faith negotiations with their employees and retirees before the municipality can apply for chapter 9 bankruptcy relief. This measure would also expedite the appellate review process of whether a municipality has complied with this and other requirements. And, the bill ensures employees and retirees have a say in any plan that would modify their benefits.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Sec. 1. Short Title. Section 1 of the bill sets forth the short title of the bill as the "Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2014."

Sec. 2. Determination of Municipality Eligibility To Be a Debtor Under Chapter 9 of Title II of the United States Code. A municipality can petition to be a debtor under chapter 9, a specialized form of bankruptcy relief, only if a bankruptcy court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the municipality satisfies certain criteria specified in Bankruptcy Code section 109. In the absence of obtaining the consent of a majority of its creditors, section 109 requires the municipality, in pertinent part, to have negotiated in good faith with its creditors or prove that it is unable to negotiate with its creditors because such negotiation is impracticable.

Section 2(a) of the bill amends Bankruptcy Code section 109 in three respects. First, it provides clear guidance to the bankruptcy court that the term "good faith" is intended to have the same meaning as it has under the National Labor Relations Act at least with respect to creditors who are employees or retirees of the debtor. Second, section 2(a) revises the standard for futility of negotiation from "impracticable" to "impossible." This change ensures that before a municipality may avail itself of chapter 9 bankruptcy relief it must prove that there was no possible way it could have engaged in negotiation in lieu of seeking such relief. Third, the amendment clarifies that the standard of proof that the municipality must meet is "clear and convincing" rather than a preponderance of the evidence. These revisions to section 109 will provide greater guidance to the bankruptcy court in assessing whether a municipality has satisfied the Bankruptcy Code's eligibility requirements for being granted relief under chapter 9.

Bankruptcy Code section 921(e), in relevant part, prohibits a bankruptcy court from ordering a stay of any proceeding arising in a chapter 9 case on account of an appeal from an order granting a municipality's petition to be a debtor under chapter 9. Section 2(b) strikes this prohibition thereby allowing a court to issue a stay of any proceeding during the pendency of such an appeal. This ensures that the status quo can be maintained until there is a final appellate determination of whether a municipality is legally eligible to be a chapter 9 debtor.

Typically, an appeal of a bankruptcy court decision is heard by a district or bankruptcy appellate panel court. Under limited circumstances, however, a direct appeal from a bankruptcy court decision may be heard by a court of appeals. Until a final determination is made as to whether a municipality is eligible to be a debtor under chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code, the rights and responsibilities of numerous stakeholders are unclear. To expedite the appellate process and promote greater certainty to all stakeholders in the case, section 2(c) of the bill allows an appeal of a bankruptcy court order granting a municipality's petition to be a chapter 9 debtor to be filed directly with the court of appeals. In addition, section 2(c) requires the court of appeals to hear such appeal de novo on the merits as well as to determine it on an expedited basis. Finally, section 2(c) specifies that the doctrine of equitable mootness does not apply to such an appeal.

Sec. 3. Protecting Employees and Retirees. The chapter 9 debtor must file a plan for the adjustment of the municipality's debts that then must be confirmed by the bankruptcy court if it satisfies certain criteria specified in Bankruptcy Code section 943. Section 3 of the bill makes several amendments to current law intended to ensure that interests of municipal employees and retirees are better protected. With respect to plan confirmation requirements, section 3 amends Bankruptcy Code section 943 to require consent from such employees and retirees to any plan that impairs—in a manner prohibited by nonbankruptcy law—a collective bargaining agreement, a retiree benefit, including an accrued pension, retiree health, or other retirement benefit protected by state or municipal law or as defined in Bankruptcy Code section 1114(a).

Such consent would be conveyed to the court by the authorized representative of such individuals. Subject to certain exceptions, section 3 specifies that the authorized representative of individuals receiving any retirement benefits pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement is the labor organization that signed such agreement unless such organization no longer represents active employees. Where the organization no longer represents active employees of the municipality, the labor organization that currently represents active employees in that bargaining unit is the authorized representative of such individuals.

Section 3 provides that the exceptions apply if: (1) the labor organization chooses not to serve as the authorized representative; or (2) the court determines, after a motion by a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, that different representation is appropriate. Under either circumstance, the court, upon motion by any party in interest and after notice and a hearing, must order the United States Trustee to appoint a committee of retired employees if the debtor seeks to modify or not pay the retiree benefits or if the court otherwise determines that it is appropriate for that committee be comprised of such individuals to serve as the authorized representative.

With respect to retired employees not covered by a collective bargaining agreement, the court, on motion by a party in interest after notice and a hearing, must order the United States Trustee to appoint a committee of retired employees if the debtor seeks to modify or not pay retiree benefits, or if the court otherwise determines that it is appropriate to serve as the authorized representative of such employees. Section 3 provides that the party requesting the appointment of a committee has the burden of proof.

Where the court grants a motion for the appointment of a retiree committee, section 3 requires the United States Trustee to choose individuals to serve on the committee on a proportional basis per capita based on organization membership from among members of the organizations that represent the individuals with respect to whom such order is entered. This requirement ensures that in a case where there are multiple labor organizations, the committee fairly represents the interests of the members of those various organizations on a proportional basis.

Finally, section 3 of the bill imposes a significant threshold that must be met before retiree benefits can be reduced or eliminated. Current law has no such requirement. In a case where the municipality proposes in its plan to impair any right to a retiree benefit, section 3 permits the committee to support such impairment only if at least two-thirds of its members vote in favor of doing so.

HONORING ED HATRICK

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ed Hatrick, who served as superintendent of Loudoun County Public Schools for 23 years before retiring on June 30.

Ed spent his entire career in Loudoun County, starting as a high school English teacher in 1967. He also served as a principal, director of special education, director of instruction, supervisor of guidance and foreign languages and assistant superintendent for pupil services before becoming superintendent in 1991.

As superintendent, Ed has watched Loudoun grow from a rural farming community with 8,000 students into a suburban community with a student population of 70,000 students. Since 1991, Loudoun County has constructed 54 new schools and renovated 33 more.

Ed has served as president of the Urban Superintendents Association of America and president of the American Association of School Administrators. He also has served in numerous professional and community offices and has been recognized for his work by the General Assembly of Virginia. He received an honorary doctor of humanities degree from Shenandoah University for his community service.

I am pleased to submit the following article from Leesburg Today on Ed's career and retirement. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating him for many years of distinguished service to our nation's youth.

[From Leesburg Today, June 24, 2014]

SUPERINTENDENT HATRICK HONORED AS ''UNCOMMON COMMON MAN''

(By Danielle Nadler)

Even at 9:30 p.m. on a Friday, Edgar B. Hatrick III couldn't help but teach.

Standing in a sprawling ballroom with some of the commonwealth's most influential individuals at his retirement dinner, the 23-year superintendent and former high school English teacher launched into a metaphor.

He said, as geese fly in formation they offer encouragement to the lead goose through their honking, and when the lead goose tires, another pulls forward to take the lead. The story left many in the room chuckling. They'd heard it repeated at staff meetings and back-to-school orientations over the years.

Hatrick laughed with them, before finally interrupting the chatter to say, ''That's what being in Loudoun County Public Schools has been all about.

''I have felt the warmth, the support and the understanding that has led me to say if I had to do it all over again—the whole 47-and-a-half years—I would not change one thing,'' he said, fighting back tears. ''It has been just that wonderful to be able to work with you to build up this school system.''

Hatrick, 68, retires Monday as the region's longest serving superintendent. More than 500 people crowded the National Conference Center ballroom Friday to thank Hatrick for his service to help shape the learning experiences of hundreds of thousands of students in Virginia.

Politicians and fellow school administrators praised Hatrick for his influence on public education on a national and even global scale. He drew attention to Loudoun when it was the fastest growing school system in the country, opening 50 new schools to keep up with enrollment that has increased by 53,637 students during his tenure. And as former president of the American Association of School Administrators, he united superintendents to advocate better measures of schools' effectiveness than the federal No Child Left Behind model.

AASA Executive Director Dan Domenech described him as ''a recognized brand for education around the world.''

But it was the stories of Hatrick, from as early as his high school years when friends knew him as Skip, that best illustrate what he's been to Loudoun County, an individual the Loudoun Education Foundation called an ''uncommon common man.''

His former classmate Karolyn Whitely and Evan Mohler, former assistant superintendent for Support Services, described Hatrick as the student teachers wanted in their classes, and the teen who set the bar on test scores and class projects.

''As a teenager, he was very focused and very hardworking,'' Whitely said.

''He was shaping education in Loudoun County back in 1962,'' Mohler said, ''and here we are 52 years later—he's still setting the standard of excellence.''

He spent his entire educational career in Loudoun's public schools, first on the payroll as a school bus driver during his senior year in high school. He graduated from Loudoun County High School in 1963 and returned to his alma mater after four years of college to teach English.

He especially loved teaching British literature, former Broad Run High School teacher Jo Ann Pearson recalled. So much so that he required one of his senior classes to memorize the bulk of the Canterbury Tales Prologue in Middle English.

Hatrick commented on this bit of leaked information later in the evening, saying, ''In my defense, I listened to each of them recite it.''

He served as assistant principal at Broad Run High School from 1969 to 1970, and as principal of Loudoun County High School from 1975 to 1978. He moved up the administration ranks to positions that had him overseeing special education, foreign language, instruction, planning and pupil services before he was named superintendent in 1991.

He served as superintendent under five school boards, and three former School Board members—Joe Vogric, John Andrews and Robert DuPree—did not hesitate to say that the superintendent was stubborn when it came to fighting for funding for public education.

Whether board members wanted it or not, he gave them his opinion, Vogric said, ''and it wasn't always done in a way that we liked it . . . . but it was about setting policies and taking actions to ensure the best education of our children.''

Most of the stories shared well beyond dinnertime Friday described Hatrick as a colleague, a mentor and a friend.

Whether a custodian or a principal loses a loved one, the superintendent can usually be seen at the funeral. Plays, football games, science fairs, club dedications, essay contests and, yes, retirement dinners, he's been there.

''We always knew that he cared about us,'' Pearson said.

''There's still a family feel about this district because that's how he wants it to be,'' Sharon Ackerman, who worked alongside Hatrick as assistant superintendent of instruction for 15 years, said.

W. John Brewer, principal at Dominion High School, joked that the school administration office, while called the Taj Mahal or ''the palace'' by some, ''from time to time it's simply the woodshed.'' He said Hatrick didn't scold principals or teachers but he used those moments to teach. ''He helped us grow personally and professionally,'' Brewer said. ''We've become better educators, and we've become better people.''

Whitely, who attended high school with Hatrick and later taught under his leadership, told a story about the superintendent's impression at their class's recent 50-year reunion. After a friend greeted Hatrick, she leaned over to Whitely and said, ''You know, success hasn't spoiled him one bit. He's still Skip.''

Eric Williams will officially take the helm of the school system as superintendent Tuesday.

HONORING HOOVER CASE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Hoover Case on having the Ozark Empire Fair Foundation's annual Gold Buckle Gala dedicated in his honor.

The Ozark Empire Fair Foundation was established in 2003 as a non-profit organization working to preserve Southwest Missouri's vast agricultural history and to sustain and better the Ozark Empire Fairgrounds.

Since 2004, the Foundation has held an annual gala to recognize the efforts of outstanding 4–H and FFA livestock exhibitors and to award grants and scholarships to local youths. In the ten years the event has been held, the Foundation has awarded almost $600,000 to local youths and raised over $521,000 in funds to be used for fairground improvements.

Each year, the Gold Buckle Gala is dedicated to a philanthropist that has shown outstanding support of the Foundation's goals. This year's recipient, Hoover Case of Marshfield, MO, has proved more than deserving. Case, a longtime auctioneer, created a mentoring program, Brangus for Kids, as a way of giving back to the purebred world and connecting kids with potential show animals. Case has also shown great support and love for the annual fair by being an involved volunteer. It is because of Case's continued dedication and commitment that the Foundation is able to impact the lives of so many.

I would like to thank Hoover Case for his continued support and devotion towards the Ozark Empire Fair and Ozark Empire Fair Foundation and congratulate him once again on having this year's Gold Buckle Gala held in his honor.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of international adoption. Adoption is an important building block that contributes to strong and loving families for children and parents alike.

I recently met with a family from my congressional district which adopted a young girl from Nepal. The family experienced a great deal of difficulty throughout the adoption process, as evidenced by the numerous administrative roadblocks they encountered. However, the family persevered through the adversity and eventually completed the adoption process, welcoming a new daughter into their family.

The family's dedication to providing a better life for an orphan born into poverty on the other side of the world exemplifies the spirit of international adoption. The family's perseverance is a symbol of hope for the thousands of children living in orphanages around the world who yearn to become part of a loving and nurturing family. No matter the country or continent, children in each corner of the globe deserve to be part of a family.

As Americans, we should take every opportunity to offer a helping hand to those who are less fortunate. Today, there are thousands of orphanages with a growing number of children waiting to be adopted by a loving family that will provide sustenance, support, and stability. By providing these underprivileged children with the American ideals of hope and opportunity, we not only brighten their future, but America's future as well.

TRIBUTE TO DR. VINCENT HARDING

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and Congressman RUSH HOLT, I rise to honor the life of one of Colorado's most respected and honorable residents, Dr. Vincent Harding, who passed away May 19 at age 82. This remarkable man merits both our recognition and gratitude for his unwavering efforts to improve our society. He leaves behind an impressive record of leadership in social justice and education, and he made an enormous impact on many lives.

Vincent Harding lived a life of compassion and was committed to the ''beloved community'' that his friend and colleague, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., dreamed this country could become. We are fortunate to have been touched by such an intellectually gifted man. He was an historian, theologian, teacher, social justice activist, author, and much more. The legacy that Dr. Harding leaves behind should inspire us all to continue to build on the foundation of nonviolence, justice and equality. The passion and dedication with which he labored is evident in his life's work.

Born in 1931 in Harlem, Vincent Harding attended City College of New York, earning a BA in history. For the following 15 years he demonstrated his dedication to education as he earned a master's degree in both journalism and history as well as a PhD in history. Dr. Harding, along with his first wife, the late Rosemarie Freeney, a writer and activist in her own right, moved to Atlanta in 1961 to become involved in the American civil rights movement. There, he fought for equality as an advisor to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. Harding drafted several of Dr. King's speeches and is best known for writing his ''Beyond Vietnam'' speech, a landmark 1967 anti-war sermon. Following Dr. King's death, Dr. Harding wrote a book, Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero, and he served as the first director at King's memorial center.

As a professor, Dr. Harding had an impact on countless students. He taught at a number of universities, including the University of Pennsylvania, Spelman College and Temple University, and he spent nearly three decades teaching at Denver's Iliff School of Theology. He founded the Veteran's Hope Project in order to preserve the lessons we have learned from social justice leaders. Dr. Harding's dedication did not end with his retirement. He still worked to achieve his vision of utilizing social justice activism to connect spirit, creativity, and citizenship. He endeavored to heal America and make our country the beloved community Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had envisioned. His talent for teaching, gift of inspiring others, and capacity to relate to people of diverse racial, socio-economic and educational backgrounds means that his work will live on and continue to make a difference. Vincent Harding is an example of the life of commitment and courage we all can make.

Dr. Harding is survived by his wife, Aljosie Aldrich Knight; his daughter, Dr. Rachel Harding; and son, Jonathan Harding.

Please join me in commending Dr. Vincent Harding. His leadership in the search for justice, equity and truth continually enhances our lives and builds a better future for all Americans.

JOANN MOTT

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize JoAnn Mott who is being honored for her many years of service at the Haydon Corporation. Her friends, family, and coworkers will join together to celebrate her retirement tonight at the Brownstone in Paterson, New Jersey.

JoAnn Mott was born in North Carolina. She later moved to Tennessee where she met her future husband, Vincent Mott, who was stationed at the United States Air Force Base in Nashville.

In 1966, JoAnn and Vinnie moved to New Jersey upon Vinnie's discharge from the Air Force. It was then that JoAnn began working for New Jersey Bell for a short time before starting her career at the Haydon Corporation in 1968.

The Haydon Corporation is the leading manufacturer of strut metal framing systems and serves the industrial and commercial construction industries, as well as the communications and OEM markets. The Haydon Corporation is famed for their superior products but is truly defined by their outstanding customer service to all their clients.

JoAnn worked at the Haydon Corporation up until her retirement this year. JoAnn started off as a Sales Representative and was later promoted to Sales Manager. Today, she retires as the Office Manager. Her work ethic is second to none, and she truly embodies what it means to be a hard-working American.

As her Congressman, I am very pleased to have the great fortune of being able to honor such a marvelous member of our community. I sincerely wish Mrs. JoAnn Mott and her entire family the best. I consider JoAnn and Vinnie to not only be constituents of mine, but also good friends.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the achievements of individuals like Mrs. JoAnn Mott.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Mrs. Mott's family, friends, coworkers, and all those whose lives she has touched, and me, in recognizing JoAnn Mott.

RECOGNITION OF CRS CENTENNIAL

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service, otherwise known as CRS on Capitol Hill. CRS is a unit of the Library of Congress that provides policy analysis to Members of Congress and our staffs. CRS is a tremendous resource for Congress. In 1914, in its wisdom, Congress created the predecessor to CRS, named the Legislative Reference Service, to help support our work. In 1970, the Legislative Reference Service was expanded and became CRS. These days, we rely on CRS to provide us with authoritative and objective information so we can do our jobs. CRS has an impressive repository of reports on subjects we consider, and we look to CRS and the professionals who make up its workforce to provide us with factual and nonpartisan answers. I congratulate CRS on its Centennial, and we look forward to another 100 years of service to Congress.

HONORING TINDLEY TEMPLE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Tindley Temple United Methodist Church's celebration of Nelson Mandela on July 18, 2014.

Nelson Mandela has inspired so many through his work as a revolutionary leader in the South-African anti-apartheid movement, and his later career as a politician and philanthropist left a lasting legacy. Mandela's leadership and participation in peaceful protests against the oppressive regime in South Africa led to his incarceration, and he became the face of the anti-apartheid movement. As the President of South Africa, he was the nation's first black chief executive, and the first elected in a truly democratic election. Under Nelson Mandela, the government worked tirelessly to break through the institutionalized racism, poverty, and inequality that had long plagued the nation. After he left office, he continued to work as a global advocate for human rights.

On July 18, the Tindley Temple United Methodist Church will celebrate the legacy that Nelson Mandela created. The Tindley Temple United Methodist Church is well known in Philadelphia for being the birthplace of gospel music. Dr. Charles Albert Tindley, a pastor of the Church during the Depression, is renowned for composing more than 60 hymns, including ''Stand by Me'' and ''We'll Understand It Better By and By.'' They work in service to the community through their soup kitchen, and in their aid to the ill and underprivileged in the area.

It is a privilege to recognize this celebration of a person whose leadership and commitment have inspired and supported so many around the globe. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending the Tindley Temple United Methodist Church for honoring Nelson Mandela in their celebratory day.

COMMENDING S.P. MANDALI'S NARALKAR INSTITUTE

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Shikshana Prasaraka Mandali, or S.P. Mandali, for their vision and contribution to the Indian state of Maharashtra. S.P. Mandali, a historic education society in India, was established 125 years ago on May 2, 1888.

S.P. Mandali has made significant contributions in developing and improving the quality of education in Maharashtra by founding and managing more than 40 institutions in Pune, Mumbai, Bangalore, Solapur, Chiplun, Nagothana, and other municipalities that provide education from kindergarten to graduate level courses.

I am grateful for the leadership of the S.P. Mandali: President—Shri. Bal J. Pandit, Vice President—Shri. Sushilkumar Ruia, Chairman (Managing Council)—Shri. A.S. Dadhe, Vice Chairman (Managing Council)—Shri. A.N. Mate, and Secretary—Shrimati Nanda Mane, for their hard work and commitment to education.

I want to take this opportunity to specifically recognize the Naralkar Institute of Career Development and Research (NICDR) that was started by S.P. Mandali in 1986. The NICDR was established and named in honor of the late Principal Nanasaheb Naralkar who was a great educator in Pune. The NICDR is affiliated with the University of Pune and is recognized as a research center for the Ph.D. program in Management Science. NICDR in the last twenty years has created many partnerships with different businesses and industries in the Pune region. NICDR offers many computer and vocational courses that use state of the art equipment for hands-on-training that include software and computer programming. NICDR's high standard of curriculum and meticulous trainings sets them apart from the many other institutions in Pune.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of the Director of NICDR, Dr. G.K. Shirude, his staff, and faculty for their tremendous contributions in improving the quality of education and empowering students in becoming competent managers in many fields. I would be remiss if I did not also recognize members of the Managing Committee of NICDR: Chairman—Shri. A.S. Dadhe, Members—Adv. Jayant Shaligram, Shri. A.N. Mate, Shri. Ajay Datar, Shri. V.V. Joshi, Prof. Seema Bapat, and Mrs. Jyoti S. Joshi.

Dr. Shirude and the Managing Committee of NICDR have embarked on a pathway to possibly establish community colleges in Maharashtra. In the U.S., we have had community colleges for more than 100 years and

have been a critical component in our education system. However, in India, this concept is brand new. The establishment of community colleges in India will provide greater access to education for the large population of Indians who live in rural and remote locations. It will also allow for many individuals to receive specialized training in fields that are necessary or required by local industries and businesses.

This pathway will be possible with the assistance of many stakeholders, including Captain Shivaji Mahadkar and Mr. Sanjay Puri. Captain Shivaji, a retired commando of the Indian army, a former General Secretary for the Sinik Cell of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee, and an active trustee for many educational trusts in Maharashtra, has worked closely with Indian universities in building partnerships with other institutions in Germany, United Kingdom, and the U.S. I thank him for his service and dedication to improving the quality of education in India. His collaboration with Mr. Sanjay Puri, founder and Chairman of the Alliance for U.S.-India Business, will be instrumental in advancing education in India. I know that this venture in education between U.S. and India will be beneficial for both sides.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIVISION OF CYPRUS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus, which began a conflict that continues to this day.

Since July 20, 1974, Turkey has occupied the northern territory of Cyprus, denying thousands of Greek Cypriots the right to return to their homes and imposing severe restrictions on their property rights and religious freedoms. They continue to block the exhumation of mass graves, even under UN supervision, leaving hundreds of cases of missing people unresolved.

Cyprus should not be expected to accept anything less in terms of fundamental democratic rights than any American would accept. A final resolution must be determined by the Cypriots and for the Cypriots.

I am encouraged that both parties agreed to a Joint Statement which lays the foundation for future resolution talks, and I applaud President Anastasiades' proposed confidence-building measures as helpful ways to facilitate the negotiating process.

I also wish to recognize the incredible achievements by Cyprus despite the ongoing conflict.

Cyprus has flourished as a nation and grown as a democratic stalwart in the eastern Mediterranean. This ally of the United States has helped progress U.S. interests in the region, including their integral role in the removal of chemical weapons from Syria.

As a member of the European Union, they helped push the body to designate Hezbollah a terrorist organization. Their recent discovery of offshore natural gas will not only provide a significant revenue stream for the country, but also creates opportunities for cooperation with Israel and offers an alternative energy source for the EU.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Hellenic-Israeli Alliance Caucus, I will continue to promote greater collaboration between Congress, Israel, Greece, and Cyprus.

This conflict has continued for far too long, and I call on both parties to resume negotiations and work toward a permanent resolution.

IN HONOR OF THE SILLER FAMILY, A TRIBUTE TO TUNNEL TO TOWERS

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Siller Family who lost their youngest brother, Stephen, of the FDNY's Squad One on 9/11. On the morning of 9/11 Stephen was off-duty when he heard the news. He quickly radioed in and told Squad One he would join them back at the Towers. When he got to the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel it was closed, so he strapped on sixty pounds of gear and ran through traffic towards and up and into the Towers to rejoin his FDNY brothers and help save others. Stephen was never seen or heard from again. His courage and sacrifice are a true reflection of all those who died on that day, and of our troops, who are willing to give that last full measure for us all. And out of all this heartache, his family has created a magnificent foundation to raise money to build homes for our Wounded Warriors and get families back on their feet after Hurricane Sandy; triumph out of tragedy. Stephen left behind a wonderful wife and five beautiful children, our prayers go out to them and all of those families who gave all on 9/11. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

TUNNEL TO TOWERS

As into that tunnel your heart so led!
Running through traffic up into those towers you sped!
While Stephen,
Getting closer to Heaven with every step!
All out there on that edge . . .
Between life and death . . .
As your fine heart began to crest!
For our world to bless!
But for The Greater Good!
Stephen you,
And Squad One in all you could!
''Go Together . . . Stay Together'',
to catch up to them as you would!
To do what must so be done!
While, so willing to give up all of your future sun's!
Just like all of our brave men and women,
Of The Armed Forces these ones!
To shine bright like America's son!
So brilliant like this one!
While, all in that moment of truth . . .
What your fine heart so begun!
Showing us all so the proof!
Of how angels are begun!
As thy kingdom come,
On Earth as it is in Heaven will be done!
And from that tunnel to towers . . .
While, all in those darkest of all hours!
Stephen,
As upon us your light would so shower!
Because,
On this day you weren't coming home my son!
As such selflessness so shown in all these ones!
Just like our men and women who live now without arms and legs,
Who from war come home this day!
Showing us all,
That through darkest of all hours!
It's Faith, Hope, and Courage which above all else so towers!
And holds the greatest of all powers!
As Stephen,
Step by step your climbed those towers!
Alongside all of your Brothers,
As the Angels on high cried in those hours . . .
You go . . . I go . . .
As was your most heroic creed and its power!
To save precious lives!
As why here I stand with tear in eye!
And up to heaven as a new Angel you'd rise!
And from out of all of this heartache and pain!
Of a broken hearted family love so came . . .
Out of the ashes which would remain!
Your family's great love,
Something which would so honor your name!
To give back to all of our Brothers and Sisters In Arms!
And to all of those American families who must go off to war,
And come back in such heartache and harm the same!
A chance,
To rebuild all of their most precious lives to reclaim!
For you have died Stephen,
But you are not gone!
Now all in your name and memory,
This Foundation lives on . . .
Yes Stephen,
In your honor look what was born!
Which, but put's its arms around all of our wounded warriors so warm!
Because moments are all we so have!
To live and die for something worthwhile!
And make all of the Angels up in Heaven so smile!
To climb to the mountain top!
To move onward when others stop!
As why on bended knee Stephen all in your name,
And your brothers who died with you the same . . .
We honor our troops who like you were so ready to die in faith's name!
For all of those heroes,
Who come back home to rebuild their shattered lives!
To give them all a future,
A warm home,
And some hope so all inside!
Telling them hero your not alone!
As they run to recovery proving a home!
As we discover how like yours Stephen,
How much strength a heart can so own!
When Johnny comes marching home!
Tunnel to Towers,
Will be there for your America's heroes throughout all of the hours!
Just like 9/11,
We Will Never Forget what all your hearts so own!
So our Brothers and Sisters,
Our wounded warriors . . . you will never be alone!

STATEMENT ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of July 20th, a special day of remembrance for the families and loved ones of all those who have suffered so greatly as the result of one of the biggest national tragedies in modern Greek History—the 1974 illegal invasion and occupation of the island of Cyprus by Turkish soldiers.

On July 20th, 40 years will have passed since the invasion forced nearly two hundred thousand Greek Cypriots to leave their homes in the occupied area and become refugees in their own country.

Turkey continues to forcibly occupy more than one-third of Cyprus with more than 43,000 troops. This amounts to almost one Turkish soldier for every two Turkish Cypriots.

To date, Turkey has repeatedly ignored all U.N. Resolutions pertaining to Cyprus and has continued to occupy the island in complete violation of international law.

As the co-chair and co-founder of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I fully support the reunification of Cyprus, and I am encouraged by the commitment of the Government of Cyprus to the UN-sponsored reunification talks.

I believe the partnership between America and Cyprus is based on mutual respect, a commitment to common goals, and a sharing of fundamental values.

I hope the recently renewed peace talks will allow Cyprus to take advantage of their gas reserves in the Eastern Mediterranean, and the ability to work with another strong ally, Israel, to deliver natural gas to Europe.

It is up to Congress to continue to make our voices heard on our ultimate goal of a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace, security and stability.

RECOGNIZING POLLY'S FREEZE

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my home state of Indiana takes great pride in creating an atmosphere conducive to small business innovation and entrepreneurship. When locally owned businesses are given the opportunity to succeed, families, workers, and the surrounding community all benefit. Once such example is Polly's Freeze, a popular ice cream shop just outside of Georgetown, Indiana. Polly's Freeze is a classic tale of American entrepreneurship. Elmer and Polly Gleitz purchased an abandoned filling station with the intention of restoring the facility and reopening it. After some consideration and a clever suggestion from Polly, the Gleitz family abandoned those plans and decided to turn the property into an ice cream shop and food stand. Sixty-two years later, Polly's Freeze stands as a model for excellent service and delicious ice cream that attracts large crowds all season long.

After opening in 1952, Elmer and Polly ran the business for several years until they passed it on to their children George, Donna, and Delores. Donna and her husband Paul continued the tradition until their retirement in 2009. Subsequently, Polly's was left to Penny Bodner, an employee of thirty-two years and friend of the family. The business is now under the direction of Cara and Mike Rothrock, also longtime employees, who are dedicated to sustaining Polly's reputation for quality products and service in a family-friendly environment.

From all across southern Indiana, residents can identify the iconic neon Polly-the-Parrot sign resting just to the side of Highway 62. It serves as a guide to Hoosiers who are looking for some good food or a cool treat on a hot summer's evening. Polly's has long been the gathering spot for youth sports teams who stop by after games to celebrate with Polly's famous upside-down banana split or their legendary orange sherbet. Polly's also provides patrons with a variety of food items such as the Pollyburger and their ground beef barbecue—a secret recipe known by only a few employees. Kids and adults alike are attracted to Polly's for its comfortable 1950's-like atmosphere, creating the perfect place to reconnect with old friends or even make new ones.

Polly's Freeze has become a landmark in Southern Indiana, exemplifying the entrepreneurial spirit that has built this great nation. For over six decades, Polly's has provided generations of loyal patrons with lasting memories, as well as great food and cool treats. I would like to congratulate Polly's Freeze for their dedication to both their customers and the community—and I wish them continued success for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL AGENCY SNOW REMOVAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ACT OF 2014

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, The Federal Agency Snow Removal in the District of Columbia Act of 2014, which I introduce today, is a bill that I have worked on with the National Park Service (NPS), at its request, to create greater efficiency and to remove snow from federal agency property in the District of Columbia in the most efficient way.

The bill amends a 1922 law by making federal agencies in the District responsible for the removal of snow and ice in public areas associated with their buildings instead of NPS. For years, agencies have taken this commonsense action in the District and assumed this responsibility, but the law has never been updated to reflect this practice, leaving NPS with legal liability. This bill simply brings the law in line with current practice.

I ask that my colleagues support this no-cost bill.

HONORING THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE (CRS) AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ON ITS 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today, we celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress. In honor of their history and continued pursuit of knowledge, I would like to commemorate CRS as we celebrate this milestone today.

CRS stands as an invaluable and respected institution in Congress—providing insight, research, and in-depth analysis on a wide range of issues. A Progressive-era invention, this service has evolved over the last century, growing in both size and scope since Wisconsin Senator Robert LaFollette first championed the idea.

In the 100 years since their inception, CRS has steadily provided comprehensive and objective research to the entire legislature. My staff and I have repeatedly benefited from the nonpartisan expertise provided by CRS and are fortunate that they continue to serve as a shared workforce for Congress. At a time of unprecedented partisanship in Washington, CRS has remained the unbiased repository of knowledge our nation needs.

Congratulations to the Congressional Research Service and its dedicated staff on this special day. I'd like to submit for the RECORD—a brief history of CRS:

FORMATION

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a service unit of the Library of Congress.

The idea of a legislative reference service for Congress was first championed by Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Sr. (served in the House from 1885–1891, and in the Senate from 1906–1925), and Rep. John M. Nelson (served in the House from 1906–1919, and from 1921–1933).

Supporters realized their goal through a Senate floor amendment offered by Rep. LaFollette to the Library's 1915 appropriations bill.

Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam established the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) in the Library of Congress by administrative order on July 18, 1914.

In its early years, LRS provided basic reference services to assist lawmakers in their work.

Both LRS in 1914, and CRS today, benefits from the Library's collections for its research, analysis, and dissemination of information and materials to assist the Congress.

EVOLUTION

By the 1940s and following World War II, demands on LRS had increased significantly.

The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act (LRA) called for an increase in the size and scope of LRS and directed it to hire expert policy specialists to provide expertise to Congress in subject fields aligned with a new committee system.

In 1970, the Service underwent another transformation with the passage of the LRA which renamed it the Congressional Research Service.

Emphasizing the fact that the research and informational needs of the Congress required

the services of highly-skilled experts, the 1970 Act mandated that CRS provide authoritative and objective research and analysis as well as close support for Members and committees.

The Service evolved into a 21st century organization that utilizes formats and delivery methods (e.g., CRS4Congress Twitter, CRS.gov, Congress.gov) for CRS products and services.

CRS TODAY

Today, CRS provides comprehensive, objective, and non-partisan research and analysis to the entire Congress on all legislative and oversight issues of interest. In the Second Session of this Congress, CRS identified over 150 issues of interest to Congress that they could support.

CRS provides reports, confidential memoranda, briefings, and programs to Congress about policy issues and the legislative process.

CRS has a diverse workforce of over 600 analysts, attorneys, information professionals and support staff. The workforce is composed of expert, highly-trained, and collaborative professional staff, dedicated to supporting the work of Congress.

In FY2013, Members and committees received information and analysis from CRS in more than 636,000 responses that took the form of 67,000 requests for custom analysis and research, 9,000 congressional participations in 350 seminars, and over half a million instances of Website services.

CRS is a repository of objective knowledge and expertise that Congress can rely on when making difficult policy decisions.

THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OAKLAND LIVINGSTON HUMAN SERVICE AGENCY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Oakland Livingston Human Service Agency's (OLHSA) 50th Anniversary. OLHSA, founded in 1964 as a part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty, provides over 70 collaborative programs to the elderly, disabled, and low-income residents of Oakland and Livingston Counties.

Created with the mission of empowering individuals to attain self-sufficiency, OLHSA has developed a long record of success. Just last year, it provided information, advice, and material assistance to over 50,000 people—support that helped them to improve their own lives, as well as the vitality of their communities. OLHSA provided them with crucial resources such as food assistance, tax preparation, financial planning, foreclosure prevention counseling, referral guidance, early childhood development and energy assistance.

Recognizing the key role that education plays as a tool that empowers individuals to shape their own future, OLHSA has directed significant resources into education at the youngest ages with its Head Start program. Centered on the principle of involving parents directly in their children's learning process, OLHSA sees its Head Start program as a vital component of its efforts to break the poverty cycle. Through this program, OLHSA continues to demonstrate its commitment to strengthening communities by providing the basic services that enable its clients to attain prosperity.

Veterans facing housing insecurity can also turn to OLHSA to access the VA Supportive Services for the Veteran Families program, which was created with the goal of eliminating homelessness amongst veterans and their families. By providing case management, rent payment assistance, and emergency housing, OLHSA energetically works to ensure that veteran families in Oakland and Livingston Counties receive the housing and peace of mind they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, as the Oakland Livingston Human Services Agency celebrates its 50th Anniversary of service to communities across Southeastern Michigan, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the remarkable impact it has made on its clients. Thanks to OLHSA's leadership and the dedication of its staff, many tens of thousands of residents of Oakland and Livingston counties of Michigan have received support at critical moments in their lives. In the face of the recent economic challenges in Michigan, OLHSA's programs were vital to families' continued well-being. I congratulate OLHSA's staff on all of their organization's accomplishments over the last five decades and I look forward to continuing to work with them to strengthen the Southeast Michigan community by empowering its residents with the necessary tools to build a successful future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PREVENTING TERMINATION OF UTILITY SERVICES IN BANKRUPTCY ACT OF 2014

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, utility companies provide many basic and life-saving services, such as electricity to light our homes, water to drink, and gas to heat our homes. Sometimes, however, individuals, through no fault of their own, struggle to pay for these services often in the face of devastating medical debt, job loss, or economic disruption caused by divorce. While resorting to bankruptcy provides some relief from financial distress, current law permits utility companies to force these debtors to pay security deposits for continued service even if they were current on their bills before filing for bankruptcy or if they promise to be current on their bills after bankruptcy. Utility companies typically insist that debtors pay at least two months or more of their average bills as a deposit—in addition to requiring that they remain current on their utility bills after bankruptcy—in exchange for the utility continuing to supply service.

H.R. ___, the ''Preventing Termination of Utility Service in Bankruptcy Act of 2014,'' corrects this injustice. It provides that if the debtor remains current on his or her utility bills after filing for bankruptcy relief, the debtor should not have to pay a deposit to the utility to continue service.

In Detroit, for example, families across the city have seen their water rates increase by 119 percent over the past decade. During the same period, the Nation generally and Detroit in particular suffered in the aftermath of a global financial crisis that left one-in-five local residences in foreclosure and sent local unemployment rates skyrocketing.

Fortunately, we are incrementally recovering from the Great Recession of 2008. For those individuals who must seek bankruptcy relief, however, we should ensure that their ability to pay their utility bills going forward is not hindered by unnecessary demands for deposits if these debtors remain current on their payments to these companies.

Terminating a family's access to such life-saving services that keeps the lights on, warms our homes, and ensures that they can bathe, hydrate and prepare meals is simply wrong if these utility bills are being paid on time.

This legislation is part of a range of solutions that are needed to address the still pervasive adverse impacts of the Great Recession of 2008. I continue to work with my colleagues in Congress, state and federal officials, and my constituents to defend the right to water and protect public health. I will not tolerate the notion that—in the 21st Century, in the wealthiest nation on earth—families should go without access to affordable public water and sanitation services.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 2014, I was unavoidably detained from votes due to a conflict. Had I been present on the House floor I would have voted as follows on amendments to H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act: ''no'' on rollcall No. 360, the Wittman/Duncan (SC) Amendment; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 361, the Lowenthal/Capps/Farr/Holt/Honda/Huffman/Langevin/Peters (CA)/Pingree/Shea-Porter/Lee Amendment; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 362, the Capps/Brownley/Huffman/Lowenthal Amendment; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 363, the Deutch Amendment; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 364, the Blumenauer Amendment; ''no'' on rollcall No. 365, the Bishop (UT) Amendment; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 366, the DeFazio Amendment.

A TRIBUTE TO THE JERSEY BOYS . . . THE FOUR SEASONS: A BAND FOR ALL SEASONS . . . DOO WOP DO WA!

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following poem penned by Albert Carey Caswell.

''Are the stars out tonight''

''it doesn't matter who's wrong or right''
''I've only got eyes for you'' . . .
doo wop do wa!
In the rhythm of our lives . . .
In these moments that we're alive . . .
All in the music of our lives!
Comes these beats,
these rhythms,
and these measures . . .
we all so feel inside . . .
These lyrics . . .
these sounds . . .
which so gives us such pleasure,
all in our strides . . .
All within our hearts,
which so makes us cry . . .
Taking us all so back in time,
to all those moments . . .
we so cherished so deep down inside . . .
Which so ''Stay'' with us,
as so timelessly they do reside!
And no matter where we are,
when we hear them we all so smile . . .
Making us all want to get up and dance,
so all the while!
To move to that beat,
to that music,
to that rhythm,
to that cadence oh so very sweet!
As it was the birth of Rock and Rock,
and doo wop was King as so!
When a King once so ruled the show!
The one who could so shake,
rattle,
and roll!
As Dick Clark,
and The American Band Stand,
so helped that vibe to grow!
As a group of Beatles invaded our coast!
As Motown but meant the most!
And for our Boys in Nam,
marching through those jungles,
it so helped them cope!
As music was everywhere,
touching our very souls there!
When a group of . . .
Jersey Boys let it rip . . . let it go!
Starting out as The Four Lovers . . .
then into The Lovers . . .
Becoming A Band for all The Seasons
those record covers those . . .
And then Franki ''Working It's Way
Back To You''. . . like no others you!
As The Four Seasons . . . oh!
Because ''Breaking Up Is Hard To Do!''
Seasons change but still over,
100 million records have been sold!
As why A Band For All Seasons,
we now know!
FEE . . . FI . . . FO . . . FOM as these Jersey
Giants turned music into GOLD!
With the founding members Franki,
and Bob being raised in the depression,
like a ''RAG DOLL'' it left them with
quite an impression!
Maybe that's why,
their music lift's us all up so!
And there's nothing false,
about Franki's 3 octave voice,
and falsesetto!
As it makes you feel like your in heaven,
even when your in a ghetto . . .
Cutting deep into our hearts like a stiletto!
As to that depression they said,
''Dawn, (Go Away) . . . your no good for
me'' learning life's lessons!
Forming a band,
to so make all their dreams come true!
Knowing,
they had to ''Walk Like A Man'' . . .
and ''talk like a man'' too!
They did not go ''Begging'' as they
knew . . . ''Big Girls Don't Cry'',
and neither do Big Guys too . . ..
Yea ''that's just an alibi . . .
they don't cry''
As to heartache they said ''Bye Bye Baby
(Baby Goodbye)'' . . .
And ''Let's Hang On'' (to what we
got), and ''Don't Think Twice It's
Alright'' . . .
As all in these The Seasons of our lives,
they have left us with such a warm hue!
That's why on any radio station today,
''There's Always Something There To
Remind Me''of The Four Seasons you!
With 46 hits on Billboards Hot 40,
that's true!
Yea, ''I Got You Under My Skin''!
Because your music goes with me
wherever I go, and been!
Yea I, ''Can't Take My Eyes Off Of
You'' nor my ears too!
Yea your music,
Your Just To Good To Be True''
And even ''Ronnie'' . . .
Ronald Reagan loved you!
And after the concert's over,
they'll be crying too,
''Aint That Shame''!
''Oh What A Night'' ''SHERRY''
listening to you!
''Alone (Why Must We Be Alone)''?
Can't you just play one more song?
Because before The New York Giants
moved to Jersey,
this place was already inhabited by Four
Giants who this state so owned!
The Jersey Boys music,
too all our hearts so roamed!
Even The Great One,
Frank from Hoboken,
would have paid many a token to listen to
you and your records to own!
Because in The Seasons of our lives,
all in our thoughts and hearts so deep
down inside . . .
There is some music upon our souls rely!
That when we are feeling low,
gives hearts to rise!
That we will treasure,
and cherish until the day we die!
The Fours Seasons,
are but an important put of all our lives!
And why for so many reasons,
you guys are The Band Four All Seasons!
''Are the stars out tonight'' ''it doesn't
matter who's wrong or right'' ''I've only
got eyes for you'' . . . doo wop do wa!
Oh Jersey Boys how you do what you do
to us so all inside!
Doo wop do waaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 381, 385, 389, 390, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, and 404 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING CHIEF TONY SCHNELL AND CAPTAIN KURT IRELAND

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the decorated careers of Chief Tony Schnell and Captain Kurt Ireland of the Olean Police Department. Longtime members of the department, Chief Schnell and Captain Ireland have a combined 68 years of dedicated service to the Olean community.

Tony Schnell joined the Olean Police Department in 1982 and rose to the rank of chief in 2006. Throughout his 32-year career, Chief Schnell earned the trust and respect of his fellow officers, city leaders, and citizens. During his time with the Olean Police Department, Chief Schnell completed training at the FBI Academy, learning advanced skills and strategies that have positively benefited the department. Throughout his tenure as chief, Mr. Schnell repeatedly fought to secure necessary funding and support for the police department. His career exemplifies the values outlined in the department's mission statement, serving with "integrity, common sense, and sound judgment."

Kurt Ireland joined the Olean Police Department in 1977. He spent the majority of his 36-year career with the department's patrol division, earning promotions to sergeant in 1993 and captain in 1998. While holding these leadership positions, Captain Ireland managed the daily operations of his unit and established department procedures. Captain Ireland was a responsible, dedicated, and hard-working officer who served his community with the highest level of integrity.

I congratulate Chief Tony Schnell and Captain Kurt Ireland on their retirement from the Olean Police Department. We owe these men a debt of gratitude for their combined 68 years of service to the Olean community. Their impressive careers in law enforcement and numerous contributions to our community improved quality of life and made Olean a safer place to live.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, July 18, 2014*

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 18, 2014.

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

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again we come to You to ask wisdom, patience and peace for the Members of the people's House. As they encounter their constituents, endow them with grace and understanding, especially of those issues which are most pressing.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them in their service to the work of the Capitol.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On July 16, 2014, pursuant to section 3307 of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider resolutions to authorize 27 prospectuses, including 24 alteration projects, two construction projects, and one project design, included in the General Services Administration's FY 2014 and FY2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Programs.

Our Committee continues to work to cut waste and the cost of federal property and leases. The resolutions include eliminating or reducing previously approved construction projects, saving nearly $300 million. Many of the alteration resolutions will reconfigure government-owned space to consolidate agencies out of leased space and avoid $610 million in lease costs over the term of the leases. These savings more than offset the total cost of the approved projects by more than $80 million. All the projects approved are within amounts included in the relevant appropriations bills.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 16, 2014.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES, VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for the reconfiguration and renovation of space within government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2014 to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, and decrease reliance on leased space at a total cost of $70,000,000, a prospectus as amended by the FY2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that consolidation projects result in reduced annual rent paid by the tenant agency.

Provided, that no consolidation project exceeds $20,000,000 in costs.

Provided further, that preference is given to consolidation projects that achieve an office utilization rate of 130 usable square feet or less per person.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PFP-2014

FY2014 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the reconfiguration and renovation of space within government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2014 to support the General Services Administration's (GSA's) ongoing consolidation efforts to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, decrease reliance on leased space, and reduce the government's environmental footprint.

FY2014 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$100,000,000

Program Summary

As part of its ongoing effort to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, decrease reliance on leased space, and reduce the government's environmental footprint, GSA is identifying consolidation opportunities within its inventory of real property assets. These opportunities are presented through surveys and studies, partnering with client agencies, and through agency initiatives such as Client Portfolio Planning (CPP) and Transforming Real Property Information and Management (TRIM). Projects will vary in size by location and agency mission/operations, however, no single project will be more than $10M in costs or exceed a 5 year Estimated Economic Payback. All projects will aim for a typical Office Utilization Rate of 130 usf/per person or less.

Typical projects include the following:

- Reconfiguration and alteration of existing federal space to accommodate incoming agency relocation/consolidation. (Note: May include reconfigurations of existing occupied federal tenant space)
- Incidental alterations and system upgrades such as fire sprinklers or HVAC, needed as part of relocation and consolidation

Projects will be selected in line with the following criteria:

- First consideration will be given to projects that are identified as a reduction opportunity in a Customer Portfolio Plan which has been agreed to by both GSA and the subject agency and meet the remaining criteria.
- Proposed consolidation projects will result in a reduction in annual rent paid by the impacted customer agency.
- Consolidation of expiring leases into GSA owned buildings will have preference over those business cases for lease cancellations

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PFP-2014

- Co-location with other agencies where there are shared resources/special space will receive preference over single agency occupancies

- Links to other consolidation projects will receive preference over stand-alone projects

Justification

Consistent with Administration initiatives such as the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*, as well as Congressional efforts to dispose of excess and underutilized properties, GSA is continually analyzing opportunities to improve space utilization and realize long-term cost savings for the government. Funding for space consolidations is essential to ensuring that GSA can execute those opportunities.

Projects funded under this authorization will enable agencies to relocate from either leased or federally-owned space to federally-owned space that more efficiently meets mission needs. These relocations will result in improved space utilization, cost savings for the American taxpayers, and a reduced environmental impact.

FY2014 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$100,000,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PFP-2014

Certification of Need

Current Administration and Congressional initiatives call for improved space utilization, lower costs for the government and a reduced environmental footprint. It has been determined that the proposed consolidation program is the most practical solution to meeting those goals.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on April 4, 2013

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Acting Administrator, General Services Administration

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

Jacob K. Javits Federal Building & 201 Varick Street – NY, NY	5,000,000
George H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD	621,000
Norfolk Federal Building - Norfolk, VA	1,811,000
Peachtree Summit – Atlanta, GA	509,000
Schiller Park – Vernon Hills, IL	520,000
Austin Federal Courthouse – Austin, TX	14,416,000
Wallace F. Bennett Federal Office Building – Salt Lake City, UT	4,400,000
Evo A. DeConcini Courthouse – Tucson, AZ	3,804,000
300 North Los Angeles - Los Angeles, CA	5,000,000
Guarantee Savings Building – Fresno, CA	155,000
Chet Holifield Federal Building – Laguna Niguel, CA	674,000
Ronald Dellums – Oakland, CA	1,470,000
Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH – San Diego, CA (2 projects)	5,020,000
U.S. Trustees	2,733,000
Federal Protective Service	2,287,000
911 Federal Building – Portland, OR	2,148,000
Bank of America Fifth Ave & Jackson FB – Seattle, WA	1,143,000
Hubert H. Humphrey Building – Washington, DC	6,740,000
Mary E. Switzer Building, 330 C Street SW – Washington, DC	10,384,000
7980 Science Applications Court – Vienna, VA	3,569,000
Total	$67,384,000

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

Jacob K. Javits FB & 201 Varick Street – New York, NY **$5,000,000**

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) currently occupies 182,000 rentable square feet (RSF) at a leased location at 1133 Avenue of the Americas in New York, NY. The IRS is currently working on regional space reduction alternatives including desk sharing initiatives and plans to relocate the employees located at this location to approximately 92,000 RSF of space within several federally owned and leased locations. This project proposes consolidating 47,000 RSF of the 92,000 RSF within two Federal buildings -- 26 Federal Plaza and 201 Varick Street, prior to the lease expiration on September 21, 2014. The relocation into existing government-owned and leased space will eliminate the need for the 1133 Avenue of the Americas lease saving the taxpayer almost $9,000,000 annually in government leasing costs and will save IRS approximately $7,000,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office Utilization Rate (UR) from 143 to 86.

In addition to the $5,000,000 in needed build-out costs, the project also will require $250,000 in move costs and $3,450,000 in IT, furniture, and security funded by IRS.

George H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD **$621,000**

IRS currently occupies 200,697 RSF in the George H. Fallon Federal Building in Baltimore, MD; however this project only affects a 154,797 RSF area. This project proposes the release of approximately 62,815 RSF by 1st Quarter FY2015. The project includes consolidation of excess space and implementation of hoteling for frequent telework employees. The project will save IRS approximately $1,117,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 318 to 190. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $621,000 in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $453,000 in IT, security, move and other project costs funded by IRS. IRS is not purchasing furniture, but they will be disposing of 245 workstations.

Norfolk Federal Building – Norfolk, VA **$1,811,000**

Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Enforcement Removal Operations (ERO) currently occupies 6,440 RSF of a 20,125 RSF lease at 5280 Henneman Drive in Norfolk, VA. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) occupied the remainder of the space until they moved to a new leased location in FY2013. GSA only may cancel the lease in full, so GSA proposes moving ERO to the Norfolk Federal Building to cancel the lease prior to expiration in 2016. The project will eliminate the need for 20,125 RSF of leased space, saving the taxpayer $300,000 annually in government leasing costs, and will save ERO $14,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 108 to 94.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

In addition to the $1,811,000 in needed build-out costs, the project also will require $57,000 in agency move costs and $614,000 in space fit-out funded by ICE.

Peachtree Summit – Atlanta, GA **$509,000**

The IRS proposes to reduce its footprint by 47,460 RSF in the Peachtree Summit Federal Building, Atlanta, GA. This project will reduce approximately $745,456 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 195 to 144. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $509,000 in needed build-out costs, the project also will require $380,902 in IRS funding for IT, security, move, and other project costs.

Schiller Park – Vernon Hills, IL **$520,000**

IRS will be terminating the Vernon Hills, IL, leased location, which expires June 30, 2015. This project proposes renovating the Schiller Park, IL, facility to incorporate the Vernon Hills lease, resulting in a reduction of 9,335 RSF from the release of the Vernon Hills lease location. In addition, IRS will release 9,944 RSF from the Schiller Park lease. Together, these space releases will reduce IRS' footprint by 19,279 RSF. This project will save the taxpayer approximately $450,000 annually in government leasing costs, and will save the IRS more than $370,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 178 to 120.

In addition to the $520,000 in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $487,429 in IRS funding for furniture, IT, moves, and other project costs.

Austin Federal Courthouse – Austin, TX **$14,416,000**

GSA proposes a consolidation and backfill of federally owned space in Austin, TX. The project will consolidate the Court of Appeals, Bankruptcy Court, U.S. Trustees and Marshals operations from the Thornberry Federal Building into the historic Austin Federal Courthouse. This move will reduce the total RSF from 85,000 to 53,000 and will backfill the historic courthouse which has been 100% vacant since the District Court moved to the new Austin Courthouse in 2012. Additionally, the project proposes backfilling 27,000 RSF of space vacated in the Thornberry Federal Building with the U.S. Attorney's currently located in leased space. The project will eliminate the need for that lease saving the taxpayer over $700,000 annually in government lease costs. The project will also save the Courts and U.S. Marshalls over $750,000 annually in rental payments and allow the government to retain an asset that would otherwise be slated for disposal. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to improve their overall Total Office UR in the Austin Federal Courthouse.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

In addition to the $14 million needed for the consolidation project, $500,000 will funded by the agencies to cover moving and relocation costs not covered under the consolidation activities program.

Wallace F. Bennett Federal Office Building – Salt Lake City, UT **$4,400,000**

This project is part of a larger realignment strategy for the Federal inventory in Salt Lake City that includes the Wallace F. Bennett Federal Office Building (Bennett), Frank Moss Courthouse, and the Salt Lake City Annex.

The Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the U.S. Forest Service are currently co-located in 116,000 RSF of leased space in Salt Lake City. FSA plans to move into Bennett, and this project would relocate the Forest Service into 58,000 RSF at Bennett. Maintaining co-location will allow the two agencies to continue to share a 10 Gig bandwidth fiber optic connection that saves approximately $500,000 annually in IT costs. In addition, this project will eliminate the need for the lease saving the taxpayer more than $1,500,000 in annual government leasing costs, and will save the Forest Service approximately $220,000 in annual rental payments. This project supports the proposed FY2015 consolidation project at the Wallace F. Bennett Federal Office Building, but does not duplicate the work or scope requested as part of that request. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 226 to 150. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the required construction costs, the project also will require $1,500,000 in U.S. Forest Service funding for moving and tenant fit-out costs.

Evo A. DeConcini Courthouse –Tucson, AZ **$3,804,000**

The U.S. Probation Office (Probation) currently occupies 18,305 RSF at a leased location at 407 West Congress and 25,117 RSF in the federally owned Evo A. DeConcini Courthouse. GSA plans to reconfigure 33,568 RSF of space within the DeConcini Courthouse to consolidate Probation into one location and eliminate the need for 9,854 RSF of space. The project will eliminate the need for the lease, saving the taxpayer $556,000 in annual government leasing costs, and will save Probation approximately $370,000 in annual rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 206 to 108.

In addition to the $3,804,000 needed for build-out costs, the project also will require approximately $363,000 in moving costs and $640,000 telecommunications and furniture costs funded by the U.S. Probation Office.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

300 North Los Angeles - Los Angeles, CA **$5,000,000**

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) currently occupies 82,741 RSF in a leased location at 611 6th Street, Los Angeles, CA, and is seeking to reduce their overall footprint and rental of space costs in Los Angeles. GSA proposes relocating HUD to approximately 59,000 RSF within the 300 North Los Angeles Federal Building prior to the 611 6th Street lease expiration March 19, 2016. The project will eliminate the need for the lease, saving the taxpayer $2.5 million annually in government leasing costs and will save HUD approximately $1.3 million annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 328 to 195. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $5,000,000 in build-out costs, approximately $1,700,000 will be funded by HUD for moving and space fit-out costs.

Guarantee Savings Building – Fresno, CA **$155,000**

The IRS currently occupies 51,982 RSF in three leased locations in Fresno, California. This project proposes collapsing the current lease at the Van Ness building, which expires December 31, 2014, into the other two existing leased locations that do not expire until 2019 and 2021, respectively. This project will eliminate the need for 17,400 RSF of leased space, saving the taxpayer $489,636 annually in government leasing costs and will save IRS $398,962 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 192 to 142. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $155,000 in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $253,586 in IT, security, move and other project costs funded by IRS. IRS will utilize GSA's Total Workplace FIT program (TW/FIT) to purchase furniture, fixtures, equipment (FFE) at the new location.

The GSA TW/FIT program will fund $58,974 in project costs that will be amortized in their rent over five years.

Chet Holifield Federal Building – Laguna Niguel, CA **$674,000**

IRS currently occupies 197,864 RSF in the Chet Holifield Federal Building in Laguna Niguel, California. This project proposes the release of approximately 32,046 RSF of space on the third floor. The project includes repurposing an underutilized large computer room and shifting frequent telework employees into hoteling workstations. The project will save IRS $905,778 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 187 to 115.

In addition to the $674,000 needed for build-out costs, the project will also require $569,943 in IRS funding for IT, security, move, and other project costs.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

Ronald Dellums Federal Building – Oakland, CA **$1,470,000**

IRS currently occupies 277,221 RSF in the Ronald Dellums Federal Building, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California. This project will optimize the space by releasing 26,373 RSF on the 10th floor of the South Tower, move employees to the 8th and 9th floors, and implement shared workstations. This project will affect 137 employees and reuse current furniture where needed. The project will save IRS $634,374 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 203 to 119.

In addition to the $1,470,000 in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $1,271,576 in IRS funding for IT, security, move, and other project costs. IRS will utilize GSA's Total Workplace FIT program (TW/FIT) to purchase furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE) at the new location.

The GSA TW/FIT program will fund $338,882 in project costs, which will be amortized in their rent over five years for FFE.

Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH – San Diego, CA **$2,733,000**

The U.S. Trustees are currently located in 10,039 RSF of leased space at 402 West Broadway in San Diego, CA. This project proposes consolidating the U.S. Trustees into 9,008 RSF of space within the Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH. The project will eliminate the need for 10,039 RSF of leased space saving the taxpayer $396,000 annually in government leasing costs and will save the U.S. Trustees $127,000 annually in rental payments. This project supports the proposed FY2014 consolidation project at the Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH, but does not duplicate the work or scope requested as part of that request. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 359 to 202. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $2,733,000 needed in construction costs, approximately $225,000 will be funded by the U.S. Trustees for moving costs and space fit-out.

Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH – San Diego, CA **$2,287,000**

The Federal Protective Service (FPS) is currently located in 7,025 RSF of space at 101 West Broadway in San Diego, CA. This project proposes consolidating FPS into 6,500 RSF of space within the Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH. The project will backfill vacant federally owned space, eliminate the need for 7,025 RSF of leased space, and will save FPS approximately $72,000 annually in rental payments. This project supports the proposed FY14 consolidation project at the Edward J. Schwartz FB & CH, but does not duplicate the work or scope requested as part of

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

that request. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 180 to 133. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to $2,287,000 needed in build-out costs, $159,000 will be funded by FPS for moving costs and space fit-out.

911 Federal Building – Portland, OR **$2,148,000**

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is currently located in 109,000 RSF of space in the 911 Federal Building in Portland, OR. In order to improve FWS' space utilization and reduce their future rental of space costs, GSA proposes reducing their footprint by 25 percent within the 911 Building to 81,000 RSF. This project will save FWS almost $300,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 194 to 140. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to build-out costs, approximately $210,000 will be funded by FWS for moving costs. FWS will also use GSA's FIT program to provide the $3,800,000 needed for furniture.

Bank of America Fifth Ave & Jackson FB – Seattle, WA **$1,143,000**

IRS currently occupies 274,898 RSF at the Jackson Federal Building in Seattle, WA. This project proposes to reconfigure IRS' space within the building in order to relocate IRS Criminal Investigations (CI) from a lease location less than half a mile away, into the Jackson Federal Building. The current lease for IRS CI office is 10,929 RSF. By moving and consolidating from the lease, as well as eliminating 4,235 RSF of training space within the Jackson Federal Building, IRS is realizing a space reduction of 15,164 RSF. This project will save the taxpayer $524,000 annually in government leasing costs, save IRS $388,176 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 166 to 153. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less.

In addition to the $1,143,000 in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $493,000 in IT, security, move and other project costs funded by IRS.

Hubert H. Humphrey Building – Washington, DC **$6,740,000**

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) currently houses the majority of the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) in three locations: the Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Wilbur J. Cohen Building and one leased location at Silver Spring Centre, located at 8455 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Maryland. This project proposed consolidating the Wilbur J. Cohen and Silver Spring Centre locations onto the third floor of the Humphrey Building. If completed, the project will result in OCIO's occupancy decreasing from 85,834 RSF to 58,339 RSF – a reduction of 27,495 RSF. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 161 to 80.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

As evidenced by the low utilization rate, OCIO's consolidation is HHS's first opportunity to create a showcase space for employee mobility in its headquarters building - a strategic goal for HHS in its efforts to reduce its footprint. This project will save the taxpayer $1,816,472 annually in government leasing costs. Furthermore, it will save HHS approximately $750,000 in annual rental payments and further reduce HHS's portfolio of leased space by 57,165 RSF.

HHS will utilize GSA's Total Workplace FIT (TW/FIT) program to purchase furniture, fixtures, equipment (FFE) and IT at the new location. GSA TW/FIT program will fund $6.71 million costs, which will be amortized in their rent over three years for IT and five years for FFE.

Mary E. Switzer Building, 330 C Street SW – Washington, DC **$10,384,000**

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) currently houses five divisions, which comprise approximately 1,627 employees in 399,031 RSF, at seven different leased locations and two federally owned buildings throughout Washington, DC. The leased locations are: 1250 Maryland Avenue SW, 901 D Street SW, One Massachusetts Avenue NW, 800 North Capitol Street NW, 355 E Street SW, 425 3rd Street SW, 1425 New York Avenue NW. The two federally owned buildings include HHS's headquarters at 200 Independence Ave SW and 330 C Street, SW. HHS will consolidate these seven leased and two owned locations into the federally owned Mary E. Switzer Building located at 330 C St SW, Washington, DC. The rentable square feet will be reduced from 399,031 to 374,810 - a reduction of 24,221 RSF. The project will save the taxpayer $17,388,582 annually in government leasing costs and will save HHS approximately $969,015 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 162 to 135. GSA will continue to work with the Agency to accommodate a Total Office UR of 130 or less. HHS will utilize GSA's Total Workplace FIT program (TW/FIT) to purchase furniture, fixtures, equipment (FFE) and IT at the new location.

In addition to the $10,384,000 needed in consolidation funding, the GSA TW/FIT program will fund $27 million costs which will be amortized in their rent over three years for IT and five years for FFE.

7980 Science Applications Court – Vienna, VA **$3,569,000**

IRS currently occupies 41,770 RSF in a leased location at One Skyline Place, Falls Church, Virginia, which expires March 31, 2014, and 19,034 RSF at 50/66 Office Plaza, 11166 Main Street, Fairfax, Virginia, which expires September 30, 2014, for a total of 60,804 RSF. This action proposes consolidation of these two leases plus 25,100 RSF from 6009 Oxon Hill Road, Oxon Hill, Maryland, which expires 1/9/2016 into 47,450 RSF of space at 7980 Science Applications Court, Vienna, Virginia, which is currently vacant. When complete, this project will eliminate the need for 85,904 RSF of leased space, saving the taxpayer more than $2.75 million annually in government leasing costs and will save IRS over $600,000 annually in rental payments. This project will reduce the Total Office UR from 230 to 125.

In addition to the $3.6 million in needed build-out costs, the project will also require $2.6 million in IT, security, move and other project costs funded by IRS. IRS will utilize GSA's Total

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan

Workplace FIT program (TW/FIT) to purchase furniture, fixtures, equipment (FFE) at the new location.

The GSA TW/FIT program will fund $784,080 in project costs which will be amortized in their rent over five years for FFE.

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE, SAN JOSE, CA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for limited scope repairs and alterations for the Robert F. Peckham Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse located at 280 South First Street in San Jose, California at a design cost of $568,000, an estimated construction cost of $9,452,000, and a management and inspection cost of $660,853 for a total estimated project cost of $10,680,853, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends and replaces the originally planned site acquisition, design and construction of a new U.S. courthouse approved on July 23, 1998, as amended July 18, 2001 and as further amended July 23, 2003.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE
SAN JOSE, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-0260-SJ13
Congressional District: 16

Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a limited scope repair and alteration project for the Robert F. Peckham Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse (Peckham) in San Jose, California. Through Public Law 105-277, Congress appropriated $10,800,000 for acquisition of a site for new courthouse construction in San Jose. This prospectus proposes repair and alteration of the existing Peckham buildings in lieu of the originally planned site acquisition, design and construction of a new U.S. courthouse.

Major Work Items

Building systems (HVAC work and roof replacement) and electrical and accessibility upgrades in courtrooms.

Project Budget

Design and Review	$ 568,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	$ 9,452,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	$ 660,853
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$10,680,853**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by GSA.

Authorization Requested (Design, ECC and M&I) ..... **$10,680,853**[1]

Funding Requested ..... **$0**[2]

Prior Authority and Funding (Alteration of Peckham):

None

---

[1] The originally approved project for acquisition of a site to construct a new U.S. courthouse was funded at $10,800,000 in FY 1999 (PL 105-277). Although no funds are being requested in this prospectus, approval of the prospectus is needed for this repair and alteration project. Concurrently, GSA will request approval to transfer the remaining balance of the previously appropriated project funds to pay for the proposed repair and alteration project. Obligations to date include $119,146.48, thus leaving a remaining balance of $10,680,853. The U.S. Courts support redirection of site funds for this repair and alteration project.

[2] Same as note #1.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE
SAN JOSE, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-0260-SJ13
Congressional District: 16

Prior Authority and Funding (New U.S. courthouse construction in San Jose, CA):

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorized $39,922,000:

- $10,800,000 for acquisition of a site for the construction of a U.S. courthouse on July 23, 1998;
- $19,441,000 for additional site and design for a 420,635 gsf courthouse, including 112 inside parking spaces, on July 18, 2001; and
- $6,681,000 for additional site and design for a 404,361 gsf courthouse, including 76 inside parking spaces, on July 23, 2003.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works authorized $51,341,000:

- $10,800,000 for acquisition of a site for the construction of a U.S. courthouse on September 23, 1998;
- $19,441,000 for additional site and design for a 420,635 gsf courthouse, including 112 inside parking spaces and 20 outside parking spaces, on September 25, 2001; and
- $21,100,000 for additional site acquisition for the construction of a U.S. courthouse on September 13, 2006.

Through Public Law 105-277, Congress appropriated $10,800,000 for FY 1999.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2014	FY2014
Construction	FY2014	FY2015

Building

Peckham is located within the central business district at 280 South First Street, San Jose, California. Constructed in 1984, the property consists of two low-rise steel framed buildings: a five-story U.S. courthouse and a three-story federal building. The buildings are connected by a steel trussed sunshade structure and two exterior pedestrian bridges at the second and third levels. The buildings total 269,340 gross square feet, with a total of 231,455 rentable square feet. The building is named after the late Judge Robert F. Peckham, a former Chief Judge of the Northern District of California, who helped pioneer the use of legal means other than court trials to resolve disputes.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE
SAN JOSE, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-0260-SJ13
Congressional District: 16

Tenant Agencies

District Court, Bankruptcy Court, Circuit Library, U.S. Probation, U.S. Pretrial Services, U.S. Public Defender Service; Justice Department - U.S. Trustees, U.S. Marshals Service, U.S. Attorney's Office, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms; Department of Homeland Security - U.S. Secret Service, Immigration & Customs Enforcement, National Protection & Programs Directorate FPS, Customs and Border Protection Field Operations; GSA - Public Buildings Service, Federal Acquisition Service; Social Security Administration.

Proposed Project

The proposed project is a targeted repair and alteration project focused on building systems/infrastructure (HVAC, roofing, life safety, energy, exterior, and common areas) and courtroom electrical and accessibility upgrades. The courtroom improvement portion of the project proposes electrical upgrades for all eleven courtrooms and accessibility upgrades for two courtrooms. This results in improved courtroom functionality by upgrading electrical infrastructure to allow for the installation of audio and visual equipment and for enhanced accessibility for persons with disabilities in one District courtroom (shared by both District and Magistrate judges) and one Bankruptcy courtroom.

Major Work Items

Building Systems:	
HVAC, Life Safety & Energy	$6,656,000
Roofing, Exterior & Common Areas	$ 818,000
Electrical (courtrooms)	$1,704,000
Accessibility (courtrooms)	$ 274,000
Total ECC	**$9,452,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE
SAN JOSE, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-0260-SJ13
Congressional District: 16

Justification

Since 1996, the Judiciary's Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan has included a new courthouse to replace Peckham. Based on the long-term operational and space requirements of the District Courts at that time, the facility did not meet their minimum standards. Although funding for site acquisition was approved in 1999, the balance of funding to design and construct a new Federal courthouse has not been authorized or appropriated to date. During the time since initial funding was received, Court priorities shifted, the Judiciary imposed a two-year moratorium (2004) on new construction and capital investment for new courthouses diminished over recent years.

GSA and the Courts continued to evaluate the project based on priorities as outlined in the Courts' Five-Year Plan. In June 2011, a GSA feasibility study showed a substantial reduction in the anticipated growth for the U.S. Courts and related agencies. This was due to a decline in anticipated caseload growth, courtroom sharing policies for senior District, Magistrate and Bankruptcy judges and the recent policy change to exclude courtrooms and chambers for projected judges from the Judiciary's Program of Requirements. Based on the new policies and growth projections, GSA and the Courts determined that a new courthouse is no longer required. Peckham can meet the Courts' space needs through 2024. With issuance of the Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan for FYs 2013-2017 on February 1, 2012, the Judicial Conference removed the San Jose new courthouse from the Plan. Of the originally appropriated $10.8 million, $10,680,853 is remaining to be repurposed for the proposed limited scope repair and alteration project at Peckham. The U.S. Courts support the redirection of site funds for this repair and alteration project.

Since the complex was constructed in 1984, it has not undergone any significant renovations. The existing Peckham building systems, such as enclosure (roof, window and curtain wall seals) and HVAC equipment, have reached the end of their useful lives. This proposed limited scope repair and alteration project will improve the HVAC systems, result in significant energy savings and extend the useful life of the HVAC systems. In addition, a new roof will better secure the buildings' envelopes. Long-term, a full modernization of the facility will be needed in the future to address remaining building systems, tenant standards and functionality, security, blast and seismic deficiencies.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
ROBERT F. PECKHAM FEDERAL BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE
SAN JOSE, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-0260-SJ13
Congressional District: 16

Summary of Energy Compliance

The project will integrate and implement sustainable design principles and energy efficiency efforts as seamlessly as possible into the design and construction process, as applicable.

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value costs)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on JAN 10 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

CONSTRUCTION & ALTERATION—JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE, MOBILE, AL

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for the design and construction of a U.S. Courthouse of up to 155,600 gross square feet (including 38 inside parking spaces), located in Mobile, Alabama, at additional design costs of $8,503,000, a total estimated construction cost of $71,050,000, and management and inspection costs of $6,388,000 at a proposed total cost of $85,941,000, for which a fact sheet is attached to, and included in, this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of November 5, 2009 authorizing appropriations pursuant to a May 11, 2000 11(b) report and fact sheet, and amending the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of July 23, 2003.

Further resolved, that appropriations are authorized for the repair and alteration of the John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse located at 113 St. Joseph Street in Mobile, Alabama, at a design cost of $3,406,000, an estimated construction cost of $26,611,000, and a management and inspection cost of $2,555,000 for a total estimated project cost of $32,572,000, a prospectus and fact sheet, amending the prospectus, for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that construction of the new courthouse and renovation of space in the John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse, combined, comply, at a minimum, with courtroom sharing requirements adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the construction of the new courthouse and renovation of space in the John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse, combined, contains no more than nine courtrooms, including four for District and Senior District Judges, three for Magistrate Judges, and two for Bankruptcy Judges.

Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services submit a flood plain mitigation plan to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on the new courthouse prior to construction award.

Provided further, that the design of the new courthouse shall conform with the requirements of the U.S. Courts Design Guide.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

FY2014 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project for the reconfiguration and alterations of the John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse (Campbell CT) at 113 St. Joseph Street in Mobile, Alabama.

Through Public Laws 107-67 (FY2002) and 111-117 (FY2010), Congress previously approved a total of $61,290,000 for site acquisition, design, and construction of a new standalone courthouse in Mobile, AL, which was to work in conjunction with the Campbell CT to house the long-term needs of the Judiciary. GSA, in collaboration with the Courts has determined that alteration to the existing Campbell Courthouse in conjunction with the construction of a Courthouse annex can meet the Courts' needs.

This prospectus proposes alteration of the Campbell CT to work in conjunction with a smaller adjoining courthouse annex in lieu of the originally planned standalone courthouse. The revised project will result in an estimated savings of $16,083,000 to the taxpayer.

FY2014 Campbell CT Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $41,000,000

(Approve the continued development of the Courthouse Complex in Mobile, AL to meet the reduced requirements of the Judiciary in that location in lieu of the originally planned standalone courthouse)

Major Work Items

Selective demolition, abatement of hazardous materials, interior construction, repair/replace HVAC, electrical, lighting, plumbing, fire protection, and roofing systems, repair/replace conveying systems and elevators, and provide fire and life-safety improvements.

Project Budget

Design and Review	$3,470,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	34,209,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	3,321,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$41,000,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Schedule

Constructing an adjoining annex to the Campbell Courthouse will require the integration of all major building systems and components together to work seamlessly as one building when the project is completed. To accomplish this and to ensure the continued safe and efficient operation of the facility during the construction of the new annex and follow-on repair and alteration work in the existing courthouse, it is necessary that both efforts be completed through a single design-build contract. Doing so will help ensure that the combined facility meets today's stringent energy goals, provides an efficient building for the court that meets their planned housing needs and allows for future changes in operations. Completing this courthouse complex under one contract will also ensure that the project is completed as quickly as possible, at the lowest cost to the American public, while minimizing the disruptions to court operations.

Courthouse Complex (Campbell CT R&A and New CT Annex)

FY2014	Design
FY2014-2019	Construction
FY2019	Occupancy

Building

The John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse is a five-story, 115,014 GSF building constructed in 1932. The courthouse is limestone and brick construction and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This building is part of the John A. Campbell facility which also includes the Federal Building, located at 109 St. Joseph Street, and Combined Parking Facility, located at 167 St. Louis Street.

Tenant Agencies

The Courthouse Complex, Campbell CT and a new courthouse annex, will house a combination of Court and Court-related agencies, which will include: U.S. Court of Appeals; U.S. District Court, U.S. Bankruptcy Court; Federal Public Defender; U.S. Probation Office; U.S. Attorney's Office; and U.S. Marshals Service. Space for Senate and a GSA Field Office will also be included.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Proposed Project

GSA will reconfigure the existing space within the Campbell CT to work in conjunction with the construction of a new adjoining courthouse annex to provide for the Judiciary's long-term needs in Mobile, AL. The two buildings will meet the 10-year needs of the court and the court-related agencies and the site/building design will accommodate the Courts 30 year needs, including two chambers for the Court of Appeals, four courtrooms and five chambers for the District and Senior District judges, three courtrooms and four chambers for Magistrate judges, and one courtroom and two chambers for Bankruptcy judges. The Bankruptcy Court and Clerk will be relocated from their current leased space into one of these federally-owned facilities. The space within both the Campbell CT and the annex will be configured to address the Courts' design guide standards. The renovation of the Campbell CT will address several critical building needs, including repairs and replacements to the roofing, HVAC, electrical systems and lighting, plumbing, elevators, and the fire protection systems, as well as lobby reconfiguration to accommodate the proposed connection to the new annex.

It is anticipated that the construction of the new courthouse annex will be funded from the $50,000,000 appropriated in FY 2010 (PL 111-117).

The historic Hannah Houses are located on the site originally acquired for the new standalone courthouse. These historic structures will be rehabilitated under a future separate project and used to house other Federal agencies.

Major Work Items

Interior Alterations	$16,370,000
Roofing	684,000
HVAC	9,239,000
Electrical System & Lighting	3,128,000
Plumbing	1,647,000
Conveying Systems/Elevators	948,000
Fire & Life Safety	2,040,000
Demolition & Abatement	153,000
Total ECC	**$34,209,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Justification

For many years, the Judiciary's Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan included a project to construct a new courthouse in Mobile. The Judiciary's Plan for FY's 2013-2017, which reflects priorities approved by the Executive Committee for the Judicial Conference of the United States in February 2012, includes Mobile as its top priority for construction appropriation. Design for this new courthouse was originally funded in FY 2002 and completed in FY 2004. However, the construction for this project was put on hold during the Judiciary's moratorium on new courthouse from 2004 through 2006, and had not received construction appropriations until FY 2010. The appropriations received in FY 2010, in the amount of $50,000,000, only constituted a portion of the identified construction appropriation requirement, as the appropriation for the new courthouse was estimated in FY 2010 to be approximately $190 million. With only partial appropriation, GSA was unable to proceed with the award for the construction of this new courthouse appropriation.

Requirements for the original standalone courthouse concept were largely driven by the projected need for courtrooms and chambers for existing and incoming judges. The proposed changes in scope for the new annex and the Campbell CT renovation are based upon space reduction efforts undertaken by the Judiciary and meet Judiciary courtroom sharing policies and requirements. The US Attorney's Office (originally slated for the new courthouse) is not currently housed in the Complex, and will remain in leased space after the completion of the project, however, the USAO will be provided with trial preparation space.

The Campbell FB-CT currently provides inadequate security. There is no separate circulation for judges and prisoners. There are no courtroom holding cells and no secured parking. The combined projects (new annex and alteration of Campbell) will address separate circulation for the public, judges, and prisoners and secure parking.

The proposed renovation of the Campbell CT and the recommended changes to the project scope for the new courthouse construction reflect senior district and magistrate judge sharing policies and do not include courtrooms for projected new judgeships. The proposed project contains no exception to the US Courts Design Guide. The reconfiguration of existing space in the Campbell CT and the construction of a new courthouse annex in lieu of the previously proposed standalone courthouse will house the Court's current reduced program while reducing taxpayer costs. This strategy will also provide for the continued long-term use of a historic property and maintain GSA's focus on its sustainable design initiatives.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Explanation of Changes

The project previously approved by the House and Senate Committees was for a new stand-alone courthouse and stipulated use of energy efficient and renewable systems. This project proposes renovation and modernization of the Campbell CT to address needed improvements to the building systems, infrastructure, and security as well as interior space modifications. Assuming construction of a smaller annex in lieu of the originally planned new stand-alone courthouse, the combination of both projects will address the space needs of the proposed tenants while providing energy efficient and renewable systems.

Space Requirements of the U.S. Courts

	Current		Proposed	
	Courtrooms	Chambers*	Courtrooms	Chambers
District	3	3	3	3
Senior District	1	1	1	2
Magistrate	4	4	3	4
Bankruptcy	2	2	1	2
Appeals	0	1	0	2
Total	**10**	**11**	**8**	**13**

* The Campbell Courthouse also has an additional visiting judge chamber, which is utilized by all visiting judges, regardless of Court.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Prior Committee Approval and Appropriation

Campbell CT - No prior Committee approval or appropriation for a renovation of the Campbell CT have been provided by Congress. See appropriation and approvals for new courthouse below.

New Courthouse - Prior Appropriations

Mobile, AL New Courthouse Prior Appropriations			
Public Law	**Fiscal Year**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
107-67	2002	$11,290,000	Site, Design
111-117	2010	$50,000,000	Construction
Appropriation to Date		**$61,290,000**	

New Courthouse – Prior Committee Approvals

Mobile, AL New Courthouse Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
House T & I	7/26/2000	$7,537,000	Site, Design for 305,361 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces
Senate EPW	7/26/2000	$7,782,000	Site, Design for 321,722 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces
House T & I	7/18/2001	$3,753,000	Additional Site and Design for 325,452 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces.
House T & I	7/23/2003	$85,743,000	Additional Design, Construction, M&I for 342,273 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Senate EPW	9/13/2006	$130,326,000	Balance of site and design not previously authorized; Construction and M&I for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces.
House T & I	11/5/2009	$104,788,000	Additional Site = $2,603,000; Additional Design $6,009,000; Balance of construction and M&I not previously authorized for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces.
Senate EPW	2/2/2010	$59,960,000	Balance of site, design, construction and M&I not previously authorized for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces
Approvals to Date*		**$201,821,000**	

*** Approvals to Date includes a total of $201,821,000 for both House and Senate**

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JOHN A. CAMPBELL U.S. COURTHOUSE
MOBILE, AL

Prospectus Number: PAL-0039-MO14
Congressional District: 01

Recommendation

ALTERATION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on April 4, 2013

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Acting Administrator, General Services Administration

Mobile Fact Sheet
June 2014

Overview

The General Services Administration (GSA) will complete the design and construction of a 155,600 gross square foot New Courthouse, including 38 inside parking spaces, and rehabilitate the John A. Campbell Courthouse (Campbell CT) in Mobile, AL.

The Campbell CT is a five-story, 115,014 GSF building constructed in 1932. The courthouse is limestone and brick construction and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This building is part of the John A. Campbell facility which also includes the Federal Building, located at 109 St. Joseph Street, and Combined Parking Facility, located at 167 St. Louis Street.

GSA will construct a New Courthouse across St. Louis Street from the Campbell CT. The two buildings will provide four courtrooms and six chambers for the District and Senior District judges, three courtrooms and four chambers for Magistrate judges, and two courtrooms and two chambers for Bankruptcy judges. The Bankruptcy Court and Clerk will be relocated from their current leased space into one of these federally owned facilities. The space within both the New Courthouse and the Campbell CT will be configured to address the Courts' design guide standards. The rehabilitation of the Campbell CT will address several critical building needs, including repairs and replacements to the roofing, HVAC, electrical systems and lighting, plumbing, elevators, and the fire protection systems.

The Courthouse Complex (Campbell CT and New Courthouse) will house a combination of Court and Court-related agencies, including: U.S. Court of Appeals; U.S. District Court, U.S. Bankruptcy Court; Federal Public Defender; U.S. Probation Office; U.S. Attorney's Office (trial preparation space only); and U.S. Marshals Service. Space for Congressional offices and a GSA Field Office will also be included.

Mobile Fact Sheet
June 2014

Building Area

Gross square feet (including inside parking) ..... 155,600 gsf
Gross square feet (excluding inside parking) ..... 138,500 gsf
Structured parking spaces 38

Project Budget New Construction

Site Acquisition & Preparation (FY2002 & FY2010) $5,988,250
Previous Design (346,691 GSF Courthouse) $6,288,750

Total Spent for Site and Previous Design $12,277,000

New Design New Courthouse (155,600 GSF) $8,503,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC) New Courthouse $71,050,000
Management and Inspection (M&I) New Courthouse $6,388,000

Total Estimated New Courthouse Cost * $85,941,000

Project Budget Campbell Rehabilitation

Design $3,406,000
ECC $26,611,000
M&I $2,555,000

Total Rehabilitation Cost $32,572,000

Total Costs (New Courthouse and Campbell) $130,790,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Location

The site is located in Central Business District of Mobile and bound by St Louis, N. Joachim, St. Anthony, and St. Joseph Streets.

Schedule

Design of New Courthouse	FY2015
Construction of New Courthouse	FY2016
Occupancy of New Courthouse	FY2018
Design of Campbell	FY2017
Construction of Campbell	FY2018
Occupancy of Campbell	FY2020

Mobile Fact Sheet
June 2014

Prior Appropriations

Mobile, AL New Courthouse Prior Appropriations			
Public Law	**Fiscal Year**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
107-67	2002	$11,290,000	Site, Design
111-117	2010	$50,000,000	Construction
113-76	2014	$69,500,000	Construction and Repair to meet housing requirements of Judiciary's Southern District in Mobile
Appropriation to Date		**$130,790,000**	

Prior Committee Approvals

Mobile, AL New Courthouse Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
House T & I	7/26/2000	$7,537,000	Site, Design for 305,361 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces
Senate EPW	7/26/2000	$7,782,000	Site, Design for 321,722 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces
House T & I	7/18/2001	$3,753,000	Additional Site and Design for 325,452 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces.
House T & I	7/23/2003	$85,743,000	Additional Design, Construction, M&I for 342,273 gsf; 50 inside parking spaces
Senate EPW	9/13/2006	$130,326,000	Balance of site and design not previously authorized; Construction and M&I for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces.

Mobile Fact Sheet
June 2014

House T & I	11/5/2009	$104,788,000	Additional Site = $2,603,000; Additional Design $6,009,000; Balance of construction and M&I not previously authorized for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces.
Senate EPW	2/2/2010	$59,960,000	Balance of site, design, construction and M&I not previously authorized for 346,691 gsf; 50 parking spaces
Approvals to Date*		**$201,821,000**	

*** Approvals to Date includes a total of $201,821,000 for both House and Senate**

Locations	Current						Proposed					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)				*Personnel*		*Usable Square Feet (USF)*			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
New U.S. Courthouse												
U.S. District Court Clerk	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	19,717	1,005	1,395	**22,117**
U.S. District Judge Chambers/Courtrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	26,398	**26,398**
U.S. Magistrate Judge Chambers/Courtrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	19,362	**19,362**
U.S. District Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,055	0	2,433	**3,488**
United States Marshals Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	64	11,901	0	9,140	**21,041**
Joint Use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	250	**400**
Sub Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**126**	**158**	**32,823**	**1,005**	**58,978**	**92,806**
John A. Campbell U.S. Courthouse												
U.S. Circuit Judge Chambers	0	4	128	0	2,496	**2,624**	12	12	**0**	**0**	**4,675**	**4,675**
U.S. Circuit Libraries	1	1	2,555	0	0	**2,555**	2	2	**0**	**0**	**2,600**	**2,600**
U.S. District Court Clerk	28	28	7,523	0	2,373	**9,896**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
U.S. District Judge Chambers/Courtrooms	0	13	4,201	0	33,620	**37,821**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**5,266**	**5,266**
U.S. Magistrate Judge Chambers/Courtrooms	0	15	71	0	10,231	**10,302**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
U.S. District Court	0	0	817	0	996	**1,813**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**2,244**	**2,244**
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Chambers/Courtrooms	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0	6	**0**	**0**	**10,868**	**10,868**
U.S. Bankruptcy Court Clerk	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	27	27	**8,304**	**0**	**1,483**	**9,787**
U.S. Bankruptcy Court/Administrator	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	10	10	**4,808**	**0**	**450**	**5,258**
U.S. Probation	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	82	82	**16,108**	**0**	**1,525**	**17,633**
Federal Public Defender	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0	0	**450**	**0**	**0**	**450**
Office of U.S. Attorneys	2	2	548	0	144	**692**	2	2	**350**	**0**	**330**	**680**
United States Marshals Service	22	22	3,939	0	2,178	**6,117**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Senate	2	2	0	0	813	**813**	2	2	**720**	**0**	**130**	**850**
Public Buildings Service, Field Offices	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	5	5	**679**	**0**	**550**	**1,229**
Joint Use	0	0	363	0	0	**363**	0	0	**0**	**0**	**1,250**	**1,250**
Vacant	0	0	38	0	0	**38**	0	0	**2,236**	**0**	**0**	**2,236**
Sub Total	**55**	**87**	**20,183**	**0**	**52,851**	**73,034**	**142**	**148**	**33,655**	**0**	**31,371**	**65,026**
LEASED LOCATIONS												
201 St. Michael Street												
U.S. Probation Office	53	53	19,095	0	0	**19,095**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Public Buildings Service, Field Offices	5	5	2,430	0	0	**2,430**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sub Total	**58**	**58**	**21,525**	**0**	**0**	**21,525**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Parkview Office Building												
U.S. Bankruptcy Court	8	8	5,816	0	0	**5,816**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sub Total	**8**	**8**	**5,816**	**0**	**0**	**5,816**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
201 St. Louis Street												
U.S. Bankruptcy Clerk	17	17	6973	0	0	**6,973**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
U.S. Bankruptcy Court	5	5	4,327	0	0	**4,327**	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sub Total	**22**	**22**	**11,300**	**0**	**0**	**11,300**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Riverview Plaza												
Office of U.S. Attorneys	50	50	34,352	0	0	**34,352**	50	50	34,352	0	0	**34,352**
Sub Total	**50**	**50**	**34,352**	**0**	**0**	**34,352**	**50**	**50**	**34,352**	**0**	**0**	**34,352**
Total	**193**	**225**	**93,176**	**0**	**52,851**	**146,027**	**318**	**356**	**100,830**	**1,005**	**90,349**	**192,184**

The project may contain a variance in gross square footage from that listed in this project upon measurement and review of the completed project.

Special Space	
Courtrooms	42,147
Chambers	24,422
Grand Jury Suite	2,244
Library	2,600
Conference/Training	3,053
Fitness	2,800
Lab	175
ADP	3,623
Mailroom	800
Private Toilets	890
Weapons Vault	200
Holding Cells	5,100
Food Serv/Break Area	2,295
Total	**90,349**

USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL DESIGN—U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY, COLUMBUS, NM

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for additional design of new replacement land port of entry (LPOE) facilities in Columbus, New Mexico at an additional design cost of $7,400,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of April 5, 2006 authorizing appropriations as proposed in Prospectus Number PNM–BSD–CO07.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

FY 2014 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) requests approval for additional design of new replacement land port of entry (LPOE) facilities in Columbus, NM.

The additional design funds are needed to reflect updated agency requirements since the original design authorization and to incorporate extensive site improvements needed to address significant storm water drainage issues at the port.

FY 2014 Committee Approval Requested (Additional Design)..... $7,400,000[1]

FY 2014 Appropriation Requested..... $0[2]

Overview of Project

The Columbus LPOE was built in 1989 to screen visitors entering the United States. Existing building workspace, inspection facilities and parking capacity do not meet the tenant agency's operational need. The tenant has identified a current requirement of 69,243 gross square feet of building space while the existing facility provides 21,370 gross square feet. The project will consist of expanding existing facilities to handle future traffic volumes predicted for this port and site improvements to control storm water flow.

[1] GSA has worked closely with DHS program offices responsible for developing and implementing security technology at the land ports of entry (LPOEs). These programs include United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT), Radiation Portal Monitors (RPMs), Advanced Spectroscopic Portal (ASPs) monitors, and Land Border Integration (formerly Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI)), Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII), Outbound Inspection, and Port Hardening/Absconder programs. This prospectus contains the funding of infrastructure requirements for each program known at the time of prospectus development since these programs are at various stages of development and implementation. Additional funding by a Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) may be required to provide for as yet unidentified elements of each of these programs to be implemented at this port.

[2] Funding provided via GSA reprogramming and approved by House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

The project includes construction of a new main building, non-commercial primary and secondary inspection facilities, pedestrian processing, a kennel, commercial inspection facilities, export facilities, non-intrusive inspection (NII) systems, hazardous materials containment area, a new earthen berm and drainage basin, and enlargement of an existing culvert. The project also includes the expansion of primary and secondary inspection space and outside vehicle parking. Additionally, the relocation of an existing canopy structure and building and new paving for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration are included in the project.

Site Information
Government-Owned ..... 14.72 acres

Building Area
Building (including canopies) ..... 69,243 gsf
Building (excluding canopies) ..... 48,415 gsf
Outside parking spaces 106

Cost Information
Site Development Costs[3] $35,348,000
Building Costs (includes inspection canopies) ($387/gsf) $30,112,000

Project Budget

Design (FY 2007 and FY 2009)	$3,338,395
Additional Design[4]	7,400,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	65,460,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	5,864,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$82,062,395**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for emerging technologies and alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

[3]Site development costs include grading, utilities, paving, demolition of existing facilities, drainage ponds and culverts (including piping and structures), lighting, and fencing.
[4] The additional design funds are needed to reflect updated agency requirements since design was originally authorized and to incorporate extensive site improvements needed to address significant storm water drainage issues at the port.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

Location

The site is bordered on the west by New Mexico State Highway 11 and on the east by a bypass road, approximately 3 miles south of the village of Columbus, New Mexico, adjacent to the city of Palomas, Mexico.

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY 2014	FY 2016
Construction	FY 2016	FY 2019

Tenant Agencies
Department of Homeland Security – Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture – Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine; U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Department of Transportation – Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration; and General Services Administration.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

Justification

Since its construction in 1989, screening at the Columbus LPOE has increased significantly and advances in technology have led to significant changes in the inspection process. The LPOE continues to experience an increase in commercial traffic, with anticipated additional growth over the next 15 years.

The gross square footage requirement for this facility has been reduced by 44,959 square feet from the 114,202 square feet authorized for design. Since design was authorized in 2006, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) – Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has developed a new design guide, conducted a Strategic Resource Assessment, and devised a program of requirements that supersedes the requirements identified in the feasibility study. Additionally, the Border Patrol Processing Center is no longer part of the project. Parking numbers increased to provide for referral parking, visitors to the port, and parking needs for the kennel.

The project, as originally authorized, included expansion and renovation of the existing main building. This prospectus proposes a new main building rather than renovation of the existing building, thus increasing the setback from the border. Constructing a new main building improves security, facilitates traffic and queuing, and expands critical drainage ways.

Expansions to the LPOE since its original construction have ultimately impaired future traffic movement throughout the site. Efforts are underway by the Government of Mexico to relocate port facilities south of the border further east. The construction of a bypass road to access these new crossings was completed in 2011. New commercial traffic circulation resulting from the addition of the bypass road will be accommodated in the port expansion project.

The LPOE has experienced significant flooding during high volume rainfall events. In the past decade, the area has been inundated multiple times which has subsequently elevated the flooding problem to the attention of both the U.S. and Mexican Governments and the State of New Mexico. Improvements to the LPOE will protect new and existing structures, retain all new onsite storm water, and convey storm water flows across the site. The proposed site drainage and grading improvements have a significant cost; however, the work is necessary in order for the project to proceed and to the LPOE to maintain operations.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

Summary of Energy Compliance

The project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

Columbus Land Port of Entry Prior Appropriations			
Public Law	**Fiscal Year**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
110-5	2007	$2,629,000	Design
111-5	2009 (ARRA)	$709,395	Design
Reprogram	2014	$7,400,000	Design
Appropriations to Date		**$10,738,395**	

Prior Committee Approvals

Columbus Land Port of Entry Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
House T & I	4/5/2006	$2,629,000	Design
Senate EPW	5/23/2006	$2,629,000	Design
Senate EPW	12/8/11	$59,598,000	M&I = $4,900,000; Construction = $54,698,000
House Approvals to Date*		**$3,338,395**	
Senate Approvals to Date*		**$62,936,395**	

* Approvals to Date include $709,395 via the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA); authorization is inherent in the Public Law (PL 111-5 – Recovery Act).

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ADDITIONAL DESIGN
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
COLUMBUS, NM

Prospectus Number: PNM-BSC-CO14
Congressional District: 2

Alternatives Considered

GSA owns and maintains the existing facilities at this port of entry; thus, no alternative other than Federal construction was considered.

Recommendation

ADDITIONAL DESIGN

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 20, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

June 2014

Housing Plan
Columbus Land Port of Entry

PNM-BSC-CO14
Columbus, NM

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
Columbus, NM LPOE						-						-
DHS - Customs and Border Protection	53	53	5,310	-	9,817	15,127	54	54	7,236	2,110	44,836	54,182
DHS- Immigration and Customs Enforcement	-	-					4	4	590	-	-	590
GSA-PBS, Field Offices	1	1	191			191	1	1	460	433	-	893
HHS-Food and Drug Administration	1	1	480			480	1	1	215		201	416
Joint Use	-	-	1,640		451	2,091	0	0	-			-
USDA- APHIS	2	2	504		458	962	2	2	259		234	493
DOT-Federal Motor Carrier Safety	1	1	340		1,019	1,359	1	1	340		1,019	1,359
Total	**58**	**58**	**8,465**	**-**	**11,745**	**20,210**	**63**	**63**	**9,100**	**2,543**	**46,290**	**57,933**

Note: The total proposed USF reflects a reduction of 35,772 USF from the originally authorized project.

Special Space	USF
Laboratory	616
Holding Cell	482
Restroom	1,089
Locker/Physical Fitness	949
ADP	168
Food Service	165
Hardened Space	1,189
Vault	302
Booth	205
Kennels	962
Inspection Bay/Dock	16,052
Hazardous Materials Storage	2,826
Processing Area	198
Mail Rooms	99
Inspection Canopy	20,828
Secured Storage	160
Total	46,290

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—FIRE PROTECTION AND LIFE SAFETY PROJECTS, VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for alterations to upgrade, replace, and improve fire protection systems and life safety features in government-owned buildings during Fiscal Year 2015 at a total cost of $40,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
FIRE PROTECTION AND LIFE SAFETY PROJECTS
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PFP-0001-MU15

FY2015 Project Summary

This prospectus proposes alterations to upgrade, replace, and improve fire protection systems and life safety features in government-owned buildings during Fiscal Year 2015.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$40,000,000

Program Summary

As part of its Fire Protection and Life Safety efforts, GSA is currently identifying projects in Federal buildings throughout the country through surveys and studies. These projects will vary in size, location, and delivery method. The approval and appropriation requested in this prospectus is for a diverse set of retrofit projects with engineering solutions to reduce fire and life safety hazards. Typical projects include the following:

- Replacing antiquated fire alarm and detection systems that are in need of repair or for which parts are no longer available.
- Installing emergency voice communication systems to facilitate occupant notification and/or evacuation in Federal buildings during an emergency.
- Installing and/or expanding fire sprinkler systems to provide a reasonable degree of protection for life and property from fire in Federal buildings.
- Constructing additional exit stairs or enclosing existing exit stairs to ensure safe and timely evacuation of building occupants in the event of an emergency.

Justification

GSA periodically assesses all facilities using technical professionals to identify hazards and initiate correction or risk-reduction protection strategies to assure that no aspect of our buildings' design or operation presents an unreasonable risk to GSA personnel, occupant agencies, or the general public. Completion of these proposed projects will improve the overall level of safety from fire and similar risks in GSA-controlled Federal buildings nationwide.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$40,000,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
FIRE PROTECTION AND LIFE SAFETY PROJECTS
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PFP-0001-MU15

Certification of Need

Over the years a number of fire protection and life safety issues have been identified that need to be addressed in order to reduce fire risk. The proposed program is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—JUDICIARY COURT SECURITY PROGRAM, VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for alterations to improve physical security in government-owned buildings occupied by the Judiciary and U.S. Marshals Service during Fiscal Year 2015 at a total cost of $20,000,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JUDICIARY COURT SECURITY PROGRAM
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PJCS-0001-MU15

FY2015 Project Summary

This prospectus proposes alterations to improve physical security in government-owned buildings occupied by the Judiciary and U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) during Fiscal Year 2015 in lieu of future construction of new facilities.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested $20,000,000

Program Summary

The Judiciary Capital Security (JCS) Program is dedicated to improving physical security in buildings occupied by the Judiciary and the USMS in lieu of construction of brand new facilities, thereby providing cost savings and expedited delivery. These projects will vary in size, location, and delivery method and improve the separation of circulation for the public, judges, and prisoners. Funding provided for the security improvement projects would address elements such as additional doors, reconfiguring or adding corridors, reconfiguring or adding elevators, sallyports, and constructing physical or visual barriers.

Justification

The JCS will provide a vehicle for addressing security deficiencies in a timely and less costly manner when constructing a new courthouse is unlikely in the foreseeable future. In both FY 2012 and FY 2013, GSA's appropriation (as part of Repair and Alterations line item) included funding for such security improvements to buildings occupied by the Judiciary. This prospectus requests separate funding to specifically address these security conditions at existing federal courthouses for locations that are unlikely to be considered for construction of a new courthouse. The Judiciary's asset management planning process serves to help compile a preliminary assessment of potential JCS projects that identify courthouses with poor security ratings nationwide.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
JUDICIARY COURT SECURITY PROGRAM
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PJCS-0001-MU15

Certification of Need

Over the years a number of security issues have been identified that need to be addressed in order to reduce risk to physical security. The proposed program is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53, LAKEWOOD, CO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to undertake system and architectural repairs as well as alteration or existing space at the Denver Federal Center, Building 53, located at West 6th Avenue and Kipling Street in Lakewood, Colorado at a design cost of $2,329,000, an estimated construction cost of $23,400,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,997,000 for a total estimated project cost of $27,726,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the Forest Service is consolidated into government owned space and associated leased space is released.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53
LAKEWOOD, CO

Prospectus Number: PCO-0530-LA15
Congressional District: 7

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to undertake system and architectural repairs as well as alteration of existing space at the Denver Federal Center (DFC), Building 53, at West 6th Avenue & Kipling Street, in Lakewood, CO. In addition to addressing roof, HVAC, and window deficiencies, the project will allow for backfill of approximately 78,000 rentable square feet (rsf) from a leased location and reduce annual lease payments to the private sector by approximately $2,200,000 annually.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $27,726,000

Major Work Items

Roof, air handler, and window replacement; interior construction

Project Budget

Design	$2,329,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	$23,400,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	$1,997,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$27,726,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53
LAKEWOOD, CO

Prospectus Number: PCO-0530-LA15
Congressional District: 7

Building

Building 53 is part of the DFC's main campus and contains 387,385 gross square feet. Originally constructed in 1941 as part of the Denver Ordinance Plant, it was converted to an office building after World War II. Building 53 contains two stories and is the third largest building on the DFC.

Tenant Agencies

Forest Service, Center for Disease Control, Office of Inspector General, Veterans Employment and Training Service, Office of Workers Compensation Programs, Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department - Office of the Secretary, Office of Natural Resources and Revenue, VA Office of Information and Technology, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Homeland Security-Federal Protective Service, Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service and GSA.

Proposed Project

This project provides for the reconfiguration of vacant space allowing for backfill of the space by the Forest Service, currently located in leased space. Approximately 78,000 rsf will be altered to provide a higher density open office environment. This project will also address deficiencies in the major building systems including improvements to the HVAC system, exterior deficiencies (roof and windows), as well as promoting energy savings. The existing roof will be removed and replaced with a high performing roofing system with superior insulation. The air handlers will be replaced with energy efficient units providing energy savings and improved tenant comfort. Existing single pane windows will be replaced with modern well insulated windows improving energy savings. Asbestos will be abated in the affected construction areas.

Major Work Items

Exterior Closure	$1,317,000
Roofing	11,163,000
Interior Construction	2,107,000
Interior Finishes	2,005,000
HVAC	6,808,000
Total ECC	**$23,400,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53
LAKEWOOD, CO

Prospectus Number: PCO-0530-LA15
Congressional District: 7

Justification

Building 53 has not been modernized since the 1970s and many of the building systems have become worn, inefficient, outdated and unreliable. Completion of the project will significantly reduce vacant space in the building and eliminate approximately $2.2 million in annual payments to the private sector. The reconfiguration of space will create a more efficient layout, helping the Forest Service reduce its footprint by approximately 12,000 rsf in order to meet its new space utilization standards. This will align with the goals set forth in the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*,

To date, GSA has taken an incremental approach to renovating sections of the building in an ongoing effort to backfill as customer agencies show interest and require space. Building 53 offers large amounts of contiguous office space making it a prime candidate for agencies to relocate from leased space in the surrounding community as well as consolidate from other buildings at the DFC. To accommodate a full occupancy, certain building systems need to be upgraded and renovations are needed to prevent system failures and costly repairs. This asset represents a high priority for the DFC potential of large backfill opportunities. This project will help ensure that the building's infrastructure and building systems can accommodate the increase in occupancy and projected activity in the building.

The roof has been in place for more than 30 years, is in poor condition and beyond its useful life. Water leaks into customer space, causing damage to the building and customer property along with lost work time. The installation of a cool roof will put an end to the water intrusion and allow for increased energy efficiency.

The air handler units have a useful service life of 20 years and are currently 45 years old. The aging air handlers have experienced breakdowns and obtaining parts for repairs is difficult. High-efficiency rooftop units will be installed with building automation controls optimizing efficiency, energy savings, and better climate control.

Eighty percent of the building's windows are single pane, beyond their useful life, and allow for the passage of heat and cold resulting in unnecessary energy costs. Installation of efficient windows will maintain a more constant indoor environment and help minimize unnecessary energy consumption.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53
LAKEWOOD, CO

Prospectus Number: PCO-0530-LA15
Congressional District: 7

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER BUILDING 53
LAKEWOOD, CO

Prospectus Number: PCO-0530-LA15
Congressional District: 7

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan
Denver Federal Center
Building 53

PCO-0530-LA15
Lakewood, CO

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
LEASED LOCATIONS												
740 Simms, Golden, CO												
Forest Service	337	337	77,670	-	-	77,67	-	-	-	-	-	-
GOVERNMENT-OWNED LOCATIONS												-
Denver Federal Center Building 53												
Forest Service	30	30	5,885	379	938	7,202	367	367	50,855	3,376	12,438	67,172
Center for Disease Control	-	-	-	113	-	113	-	-	-	113	-	113
Office of Inspector General	3	3	1,360	-	-	1,360	3	3	1,360	-	-	1,360
Veterans Employment and Training Service	3	3	193	-	-	193	3	3	193	-	-	193
Office of Workers Compensation Programs	173	173	31,587	-	5,422	37,009	173	173	31,587	-	5,422	37,009
Geological Survey	226	226	66,148	4,061	20,977	91,186	226	226	66,148	4,061	20,977	91,186
Bureau of Land Management	19	19	5,202	185	5,173	10,560	19	19	5,202	185	5,173	10,560
Office of the Secretary	22	22	7,304	3,115	5,538	15,957	22	22	7,304	3,115	5,538	15,957
Office of Natural Resources and Revenue	32	32	10,253	483	3,711	14,447	32	32	10,253	483	3,711	14,447
VA Office of Information and Technology	2	2	-	2,151	-	2,151	2	2	-	2,151	-	2,151
Veterans Benefits Administration	25	25	6,916	-	-	6,916	25	25	6,916	-	-	6,916
DHS - Federal Protective Service	60	60	8,953	2,855	4,046	15,854	60	60	8,953	2,855	4,046	15,854
GSA - Public Building Service	10	10	2,817	112	999	3,928	10	10	2,817	112	999	3,928
Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service	6	6	201	-	-	201	6	6	201	-	-	201
Joint Use	-	-	-	-	2,572	2,572	-	-	-	-	2,572	2,572
Vacant	-	-	47,777	22,082	1,648	71,507	-	-	2,777	5,730	-	11,507
Subtotal	**611**	**611**	**194,596**	**35,536**	**51,024**	**281,156**	**948**	**948**	**194,566**	**25,184**	**61,376**	**281,126**
Total	**948**	**948**	**272,266**	**35,536**	**51,024**	**358,826**	**948**	**948**	**194,566**	**25,184**	**61,376**	**281,126**

Office Utilization Rate[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Building Office Tenants	248	160

Total Building USF Rate[3]		
	Current	Proposed
All Building Tenants	460	297

Current Office UR excludes 42,811 usf of office support space.
Proposed Office UR excludes 42,805 usf of office support space

Special Space	USF
Conference	21,424
Food Service	4,856
ADP	16,780
Laboratory	5,123
Warehouse	8,980
Restroom	445
Light Industrial	1,643
Auditorium	2,000
Total	**61,376**

NOTES:

USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF.

Total Building USF Rate = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel).

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to replace the fire alarm system at the Frances Perkins Building located at 200 Constitution Avenue, NW in Washington, D.C., at a design and review cost of $1,500,000, an estimated construction cost of $13,380,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,440,000 for a total estimated project cost of $16,320,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–0000.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0116-WA15

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to replace the fire alarm system at the Frances Perkins Building (Perkins Building) located at 200 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC. The proposed project will replace the obsolete fire alarm system with a new emergency communication system that is intended to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. The new system will be designed and installed to meet the requirements in GSA PBS-P100, Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the Perkins Building at a total cost of $16,320,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I).....$16,320,000

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm Replacement

Project Budget

Design and Review	$ 1,500,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	13,380,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,440,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$16,320,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0116-WA15

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The Francis Perkins Building is a seven-story 1,851,000 gross-square-foot lime-stone sheathed federal office building that includes a 916-space basement parking garage. It was constructed in 1974 as the headquarters of the Department of Labor, which still occupies the building today. The building was named in 1980 for Francis Coralie Perkins, the first woman to hold a Presidential Cabinet post. Perkins served as the Secretary of the Department of Labor from 1933-1945 and directed the formulation and enactment of the Social Security Act.

Tenant Agencies

Department of Labor

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of the removal of the existing fire alarm system and the installation of a new emergency communication system to facilitate occupant notification and/or evacuation in the Perkins Building during an emergency.

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm System Replacement	$13,380,000
Total ECC	**$13,380,000**

Justification

The existing fire alarm system does not meet the requirements in the GSA PBS-P100 Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and the International Building Code, which require that an emergency communication system be able to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. In addition, many of the alarm circuits are overloaded, causing concern about system reliability during an emergency. The system manufacturer no longer supports the equipment, making it difficult to find repair parts for the aged system.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0116-WA15

for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$15,000,000	Repair and Alteration
House T&I	2/28/13	$15,000,000	Repair and Alteration

*Included in the 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
PEISA-2010	High Performance Energy Projects	2010	$3,353,408

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0116-WA15

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—GSA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for alterations to upgrade the elevators at the 1800 F Street Building, NW, in Washington, D.C., at a design and review cost of $724,000, an estimated construction cost of $5,731,000 and a management and inspection cost of $636,000 for a total estimated project cost of $7,091,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
GSA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0021-WA15

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes an alteration project to upgrade the elevators at the 1800 F Street Building, NW, Washington, DC to ensure their long-term reliability and meet the service demands of the increased population resulting from the recently completed partial modernization and expansion.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the GSA Headquarters Building at a total cost of $7,091,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriations Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I).....$7,091,000

Major Work Items

Elevator Upgrades

Project Budget

Design and Review	$724,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	5,731,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	636,000
Estimated Total Project Cost*	**$7,091,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
GSA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0021-WA15

Building

The 1800 F Street Building is a seven-story approximately 764,000 gross-square-foot limestone-clad federal office building situated at 1800 F Street just west of downtown Washington, DC. The building provides 518,700 useable square feet of space and includes outside parking in an interior courtyard. The building was constructed in 1917 as the headquarters of the Department of the Interior, which resided in it until 1949, at which time it became the headquarters of GSA, which occupies the building today. It was one of the first steel-framed buildings constructed in Washington, as well as one of the first government buildings to use limestone on the exterior. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Tenant Agencies

General Services Administration

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of upgrading eight elevators in the yet to be modernized areas of the building. The upgrades include the removal and replacement of the majority of the major components of 8 elevators, a tie into the new fire alarm system and cleaning and restoration of the historic finishes of the cabs at the Lobby level.

The elevator upgrades were planned as an integral part of the on-going multi-phase modernization and expansion project at the building. Phase 1 of the modernization was funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 and this modernization included elevator upgrades in parts of the building. GSA had originally planned to upgrade the remaining 8 elevators as part of Phase II of the project, but since the schedule and funding of Phase II remains uncertain, and as the condition of the elevators continues to deteriorate and the population of the building continues to grow, GSA felt that the elevators needed to be addressed immediately.

Major Work Items

Elevator Upgrades	$5,731,000
Total ECC	**$5,731,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
GSA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0021-WA15

Justification

The elevator cabs, parts and components are original to the building and need to be replaced. The elevators are no longer supported by the manufacturer and due to age, replacement parts are becoming increasingly difficult to find. The limited availability of parts results in the common occurrence of expensive and sustained outages. Additionally, outages have become more prevalent with the increased building population and the interim repairs that are undertaken take the cabs out of service for extended time periods disrupting building tenants and operations.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$3,200,000	Repair and Alteration
House T&I	2/28/13	$3,200,000	Repair and Alteration

*Included in the 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
PDS-02003	Design	2003	$13,000,000
P.L. 111-5 (ARRA)	Modernization & Expansion	2009	$153,664,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
GSA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0021-WA15

Alternatives Considered (30-year present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—ROBERT C. WEAVER BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to replace the fire alarm system at the Robert C. Weaver Building located at 451 7th Street, SW, in Washington, D.C., at a design and review cost of $1,250,000, an estimated construction cost of $10,940,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,185,000 for a total estimated project cost of $13,375,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
ROBERT C. WEAVER BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0092-WA15

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to replace the fire alarm system replacement project at the Robert C. Weaver Building (Weaver Building) at 451 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC. The proposed project will replace the existing fire alarm system with a new emergency communication system that is intended to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. The new system will be designed and installed to meet the requirements in GSA PBS-P100, Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the Weaver Building at a total cost of $13,375,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I).....$13,375,000

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm System Replacement

Project Budget

Design and Review)	1,250,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	$10,940,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,185,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$13,375,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	April 2015	March 2017

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATIONS
ROBERT C. WEAVER BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0092-WA15

Building

The Weaver Building is a thirteen-story 1,372,300 gross-square-foot modular precast concrete office building with 351-space three-level basement parking garage, and a 104-space adjacent parking lot. It was constructed in 1967 as the headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which still occupies the building today; and is part of the city's Southwest Urban Renewal Plan. The building was designed by famed architect Marcel Breuer and is on the National Register of Historic Buildings.

Tenant Agencies

HUD

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of replacing the antiquated fire alarm system, including the removal of the existing system, and the installation of a new emergency communication system to facilitate occupant notification and/or evacuation in the Weaver Building during an emergency.

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm System Replacement	$10,940,000
Total ECC	**$10,940,000**

Justification

The existing fire alarm system is obsolete and does not meet the requirements in the GSA PBS-P100 Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and the International Building Code which require an emergency communication system be installed to be able to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. The existing system utilizes bells and horns to notify occupants. In addition, the system is no longer supported by the manufacturer, and many of its key components are limited in availability. Lastly, the alarm's audibility is not adequate in all areas of the building, a deficiency that poses a danger to tenants in case of an emergency.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
ROBERT C. WEAVER BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0092-WA15

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$12,000,000	Construction
House T&I	2/28/13	$12,000,000	Construction

*Included in the 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
PEISA-2010	High Performance Energy Projects	2010	$5,281,444

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
ROBERT C. WEAVER BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0092-WA15

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—SIDNEY R. YATES FEDERAL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to undertake facade repairs and to replace chillers at the Sidney R. Yates Federal Building located at 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, in Washington, D.C., at a design and review cost of $440,000, an estimated construction cost of $29,480,000 and a management and inspection cost of $2,900,000 for a total estimated project cost of $32,820,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
SIDNEY R. YATES FEDERAL BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0501-WA15

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to undertake façade repairs and to replace chillers at the Sidney R. Yates Federal Building (Yates FB) at 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC. The proposed project is necessary for the continued, safe occupancy of the highly prominent, 133 year old Federal Building situated between the Washington Monument and the National Holocaust Museum. The building is listed on the National Historic Register.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015 this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the Yates Federal Building at a total cost of $32,820,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $32,820,000

Major Work Items

Building exterior repairs; Chiller replacement

Project Budget

Design and Review	$440,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	29,480,000
Management & Inspection (M&I)	2,900,000
Total Estimated Construction Cost	**$32,820,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY 2015	FY2017

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
SIDNEY R. YATES FEDERAL BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0501-WA15

Building

The Yates FB is a five-story, 208,000 gross square foot red brick office building constructed in 1880 for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing's operations. In 1915, the main building was renovated to house the offices for the auditors of the Navy, Treasury, and State Departments, and thus became known as the "Auditors" building. In 1987, the building was renovated to house the Forest Service and in January 1999, the Auditors Main Building was re-designated the Sidney R. Yates Federal Building, Public Law 105-277, to honor the Congressman from Illinois who served on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies.

Situated on the corner of Independence Avenue and 16th Street, SW, the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and serves as the headquarters of the U.S. Forest Service. Its prominent location fronting the National Mall and Washington Monument, and its adjacency to the National Holocaust Museum and tidal basin ensure its visibility by thousands of passing tourists daily.

Tenant Agencies

U.S. Forest Service

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of exterior and structural repairs, including re-pointing building exterior and moat walls, repairing building perimeter railings, caulking exterior facing windows, repairing/replacing built-in gutter lines, replacing counter flashing above gutter lines, and installing drain bodies in all rain leaders; and replacing the chillers.

Major Work Items

Building Exterior Repairs	$26,480,000
Replace Chillers	3,000,000
Total ECC	**$29,480,000**

Justification

The exterior masonry walls are severely deteriorated and disintegrating. Dislodging debris is falling on to adjacent sidewalks, posing a danger to pedestrians near the building, as the building is not set back from the street. Recently, GSA made emergency re-pointing repairs on the north side of the building using minor repair and alteration funds. Also, the flashing, gutters, and leader heads are loose, corroded, and/or leaking, allowing water migration into the walls.

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
SIDNEY R. YATES FEDERAL BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0501-WA15

The building chillers are obsolete, inefficient, and at the end of their serviceable life and are plagued with expensive breakdowns and protracted outages. The manufacturer no longer supports the system and it has becoming increasingly difficult to find replacement parts. Further complications are arising from the increased population resulting from U.S. Forest Service's ongoing consolidation into the building.

Undertaking the exterior repairs and chiller replacement project supports the U.S. Forest Service's effort to maintain long term occupancy of this historic building.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$11,000,000	Construction
House T&I	2/28/13	$11,000,000	Construction

*Included in the 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
SIDNEY R. YATES FEDERAL BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC

Prospectus Number: PDC-0501-WA15

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK, CHAMBLEE, GA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to repair the structural deficiencies at the parking deck adjoining the Internal Revenue Service Service Center Annex located at 2385 Chamblee Tucker Road in Chamblee, Georgia, at an estimated construction cost of $6,619,000 and a management and inspection cost of $790,000 for a total estimated project cost of $7,409,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK
CHAMBLEE, GA

Prospectus Number: PGA-0010-CH15
Congressional District: 6

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alterations project to repair the structural deficiencies at the parking deck adjoining the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Service Center Annex located at 2385 Chamblee Tucker Road in Chamblee, GA which have led to the closure of more than 100 parking spots. The IRS Annex parking deck is experiencing excessive slab deflections, cracking and stress at the elevated slabs and other serviceability and strength issues. The completion of the repairs proposed in this prospectus will extend the service life of the parking deck and return it a condition safe for continued use.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the IRS Parking Deck at a total cost of $7,409,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(ECC, M&I) $7,409,000

Major Work Items

Parking deck repairs/replacement; Site work

Project Budget

Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	$6,619,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	790,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$7,409,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK
CHAMBLEE, GA

Prospectus Number: PGA-0010-CH15
Congressional District: 6

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The IRS Parking Deck, which is collocated with the IRS Service Center Annex in Chamblee Georgia, was constructed in 1998. It is a three level, slab-on-grade with two elevated post-tension slabs, cast-in-place (CIP) parking structure. The elevated slabs are supported by CIP concrete columns with drop panels. The elevated slab consists of a combination of mild reinforcing and post tensions tendons. The total square footage of the parking deck is approximately 259,000 square feet and provides 778 inside structured parking spaces.

Tenant Agencies

IRS

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes strengthening the existing elevated slabs and their supporting columns, repair of all concrete/CMU cracks and spalls, adding additional lateral force resisting shearwalls with supporting foundations, and adding a steel support frame with supporting foundation along the length of the cantilever portion of the slabs.

Interim short term repairs in an effort to address immediate safety measures along with testing have been undertaken with minor program funds. The work proposed in this prospectus will accomplish all of the construction needed to secure the structure.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK
CHAMBLEE, GA

Prospectus Number: PGA-0010-CH15
Congressional District: 6

Major Work Items

Parking Deck Repairs	$6,057,000
Site Work	562,000
Total ECC	**$6,619,000**

Justification

The IRS Annex parking deck is experiencing excessive slab deflections, cracking and stress at the elevated slabs and multiple other serviceability and strength issues. Sections of the garage have been closed down - over 100 spaces are not available for parking due to falling debris, structural concerns.

Initially, GSA examined the possibility of minor maintenance repairs in order to permanently resolve standing water at the parking deck elevated slabs. Further investigation revealed that the elevated slabs were experiencing excessive deflection and serviceability that resulted in the slab low points not matching the drain locations. A study was performed and resulted in the determination that the parking deck suffers from strength and serviceability issues resulting from substandard construction and design practices. Recommendations from the study resulted in partial areas being deemed unsafe for use.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK
CHAMBLEE, GA

Prospectus Number: PGA-0010-CH15
Congressional District: 6

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$3,400,000	Exigent Needs - Construction
House T&I	2/28/12	$3,400,000	Exigent Needs – Construction

*Included in the FY 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
IRS ANNEX PARKING DECK
CHAMBLEE, GA

Prospectus Number: PGA-0010-CH15
Congressional District: 6

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING, JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING, U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION, CHICAGO, IL

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to reconfigure and alter currently vacant space at the 536 South Clark Street Federal Building, U.S. Post Office Loop Station, and the John C. Kluczynski Federal Building located in Chicago, Illinois, at a design cost of $1,230,000, an estimated construction cost of $14,626,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,260,000 for a total estimated project cost of $17,116,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that Immigration and Customs Enforcement is consolidated into government owned space and associated leased space is released.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING
U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION
CHICAGO, IL

Prospectus Number: PIL-0054-CH15
Congressional District: 07

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project for the reconfiguration and alteration of currently vacant space at the 536 South Clark Street Federal Building, US Post Office Loop Station (USPO), and John C. Kluczynski Federal Building (JCK) in Chicago, Illinois to consolidate functions and meet the long term housing needs of the Department of Homeland Security, Immigration, Customs Enforcement (DHS-ICE). The proposed consolidation will reduce federally owned vacant space, improve space utilization, and allow the Government to release leased space and eliminate annual lease payments to the private sector by approximately $2,700,000 annually.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, Construction, M&I) $17,116,000

Major Work Items

Interior construction; HVAC, fire protection/alarm, and electrical upgrades; selective building demolition.

Project Budget

Design	$1,230,000
Estimated Construction Cost	14,626,000
Management and Inspection	1,260,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$17,116,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for tenant improvements above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2018

Buildings

The 536 S. Clark Street Federal Building was built in 1912 and is constructed of a steel frame superstructure with exterior masonry walls. The building primarily houses the Department of Homeland Security. The ten story building is 681,862 gross square feet (gsf) and is located on the south side of the Central Loop area. The building's façade,

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING
U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION
CHICAGO, IL

Prospectus Number: PIL-0054-CH15
Congressional District: 07

designed by Chicago architects Holabird and Roche, is an example of the Chicago School architectural style. The building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The JCK and USPO are part of the Chicago Federal Center (CFC) and are located in the Central Loop. The JCK is adjacent to the USPO on the northwest and is connected below grade. A grade level plaza surrounds the USPO Loop Station and JCK. The Chicago Federal Center was designed by renowned architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and is an excellent example of contemporary public architecture in the International Style. The Chicago Federal Center is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The 46-story JCK (four stories below grade) built in 1973 is constructed of structural steel framing encased in concrete with the exterior skin consisting of glass and structural steel plate spandrels and is 1,428,620 gsf with 36 inside parking spaces. JCK supports multiple federal agencies, including the Department of Labor, Drug Enforcement Administration, Internal Revenue Service and General Services Administration.

The five-story (four stories below grade) USPO, built in 1973 is constructed of structural steel framing with an exterior skin consisting of glass, steel mullions, and spandrels and is 288,104 gsf with 49 inside parking spaces.

Major Tenant Agencies

Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Department of Labor, Department of State, Environmental Protection Agency, General Services Administration, Internal Revenue Service, US Postal Service

Proposed Project

The project proposes to recapture vacant space at the 536 S. Clark Street Federal Building and the lower levels of the USPO and JCK. The interior space alterations and building systems upgrades will allow ICE to consolidate its operations in Chicago and to release over 100,000 usf of leased space. The ICE housing requirements include approximately 64,000 usf of office space, 15,000 usf of warehouse space, and 214 parking spaces. The project will renovate the majority of the vacant space within the 536 S. Clark Federal building to meet the agency's office space requirement. The warehouse and parking requirements will be fulfilled by renovating and repurposing vacant light industrial space within the lower levels of the USPO and JCK. The HVAC, electrical, and fire system upgrades will be limited to what is required to build out the tenant space.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING
U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION
CHICAGO, IL

Prospectus Number: PIL-0054-CH15
Congressional District: 07

Major Work Items

Interior Construction	$6,163,000
HVAC Upgrades	3,136,000
Electrical Upgrades	2,562,000
Selective Building Demolition	1,892,000
Fire Protection/Alarm Upgrades	873,000
Total ECC	**$14,626,000**

Justification

The 536 S. Clark Street Federal Building is currently nearly 15% vacant. Currently, DHS ICE is housed in leased space with more than $2.7 million in annual rent costs. This project will satisfy ICE's long term housing requirements and backfill federally owned vacant space. In addition, consistent with the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*, the project will result in a reduction of the DHS footprint and improved space utilization in federal inventory. It will also repurpose and make usable light industrial vacant space in the lower levels of USPO and JCK that is difficult to backfill in its current condition.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING
U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION
CHICAGO, IL

Prospectus Number: PIL-0054-CI15
Congressional District: 07

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 ARRA	Fire Alarm/Mechanical Upgrades (LPO & JCK)	2009	$99,673,000
111-5 ARRA	Plaza Upgrades (Chicago Federal Center)	2009	$28,131,000
111-5 ARRA	Roof Replacement & Lighting Upgrades (536 S. Clark FB)	2009	$5,751,000

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

Alteration: $47,612,000
Lease $153,528,000
New Construction: $70,027,000

The 30-year, present value cost of alteration is $22,415,000 less than the cost of new construction with an equivalent annual cost advantage of $1,144,000.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET FEDERAL BUILDING
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BUILDING
U.S. POST OFFICE LOOP STATION
CHICAGO, IL

Prospectus Number: PIL-0054-CH15
Congressional District: 07

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan
536 South Clark Street Federal Building
John C. Kluczynski Federal Building
U.S. Post Office Loop Station

PIL-0054-CH15
Chicago, IL

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
536 S. Clark Street												
Armed Forces Recruiting	1	1	577	0	0	577	1	1	577	0	0	577
Department of the Army	7	7	3,573	0	0	3,573	7	7	3,573	0	0	3,573
Health and Human Services	6	6	2,032	0	2,850	4,883	6	6	2,032	0	2,850	4,883
DOJ-Drug Enforcement Administration	43	43	32,915	0	9,543	42,459	43	43	32,915	0	9,543	42,459
DHS-Citizenship and Immigration Services	215	215	94,957	4,354	19,740	119,050	215	215	94,957	4,354	19,740	119,050
DHS-Fed. Emergency Management Agency	210	210	55,981	0	8,363	64,344	210	210	55,981	0	8,363	64,344
DHS-Immigration and Customs Enforcement	154	154	65,439	786	16,532	82,757	467	467	96,958	2,048	44,324	143,330
DHS-Customs and Border Protection	4	4	2,096	0	0	2,096	4	4	2,096	0	0	2,096
Environmental Protection Agency	25	25	21,535	0	23,876	45,411	25	25	21,535	0	23,876	45,411
GSA-Public Buildings Service	15	15	3,488	0	1,282	4,770	15	15	3,488	0	1,282	4,770
Building Joint Use	0	0	107	0	5,302	5,408	0	0	107	0	5,302	5,408
Vacant	0	0	57,731	759	2,082	60,573	0	0	0	0	0	0
U.S. Post Office Loop Station												
DOJ-U.S. Marshals Service	0	0	60	0	0	60	0	0	60	0	0	60
GSA -Off. of the Chief Information Officer	0	0	0	289	0	289	0	0	0	289	0	289
GSA - Public Buildings Service	0	0	0	8,383	0	8,383	0	0	0	8,383	0	8,383
U.S. Postal Service	20	20	32,251	8,150	626	41,027	20	20	32,251	8,150	626	41,027
DHS-Immigration and Customs Enforcement	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	7,500	7,500
Vacant	0	0	3,140	60,678	110	63,928	0	0	0	0	0	0
John C. Kluczynski FB												
Congress - Senate	40	40	7,905	0	522	8,427	40	40	7,905	0	522	8,427
Congress -Board of Gov. Fed. Reserve Sys.	9	9	1,717	0	0	1,717	9	9	1,717	0	0	1,717
U.S. Department of Agriculture	7	7	3,051	0	0	3,051	7	7	3,051	0	0	3,051
DOE - Fed. Energy Regulatory Commission	15	15	5,357	0	0	5,357	15	15	5,357	0	0	5,357
DOJ-U.S.Marshals Service	4	4	0	0	7,009	7,009	4	4	0	0	7,009	7,009
DOJ - Community Relations Service	4	4	2,698	0	184	2,882	4	4	2,698	0	184	2,882
DOJ - Drug Enforcement Administration	237	237	62,375	1,021	8,887	72,283	237	237	62,375	1,021	8,887	72,283
DOL- Asst Secy For Adm&Mgmt Inclnat Com On	47	47	12,800	0	1,014	13,814	47	47	12,800	0	1,014	13,814
DOL - Office of the Inspector General	38	38	10,192	0	201	10,393	38	38	10,192	0	201	10,393
DOL - Employee Benefits Security Admin.	50	50	13,659	0	1,626	15,285	50	50	13,659	0	1,626	15,285
DOL- Office of Labor Mgmt Standards	25	25	6,698	0	0	6,698	25	25	6,698	0	0	6,698
DOL-Occupational Safety and Health Admin.	32	32	8,588	0	196	8,784	32	32	8,588	0	196	8,784
DOL-Bureau of Labor Statistics	99	99	26,883	0	2,271	29,154	99	99	26,883	0	2,271	29,154
DOL- Employment and Training Admin.	56	56	15,140	0	0	15,140	56	56	15,140	0	0	15,140
DOL- Office Of The Solicitor	34	34	9,066	0	0	9,066	34	34	9,066	0	0	9,066
DOL - Veterans Employment & Train. Svc.	9	9	2,484	0	0	2,484	9	9	2,484	0	0	2,484
DOL-Office Of Public Affairs	3	3	680	0	0	680	3	3	680	0	0	680
DOL-Regional Representative	2	2	416	0	0	416	2	2	416	0	0	416
DOL-Women's Bureau	3	3	876	0	0	876	3	3	876	0	0	876
DOL-Office of Workers Compensation Prog.	38	38	10,202	0	960	11,162	38	38	10,202	0	960	11,162
DOL-Wage And Hour Division	46	46	12,426	0	0	12,426	46	46	12,426	0	0	12,426

Housing Plan
536 South Clark Street Federal Building
John C. Kluczynski Federal Building
U.S. Post Office Loop Station

PIL-0054-CH15
Chicago, IL

DOL - Ofc. of Fed. Cont. Comp. Programs	35	35	9,573	0	0	9,573	35	35	9,573	0	0	9,573
DOL- Office of Apprenticeship	8	8	2,042	0	0	2,042	8	8	2,042	0	0	2,042
DOL - Office Of Job Corps	15	15	4,075	0	0	4,075	15	15	4,075	0	0	4,075
Navy - Chief Of Naval Research	16	16	6,378	0	325	6,703	16	16	6,378	0	325	6,703
Department Of State	100	100	31,137	56	1,519	32,712	100	100	31,137	56	1,519	32,712
Treasury-Internal Revenue Service	735	735	171,981	2,903	16,213	191,097	735	735	171,981	2,903	16,213	191,097
Treasury, Acting Asst. Dir.	12	12	4,120	0	404	4,524	12	12	4,120	0	404	4,524
DHS-Nat. Protecion & Prog. Directorate FPS	50	50	18,221	0	215	18,436	50	50	18,221	0	215	18,436
GSA - Office of Inspector General	13	13	7,299	0	0	7,299	13	13	7,299	0	0	7,299
GSA - Office of Civil Rights	2	2	929	0	0	929	2	2	929	0	0	929
GSA -Office of the Chief Information Officer	15	15	8,537	0	1,073	9,610	15	15	8,537	0	1,073	9,610
GSA - Regional Administrators	5	5	1,660	0	1,201	2,861	5	5	1,660	0	1,201	2,861
GSA - General Counsel	6	6	1,879	0	351	2,230	6	6	1,879	0	351	2,230
GSA- Federal Acquisition Service	106	106	23,887	0	1,486	25,373	106	106	23,887	0	1,486	25,373
GSA-Public Buildings Service	430	430	77,041	1,563	7,891	86,495	430	430	77,041	1,563	7,891	86,495
GSA - Chief People Officer	8	8	3,058	0	682	3,740	8	8	3,058	0	682	3,740
Merit Systems Protection Board	14	14	4,801	89	0	4,890	14	14	4,801	89	0	4,890
Office of Personnel Management	36	36	8,875	0	0	8,875	36	36	8,875	0	0	8,875
U.S. Taxcourt	3	3	1,423	91	1,372	2,886	3	3	1,423	91	1,372	2,886
U.S. Potal Service	0	0	8,688	27,108	973	36,769	0	0	8,688	27,108	973	36,769
DHS-Immigration and Customs Enforcement	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	7,500	7,500
Building Joint Use	0	0	2,908	1,067	816	4,791	0	0	2,908	1,067	816	4,791
Facility Joint Use	0	0	13,316	185	5,163	18,664	0	0	13,316	185	5,163	18,664
Vacant	0	0	87,710	5,727	3,018	96,455	0	0	66,052	5,727	3,018	74,797
1 Tower Lane (Lease)												
DHS - Immigration and Customs Enforcement	319	319	87,595	0	16,035	103,630	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**3,425**	**3,425**	**1,176,228**	**123,209**	**171,913**	**1,471,351**	**3,425**	**3,425**	**1,037,623**	**63,034**	**196,478**	**1,297,135**

Housing Plan
536 South Clark Street Federal Building
John C. Kluczynski Federal Building
U.S. Post Office Loop Station

PIL-0054-CH15
Chicago, IL

Office Utilization Rate[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Building Office Tenants (excluding Judiciary, Congress, and agencies with less than 10 employees)	267	235
All Building Office Tenants (including Judiciary, Congress, and agencies with less than 10 employees)	268	236

Current Office UR excludes 253,311 usf of office support space.
Proposed Office UR excludes 222,817 usf of office support space

Current Office UR excludes 258,770 usf of office support space.
Proposed Office UR excludes 228,277 usf of office support space

Total Building USF Rate[3]		
	Current	Proposed
Building Tenants (excluding Judiciary, Congress, and agencies with less than 10 employees)	421	367
All Building Tenants (including Judiciary, Congress, and agencies with less than 10 employees)	430	379

Special Space	USF
Laboratory	40,043
Food Service	19,050
Fitness Center	5,475
Private Toilet	9,054
Auditorium	4,078
Conference/Training Room	41,828
ADP	22,897
Courtroom/Judiciary	2,605
Health Unit	737
Holding Room	8,353
Private Elevator	1,059
Sallyport	7,830
Atrium	8,172
Secure Storage	25,297
Total	**196,478**

NOTES:

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

[2] Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF.

[3] Total Building USF Rate = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel).

*An assumption was made that 3,800 USF of existing ICE space will be released/consolidated at 536 S. Clark St. as the total requested USF is greater than the available vacant space in the building. In the Kluczynski FB and Loop Station the total USF of the building decreases as the buildings' lower level space is converted from vacant USF into parking. The buildings' GSF will remain the same.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—CAPTAIN JOHN FOSTER WILLIAMS U.S. COAST GUARD BUILDING, BOSTON, MA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to provide critical structural foundation and site repairs at the Captain John Foster Williams U.S. Coast Guard Building located in Boston, Massachusetts, at a design cost of $1,655,000, an estimated construction cost of $6,252,000 and a management and inspection cost of $709,000 for a total estimated project cost of $8,616,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
CAPTAIN JOHN FOSTER WILLIAMS U.S. COAST GUARD BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0011-BO15
Congressional District 8

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to provide critical structural foundation and site repairs at the Captain John Foster Williams U.S. Coast Guard Building (Williams Building) in Boston, MA. The project will eliminate deleterious building water infiltration, and sustain safe, public waterfront access at the site.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $8,616,000

Major Work Items

Structural repairs; Waterproofing

Project Budget

Design	$1,655,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	6,252,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	709,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$8,616,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The Williams Building, constructed in 1918, is an eight story, 176,013 gross square foot building located in the Rowe's Wharf district on Boston Harbor. The building is constructed upon backfilled tidelands and is situated only 16-20 feet from the water's edge and the only protection is a 100-year-old granite/wood pile supported seawall with a paved pedestrian causeway. Underneath a significant portion of the pedestrian causeway, and adjacent to the building's basement, is an abandoned coal vault with a floor elevation approximately four feet below the harbor's mean high water line. The basement, which houses the electrical service switchgear and mechanical equipment, has a floor elevation of only one foot above the mean high water line.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
CAPTAIN JOHN FOSTER WILLIAMS U.S. COAST GUARD BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0011-BO15
Congressional District 8

Tenant Agencies

Commerce Department, Department of Justice, Treasury Department, Department of Homeland Security, General Services Administration, Office of Personnel Management, Railroad Retirement Board and Social Security Administration

Proposed Project

The proposed project provides critical repairs to the full length of the site's existing seawall to restore structural stability and mitigate recurring tidal water infiltration to the building's basement. Repairs will include integrated waterproofing under the pedestrian causeway, within the abandoned coal vault, and along the perimeter of the building foundation. Furthermore, cracks, utility penetrations, and concrete deterioration of the foundation will also be repaired to provide additional infiltration mitigation. The project also provides a comprehensive waterproofing solution to eliminate recurring risks to the building's electrical and mechanical systems, improves personnel life safety, and maintains public access to the waterfront. This project is required to ensure the continued mission use/occupancy of the building and safety of all public pedestrians utilizing the waterfront.

Major Work Items

Structural Repairs/Waterproofing	$6,552,000
Total ECC	**$6,252,000**

Justification

Multiple engineering assessment reports have identified structural and waterproofing deficiencies at the building, resulting in significant water infiltration entering the multi-leveled basement. The continued impact of sea water and subsequent deterioration of the seawall has caused recurring maintenance issues for nearly 50 years, necessitating emergent patches, repairs, and work-arounds. The pedestrian causeway is used regularly by the public to access transportation and other waterfront activities. The pedestrian causeway is cracked, deteriorated, and could become unstable over the abandoned coal vault if not restored. The coal vault itself is the primary conduit for tidal and rainwater infiltration to the building's basement resulting in costly structural, mechanical and electrical damage. If not addressed, the infiltration will continue to cause foundation damage to the building, as well as increase future electrical and mechanical system outages that will severely impact all tenant missions. Existing sump wells and pumps cannot alone mitigate the magnitude of the recurring tidal influx of water incursion.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
CAPTAIN JOHN FOSTER WILLIAMS U.S. COAST GUARD BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0011-BO15
Congressional District 8

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
CAPTAIN JOHN FOSTER WILLIAMS U.S. COAST GUARD BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0011-B015
Congressional District 8

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR, FEDERAL BUILDING, BOSTON, MA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to replace and upgrade multiple failing and deficient systems at the Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Federal Building located at 10 Causeway Street in Boston, Massachusetts, at a design cost of $1,306,000, an estimated construction cost of $13,765,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,075,000 for a total estimated project cost of $16,146,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0153-BO15
Congressional District: 8

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to replace and upgrade multiple failing and deficient systems at the Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Federal Building (O'Neill Building) located at 10 Causeway Street, Boston, MA. The replacement of the fire alarm system, building automation system, and upgrade of the elevators will allow for improved building performance and code compliance.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $16,146,000

Major Work Items

Elevator upgrades; building automation system replacement; fire alarm system replacement

Project Budget

Design	$1,306,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	13,765,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,075,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$16,146,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	**Start**	**End**
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The O'Neill Building is a 670,818 rentable square foot (rsf) steel and concrete office building adjacent to North Station, one of Boston's main commuter rail stations, and the TD Garden Arena. The building is defined by a five-story atrium/lobby, a five-story office low-rise, and eleven-story office high-rise. The building sits on piles driven down to the glacial till. Granite panels and a ribbon window system characterize the exterior facade.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0153-BO15
Congressional District: 8

Major Tenant Agencies

General Services Administration, Housing and Urban Development, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Department of State, Internal Revenue Service, Department of Agriculture

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes upgrades to all 12 building elevators, including one freight elevator, to bring the elevators up to current technology, performance and building code standards. The modernized systems shall incorporate non-proprietary, regenerative energy drives. The passenger cab enclosures will also be refinished with durable and sustainable materials, and be outfitted with the required life safety and handicapped compliant systems.

Additionally, the outdated and fragmented building automation system will be replaced with a system that consolidates and integrates system devices via a common, expandable communication network. The replacement system will supplement the number of points/zones monitored and controlled to optimize building performance and increase annual energy savings.

Lastly, the existing fire alarm system will be replaced to bring the system up to building code standards. The project will include installation and electrical conduit distribution for all integrated alarms, sensors and control panels throughout the building.

Major Work Items

Elevator Upgrades	$5,488,000
Building Automation System Replacement	5,325,000
Fire Alarm Replacement	2,952,000
Total ECC	**$13,765,000**

Justification

Recurring elevator failures regularly and adversely impact the 1,300 building personnel and multiple agency missions. The 30-year-old elevators have exceeded their useful life and require replacement to eliminate deficiencies and failures. Increased downtime of the system is due to antiquated passenger cars, diminishing parts availability, increased personnel entrapments due to failing door operators, and increased frequency of maintenance cycles. Over the past 12 months 80% of the elevator service call backs were equipment related. Two elevator cars were out of service for over one month due to

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0153-BO15
Congressional District: 8

problems getting parts. One of the two elevators that were out of service was the freight elevator, which caused a passenger elevator to be reassigned. This resulted in longer passenger wait times, as well as increased wait times for material and construction deliveries.

Replacement of the building automation system will allow for improved tenant comfort and better monitoring and control over the O'Neill Building's energy consumption. The current system, responsible for managing and monitoring all mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, is antiquated and has exceeded its useful life. Interim modifications have created an assortment of inefficient and network-incompatible fragments. As a result, the entire system lacks adequate coverage and control which has resulted in recurring occupant temperature comfort issues and less control over energy consumption.

The existing fire alarm system is outdated with replacement parts that are difficult to source and should be upgraded to meet current code requirements. Fire protection systems have evolved significantly since the installation of the original system which has had components replaced over the years due to various build-out projects, but has created a proprietary, yet hodgepodge type of fire alarm system. The proposed project improves life safety by providing reliable fire detection and improved mass notification coverage in the high density, high-rise building. Upgrades will improve reliability of fire reporting to local emergency responders and provide tactical system aides to reduce personnel life safety and property risks.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0153-BO15
Congressional District: 8

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 (ARRA)	Renovate tenant agency space	2009	$12,950,000

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MA

Prospectus Number: PMA-0153-BO15
Congressional District: 8

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—985 MICHIGAN AVENUE, DETROIT, MI

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to consolidate federal agencies into 985 Michigan Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, at a design cost of $7,834,000, an estimated construction cost of $61,073,000 and a management and inspection cost of $6,006,000 for a total estimated project cost of $74,913,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration executes the existing purchase option in the lease, at an estimated cost of $1, and federal agencies are consolidated into 985 Michigan Avenue.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
985 MICHIGAN AVENUE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-1951-DE15
Congressional District: 14

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to consolidate federal agencies into 985 Michigan Avenue in Detroit, Michigan. The consolidation of federal agencies will decrease reliance on leased space, improve space utilization and incorporate alternative workplace solutions. The building's systems will also be renovated to extend service life and improve operational efficiency.

The building was constructed in 1995 as a build-to-suit lease to be occupied by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). GSA intends to execute an existing purchase option in the lease, and purchase the building for $1 with a transfer of ownership occurring April 2015.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, Construction, M&I) $74,913,000

Major Work Items

Interior construction; HVAC, electrical and plumbing upgrades, fire and life safety upgrades; elevator repairs; exterior construction and parking garage repairs

Project Budget

Design	$7,834,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	61,073,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	6,006,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$74,913,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for tenant improvements above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2018

Building

The office building is 10-stories above grade with a basement and has approximately 484,000 rentable square feet. The majority of the mechanical equipment is housed in a 3-story structure adjacent to the building. The building has a 10-story parking garage with approximately 850 spaces.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
985 MICHIGAN AVENUE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-1951-DI15
Congressional District: 14

Tenant Agencies

IRS, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Labor, State Department, GSA, U.S. Air Force Reserves, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, Social Security Administration

Proposed Project

Upon receipt of ownership, GSA proposes to renovate the 985 Michigan Avenue building to extend the useful life of the building and consolidate federal agencies from leased locations within Detroit, MI. Renovation of the building systems includes improvements to the HVAC systems that will result in energy savings, repairs to the passenger and freight elevators, replacement of the roof, repairs to the building's windows and façade, upgrades to the fire alarm and sprinkler systems, repairs to the plumbing system and public restrooms, improvements to the electrical infrastructure, and repairs to the parking garage and site.

The IRS is currently located at the 985 Michigan Avenue building and two other leased locations. Interior alterations will be made to allow for the reconfiguration of IRS space and consolidation of federal agencies into space released by IRS. Other proposed backfill agencies are in leased facilities.

Major Work Items

Interior Construction	$17,725,000
HVAC Upgrades	17,189,000
Exterior Construction and Parking Garage Repairs	7,384,000
Electrical Upgrades	6,676,000
Fire and Life Safety Upgrades	6,642,000
Elevator Repairs	4,206,000
Plumbing Upgrades	1,251,000
Total ECC	**$61,073,000**

Justification

This project will create a multi-tenant building by significantly reducing the IRS' footprint in the building and relocating a number of federal agencies (including the IRS) from leased facilities into the Federally owned facility. The government is expected to achieve savings due to lease cost avoidance, of approximately $11,000,000 per year, the saving estimate includes the costs that would be associated with relocating the IRS from

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
985 MICHIGAN AVENUE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-1951-DE15
Congressional District: 14

985 Michigan Avenue to leased space in the event that funds for this project are not appropriated. The strategy to convert the asset to a multi-tenant federal building is consistent with the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*.

The building is approximately 20 years old and many systems are inefficient and are approaching the end of their useful lives. Upgrades to the building's infrastructure are required to extend service life, reduce energy consumption and operating expenses, and ensure long-term occupancy of federal tenants. Mechanical, electrical, elevator and plumbing systems have operated 24/7, 365 days/year since the building was constructed in 1995. The HVAC system is inefficient and oversized for office use. Fire and life safety systems are not compliant with current code. Additionally, the building envelope and parking structure are showing signs of deterioration.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

Alteration:	$267,023,000
Lease	$618,338,000
New Construction:	$410,178,000

The 30-year, present value cost of alteration is $143,155,000 less than the cost of new construction with an equivalent annual cost advantage of $7,304,000.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
985 MICHIGAN AVENUE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-1951-DE15
Congressional District: 14

Recommendation

ALTERATION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan

985 Michigan Avenue

PMI-1951-DE15
Detroit, MI

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
985 Michigan Ave.												
Internal Revenue Service	1,200	1,200	261,485	33,973	125,293	420,751	1,323	1,323	140,281	18,456	19,633	178,370
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Admin	2	2	155	20	74	249	2	2	155	20	74	249
Drug Enforcement Administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	215	215	21,458	5,720	27,475	54,653
JD Community Relations Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	632	74	37	743
JD Office of Inspector General	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	680	80	40	800
DOL Office of Inspector General	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	1,587	186	93	1,866
DOL Employee Benefits Security Admin.	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	2,180	256	128	2,564
DOL Office of Labor Management Standards	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	2,287	269	135	2,691
DOL Bureau of Labor Statistics	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	1,813	213	107	2,133
DOL Wage & Hour Division	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	4,691	552	276	5,519
DOL Office of Federal Contract Compliance	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15	2,912	343	171	3,426
DOL Bureau of Apprenticeship & Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	1,106	130	65	1,301
U.S. Office of Special Counsel	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	2,410	284	141	2,835
DHS Field Operations Facility	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	40	25,094	2,952	1,476	29,522
DHS Mission Support Facility	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	4,942	581	291	5,814
State Department	-	-	-	-	-	-	65	65	19,326	2,274	1,136	22,736
GSA Federal Acquisition Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	600	-	-	600
GSA Public Building Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	38	6,900	1,000	1,500	9,400
USA AFR Navy	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	40	11,312	1,331	665	13,308
Social Security Administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	70	14,698	-	-	14,698
HHS Departmental Management (IG)							12	12	6,312	-	-	6,312
Vacant	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	1,187	90	-	1,277
Joint Use	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	17,716	17,716
211 W. Fort Street												
Internal Revenue Service	3	3	1,852	-	-	1,852	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drug Enforcement Administration	32	32	6,792	-	-	6,792	-	-	-	-	-	-
JD Community Relations Service	2	2	743	-	-	743	-	-	-	-	-	-
JD Office of Inspector General	2	2	800	-	-	800	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Office of Inspector General	3	3	1,866	-	-	1,866	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Employee Benefits Security Admin.	5	5	2,564	-	-	2,564	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Office of Labor Management System	6	6	2,691	-	-	2,691	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Bureau of Labor Statistics	4	4	2,133	-	-	2,133	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Wage & Hour Division	17	17	5,519	-	-	5,519	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Off. of Federal Cont. Comp. Prog.	15	15	3,426	-	-	3,426	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOL Bureau of Apprenticeship & Training	4	4	1,301	-	-	1,301	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S. Office of Special Counsel	5	5	2,835	-	-	2,835	-	-	-	-	-	-
DHS Field Operations Facility	40	40	29,522	-	-	29,522	-	-	-	-	-	-
DHS Mission Support Facility	3	3	5,814	-	-	5,814	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Department	65	65	22,737	-	-	22,737	-	-	-	-	-	-
431 Howard Street												
Drug Enforcement Administration	183	183	60,507	-	7,556	68,063	-	-	-	-	-	-
500 Woodward Avenue												
Internal Revenue Service	250	250	70,794	-	-	70,794	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 Parklane Boulevard												
GSA Federal Acquisition Service	3	3	968	-	-	968	-	-	-	-	-	-

GSA Public Building Service, Field Offices	3	3	1,404	-	-	1,404	-	-	-	-	-	-
GSA Public Building Service, District Offices	35	35	12,638	-	-	12,638	-	-	-	-	-	-
1155 Brewery Park Boulevard												
USA AFR (Navy)	40	40	13,308	-	-	13,308	-	-	-	-	-	-
300 River Place												
HHS Departmental Management (IG)	12	12	6,312	-	-	6,312	-	-	-	-	-	-
719 Griswold												
Social Security Administration	70	70	14,698	-	-	14,698	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**2,004**	**2,004**	**532,864**	**33,993**	**132,923**	**699,780**	**1,874**	**1,874**	**272,563**	**34,811**	**71,159**	**378,533**

Office Utilization Rate[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Building Office Tenants	207	113

Total Building USF Rate[3]		
	Current	Proposed
All Building Tenants	349	202

Current Office UR excludes 117,230 usf of office support space. Proposed Office UR excludes 59,963 usf of office support space

Special Space	USF
Laboratory	390
Food Service	13,485
Fitness Center	6,071
Conference/Training Room	29,305
ADP	11,963
Interview/Detention	260
Secure Storage	9,685
Total	**71,159**

NOTES:

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

[2] Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF, vacant office USF.

[3] Total Building USF Calculation = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel). Building USF calculation excludes building vacant usf.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE, DETROIT, MI

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for Phase II of a multi-phase alteration project, including replacement of the fire alarm electrical distribution systems, emergency generator, perimeter fan coils and passenger elevators and the extension of the fire sprinkler system, to correct serious building deficiencies at the Theodore Levin U.S. Courthouse located at 231 West Lafayette Boulevard in Detroit, Michigan, at an estimated construction cost for Phase II of $37,539,000 and a management and inspection cost for Phase II of $2,960,000 for a total authorization for Phase II of $40,499,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS –ALTERATION
THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-0029-DE15
Congressional District: 14

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) is proposing Phase II of a multi-phase alteration project to correct serious building deficiencies at the historic Theodore Levin U.S. Courthouse (Levin Courthouse) located at 231 West Lafayette Boulevard in Detroit, MI. The Levin Courthouse houses the Federal Courts for the Eastern District of Michigan. The proposed multi-phase project will correct deficiencies to ensure the long term occupancy of federal agencies by providing a safe and reliable work environment. The proposed scope for this phase includes replacement of the fire alarm electrical distribution systems, emergency generator, perimeter fan coils, and passenger elevators and the extension of the fire sprinkler system.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Phase II M&I and ECC) $40,499,000

Major Work Items (all phases)

HVAC and electrical systems replacement; elevator improvements; plumbing and fire and life safety upgrades; interior construction

Project Budget

Design (FY2014) $10,200,000

Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)
Phase I (FY2014) $19,256,000
Phase II (FY2015 request) $37,539,000
Phase III (future year request) $62,173,000
Total ECC $118,968,000

Management and Inspection (M&I)
Phase I (FY2014) $1,541,000
Phase II (FY2015 request) $2,960,000
Phase III (future year request) $6,040,000
Total M& I $10,541,000

Estimated Total Project Cost* $139,709,000

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS –ALTERATION
THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-0029-DE15
Congressional District: 14

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2014	FY2016
Construction	FY2014	FY2019

Building

The Levin Courthouse, located at 231 West Lafayette Boulevard in Detroit, MI was constructed in 1934 in the Neo-Classical Revival style using reinforced concrete with an Indiana limestone façade. The building is 771,904 gross square feet and contains 19 inside parking spaces. It has 10 stories above grade with a pair of two-story penthouses and a below grade level where vehicles access the basement for deliveries, prisoner transfer to the building and judges' parking. The central core of the building opens to form a light-well from the 3rd to 10th floors. The building is located on the southeastern edge of the central portion of the central business district of Detroit. This asset is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing property to the historic district.

Tenant Agencies

Judiciary, Department of Justice, Congress-House of Representatives, GSA, U.S. Tax Court

Proposed Project

The multi-phase project includes replacement of the building's chillers, air handling units, perimeter fan coil units, fiber-board ductwork, and upgrades to the Building Automation System. The building's electrical distribution system and emergency generator will be replaced and cloth wiring will be removed throughout the building. Domestic water piping will be repaired and restrooms will be renovated to provide Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standard (ABAAS) compliance. An egress stairwell will be added, the fire alarm will be replaced, and the sprinkler system will be extended to provide full coverage. Public elevators will be replaced and a new freight elevator will be added. The basement loading dock area will be modified to better facilitate deliveries to the building. Hazardous materials related to the scope of work will be abated.

This proposed phase of the larger project includes replacement of the fire alarm electrical distribution systems, emergency generator, perimeter fan coils, and passenger elevators and the extension of the fire sprinkler system.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS –ALTERATION
THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-0029-DE15
Congressional District: 14

Phase I (requested in FY2014) included the design of the entire project and the addition of the egress stairwell and Fort Street stair corridor, a new freight elevator, replacement of the chillers, and reconfiguration of the basement loading dock area.

Phase III, the final phase, will include replacement of major HVAC system components including air handling units and fiberboard ductwork and upgrades to the BAS and plumbing. Under this phase, temporary swing space will be constructed within the building for tenants to occupy while work is performed in their space. The build-out of internal swing space will require the relocation of a tenant from the building into external swing space.

Major Work Items (all phases)

HVAC Replacement	$56,614,000
Fire and Life Safety Upgrades	19,864,000
Electrical System Replacement	15,895,000
Interior Construction	12,976,000
Plumbing Upgrades	7,143,000
Elevator Improvements	6,476,000
Total ECC	**$118,968,000**

Justification

The historic Levin Courthouse serves as the Federal Courts for the Eastern District of Michigan. In recent years, the Courthouse has experienced electrical outages, failures of the HVAC system, elevator outages, and frequent flooding resulting from pipe ruptures, resulting in major disruptions to tenant agencies' mission execution. Major building systems are well beyond their useful lives, do not comply with current codes, and are inefficient and difficult to maintain. Fire and life safety systems are outdated and egress pathways are inadequate.

Public restrooms do not comply with accessibility requirements and the current configuration of the basement loading dock area prevents the delivery of materials during normal business hours. The building's freight elevator is undersized, which makes the transport of materials throughout the building very inefficient.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles

PROSPECTUS –ALTERATION
THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-0029-DE15
Congressional District: 14

for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus Level Projects in the Building (past 10 years)

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

Alteration: $235,644,000
Lease $415,631,000
New Construction: $293,849,000

The 30-year, present value cost of alteration is $57,747,000 less than the cost of new construction with an equivalent annual cost advantage of $2,946,000.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS –ALTERATION
THEODORE LEVIN U.S. COURTHOUSE
DETROIT, MI

Prospectus Number: PMI-0029-DE15
Congressional District: 14

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—TED WEISS FEDERAL BUILDING, NEW YORK, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to modernize elevators in the Ted Weiss Federal Building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, at a design cost of $1,004,000, an estimated construction cost of $9,811,000 and a management and inspection cost of $918,000 for a total estimated project cost of $11,733,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
TED WEISS FEDERAL BUILDING
NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-0350-NY15
Congressional District: 08

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to modernize elevators in the Ted Weiss Federal Building (Weiss FB) located at 290 Broadway, New York, NY. The elevators have reached the end of their useful life, are inefficient and difficult and costly to maintain.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the Weiss FB at a total cost of $11,733,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) **$11,733,000**

Major Work Items

Elevator upgrades

Project Budget

Design	$1,004,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	9,811,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	918,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$11,733,00**

Schedule	**Start**	**End**
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The Weiss Federal Building is a 34-story office building built in 1994 as part of the $700 million Foley Square Project. The building was named after the late Congressman Ted Weiss, who represented the district in the House of Representatives from 1977 until his

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
TED WEISS FEDERAL BUILDING
NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-0350-NY15
Congressional District: 08

death in 1992. The building contains 768,759 rentable square feet of office space and approximately 163 indoor parking spaces. The top 2 floors are mechanical floors and there are two floors below grade.

The Weiss FB is adjacent to the Jacob K. Javits Federal Office Building, the James L. Watson Court of International Trade, the Daniel P. Moynihan U.S. Courthouse, the Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse, the New York County and State Courts, and the downtown Manhattan Civic Center.

During construction of the Foley Square Project which included both the Weiss FB and the Moynihan Courthouse at 500 Pearl Street, an African burial ground was discovered. The project was revised in order to preserve what is now known as the African Burial Ground National Monument and was transferred to the National Park Service in 2006. The African Burial Ground National Monument Visitor Center is located on the first floor of the Weiss FB.

The Weiss FB has the distinction of being the first federal building in the nation to participate in and receive the prestigious Energy Star Building Label from the Department of Energy (DOE) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Major Tenant Agencies

Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Project

The proposed project will modernize the 16 passenger and two service elevators in the building. The scope includes the total overhaul of control, mechanical, air conditioning, electrical, and fire safety systems and modernization of the door closers equipment and access platforms. The prospectus will fully modernize the low-rise elevators that service floors 1-15 and the freight elevators that service the basement through the penthouse.

Interim repairs to the high-rise elevators were undertaken in FY 2012 and FY 2013 using minor program funds.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
TED WEISS FEDERAL BUILDING
NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-0350-NY15
Congressional District: 08

Major Work Items

Elevator Upgrades	$9,811,000
Total ECC	**$9,811,000**

Justification

The 20 year old elevators at the Weiss Federal Building are beyond their useful life and are in need upgrades. When the elevators are taken out of service for needed repairs and service, the interruptions negatively impact the tenants. Upgrades to the elevators will improve serviceability and as GSA continues its effort to optimize inventory, increase building population, improve space utilization and reduce the government's environmental footprint, a reliable and safe conveyance system is critical for the building occupants.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$11,700,000	Repair and Alteration
House T&I	2/28/12	$11,700,000	Repair and Alteration

*Included in the FY 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
TED WEISS FEDERAL BUILDING
NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-0350-NY15
Congressional District: 08

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING, CINCINNATI, OH

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations that will reconfigure approximately 233,000 usable square feet of space at the John Weld Peck Federal Building in Cincinnati, Ohio to meet the long term housing needs of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of Energy, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Social Security Administration Office of Disability Adjudication and Review, and the U.S. Trustees, at a design cost of $2,872,000, an estimated construction cost of $29,725,000 and a management and inspection cost of $2,776,000 for a total estimated project cost of $35,373,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING
CINCINNATI, OH

Prospectus Number: POH-0189-C115
Congressional District: 01

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project that will reconfigure approximately 233,000 usable square feet (usf) of space at the John Weld Peck Federal Building (Peck FB) in Cincinnati, Ohio to meet the long term housing needs of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Department of Energy (DOE), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Social Security Administration Office of Disability Adjudication and Review (SSA ODAR), and the U.S. Trustees. The IRS is currently located in the Peck FB as well as two leased locations in Cincinnati. The DOE, OSHA, SSA ODAR, and U.S. Trustees are currently in leased facilities. The project will decrease reliance on leased space, reduce federally owned vacant space, and increase space utilization of the Peck FB.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $35,373,000

Major Work Items

Interior construction; HVAC, fire protection and electrical upgrades; selective building demolition.

Project Budget

Design (FY 2015)	$2,872,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	29,725,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	2,776,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$35,373,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for tenant improvements above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2018

Building

The Peck FB is located at 550 Main St. in Cincinnati, Ohio and was constructed in 1964 to house federal agencies. The steel-framed masonry limestone and glass office building has ten stories above grade, a basement with inside parking spaces, and a sub-basement. It is located on a 1.8 acre parcel in the heart of Cincinnati and has approximately 690,000 rentable square feet of space. A service and pedestrian tunnel beneath Main Street

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING
CINCINNATI, OH

Prospectus Number: POH-0189-C115
Congressional District: 01

connects the Peck Federal Building to the Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse. In 1984, the building was named after the Honorable John Weld Peck, a former federal judge who served terms on both the U.S. District and Appeals courts and on the Ohio Supreme Court.

Tenant Agencies

Department of the Treasury, Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Labor, U.S. Secret Service, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, GSA, Social Security Administration, Department of Justice, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service; National Labor Relations Board, Department of Energy

Proposed Project

The project proposes interior alterations to reconfigure approximately 233,000 usf of space at the Peck FB in order to consolidate the IRS's operations (the building's anchor tenant) and backfill space with agencies currently in leased space. The IRS intends to reconfigure their existing space within the Peck FB and consolidate their leases in Cincinnati, currently 65,000 usf, into the building, and implement alternative workplace arrangements in order to reduce their local real estate footprint by approximately 90,000 usf.

The HVAC, electrical, and fire system upgrades will be limited to what is required to build out the tenant space. Electrical system upgrades will include energy efficient lighting.

Major Work Items

Interior Construction	$11,115,000
Electrical Upgrades	7,493,000
HVAC Upgrades	6,860,000
Selective Building Demolition	2,272,000
Fire Protection Upgrades	1,985,000
Total ECC	**$29,725,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING
CINCINNATI, OH

Prospectus Number: POH-0189-CI15
Congressional District: 01

Justification

Consistent with the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*, the project will consolidate all IRS space in Cincinnati, OH into federal space and will relocate the DOE, OSHA, SSA ODAR, and the U.S. Trustees from leased to federally owned space. Nearly 176,000 usf of leased space will be eliminated when agencies consolidate into the Peck FB. It is estimated that annual lease payments will be reduced by approximately $4,400,000.

The Peck FB currently has a vacancy rate of 22% resulting from the relocation of the FBI from the Peck FB to a build-to-suit leased location in FY 2012. The proposed project is anticipated to backfill 56percent of the total vacant space. GSA is currently working with other Federal agencies located in Cincinnati to identify consolidation opportunities that will allow GSA to continue to backfill vacant space in the building.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 (ARRA)	HVAC and fire/ life safety upgrades, window and roof replacement	2009	$46,921,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING
CINCINNATI, OH

Prospectus Number: POH-0189-C15
Congressional District: 01

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

Alteration: $129,510,000
Lease $253,667,000
New Construction: $169,998,000

The 30-year, present value cost of alteration is $40,488,000 less than the cost of new construction with an equivalent annual cost advantage of $2,066,000.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
JOHN WELD PECK FEDERAL BUILDING
CINCINNATI, OH

Prospectus Number: POH-0189-C115
Congressional District: 01

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan
John Weld Peck Federal Building

POH-0189-CI15
Cincinnati, OH

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
John W. Peck FB												
U.S.Army Corps of Engineers	120	120	27,773	0	79	27,852	120	120	27,773	0	79	27,852
DOJ-Bur. of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Exp.	32	32	7,668	0	470	8,138	32	32	7,668	0	470	8,138
DOL -Wage And Hour Division	10	10	1,911	0	54	1,965	10	10	1,911	0	54	1,965
Dept. Of Treasury-IRS	693	693	161,631	904	5,133	167,668	741	741	82,697	17,899	36,714	137,310
Treasury-Alcohol &Tobacco Tax & Trade Bur.	200	200	47,869	0	4,998	52,867	200	200	47,869	0	4,998	52,867
Dept Of Treasury, Acting Asst. Director	52	52	12,422	0	100	12,522	52	52	12,422	0	100	12,522
U.S. Secret Service	18	18	6,793	0	1,057	7,850	18	18	6,793	0	1,057	7,850
DHS-Citizenship and Immigration Services	20	20	10,823	0	1,128	11,951	20	20	10,823	0	1,128	11,951
DHS-Immigration and Customs Enforcement	15	15	9,441	0	848	10,289	15	15	9,441	0	848	10,289
DHS-Nat. Protection and Programs Directorate	3	14	3,635	0	188	3,823	3	14	3,635	0	188	3,823
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	10	10	6,427	0	757	7,184	10	10	6,427	0	757	7,184
Federal Mediation And Conciliation Service	4	4	1,523	0	0	1,523	4	4	1,523	0	0	1,523
GSA- Public Buildings Service	6	36	1,234	1,152	82	2,468	6	36	1,234	1,152	82	2,468
GSA - Federal Acquisition Service	1	1	1,146	0	0	1,146	1	1	1,146	0	0	1,146
National Labor Relations Board	40	40	16,982	0	196	17,178	40	40	16,982	0	196	17,178
Defense Contract Management Agency	12	12	2,635	0	0	2,635	12	12	2,635	0	0	2,635
Social Security Administration	67	67	35,909	0	380	36,289	145	145	55,659	0	680	56,339
DOJ - U.S. Trustees	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	3,826	0	0	3,826
Department of Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	209	38,550	410	9,040	48,000
DOL - Occupational Safety & Health Admin.	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	23	10,266	11,329	2,319	23,914
Building Joint Use	31	101	5,286	0	3,464	8,750	31	101	5,286	0	3,464	8,750
Facility Joint Use	0	0	10,353	322	10,152	20,827	0	0	10,353	322	10,152	20,827
Vacant	0	0	111,700	1,122	3,316	116,138	0	0	49,584	1,122	0	50,706
36 E. 7th Street												
DOJ- U.S. Trustees	8	8	3,826	0	0	3,826	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internal Revenue Service	10	10	18,264	0	0	18,264	0	0	0	0	0	0
312 Elm Street												
Internal Revenue Service	126	126	46,672	0	0	46,672	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social Security Administration			22,045	0	0	22,045	0	0	0	0	0	0
250 E. 5th Street												
Department Of Energy	141	141	61,219	0	0	61,219	0	0	0	0	0	0
435 Elm Street												
DOL - Occupational Safety and Health Admin.	17	17	3,692	11,329	2,319	17,340	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 Triangle Park Drive												
DOL - Occupational Safety and Health Admin.	23	23	6,574	0	0	6,574	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**1,659**	**1,770**	**645,453**	**14,829**	**34,721**	**695,003**	**1,700**	**1,811**	**414,503**	**32,234**	**72,326**	**519,063**

March 2014

Housing Plan
John Weld Peck Federal Building

POH-0189-CI15
Cincinnati, OH

Office Utilization Rate[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Building Office Tenants	303	190

Total Building USF Rate[3]		
	Current	Proposed
All Building Tenants	393	287

Current Office UR excludes 141,999 usf of office support space.
Proposed Office UR excludes 91,190 usf of office support space

Special Space	USF
Food Service	9,948
ADP	6,128
Conference Training	41,607
Private Toilets	2,507
Fitness Center	1,224
Child Care	4,260
Health Unit	599
Vault	360
Holding	511
Secured Storage	2,088
Mail Room	800
Library	650
Laboratory	1,644
Total	72,326

NOTES:

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.
[2] Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF.
[3] Total Building USF Rate = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel).

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—911 FEDERAL BUILDING, PORTLAND, OR

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to upgrade the electrical system in the 911 Federal Building located at 911 NE 11th Avenue in Portland, Oregon, at a design cost of $683,000, an estimated construction cost of $6,083,000 and a management and inspection cost of $673,000 for a total estimated project cost of $7,439,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
911 FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0033-PO15
Congressional District: 3

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to upgrade the electrical system in the 911 Federal Building located at 911 NE 11th Avenue, Portland, OR. The majority of the electrical equipment is original to the 1953 construction and has reached the end of its useful life. The parts are no longer manufactured, therefore when replacement parts are needed, parts have to be fabricated at great expense to the government and repairs cause service interruptions for extended period of time.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the 911 Federal Building at a total cost of $7,439,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $7,439,000

Major Work Items

Electrical system upgrade

Project Budget

Design	$683,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	6,083,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	673,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$7,439,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
911 FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0033-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

Constructed in 1953, the 911 Federal Building is an eight-story steel-framed structure with 312,447 gross square feet of space. The basement level has one level of underground parking with 83 spaces. The 911 Federal Building is connected to and shares infrastructure with the neighboring Bonneville Power Administration Federal Building and together they are known as the Eastside Federal Complex.

Tenant Agencies

Congress; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Department of Energy; Department of Labor; Department of Interior; Department of Homeland Security; GSA

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of upgrades to the electrical distribution system to meet current code and improve serviceability. In addition, a lightning protection system will be installed and sub-metering will be installed at strategic locations throughout the building to aid with energy conservation measures.

Major Work Items

Upgrade electrical system	$6,083,000
Total ECC	**$6,083,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
911 FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0033-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Justification

The electrical distribution system is original to the 1953 construction of the building and is near the end of its useful life. The current system has reliability issues and parts must be custom fabricated whenever repairs are done. These repairs cause service interruptions for extended time periods. While undertaking these upgrades, sub- metering will be installed at strategic locations through-out the building to aid with energy conservation measures.

The building does not have a lightning protection system and a facility condition assessment indicated that the building has a moderate to high risk per National Fire Protection Association standards.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/2012	$7,000,000	Exigent Needs – Electrical Service & Distribution Equipment
House T&I	2/28/2013	$7,000,000	Exigent Needs – Electrical Service & Distribution Equipment

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
911 FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0033-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 (ARRA)	High Performance Green Building including HVAC upgrades, and green roof installation.	2010	$4,079,000

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
911 FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0033-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING, PORTLAND, OR

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to upgrade multiple building systems at the Bonneville Power Administration Federal Building located at 905 NE 11th Avenue in Portland, Oregon, at a design cost of $817,000, an estimated construction cost of $7,422,000 and a management and inspection cost of $811,000 for a total estimated project cost of $9,050,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0058-PO15
Congressional District: 3

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to upgrade multiple building systems at the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Federal Building located at 905 NE 11th Avenue in Portland, OR. Alterations include upgrading the obsolete elevator system and the relocation of air intakes from the street level to reduce the amount of ground contamination particles entering the ventilation system.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the BPA Federal Building at a total cost of $9,050,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $9,050,000

Major Work Items

Elevator system upgrade; HVAC modifications

Project Budget

Design	$817,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	7,422,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	811,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$9,050,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0058-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Schedule

	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The BPA Building, constructed in 1987, houses the headquarters of the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), a component of the Department of Energy that manages the electrical generating resources of the Columbia River watershed. The eight story steel frame structure, constructed in 1987 provides 701,184 gross square feet. It includes three levels of underground parking with 428 spaces. The BPA Federal Building is connected to and shares infrastructure with the neighboring 911 Federal Building and together they are known as the Eastside Federal Complex.

Tenant Agencies

Department of Energy

Proposed Project

The proposed project will upgrade both the elevator system and eight existing traction passenger elevators by providing a code compliant system that will improve safety, reliability, and serviceability. The eight existing traction passenger elevators will be converted to a destination dispatch control system with regenerative drives.

Ventilation system modifications include relocation of the ground/street level air intake and changes to ventilation ducts and fans.

Major Work Items

Elevator system upgrades	$4,459,000
HVAC modifications	2,963,000
Total ECC	**$7,422,000**

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0058-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Justification

The elevator system is more than 25 years old and near the end of useful life. The elevator system and traction passenger elevators breakdowns are increasing and parts are becoming more difficult and costly to procure.

The existing air intakes will be relocated approximately 25 feet above grade so the ventilation system will be less vulnerable to airborne contamination from accidental or intentional discharge of environmental contaminates.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/2012	$8,500,000	Exigent Needs – Elevator Controls and Air Intakes
House T&I	2/28/2013	$8,500,000	Exigent Needs – Elevator Controls and Air Intakes

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0058-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 (ARRA)	High Performance Green Building including HVAC upgrades, green roof, and rain water harvesting	2010	$5,094,000

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDING
PORTLAND, OR

Prospectus Number: POR-0058-PO15
Congressional District: 3

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TX

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to upgrade and renovate building components and systems to abate hazardous materials at the Fritz G. Lanham Federal Building located at 819 Taylor Street, in Fort Worth, Texas, at a design cost of $1,737,000, an estimated construction cost of $14,541,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,766,000 for a total estimated project cost of $18,044,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TX

Prospectus Number: PTX-0224-FW15
Congressional District: 12

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to upgrade and renovate building components and systems and to abate hazardous materials at the Fritz G. Lanham Federal Building (FB), at 819 Taylor Street, Fort Worth, Texas. The proposed renovations include fire protection upgrades alterations to building's system.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $18,044,000

Major Work Items

Fire protection and piping replacement; interior construction; demolition and hazardous materials abatement; plumbing and electrical system repairs/replacement.

Project Budget

Design	$1,737,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	14,541,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,766,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$18,044,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	**Start**	**End**
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The Fritz G. Lanham FB, built in 1966, contains 15 stories (including basement) and is located at 819 Taylor Street, Fort Worth, Texas. The Lanham FB has 766,591 gross square feet, including 139 basement parking spaces and is 99 percent occupied.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TX

Prospectus Number: PTX-0224-FW15
Congressional District: 12

Tenant Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Social Security Administration, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, Internal Revenue Service, Housing and Urban Development, National Labor Relations Board, Department of Transportation, Federal Public Defender Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Railroad Retirement Board, U.S. Postal Service, U.S. Trustees, Armed Forces Recruiting, Federal Protective Service, and GSA.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes replacement of aged, brittle, horizontal sprinkler piping (floors 2-14) with Schedule 40 iron sprinkler piping to meet National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) codes and standards and the replacement of the existing cast iron sanitary waste risers, vent risers, and all associated laterals, drinking fountain cast iron waste risers, vent risers and all associated laterals. Hazardous materials encountered during construction will be abated.

Major Work Items

Fire Protection/Pipe Replacement	$8,527,000
Interior Demolition/Finishes (drywall/ceilings)	5,116,000
Building Repairs (asbestos remediation)	473,000
Plumbing Replacement (water coolers, piping and drains)	380,000
Electrical Repairs	45,000
Total ECC	**$14,541,000**

Justification

The fire sprinkler system piping for the 2nd through 14th floors of the Lanham FB is constructed of Chlorinated Polyvinyl Chloride (CPVC) material (the first floor piping was previously replaced). It is extremely brittle, easily damaged, and has broken on multiple occasions. Over the years, this has resulted in millions of dollars in damage, countless lost work hours, and emergency expenses for government agencies housed in the building. There were 627 fire sprinkler system actions performed from 2009 to June 2013, and inspections revealed pipes are sagging in some areas as a result of the deterioration and instability of the fire sprinkler system.

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TX

Prospectus Number: PTX-0224-FW15
Congressional District: 12

Further complicating the issue, the sprinkler system is contained within the ceiling plenum. Many of the building's 14 floors contain equipment above the ceiling grid that requires regular maintenance. Completing necessary work above the plenum resulted in damage to the sprinkler pipes that led to significant water damage. GSA now requires the fire sprinkler system be drained when work is scheduled above the drop ceiling. This necessary practice has increased costs to GSA and building tenants because each time above ceiling work takes place, additional services must be procured to drain the fire sprinkler system prior to the beginning of work.

The sanitary waste water piping and ventilation piping has deteriorated over time and has 'micro fractures' which have resulted in small leaks in multiple locations. Multiple significant breakage events have resulted in extensive flooding, property damage.

The ventilation piping is also in poor condition, with 'micro fractures' throughout the system creating significant Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) issues as sewer gas leaks from cracks into building spaces.

The drinking fountain water system is in poor condition. Fixtures are obsolete and are not incompliance with the Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards (ABAAS). The piping system regularly becomes clogged, floods, and causes the closest water fountain to overflow with waste water from the fixtures above it. The equipment that chills the drinking water and circulates it through the building has reached the end of its useful life. This equipment is no longer manufactured and parts are difficult to locate. The equipment leaks consistently, which is detrimental to GSA's water conservation objectives.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TX

Prospectus Number: PTX-0224-FW15
Congressional District: 12

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FRITZ G. LANHAM FEDERAL BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TX

Prospectus Number: PTX-0224-FW15
Congressional District: 12

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—JOHN WESLEY POWELL BUILDING, RESTON, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to replace the fire alarm system at the John Wesley Powell Building located at 12201 Sunrise Highway in Reston, Virginia, at a design and review cost of $1,060,000, an estimated construction cost of $8,970,000 and a management and inspection cost of $980,000 for a total estimated project cost of $11,010,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
JOHN WESLEY POWELL BUILDING
RESTON, VIRGINIA

Prospectus Number: PVA-1468-RE15
Congressional District: 11

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alteration project to replace the fire alarm system at the John Wesley Powell Building (Powell Building) at 12201 Sunrise Highway, Reston, VA. The proposed project will replace the obsolete fire alarm system with a new emergency communication system that is intended to broadcast information to building occupants in an emergency. The new system will be designed and installed to meet the requirements in GSA PBS-P100, Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the Powell Building at a total cost of $11,010,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval & Appropriations Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I).....$11,010,000

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm System Replacement

Project Budget

Design and Review)	$1,060,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	8,970,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	980,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$11,010,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
JOHN WESLEY POWELL BUILDING
RESTON, VIRGINIA

Prospectus Number: PVA-1468-RE15
Congressional District: 11

Schedule	Start	End
Design & Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Building

The John Wesley Powell Building is an eight-story 1,015,000 gross-square-foot modular concrete and glass paneled sheathed office building with a 1,443-space parking lot on an 84-acre site. The building was constructed in 1972 as the headquarters of the U. S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey (USGS), and was continuously occupied by USGS under a 20-year lease-purchase contract, which converted to Federal ownership in December 1993.

Tenant Agencies

Department of the Interior - US Geological Survey

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of replacing the antiquated fire alarm system, including the removal of the existing system and the installation of a new emergency communication system to facilitate occupant notification and/or evacuation in the Powell Building during an emergency.

Major Work Items

Fire Alarm System Replacement	$8,970,000
Total ECC	**$8,970,000**

Justification

The approximately 20-year old existing fire alarm system is obsolete, and is at the end of its serviceable life. In addition, many of the system's detection components are deteriorated and subject to malfunction upon activation. Lastly, the system is no longer manufactured or supported by the manufacturer, and replacement parts are difficult to find which has affected the reliability of the system. The existing system currently does not meet the requirements in the GSA PBS-P100 Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and the International Building Code which require an emergency communication system be installed to be able to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. It is also non-compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, which stipulate that visible notification appliances be installed for the hearing impaired.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
JOHN WESLEY POWELL BUILDING
RESTON, VIRGINIA

Prospectus Number: PVA-1468-RE15
Congressional District: 11

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/12	$10,265,000	Construction
House T&I	2/28/13	$10,265,000	Construction

*Included in the 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000.

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years):

None

Alternatives Considered (30-year present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATIONS
JOHN WESLEY POWELL BUILDING
RESTON, VIRGINIA

Prospectus Number: PVA-1468-RE15
Congressional District: 11

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—RICHARD H. POFF FEDERAL BUILDING, ROANOKE, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations to replace two exterior brick façade walls and undertake structural and life safety upgrades to the parking garage at the Richard H. Poff Federal Building located at 210 Franklin Road, SW, in Roanoke, Virginia, at a design cost of $1,076,000, an estimated construction cost of $12,762,000 and a management and inspection cost of $1,290,000 for a total estimated project cost of $15,128,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
RICHARD H. POFF FEDERAL BUILDING
ROANOKE, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-0095-RO15
Congressional District: 06

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a repair and alterations project to replace two exterior brick façade walls and undertake structural and life safety upgrades to the parking garage at the Richard H. Poff Federal Building (Poff FB), located at 210 Franklin Road SW, Roanoke, VA. The western façade wall of the building was demolished and removed, in November 2012, after a large bulge and crack was detected.. The western wall is currently exposed to natural elements and the eastern façade wall, which is of the same age and design, could become compromised at any time. The parking garage has experienced significant deterioration and needs to be renovated or replaced. As the façade walls and parking garage are structurally integrated, it is necessary to undertake both repairs simultaneously.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $15,128,000

Major Work Items

Parking Garage Repair/Replacement; Exterior Construction; Demolition; Sitework

Project Budget

Design	$ 1,076,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	12,762,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	1,290,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$15,128,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2018

Building

The Poff FB, constructed in 1975, is 14-stories tall and contains 254,670 rentable square feet of office and courtroom space. The building is located on a 1.3 acre lot at the western end of the central business area of Roanoke, VA. The building is not eligible for inclusion on the historic register.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
RICHARD H. POFF FEDERAL BUILDING
ROANOKE, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-0095-RO15
Congressional District: 06

Tenant Agencies

Veterans Administration, U.S. District Courts, U.S. Marshal Service, U.S. Attorneys and GSA

Proposed Project

The proposed project will replace the currently bare western wall and remove and replace the eastern façade wall.

The outdoor parking garage structure, which is original to the building, experienced significant deterioration over the years resulting from water infiltration and improper drainage. Structural and life safety repairs will be taken on the garage and site. This project will repair/replace the upper parking garage deck, interior garage and structure. In addition, the security fixtures, walkways, lighting system and fire sprinkler piping will be repaired or replaced in the garage.

Major Work Items

Parking Garage Repair/Replacement	$ 6,659,000
Exterior Construction	5,722,000
Demolition	331,000
Sitework	50,000
Total ECC	**$12,762,000**

Justification

In November 2012, the Poff FB's western façade wall was removed in an emergency/life safety project undertaken after a large bulge and crack in the brick were discovered. A follow-on study was conducted which determined that the cause of the failure was poor installation and inadequate design. The study concluded that the east façade wall suffers from the same complications and should be removed and replaced.

In response to visible concerns over deterioration of various portions of the exposed concrete structure, GSA conducted a parking garage study. The study concluded that the cause of the deterioration was water infiltration and the associated corrosion. Water infiltration has caused serious deterioration of the steel reinforcement structure in portions of the garage. A portion of the walkway was closed by GSA in 2013 as it was determined to be hazardous for foot traffic. The structure of the Poff garage will pose life safety risks if it continues to deteriorate.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
RICHARD H. POFF FEDERAL BUILDING
ROANOKE, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-0095-RO15
Congressional District: 06

The façade and parking garage are structurally integrated so inclusion of both elements under one project will allow GSA to ensure proper installation and integration. A unified structural repair project serves to not only mitigate life safety conditions as soon as possible but also shorten the construction period, minimize the impact to tenants and reduce contractor costs.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

None

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

Prospectus	Description	FY	Amount
111-5 (ARRA)	Replacement of the North and South Curtain Wall, HVAC System, Restrooms & Roof	FY09	$51,991,000

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to this project. This is a limited scope renovation and the cost of the proposed project is far less than the cost of leasing or constructing a new building.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
RICHARD H. POFF FEDERAL BUILDING
ROANOKE, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-0095-RO15
Congressional District: 06

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS—REGION FOUR

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for critical fire protection and life safety repairs in four separate buildings in Region 4. These buildings are the G. Ross Anderson, Jr. Federal Building and Courthouse located at 315 S. McDuffie Street in Anderson, South Carolina; the U.S. Customhouse located at 200 E. Bay Street in Charleston, South Carolina; the J. Roy Rowland Federal Building and Courthouse located at 100 N. Franklin Street in Dublin, Georgia; and the Federal Building located at 423 Frederica Street in Owensboro, Kentucky, at a design cost of $793,000, an estimated construction cost of $4,406,000 and a management and inspection cost of $632,000 for a total estimated project cost of $5,831,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 28, 2013 authorizing prospectus number PEX–00001.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number: PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District: SC 1, 3
GA 12
KY 2

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes to undertake several critical fire protection and life safety repairs in four separate buildings in Region 4. These buildings are the G. Ross Anderson Jr. Federal Building and Courthouse (Anderson FBCT) located at 315 S. McDuffie Street, Anderson, SC; U.S. Customhouse (Customhouse) located at 200 E. Bay Street, Charleston, SC; J. Roy Rowland Federal Building and Courthouse (Rowland FBCT) located at 100 N. Franklin Street, Dublin, GA; and the Federal Building (Owensboro FB) located at 423 Frederica Street, Owensboro, KY. The projects within this proposed prospectus include the installation of a new automatic fire sprinkler system, a new underground water supply line for the fire sprinkler system, and a new fire pump necessary to supplement the water flow and pressure for the fire sprinkler system in each of the four buildings. The replacement of an obsolete fire alarm system in the Anderson FBCT and the Owensboro FB with a new emergency communication system that is intended to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants is also included in this project. The new system will be designed and installed to meet the requirements in GSA PBS-P100, Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

This project was among those previously included in GSA's FY 2013 Capital Investment and Leasing Program's Exigent Needs prospectus. Although the prospectus was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 24, 2012, and February 28, 2013, respectively, no funds were ever appropriated. GSA will not seek to have the Exigent Needs prospectus funded in the aggregate. Instead, the agency will seek individual prospectus approval and funding for certain of the projects originally included as part of the Exigent Needs prospectus, such as the work described in this prospectus.

For FY 2015, this prospectus proposes repairs and alterations to the four buildings at a total cost of $5,831,000.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(Design, ECC, M&I) $5,831,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number: PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District: SC 1, 3
GA 12
KY 2

Major Work Items

Installation of new automatic sprinkler system(s), underground water supply line(s) for the fire sprinkler system(s), fire pump(s), and emergency communication system(s)

Project Budget

Design	$ 793,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	4,406,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	632,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)	**$5,831,000**

Schedule	Start	End
Design and Construction	FY2015	FY2017

Buildings

The Anderson FBCT in Anderson, SC is a small, 3-story building with a basement. This Federal-style building was built in 1938. The building is a prominent structure in the Anderson Historic District and was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1971.

The Charleston Customhouse in Charleston, SC is a 3-story building with large terraces outside each of its 2 main facades--one facing Charleston's harbor and the other facing the historic downtown of the City. Construction was completed in 1879 after a long delay due to the Civil War. The building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974, and is a key contributing structure to the Charleston Historic District.

The Rowland FBCT in Dublin, GA is a 3-story brick and stone clad Georgian Revival-style building constructed in 1937. The building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and is a contributing property to the Dublin Commercial Historic District.

The Owensboro FB in Owensboro, KY is a 3-story building with a basement level. This Renaissance Revival style building, was constructed in 1911, and was individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1989. The building was originally constructed as a Post Office and US Courthouse that also contained office space to support administrative functions. While the building no longer serves as a Post Office, it is still utilized as a US Courthouse and as office space for various administrative functions.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number: PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District: SC 1, 3
GA 12
KY 2

Tenant Agencies

Judiciary; Department of Justice; Department of Homeland Security; Department of Defense; Department of Agriculture

Proposed Project

The proposed prospectus project includes the installation of an automatic fire sprinkler system, a new underground water supply line for the fire sprinkler system, and a new fire pump necessary to supplement the water flow and pressure for the fire sprinkler system in each of the four buildings. The installations of the new fire sprinkler systems will substantially reduce the fire risks associated with previously identified egress issues which could impact the safety of occupants, the property, and Federal tenant mission within the Anderson FBCT, the Charleston Customhouse, the Rowland FBCT, and the Owensboro FB.

In addition, the existing fire alarm system(s) in the Anderson FBCT and the Owensboro FB have been become obsolete and will be replaced with a new emergency communication system that is intended to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. The new system will be designed and installed to meet the requirements in GSA PBS-P100, Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

Major Work Items

Fire Sprinkler System Installation	$3,067,000
Fire Alarm Systems Replacement	1,339,000
Total ECC	**$4,406,000**

Justification

GSA has identified several fire risk conditions at the subject properties that need to be addressed in order to reduce the risk of injury to occupants, the loss of federal property, and interruption of a federal agency mission. The exigency of these repairs was relayed in GSA's FY13 Exigent Needs prospectus. Further delay in funding only exacerbates the risks.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number: PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District: SC 1, 3
GA 12
KY 2

Currently the Anderson FBCT, the Charleston Customhouse, the Rowland FBCT, and the Owensboro FB are not protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system. The installation of the new fire sprinkler system will substantial reduce the fire risks associated with previously identified egress issues in each of the four buildings which could impact the safety of occupants, the property, and Federal tenant mission within each of the buildings.

In addition, the existing fire alarm systems in the Anderson FBCT and the Owensboro FB currently do not meet the requirements in the GSA PBS-P100 Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service which requires an emergency communication system be installed to be able to broadcast information in an emergency to building occupants. Also, due to the age of the fire alarm system many of the alarm circuits are overloaded, causing concern about the system's reliability during an emergency. Lastly, the system's manufacturer no longer supports the equipment, while repair parts are difficult to find for such the aged system

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

Prior Appropriations

None

Prior Committee Approvals

Prior Committee Approvals*			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	7/25/2012	$3,000,000	Exigent Needs – Fire Alarm
House T&I	2/28/2013	$3,000,000	Exigent Needs – Fire Alarm

*Included in the FY 2013 Exigent Needs Prospectus PEX-00001 approved for $122,936,000

Prior Prospectus-Level Projects in Building (past 10 years)

None

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number:	PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District:	SC 1, 3
	GA 12
	KY 2

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

There are no feasible alternatives to these projects. These are limited scope renovations and the costs associated with the proposed projects are far less than the costs of potentially leasing or constructing new buildings.

Recommendation

ALTERATION

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – ALTERATION
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY REPAIRS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS – REGION FOUR

Prospectus Number: PFLS-R4-2015
Congressional District: SC 1, 3
GA 12
KY 2

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY, CALEXICO, CA

Resolved he the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized in support of a two-phase construction project, including new pedestrian processing and privately owned vehicle inspection facilities, a new head house to provide supervision and services to the non-commercial vehicle inspection area, new administration offices; and a parking structure, to reconfigure and expand the existing U.S. Land Port of Entry located in Calexico, California, at an additional Phase I estimated construction cost of $12,376,000 and an additional Phase II estimated construction cost of $72,931,000 for a total additional project cost of $85,307,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of December 2, 2010.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

FY2015 Project Summary

Through amended prospectus, General Services Administration (GSA) requests additional approval for construction of the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing land port of entry (LPOE) in downtown Calexico, CA and funding in support of Phase I of this two-phase project. The project includes new pedestrian processing and privately owned vehicle (POV) inspection facilities, a new head house to provide supervision and services to the non-commercial vehicle inspection area, new administration offices, and a parking structure. The expanded facilities will occupy both the existing inspection compound and the site of the former commercial inspection facility, decommissioned in 1996 when commercial traffic was redirected to the newly completed LPOE six miles east of downtown Calexico.

This prospectus amends Prospectus No.PCA-BSC-CA11, approved in FY 2011, to reflect budget increases subsequent to preparation of the FY 2011 prospectus. Increased costs are the result of delays in funding, increased construction costs associated with an improving construction market, and to account for project phasing complexities, and costs associated with bridging the New River.

FY2015 Committee Approval Requested

(Additional Phase I & II ECC) ..... $85,307,000[1]

FY2015 Appropriation Requested

(Phase I ECC; Phase I M&I) ..... $98,062,000[2]

---

[1] Total committee approval to date equals $298,250,000. Balance of approval needed for project = $85,307,000 ($12,376,000 Phase I ECC difference from 2011; $72,931,000 Phase II ECC difference from 2011). M&I has already been authorized via Prospectus No. PCA-BSC-CA11 (includes $13,495,000 more than current estimate), therefore, no additional authorization is requested related to M&I.

[2] GSA has worked closely with DHS program offices responsible for developing and implementing security technology at the Land Ports of Entry (LPOE's). These programs include United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT), Radiation Portal Monitors (RPM's) and Advanced Spectroscopic Portal (ASPs) monitors, and Land Border Integration (formerly Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) and Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII), Outbound Inspection, and Port Hardening/Absconder programs. This prospectus contains the funding of infrastructure requirements for each program known at the time of prospectus development since these programs are at various stages of development and implementation. Additional funding by a Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) may be required to provide for as yet unidentified elements of each of these programs to be implemented at this port.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

Overview of Project

The existing LPOE is a pedestrian and vehicle inspection facility constructed in 1974. It comprises a main building and a decommissioned commercial inspection building. The project includes the creation of new pedestrian and POV inspection facilities, and expansion of the port onto the site of the former commercial inspection facility. The commercial inspection operation was moved to Calexico East in 1996. POV inspection facilities will include expanded northbound inspection lanes, new southbound inspection lanes, and a parking structure. There will be new administration space, a new head house, and design guide mandated secondary inspection stations serving both northbound and southbound traffic. The project will be constructed in two phases.

The first phase will include a head house, ten of the project's northbound POV inspection lanes, all southbound POV inspection lanes with temporary asphalt paving, and a bridge across the New River for southbound POV traffic. The second phase will include the balance of the project, including the remaining northbound POV lanes, southbound POV inspection islands, booths, canopies and concrete paving, an administration building, an employee parking structure, a pedestrian processing building with expanded northbound pedestrian inspection stations and a photovoltaic generation facility.

Site Information

Government Owned	13.5 acres
To Be Acquired	4.3 acres

Building Area

Building (including canopies and structured parking)[3]	325,172 gsf
Building (excluding canopies and structured parking)	201,991 gsf
Outside parking spaces	79
Structured parking spaces	264

[3] Gross square footage has changed from that stated in Prospectus No. PCA-BSC-CA11. The total now includes a pedestrian tunnel and the area devoted to 264 structured parking spaces.

GSA PBS

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

Project Budget

Site Acquisition	
Site Acquisition (FY 2007)	$2,000,000
Additional Site Acquisition (FY 2010)	3,000,000
Total Site Acquisition	**$5,000,000**
Design	
Design (FY 2007)	$12,350,000
Additional Design (FY 2010)	6,437,000
Total Design	**$18,787,000**
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	
Phase I	$90,838,000
Phase II (future year request)	240,813,000
Total ECC[4]	**$331,651,000**[5]
Site Development Cost[6]	$215,595,000
Building Costs (includes inspection canopies) ($357/gsf)	$116,056,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	
Phase I	$7,224,000
Phase II (future funding request)	$7,400,000
Total M&I	**$14,624,000**
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$370,062,000**

* Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by GSA.

[4] ECC is broken into two parts – Site Development Costs and Building Cost.

[5] Increase in ECC from the 2011 prospectus reflects costs associated with an improving construction market and impacts of the New River on Construction and project and phasing complexities in the final design.

[6] Site development costs include grading, utilities, paving, extensive fill work for soil stabilization, and demolition of existing facilities.

GSA PBS

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

FY2015 Committee Approval Requested
(Additional Phase I & II ECC) $85,307,000

FY2015 Appropriation Requested

(Phase I ECC; Phase I M&I) $98,062,000

Location

The site is located at the existing LPOE in Calexico, CA at 200 First Street.

Schedule

	Start	End
Design	FY2007	FY2013
Construction		
Phase I	FY2015	FY2018
Phase II	FY2017	FY2020

Tenant Agencies

Department of Homeland Security–Customs and Border Protection; Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Department of Army; and GSA.

Justification

On an average day, over 11,000 privately operated vehicles and nearly 13,000 pedestrians enter the U.S. through this LPOE. The existing facilities are undersized relative to existing traffic loads and obsolete in terms of inspection officer safety and border security. The space required to accommodate modern inspection technologies is not available in the existing facility. When completed, the project will provide the port operation with adequate operational space, reduced traffic congestion, and a safe environment for port employees and visitors.

Summary of Energy Compliance

The Calexico LPOE project is designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

GSA PBS

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

Prior Appropriations

Public Law	Fiscal Year	Amount	Purpose
110-5	2007	$14,350,000	Site acquisition & design
111-117	2010	$9,437,000	Additional site acquisition & design
Appropriations to Date		**$23,787,000**	

Prior Committee Approvals

Calexico West Land Port of Entry Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
House T&I	4/5/2006	$14,350,000	Design = $12,350,000; Site acquisition = $2,000,000
Senate EPW	5/23/2006	$14,350,000	Site Acquisition & Design
House T&I	11/5/2009	$9,437,000	Additional design = $6,437,000; additional site acquisition = $3,000,000
Senate EPW	2/4/2010	$9,437,000	Additional site acquisition & design
House T&I	12/2/2010	$274,463,000	Construction = $246,344,000; M&I = $28,119,000
Senate EPW	11/30/2010	$274,463,000	Construction = $246,344,000; M&I = $28,119,000
Approvals to Date		**$298,250,000**	

GSA PBS

AMENDED PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
CALEXICO, CA

Prospectus Number: PCA-BSC-CA15
Congressional District: 51

Alternatives Considered

GSA owns and maintains the existing facilities at this port of entry; thus no alternative to Federal construction was considered.

Recommendation

CONSTRUCTION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan
Calexico Land Port of Entry

PCA-BSC-CA15
Calexico, CA

	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
Calexico LPOE												
DHS-Customs & Border Protection	155	155	31,569	31,455	[illegible]	73,193	479	479	[illegible]	[illegible]	158,983	219,595
DHS - Immigration and Customs Enforcement	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	35	[illegible]	-	[illegible]	3,342
Joint Use	-	-	2,180	-	796	[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	155	155	33,749	31,455	10,965	76,169	514	514	62,709	506	159,722	222,937

Special Space	USF
Lab Hazmat	1,664
Holding Cell	15,258
Restroom	5,136
Fitness	5,570
Conference	3,980
ADP	1,140
Vehicle Lift	336
Canopy	123,181
Control Booth	995
Vaults	409
Sallyports Secure elevator	667
Interview Room	2,405
Break Rooms	990
Total	159,722

Notes:

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building

[2] Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF

[3] Total Building USF Rate = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel).

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY, ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for Phase I of a two-phase construction project, including commercial inspection lanes, a new veterinary services building, an impound lot, a main administration building, non-commercial inspection lanes, a new non-commercial secondary inspection plaza, new non-intrusive inspection buildings, and employee and visitor parking areas, to replace the existing land port of entry in Alexandria Bay, New York, at additional design cost of $3,500,000, an estimated construction cost of $93,216,000 and a management and inspection cost of $8,854,000 for a total Phase I cost of $105,570,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of September 20, 2006 amending the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of July 21, 2004.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) requests approval for construction of facilities to replace the existing land port of entry (LPOE) in Alexandria Bay, NY, and funding in support of Phase I of this two-phase project. The project includes commercial inspection lanes, a new veterinary services building, an impound lot, a main administration building, non-commercial inspection lanes, a new non-commercial secondary inspection plaza, new non-intrusive inspection (NII) buildings, and employee and visitor parking areas. The project will meet the current and future operational requirements of the tenant agencies and be flexible to adapt to future changes.

FY2015 House Committee Approval Requested
(Additional Design, Phase I & II ECC, Phase I & II M&I).....$206,041,000

FY2015 Senate Committee Approval Requested
(Additional Design, Phase I & II ECC, Phase I & II M&I).....$32,476,000

FY2015 Appropriation Requested
(Additional Design, Phase I ECC; Phase I M&I) ..... $105,570,000[1]

[1] GSA has worked closely with DHS program offices responsible for developing and implementing security technology at the Land Ports of Entry (LPOE's). These programs include United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT), Radiation Portal Monitors (RPM's) and Advanced Spectroscopic Portal (ASPs) monitors, and Land Border Integration (formerly Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) and Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII), Outbound Inspection, and Port Hardening/Absconder programs. This prospectus contains the funding of infrastructure requirements for each program known at the time of prospectus development since these programs are at various stages of development and implementation. Additional funding by a Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) may be required to provide for as yet unidentified elements of each of these programs to be implemented at this port.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Overview of Project

The proposed project will address traffic issues by expanding the queuing area, increasing the number of primary inspection lanes, increasing the area for secondary inspection, providing safe and secure vehicle parking, and a safe well-defined truck queuing and maneuvering areas.

The project is proposed in two phases. Phase I includes a commercial inspection warehouse with inspection bays, commercial inspection lanes (with split-level booths for either commercial or non-commercial), a new veterinary services building, impound lot, and a portion of the elevated parking over the commercial side. In addition, the two remaining necessary parcels of land will be acquired in Phase I.

Phase II includes main administration building, a new outbound inspection facility, non-commercial inspection lanes, a new non-commercial secondary inspection plaza, new non-intrusive inspection (NII) buildings, and employee and visitor parking areas.

Site Information
Government Owned ..... 5 acres
To Be Acquired ..... 10 acres

Building Area
Building (including canopies and structured parking) ..... 261,000 gsf
Building (excluding canopies and structured parking) ..... 116,000 gsf
Outside parking spaces 50
Inside parking spaces 5
Structured parking spaces 134

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Project Budget

Site Acquisition

Site Acquisition (FY 2005 and FY 2008)	$2,965,000
Total Site Acquisition	**2,965,000**

Design

Design (FY 2005 and FY 2008)	$17,595,000
Additional Design (**FY 2015**)	3,500,000
Total Design	**$21,095,000**

Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)

Phase I (**FY 2015**)	$93,216,000
Phase II (future year request)	91,617,000
Total ECC[2]	**$184,833,000**
Site Development Cost[3]	$82,865,000
Building Costs (includes inspection canopies) ($391/gsf)	$101,968,000

Management and Inspection (M&I)

Phase I (**FY 2015**)	$8,854,000
Phase II (future year request)	8,854,000
Total M&I	**$17,708,000**

Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)* **$226,601,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

FY2015 House Committee Approval Requested
(Additional Design, Phase I & II ECC, Phase I & II M&I) **$206,041,000**

FY2015 Senate Committee Approval Requested
(Additional Design, Phase I & II ECC, Phase I & II M&I) **$32,476,000**

FY2015 Appropriation Requested

(Additional Design, Phase I ECC; Phase I M&I) **$105,570,000**

---

[2] ECC is broken into two parts – Site Development Costs and Building Costs
[3] Site development costs include grading, utilities, paving and demolition of existing facilities.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Location

The site is located at the existing LPOE on Interstate Route 81 n Alexandria Bay, NY.

Schedule

	Start	End
Design	FY2008	FY2010[4]
Construction		
Phase 1	FY2015	FY2018
Phase 2	FY2017	FY2019

Tenant Agencies

U.S. Department of Agriculture - Animal Plant Health Inspection Service; Department of Homeland Security — Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Customs and Border Protection; Food and Drug Administration; General Services Administration.

[4] Design refresh to be completed upon receipt of project funds requested in this prospectus.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Justification

The existing facility does not meet the current and future operational needs of the inspection agencies at the port. The lack of an adequate commercial cargo inspection facility is hampering the safe and secure execution of CBP and other tenant agencies' missions.

The short distance between the international border and the primary commercial inspection area is inadequate for vehicle queuing. Given the limited capacity of the US-bound bridges and roadways, the Thousand Island Bridge Authority (TIBA) currently limits the number of vehicles (in Canada) that can proceed through to the crossing. This results in significant queuing of commercial vehicles on the Canadian roadways entering the crossing and sometimes back to Highway 401. The bridges are not designed to handle prolonged periods of dead load associated with stationary commercial traffic. In addition, the removal of significant amounts of rock is necessary to allow for increased program and vehicle circulation.

The existing main building does not accommodate the current and future needs of the tenants. The existing commercial building barely has enough space to unload a single truck and the office component is housed in mobile trailers. The projected increases in traffic volume and implementation of new security procedures necessitate an increase in the LPOE workforce beyond the capacity of the existing facility.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Prior Appropriations

Public Law	Fiscal Year	Amount	Purpose
108-447	2005	$8,884,000	Site acquisition & design
110-161	2008	$11,676,000	Additional site acquisition & design to meet expanded scope
Appropriations to Date		**$20,560,000**	

Prior Committee Approvals

Alexandria Bay Land Port of Entry Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
House T&I	7/21/2004	$8,884,000	Design = $8,684,000; Site acquisition = $200,000
Senate EPW	11/17/2004	$8,884,000	Design = $8,684,000; Site acquisition = $200,000
House T&I	9/20/2006	$11,676,000	Additional design = $8,911,000; additional site acquisition = $2,765,000
Senate EPW	9/27/2006	$11,676,000	Additional design = $8,911,000; additional site acquisition = $2,765,000
Senate EPW	12/8/2011	$173,565,000	Construction = $160,990,000; M&I = $12,575,000
Approvals to Date (House T&I)		**$20,560,000**	
Approvals to Date (Senate EPW)		**$194,125,000**	

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
U.S. LAND PORT OF ENTRY
ALEXANDRIA BAY, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-BSC-AB15
Congressional District: 21

Alternatives Considered

GSA owns and maintains the existing facilities at this port of entry; thus no alternative other than Federal construction was considered.

Recommendation

CONSTRUCTION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

March 2014

Housing Plan
Alexandria Bay, NY Land Port of Entry

PNY-BSC-AB15
Alexandria Bay, NY

	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
Alexandria Bay LPOE												
DHS-Customs & Border Protection	47	47	7,455	-	30,628	38,083	89	89	21,661	-	101,922	123,583
DHS - Immigration and Customs Enforcement	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	663	-	-	663
GSA PBS	7	7	2,687	-	749	3,436	3	3	1,155	-	-	1,155
HHS - Food and Drug Administration	-	-	-		-	-	5	5	1,842	-	623	2,465
USDA - APHIS	2	2	375		2,625	3,000	2	2	978	-	2,202	3,180
Outlease - Customs brokers	-		-	-	-	-	5	5	4,780	-	-	4,780
Total	**56**	**56**	**10,517**	-	**34,002**	**44,519**	**108**	**108**	**31,079**	-	**104,747**	**135,826**

Special Space	USF
Light Industrial	35,873
Canopies	59,905
Structurally changed	1,500
Fitness Center/Restrooms	3,812
Conference Training	973
Laboratory	1145
ADP	641
Food Service	898
Total	104,747

Notes:

[1] USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building

[2] Office Utilization Rate = total office space available for office personnel. UR calculation excludes office support space USF.

[3] Total Building USF Rate = total building USF (office, storage, special) available for all building occupants (office, and non-office personnel)

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6497. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Executive Order issued declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat that significant transnational criminal organizations pose to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 113-136); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6498. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; TriRock San Diego, San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0555] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6499. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fairfield Estates Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean, Sagaponack, NY [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0212] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6500. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Schuylkill River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0342] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6501. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annually Recurring Events in Coast Guard Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0061] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6502. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Mile 464.0 to 465.0, Chattanooga, TN [USCG-2014-0323] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 4490. A bill to enhance the missions, objectives, and effectiveness of United States international communications, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII,

Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. WOLF): introduced a bill (H.R. 5158) to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

266. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 166 expressing sympathy in support of the families of victims of massacres and atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people in Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

267. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 61 urging the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Clerk to release forthwith said TBI report known as ''MLK Document 200472'' to the Tennessee Secretary of State; to the Committee on House Administration.

268. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 371 urging the Department of Veterans' Affairs to follow Federal Housing Administration guidelines as they apply to the site condominiums and view them as single-family homes as long as they meet certain criteria; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

269. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 84 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States Veterans who served in the waters defined by the Combat Zone and in the airspace over the Combat Zone in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

270. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 memorializing the Congress to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 5158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power ''[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 713: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 880: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1830: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2607: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 3382: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 3992: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 4136: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4143: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 4156: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4426: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4447: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4571: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4682: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4780: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4783: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4790: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 4934: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 5002: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 5043: Mr. HONDA and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5044: Mr. HONDA and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5077: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 5081: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5089: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 5116: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 5120: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. VEASEY.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. CHU.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 281: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H. Res. 570: Mr. NUGENT.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 10 by Mr. PETERS on the bill (H.R. 3992): Adam B. Schiff, Nydia M. Velázquez, Carolyn McCarthy, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr., Dina Titus, Wm. Lacy Clay, Zoe Lofgren, Suzan K. DelBene, Suzanne Bonamici, Robert A. Brady, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Donald M. Payne Jr., Loretta Sánchez, Susan A. Davis, James P. Moran, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Carolyn B. Maloney, Steve Cohen, Steny H. Hoyer, Nita M. Lowey, Rosa L. DeLauro, Gregory W. Meeks, Peter Welch, William L. Enyart, Gary C. Peters, James E. Clyburn, Anna G. Eshoo, Nancy Pelosi, Cheri Bustos, Grace

Meng, Linda T. Sánchez, Lois Frankel, Albio Sires, John A. Yarmuth, Cedric L. Richmond, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Bobby L. Rush, Jared Polis, Theodore E. Deutch, Denny Heck, Stephen F. Lynch, John Lewis, Bruce L. Braley, Judy Chu, Richard M. Nolan, Chaka Fattah, Rick Larsen, Elijah E. Cummings, Charles B. Rangel, Timothy H. Bishop, Jerrold Nadler, Barbara Lee, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Chris Van Hollen, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, John B. Larson, Tim Ryan, John P. Sarbanes, David E. Price, Adam Smith, Joe Garcia, Timothy J. Walz, G. K. Butterfield, Nick J. Rahall II, William R. Keating, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Keith Ellison, Marc A. Veasey, Henry A. Waxman, Collin C. Peterson, Maxine Waters, James A. Himes, John D. Dingell, Emanuel Cleaver, Bennie G. Thompson, Patrick Murphy, Gwen Moore, Kathy Castor, Joseph Crowley, Carol Shea-Porter, José E. Serrano, Earl Blumenauer, Jim McDermott, Beto O'Rourke, Bradley S. Schneider, Jim Costa, Daniel Lipinski, and Mike McIntyre.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FINANCIAL NET WORTH

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 2014

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, through the following statement, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 2014, a matter of public record. I have filed similar statements for each of the thirty-five preceding years I have served in Congress.

ASSETS

REAL PROPERTY

Single family residence at 609 Ft. Williams Parkway, City of Alexandria, Virginia, at assessed valuation. (Assessed at $1,378,823). Ratio of assessed to market value: 100% (Unencumbered): $1,378,823.00).

Condominium at N76 W14726 North Point Drive, Village of Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at assessor's estimated market value. (Unencumbered): $129,700.00.

Undivided 25/44ths interest in single family Residence at N52 W32654 Maple Lane, Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at 25/44ths of assessor's estimated market value of $1,521,700: $852,152.00.

Total real property: $2,360,675.00.

Common & preferred stock	# of shares	$ per share	Value
Abbott Laboratories, Inc.	12200	38.51	469,822.00
AbbVie Inc.	12200	51.40	627,080.00
Alcatel-Lucent	135	3.90	526.50
Allstate Corporation	370	56.58	20,934.60
AT & T	7275	35.07	255,134.25
JP Morgan Chase	4539	60.71	275,562.69
Benton County Mining Company	333	0.00	0.00
BP PLC	3604	48.10	173,352.40
Centerpoint Energy	300	23.69	7,107.00
Chenequa Country Club Realty Co.	1	0.00	0.00
Comcast	634	49.56	31,421.04
Darden Restaurants, Inc.	2160	50.76	109,641.60
Discover Financial Services	156	58.19	9,077.64
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.	1250	99.35	124,187.50
E.I. DuPont de Nemours Corp.	1200	67.10	80,520.00
Eastman Chemical Co.	540	86.21	46,553.40
Exxon Mobil Corp.	9728	97.68	950,231.04
Frontier Comm.	591	5.71	3,374.61
Gartner Inc.	651	69.44	45,205.44
General Electric Co.	15600	25.89	403,884.00
General Mills, Inc.	5760	51.82	298,483.20
NRG Energy	28	31.80	890.40
Hospira	1220	43.25	52,765.00
Imation Corp	99	5.77	571.23
Kellogg Corp.	3200	62.71	200,672.00
Merck & Co., Inc.	2457	56.77	139,483.89
3M Company	2000	135.66	271,320.00
Express Scripts	6656	75.09	499,799.04
Monsanto Corporation	2852.315	113.77	324,507.88
Moody's	5000	79.32	396,600.00
Morgan Stanley	312	31.17	9,725.04
NCR Corp.	68	36.55	2,485.40
Newell Rubbermaid	1676	29.90	50,112.40
PG & E Corp.	175	43.20	7,560.00
Pfizer	30415	32.12	976,929.80
Century Link	95	32.84	3,119.80
Tenneco Inc.	182	58.07	10,568.74
Unisys Corp.	16	30.46	487.36
US Bancorp	3081	42.86	132,051.66
Verizon	1918	47.57	91,239.26
Vodafone Group PLC	323	36.81	11,889.63
Wisconsin Energy	2044	46.55	95,148.20
Total common & preferred stocks & bonds			$7,210,025.64

Life insurance policies	Face $	Surrender $
Northwestern Mutual #4378000	$12,000.00	$113,720.08
Northwestern Mutual #4574061	30,000.00	273,598.84
Massachusetts Mutual #4116575	10,000.00	16,359.12
Massachusetts Mutual #4228344	100,000.00	433,554.07
American General Life Ins. #5–1607059L	175,000.00	42,384.25
Total life insurance policies		$879,616.36

Bank & IRA accounts	Balance
JP Morgan Chase Bank, checking account	$40,667.97
JP Morgan Chase Bank, savings account	22,777.00
BMO Harris Bank, checking account	6,252.00
JP Morgan Chase, IRA accounts	162,138.79
Total bank & IRA accounts	$231,835.76

Miscellaneous	Value
2009 Ford Taurus	$9,517.00
2013 Ford Taurus	20,956.00
1996 Buick Regal	1,532.00
Office furniture & equipment (estimated)	1,000.00
Furniture, clothing & personal property (estimated)	180,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated)	180,000.00
Deposits in Congressional Retirement Fund	229,430.61
Deposits in Federal Thrift Savings Plan	491,554.42
Traveler's checks	7,800.00
17 ft. Boston Whaler boat & 70 hp Johnson outboard motor (estimated)	5,000.00

Miscellaneous	Value
20 ft. Pontoon boat & 40 hp Mercury outboard motor (estimated)	8,000.00
Total miscellaneous	$1,134,790.03
Total assets	$11,816,942.79

Liabilities: None.
Total liabilities: $0.00.
Net worth: $11,816,942.79.

STATEMENT OF 2013 TAXES PAID

Federal Income Tax	$132,949.00
Wisconsin Income Tax	38,980.00
Menomonee Falls, WI Property Tax	2,445.00
Chenequa, WI Property Tax	22,551.00
Alexandria, VA Property Tax	14,312.00

I further declare that I am trustee of a trust established under the will of my late father, Frank James Sensenbrenner, Sr., for the benefit of my sister, Margaret A. Sensenbrenner, and of my two sons, F. James Sensenbrenner, III, and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner. I am further the direct beneficiary of five trusts, but have no control over the assets of either trust. My wife, Cheryl Warren Sensenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of each son.

Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other state or foreign country.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Member of Congress.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 2014

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, Turkey invaded the Republic of Cyprus as tensions between Turkish and Greek Cypriots rose. This invasion cost thousands of lives and forced an estimated 170,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes. The Greek Cypriots who remained in the Turkish occupied territory and those refugees who fled to the south lost property and possessions and continue to face restrictions on their ability to access and worship at religious sites.

Throughout the years leading up to the conflict and the past forty years of division, our country has been committed to a peaceful solution and a unified Republic of Cyprus. Fifty years ago, President Lyndon Johnson helped delay the occupation by strongly urging the Turkish Prime Minister against intervening in Cyprus. In a letter to the Prime Minister, President Johnson insisted that ''a final solution of the Cyprus problem should rest upon the consent of the parties most directly concerned.'' Since the invasion, our government has supported a peaceful resolution that brings both parties together in an effort to end the division and restore unity.

Today we have reason for increased optimism as leaders from both sides on the Island have reengaged in negotiations. The calls of Greek and Turkish Cypriots for a unified Republic have grown louder, and I hope this anniversary will increase the urgency to restore the rights of all Cypriots and create a lasting peace on the Island.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 2014

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 20th, the people of Cyprus will mark the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of that island nation, an invasion which resulted in the division of the island which still scars the landscape to this very day. As we mark this anniversary, I call for the end of the Turkish military occupation and the peaceful reunification of the island under its internationally recognized government.

For forty years, Cypriots have suffered not only from the division of their beloved nation, but also from the confiscation of their homes, expulsion from their lands, and the uprooting of centuries old communities. It is time for this to end.

I am pleased the Cyprus Government is committed to the U.N.-sponsored process to reach a sustainable and enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions and we should recognize the importance of the Joint Statement agreed to on February 11, 2014.

As Cyprus is not only a close friend and democratic ally of the United States, but also a partner for regional stability, be it in cooperation with the State of Israel in harnessing the natural gas reserves of the eastern Mediterranean, or playing a constructive role in the European Union, we owe it to the Cypriots, to stand by them as they move forward in finding a peaceful resolution and reunification of the island.

REMEMBERING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 2014

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, to recall those who are still missing since the invasion, and to express my support for the ongoing talks on the reunification of Cyprus.

Following the capture of the northern portion of the island, Turkish military forces declared an illegal ''Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'' which is not recognized by any countries except Turkey. The division of the island continues to this day, with disastrous human, social, and economic consequences.

It has also now been 40 years that the relatives of the missing have been unable to learn the fate of their loved ones. As you may know, the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, a bi-communal investigatory committee operating under the auspices of the United Nations since 1981, has been mandated to investigate nearly 2000 cases of missing Cypriots, mostly, but not all, Greek Cypriots.

In 1994, Congress passed a law, which I wrote, directing the State Department to investigate the disappearance of five Americans as a result of the invasion. While there was some progress—the remains of one American, Andrew Kassapis, were located—too many remain unaccounted for. Regrettably, Turkey continues to obstruct the process of determining the fate of the missing. I have, therefore, today sent a letter to Secretary Kerry asking that the United States press Turkey more intensively to allow a complete and full investigation and to, once and for all, provide closure on this deeply painful question.

Still, there is reason for some optimism. On February 11th of this year, a joint declaration between the parties set the framework for a new round of Cyprus unification negotiations. The talks advanced to a second phase in May, and I am hopeful that they could lead to a comprehensive agreement that grants true sovereignty to the Republic of Cyprus and all of the Cypriot people. There have been reciprocal visits of Greek and Turkish negotiators, respectively, to Ankara and Athens and, for now, Turkey seems interested in moving forward. However, for the talks to succeed, the United States must continue to play an active role in keeping Turkey at the table and shepherding a deal to fruition.

And, there is good news on Cypriot-American relations. Cyprus, already a member of the European Union, is working to strengthen its bond with the United States. It is seeking to forge closer economic ties and bolster defense cooperation, even as it straddles an increasingly tense area. As one of the only stable democracies in the Eastern Mediterranean, Cyprus is an essential partner for the U.S. and an increasingly close friend of our strongest ally in the region, Israel. The U.S. and Cyprus have worked together on issues from counterterrorism to the prevention of human trafficking, and, most recently, Cyprus has provided significant support in removing chemical weapons from Syria. Furthermore, there have been recent discoveries of natural gas off the coast of Cyprus, which will bolster the Cypriot economy and possibly become a viable energy source for Europe.

Mr. Speaker, on this 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus, I stand with my friends in the Cypriot American community and in the Republic of Cyprus in remembrance of the conflict that began four decades ago, in memory of those who lost their lives in the war, in continued vigilance over the fate of the missing, and in support of a better future for all Cypriots.

SENATE—*Monday, July 21, 2014*

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, Your mercy and loving kindness endure forever. Thank You for the favor You have given our Nation, for blessing us in seasons of prosperity and privation.

May our lawmakers this day renew their commitment to seek first Your will as they strive to do what is best for America and live to honor You. Lord, help them to search for priorities that will unite and not divide them, remembering that unity brings strength. Provide them with the perspective of taking victory and defeats in stride, knowing that their steps each day are only part of the long journey of progress. Shield them from discouragement.

Lord, please be with the families of the victims of Malaysia flight 17.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KAINE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 453, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

At 5:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of the following nominations: Julie E. Carnes to be U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit; Michael Lawson to be Ambassador on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization; and Eunice Reddick to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger. We expect a rollcall vote on the Carnes nomination and voice votes on the Lawson and Reddick nominations.

It is such a shame that we have had to go through this stalling on Michael Lawson for the International Civil Aviation Organization. A terrible tragedy has taken place in the world—the shooting down of the Malaysian airplane with 290 totally innocent people on board, killing every one of them. That is his job. We tried to get him confirmed last week. No, they could not do that. We have tried to get him confirmed for months. They have held him up every step of the way. It is untoward that this is happening. They are holding up these nominations out of spite. That is too bad. This is a perfect example.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2631

Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 2631 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2631) to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program unlawfully created by Executive order on August 15, 2012.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are facing a humanitarian crisis on our southern border. Thousands of migrants—the vast majority of them are children—fled to our border and other countries in the region to escape the growing violence in Central America. Most of these boys and girls come from three countries—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—where crime and lawlessness have resulted in chaos and anarchy. Honduras is the murder capital of the world, with more murders per capita than any nation on the planet. El Salvador and Guatemala are right behind. These statistics are stunning. In fact, we know that virtually all the homicides in these countries take place in the same cities these kids are leaving. Migration has spiked in the neighboring countries, not just the United States, as people try to escape this untoward violence.

Citizens of these three nations, though, are also imperiled by high rates of human trafficking, drug trafficking, sexual assaults, and widespread corruption. It is an understatement to say these are not safe places in which to live or to survive. Here is an article out of the New York Times, written by a woman by the name of Sonia Nazario, July 11—a new article. Here are just a few of the things she said:

Cristian Reyes, an 11-year-old sixth grader in the neighborhood of Neuva Suyapa, on the outskirts of [the capital], tells me he has to get out of Honduras soon—''no matter what.''

He is an 11-year-old boy.

In March, his father was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. His mother used the life insurance payout to hire smugglers to take her to Florida. She promised to send for him quickly, but she has not.

Three people he knows were murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of two weeks at the beginning of this year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of $5. She was clubbed over the head and dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat, stuffed her panties in it, and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

''I'm going this year,'' he said.

Think about what this woman wrote. Think about what this boy said. After hearing this, can anyone blame these boys and girls and their families for doing everything they can to stay alive? One of the easiest ways to stay alive, even though it is really hard, is to leave.

One can imagine how bad things are in these squalid homes and neighborhoods if these children and their families are willing to trek across dangerous terrain with little food, little

water, putting themselves at the mercy of bandits, thieves, coyotes, and cartels.

These kids are so desperate that when they reach our border, they immediately surrender themselves to the first person they encounter. They are not sneaking over the border. They are getting there for safety. They are desperate.

The truth is that we have taken steps to secure our border. So regardless of what the American people may hear from the Republicans, this is not an issue about bigger walls or more barbed wire or more drones or more helicopters or more personnel on the ground or National Guardsmen. We have doubled the number of Border Patrol agents. We have drones patrolling the air—I think there are six of them. We are catching undocumented immigrants and drug traffickers in record numbers.

After visiting the Rio Grande Valley, one FOX News reporter—FOX—said: ''There is some evidence that border security, as it stands now, is actually working pretty good, pretty well.'' This is FOX, not a friend of President Obama's. They never give him the benefit of the doubt. But they said it is working pretty well, pretty good.

But if you do not want to take FOX News's word for it, just this past weekend two Democratic Senators and a Republican Senator went down to look around, to see the crisis firsthand. One Senator asked a senior Border Patrol official, ''Is it true that border security is better than ever?'' That is a quote. He responded, ''It is true.''

How does this assessment compare to what we have heard from the Republican Congress? This morning the Republican leader disagreed with our border enforcement official, claiming that the current crisis further illustrates how insecure the border is.

I repeat: These children are not sneaking over the border. They look to the border for safety. So whom would one believe—our Border Patrol officials out their on the frontlines, a FOX News reporter who was there on the frontlines, or the Republican leader? It is pretty clear where the weight of evidence is.

Finally, our border security is working so much better, but our Border Patrol infrastructure is not equipped to care for tens of thousands of children. Barbed wire does not do that. High fences do not do that. Virtual fences do not do that. Drones do not do that. Helicopters do not do that. What we need now are resources to temporarily house and feed those children, administer deportation or asylum proceedings, and give border agents the necessary tools to keep our borders secure. They need to be temporarily taken care of until a decision is made on what should happen to them. It has to be done in a humane fashion.

Our challenge is to treat these children as children should be treated, consistent with American values. The White House emergency supplemental request does just that. If the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services do not get these resources, they are going to run out of money in a few weeks—out of money.

All we hear from the Republican Congress is blame. It is all the fault of Barack Obama. It is his fault. It is his fault these kids are coming. It is his fault the border, I guess, is secure. They are coming and turning themselves in.

Congressional Republicans are suggesting that the thousands of young migrants have come to America as a result of President Obama's 2012 deferred action plan. They are saying that is the reason for all of this trouble. But that is nonsense. This article I held up—a long article—does not mention a word from anybody she interviewed that they are coming because of deferred action. They are coming because of fathers being robbed and murdered by gangs while they are working as security officers and the other vile things that are happening to human beings.

We need the resources to temporarily house and feed these children, to legally administer whatever proceedings are necessary, and give border agents the necessary tools to keep our borders secure. I repeat: If they do not get the resources, they are going to be out of money. Then what are we going to do? I guess the Republicans will blame Obama. It is our job—our job. He cannot do it alone.

We have 45 obstinate Republicans who are not letting us get anything done about anything, certainly not anything dealing with immigration.

Cristian, the boy from this New York Times article, as I said, does not mention DACA at all. He does not mention DREAMers. He talks about the violence he sees as a boy—with his eyes. These kids are fleeing Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala and are heading anywhere they can to escape the violence. They are not just fleeing to the United States; they are going anyplace they can. They are heading to Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize. In those countries I have just mentioned, asylum claims have spiked 712 percent over the past several years. Think of all the children who don't make it.

This crisis—the humanitarian crisis on our border—has nothing to do with DREAMers—children who have lived most of their lives as Americans even though they were brought here illegally. Yet Republicans would have us believe the two are inseparably connected. This is clearly not true.

The junior Senator from Texas is trying so hard to link these two groups of children. In fact, the junior Senator from Texas is saying that before he will agree to the White House supplemental request, which would give our Border Patrol the resources it needs to care for these refugee children, President Obama must end the deferred action program.

We just read some legislation on the floor a few moments ago. That is what it is—no money for these poor boys and girls until, I guess, you deport them—hundreds of thousands of people who are here because they deserve to be here.

Republicans, in attacks such as this, are resorting to ransoming children to get their way, and that is shameful. The assistant Republican leader, the senior Senator from Texas, who has authored legislation to prevent any meaningful hearing process for migrant children, appears to support the junior Senator's plan. The bill put forward by the senior Senator from Texas implements a process that will send these children back to dangerous places without some minimal concern for their health and well-being. If people were treating animals the way these boys and girls are being treated, they wouldn't send an animal back to this, let alone a little boy or girl.

Neither of the plans put forward by the junior or senior Senators from Texas address the underlying issues. And what is the real issue?

The Presiding Officer has lived in South America. He is one of the few Senators who speaks fluent Spanish. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So what is the real issue?

The Presiding Officer could tell us what the real issue is if he were able to speak now.

Why are these children arriving at our southern border. As Nobel laureate Oscar Arias, who was President of Costa Rica and did a good job in an overwhelmingly bad situation, said yesterday in the Washington Post: ''The root cause is the violence and poverty that make these children's lives at home intolerable.''

We hear that from the schoolboy's message to us. Deporting DREAMers already here or speeding up the process for sending children who need protection back to their crime-ravaged homes does not address the root cause.

In fact, it will only break up families who are already here and ensure that we see these migrant children again in a few months if they survive, because they are not going to stay there. Many of them won't survive, but if they do, they will try to come back again until things become tolerable. Instead of playing a game of hot potato with thousands of innocent children, let's address the pressing needs we have now, which is to treat these kids humanely.

I have had the good fortune of traveling in every country in South America except Belize and Uruguay. Cuba is

sending huge numbers of physicians all over South and Central America; China has a lot of money and projects there.

We—because of the stringency of what is happening with our appropriations bills—took months and months to get a Peace Corps Director. The Peace Corps helps, but without the Director it was kind of wobbly. The Agency for International Development has a good program, but it doesn't have much money at all. We do very little to help those countries.

We have Venezuela. Chavez ships hundreds and hundreds of teachers and oil to those countries, and we do nothing. For a fraction of what we spend on our border, we could help those countries stabilize.

We need to get resources to our Border Patrol agents and others who are caring for these children from Central America. We need judges to hear these kids' cases and decide whether they need protection or need to be sent back home.

The world is watching how this great democracy of ours responds to this crisis. Congress must act now and give the administration the funding it needs to temporarily house and feed these boys and girls and reinforce the infrastructure to process thousands of asylum deportation claims.

We had a big show not long ago where we provided $35 billion to help veterans. We have spent trillions of dollars in two wars—unpaid for, by the way. That is what President Bush wanted, and that is what he got. He squandered the surplus we had—a surplus of over 10 years when he took office that was trillions of dollars. But now we are being asked to spend a few dollars to take care of these people who have come back in need—as our veterans. Senator SANDERS has been working for well more than 1 month to get them to try to agree to something, and it looks to me as if they are going to come back with nothing.

The conference has not been completed. Why? Because they have to spend money on these people on whom they were glad to spend money to take them to war. But now they are back. They are missing limbs. They have many post-traumatic stress problems, a lot of medical issues, and no money is there.

I am afraid that is where we are headed with this other situation. I am afraid we are headed to the place where either Republicans get to deport all these DREAMers—what the Texas Senators obviously want—or just give these kids no hearings at all and just shove them back. It is not fair.

The American people want these kids to be treated fairly. If the kids don't belong here, let's have somebody decide they don't belong here and have somebody do what needs to be done. But to just ignore the issue and run out of money—what do we do?

What we should do is legislate. We are not doing that.

I have said on the floor a number of times—I repeat—for 5½ years Republicans have opposed everything that President Obama has wanted—everything. That is what they set out to do 3 days after he was elected, and they have stuck by that. Scores of ambassadors' positions are not filled, and legislation has gone wanting.

They want to be able to show there is a Democrat in the White House and Democrats control the Senate, but the American people are not realizing a small minority can stop us from doing everything—and that is what they have done with the so-called filibuster, hundreds of them. I only hope this November people will respond, as I believe they will, and say: This is enough.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

45-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE LUNAR LANDING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, 45 years ago yesterday the entire world was riveted to their television sets—often a television image that was grainy, black and white, and flickering—as we heard the report, ''The eagle has landed.'' Then we saw Neil Armstrong come down the ladder of the lunar lander, and that is when he made the famous statement, ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.''

In the context of that day 45 years ago, unless one was of sufficient youth to not have a memory, anyone will remember exactly where they were and what they were doing, because that was an extraordinary time for the entire planet. This Senator at the time was an Army lieutenant. At the lift-off 4 days earlier, I had been in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and had gone to the embassy asking if they had a television so I could watch the lift-off in my hometown area of Brevard County where, from this launch pad, my family had homesteaded under the old Homestead Act in 1913, working the land for years, eking out a living which, under the Homestead Act, was a way of populating the country—particularly the westward expansion but that was also the southward expansion, into unsettled lands like Florida. I have a copy of that deed of 160 acres of land, signed by Woodrow Wilson to my grandparents in 1917. That land sits today at the north end of the space shuttle runway at the Kennedy Space Center. It is only a few miles from the launch pad where Apollo 11 launched, and years later in the early part of the Space Shuttle Program I had the privilege of launching with the crew of STS–61C.

But at that moment 45 years ago, I had gone into the embassy in Belgrade, and they did not have a television set that would show the lift-off. I asked if there was any way of getting a communication. They said: Go outside of the city on those high hills and stick up your shortwave radio antenna and get the BBC from London. My friends and I did exactly that. When that rocket, the Saturn V, lifted off, there were three young Americans screaming at the top of our lungs: ''Go, baby, go.''

Four days later, I was on my way back to the United States and was staying overnight in a London hotel. I got the desk to call me in the middle of the night, somewhere around 3:00, and turned on that flickering black-and-white television set to see Neil Armstrong come down the ladder and issue that famous statement.

Today at the Kennedy Space Center is a ceremony commemorating that event 45 years ago yesterday. I happened to bump into Buzz Aldrin yesterday at the Orlando airport as he was on his way to join with Mike Collins, who was the third of the three Apollo astronauts. They are there today to dedicate the operations and checkout building at the Kennedy Space Center to be named for the commander of that mission and the first one to set foot on the Moon—Neil Armstrong. It is that very same building where those astronauts were in quarantine before they went to the launch pad, it is that very same building where so many of the space missions have been prepared, and it is that very same building, now named for Neil Armstrong, which is preparing the spacecraft that will be the forerunner of taking us in our next journey to another celestial body—this time the planet Mars.

That spacecraft, Orion, will be tested at the end of this year in a ballistic reentry, going out some 30,000 miles, to come back in at a very steep descent to test the new protective materials on

the heat shield. In the old days we had an ablative material on the blunt end of the capsule that would burn up on reentry coming through the fiery heat of reentry, 3,000 degrees Fahrenheit. Part of the heat shield would burn up. Today, they have much more high-technology techniques that will repel the heat in order to save the crew, and that test will come at the end of the year.

When we shut down the Space Shuttle Program, most Americans felt as though the human space program was shut down. That is not the case. We have an orbiting national laboratory that is part of the International Space Station, with two American astronauts and an international crew—a total of six astronauts onboard, doing research right now, as they have been.

As a matter of fact, to give a visual mind's-eye idea of how big this International Space Station is, it is 120 yards long. Visualize from one goalpost and one end zone to the other goalpost, and that is how big the International Space Station is, and six humans are on board right now.

We are already developing the rockets that are delivering cargo—American rockets—and those rockets are now in a competition in NASA as to which ones will be selected to carry humans, and then all of the redesign, the redundancies of systems, the escape mechanisms, will be incorporated in order to make it safe for humans. We are expecting that first American launch of Americans onboard American rockets to be in 2017. Then the American people will realize that we have been in space all along.

We can speak of the wonders of our space program—the Hubble space telescope that has been on orbit carried by a human crew that has now unlocked the secrets of the universe. The follow-on telescope named after the first NASA Administrator James Webb will peer back in time to the very beginning of the universe and will bring us additional knowledge about how we got here and how it all started in this incredibly infinite thing called the universe, of which the cosmos as we look out is so large we can't comprehend it.

Our space program is vigorous, and now we will move into a new era starting right there in the building that is being dedicated today in memory of Neil Armstrong, a building that will assemble the spacecraft called Orion which will launch with Americans in 2021 for the beginning of a mission that will capture a distant object—an asteroid—fly to it, rendezvous, explore it, as we start the systems, the methods, building and creating the new technologies that will then allow us to take a human crew all the way to the planet Mars, land them, and bring them back safely to planet Earth.

So this is a day that we remember, and we remember an astronaut who was taken way too early from us, because Neil was only 82 years old.

Although of the original seven, which Neil was not a part of, we only have one left; that is, John Glenn, the first American to orbit the Earth, a former Senator of this body in his nineties. He looks terrific.

After the Mercury Program came the Gemini Program and then came the Apollo Program, and that is the celebration that has just occurred, celebrating 45 years. It is hard to believe it has been that long. Yet that was a day the world stopped as they gazed, fixed on their television sets, as a human from planet Earth set foot on another celestial body. That was quite an accomplishment, but there is a lot more to come.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join with Senator WALSH from Montana as he is leading us in the effort to pass the Bring Jobs Home Act, which is pretty basic in terms of where our values and priorities are in terms of our tax policy.

I know we are in the process of determining whether to bring that up. Hopefully we will do that. The American people say it is a no-brainer to bring up this bill and pass it. The reason, first of all, would be the fact that people understand that we need a middle class. We essentially started the middle class 100 years ago. We started it with some pretty basic policies in my State in 1914 when Henry Ford decided to invest in Detroit and Michigan and America and double the salary of his employees so that they could afford to buy his automobiles. He was really doubling down on America and on manufacturing in America. We have seen multiple ways in which that took off and literally created the middle class of our country.

Today we see the middle class under assault, folks working hard trying to hold on. People who felt in the past that if they worked really hard they could get into the middle class now feel as if the system is rigged against them.

We are really in a fight as to whether we are going to move forward and have a strong middle class. Every other country wants what we have. Too many countries have a few very wealthy people and a lot of extremely poor people, and they envy the middle-class economic engine we have had in this country.

As we look at how we move forward to keep and expand the middle class, we have to look for ways in which we can support our workers and our businesses that are investing in America. I believe our workers can outcompete anybody as long as the rules are fair.

There are a lot of ways we need to deal with the rules, but right now we have a tax code that really puts a thumb on the scales against our workers. At this point in time, after the last 10 years where we have actually seen 2.4 million jobs shipped overseas, we still have a tax code where American taxpayers are footing the bill for this movement, which is stunning. I think every time I have talked to people about the fact that when a company packs up and moves, the workers, the community, the taxpayers pay for that through write offs in the Tax Code, people say: You have got to be kidding. Why did we let that happen?

Well, the Bring Jobs Home Act is a way to address that and to stop it from happening. Let me talk about the very specific and very simple ways we do that. We would stop the taxpayer subsidies that pay for moving costs. We instead would say to companies: If you are coming back, you can write off those costs. If you want to move back, you can write off those costs, and we will add an additional 20 percent tax credit for the cost of moving, so you get an additional tax cut. So if you want to come home, we are all for it. You can write off those costs. You will get an additional tax cut. But if you want to leave this country, you are on your own.

It is very simple. That is what this does.

Are there other things we need to do in the Tax Code? You bet. We have very serious issues. More and more of our companies are using this process called inversion. It seems to me that a good place to start a full discussion about how we have a tax code for America, that invests in America, that rewards American business and American workers, families, communities, is to start with the Bring Jobs Home Act. Surely everybody on both sides of the aisle ought to be able to agree that we would not pay for the cost of shipping jobs overseas through the Tax Code.

I also wish to commend a lot of companies right now that are actually bringing jobs home. It is exciting for me, being from a major manufacturing State, to see that we are having a resurgence in manufacturing. For a number of reasons—including lower energy costs, transportation costs, and a resurgence in manufacturing—we are seeing jobs come home. We are seeing manufacturers such as Ford and Caterpillar and GE, which have announced major investments in the United

States, bringing jobs back from Japan and Mexico and China. This is good. We want that. There are smaller manufacturers that are taking advantage of our skilled and ready workforce. Over 80 percent of the companies actually bringing jobs back are companies with less than $200 million in sales.

Companies are taking a look and they are coming back. We want to reward that. When they look at the Tax Code, we want them to see the right message. We want folks to see that, hey, you know what, if you are one of the good guys and you are bringing jobs home, we want to give you some extra help—to pay for that with an extra tax credit. But we also want to send a message to those who are thinking about leaving: Our Tax Code will no longer reward your leaving America.

I do not know how many times I have heard from workers saying they not only are insulted by paying for the cost of the move through the Tax Code, but oftentimes they are training their replacements from other countries. The replacements come over and they train them. I mean, this is craziness.

At a time when too many people have lost their jobs and are looking for that fair shot—what is the next job, what is the next opportunity for them—how do we make sure the Tax Code, our laws, and our investments work for Americans and give everybody a fair shot? That is what this is about. It is very much about making sure we have a fair shot for every American. Part of that is making sure that we have good-paying jobs in America and that our Tax Code is rewarding the creation of those good jobs and rewarding the companies that are bringing jobs home.

I again thank Senator WALSH for his leadership. He has been very clear about how this affects his State of Montana and his concerns about this issue. I thank all of those who are cosponsors and working with us on this bill. I hope it will be brought up as soon as possible. This is really an opportunity for all of us to show the American people that we get it, that we are willing to work together on a bipartisan basis to do something that is very simple and very straightforward and say: As an American we are no longer going to pay for the move, and when you move jobs overseas, the Tax Code is not going to pay for that. But we will stand together in supporting those efforts that help companies bring jobs home.

I hope when we do have the vote on this issue we will see a resounding yes from everyone. I know the American people would love to see a strong bipartisan vote right now that would actually address something they care about deeply, which is the ability to have a good-paying job, to work hard, play by the rules, and have a fair shot to get ahead, which is what America has been all about. That is who we are as opposed to other places—the ability to have the opportunity to work hard and get ahead. Everybody needs to know that fair shot is still available to them. The Bring Jobs Home Act is part of letting people know it is.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I wrote my colleagues a letter that had a serious front line about policies being executed, we are told, by the President that would seriously undermine the constitutional structure of our Republic and give to the President powers that would allow him to take powers he had never been given.

Subsequent to that, a George Washington law professor, Mr. Jonathan Turley, remarked during recent congressional testimony:

When President Obama pledged to circumvent Congress [he was referring to his State of the Union Address] he received rapturous applause from the very body that he was proposing to make practically irrelevant.

Professor Turley emphasized that the ''most serious violations, in my view, are various cases where he went to Congress, as in the immigration field, as in the health care field, asked for very specific things and was rejected and then decided just to order those on his own.''

He testified before a House committee. Professor Turley I think has been known as a Democrat. I think he said he supported President Obama's election. He is not a partisan person. He is an observer who has testified before Congress many times and is well respected, and that statement should cause concern on the part of every Member of Congress.

Is it so? Is it so that he asked for the very specific things that were rejected by Congress and he decided to just order them with his pen on his own?

The primary immigration action Professor Turley was referring to was the President's decision to implement the DREAM Act by fiat, providing administrative amnesty and work permits to an entire class of illegal immigrants.

Professor Turley described it as '' . . . the clear circumvention of Congress. And for Congress not to act in my view borders on self-loathing.''

Is that a serious comment? I think it is exactly right. He is exactly right on this. Has Congress no gumption at all?

Multiple news reports have now made it clear that the President is now considering an Executive immigration action on a scale so far and indeed beyond our own imagination. Here is how that action was described by the National Journal, a prestigious publication in our country. This is the poster. This is what the National Journal reported: ''President Plans To Expand Unilateral Executive Amnesty.''

Executive amnesty means the Chief Executive, the President, expanding Executive amnesty including work permits for illegal immigrants and visa overstays.

Obama made it clear he would press his executive powers to the limit.

I would say well beyond the limit, according to Professor Turley. The article continues:

He gave quiet credence to recommendations from La Raza and other immigration groups that between 5 million to 6 million adult illegal immigrants could be spared deportation under a similar form of deferred adjudication he ordered for the so-called Dreamers in June 2012.

The article is referring to the DREAM Act that the President executed. One of the things that I think is extremely important, colleagues, is that what they are suggesting is that 5 million to 6 million people will be given a document that basically provides them legal status in America. The article continues:

Obama has now ordered the Homeland Security and Justice departments to find—

Ordered them to find—

Executive authorities that could enlarge that non-prosecutorial umbrella by a factor of 10.

That is all with the DREAM Act. 10 times that which was done. Continuing:

Senior officials also tell me Obama wants to see what he can do with executive power to provide temporary legal status to undocumented adults.

This is 5 million to 6 million. That is what a factor of 10 means. That is maybe more than half of the people who are illegally in the country today. Congress has considered these matters at great length and Congress set the law as to how someone enters the country lawfully and how someone enters the country, in effect, unlawfully and what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

The President is the chief law enforcement officer in America. The FBI, DEA, Border Patrol officers, ICE officers, Attorney General all work for him, and the leaders of those organizations serve at his pleasure. He can remove them at will if they don't carry out his policies.

He has ordered the Homeland Security and Justice Departments, to find Executive authorities—not to see if they could find them but to find them—because he has a policy he wants to carry out and Congress doesn't agree with him.

I will read another poster quoting Professor Turley. He talks about the danger, colleagues. This is dangerous.

Does anybody not respect this institution? Do we not respect the House of Representatives, the Senate? Have we become so partisan that we don't care what the President does to diminish Congress? Don't we have an institutional responsibility, a constitutional responsibility to defend the legitimate powers of Congress?

Sure, we can disagree sometimes, but this one is not a matter of disagreement, it seems to me. This is an overreach of dramatic proportions.

Professor Turley said:

The President's pledge to effectively govern alone is alarming, and what is most alarming is his ability to fulfill that pledge. When a president can govern alone, he can become a government unto himself, which is precisely the danger the framers sought to avoid.

Certainly they sought to avoid that. They were very suspicious and aware that the tendency of chief executive officers is to assume more power than they are given. So they created a strong Congress and they gave certain powers to Congress that could not be delegated to the executive branch.

Professor Turley, in his most recent testimony before the House Rules Committee—I believe last week—said:

What we're witnessing today is one of the greatest crises that members of this body will face . . . It has reached a constitutional tipping point that threatens a fundamental change in how our country is governed.

No matter what somebody thinks about immigration issues or health care issues, there are limits on what the President can do without Congress.

So the President says: Congress will not act; therefore, I have to act.

Have you ever heard that? They used to say Federal judges would say that. They would say: The legislature will not act. Governor King will not act. The court has to act.

That is not so. That is so bogus. If a Governor decides not to act, if a Congress decides not to act, if a State legislature decides not to act and do what some President would like to see done, that is a decision. It is every bit as real and firm a decision as if they had passed a law. If they are asked to pass a law and they say no, that is a decision reached through the legislative branch by people duly elected from all over this country who come to this Congress to pass laws.

I am very frustrated that my Democratic colleagues are not sufficiently concerned about it, and we certainly need more discussion from the loyal opposition, the Republicans on this question.

Do my Democratic colleagues express concern about it? Not that I have seen. They seem to celebrate it.

The newspaper, El Diario, quotes New Jersey Senator BOB MENENDEZ, saying:

Sen. Bob Menendez (D–N.J.) said Friday that he has ''no doubt'' that President Barack Obama will deliver on his promise to take executive action on immigration despite the current attention on the unaccompanied minors crisis.

It goes on to be quoted there as saying:

One executive action that Senator Menendez and other Democrats are pushing for is the expansion of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which provides deportation reprieve and work permits to undocumented youth.

Colleagues, it is one thing to be less than vigorous in carrying out deportations as the law requires; it is quite another class of action to give people who are unlawfully in the country a document from the President that says you can work and stay in the country—to give them legal status when Congress has considered this and rejected it. It is beyond the power of the President.

I wrote a letter to my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, before this testimony about these planned executive actions that I had been reading about. I said they would amount to an—

. . . executive nullification of our borders as an enforceable national boundary, [guaranteeing] that the current illegal immigration disaster would only further worsen and destabilize.

We cannot provide continuous amnesty on a regular basis and ever expect everybody not to attempt to come to the country if they believe they, too, in a manner of years—maybe now even fewer years—will be rewarded for their unlawful act by being put on a path to citizenship or permanent status.

So I therefore make two requests today:

I believe any border legislation that is sent to the Senate by the House of Representatives should include specific language denying the President any funds to execute his planned work permits. Congress clearly has that power. We can appropriate or not appropriate money. We can say that money cannot be spent for this or that thing. So we have every right to say the President should not spend money delivering work permits to people whom Congress has declared to not be lawfully able to work in America. I believe the President's actions are in clear contravention of the law, and I feel strongly about that.

Second, I am calling on every Senate Democratic colleague to stand up and be counted. Senator CRUZ has a bill that would stop this Presidential overreach. It is very simple. It lays out that we won't spend money providing legal documents to people unlawfully in the country as defined by the law of America and as defined by the Congress of the United States.

So I ask: Will you cosponsor Senator CRUZ's bill, and let us defend our constituents? Or, will our congressional colleagues remain complicit in the nullification of our laws and basically the nullification of border enforcement?

I would make a final note on what we owe to the citizens of this country. President Obama's illegal work permits add to the already huge flow of lawful work permits issued by the Federal Government. Between 2000 and 2013, we lawfully issued almost 30 million work and immigration visas. To put that number in perspective, 30 million is about the entire population of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala combined.

This matter and our situation today are in disarray as a result of confused and politically driven thinking by this administration. It just is. I wish it weren't so, but it is. Obama administration officials have gone so far as to describe amnesty as a civil right. That is an argument against the very idea of a nation-state and the idea of a nation's borders. Of course there is, and can be, no civil right to enter a country unlawfully and then to demand lawful status and even citizenship. Of course there is not. How could this possibly be, that the Attorney General of the United States of America would assert that people have a constitutional right to enter unlawfully and be given amnesty? That is the kind of thinking which has got us into this fix, and it has encouraged the flow of unlawful immigration.

The actual legal rights that are being violated here today I suggest are the rights of the American citizens.

As Civil Rights Commission Member Peter Kirsanow warned, our African-American citizens often are the ones who are hurt the most, as well as recent immigrant arrivals and working Americans. What about their rights? They have sweat and bled and died for this country, been called on to serve and responded, paid their taxes, raised their children, tried to do the right thing day after day. What about their rights? What about the right of every citizen to the protections our immigration laws afford? Will no one rise to their defense?

We need an immigration policy that helps all residents—including millions of immigrants who have come to America. We want to help them rise into the middle class and above. We need rising wages, not falling wages. We can't help those living here today if we keep bringing in record numbers of new workers to compete for their jobs, to drive up unemployment, and then pull down wages. That is just a fact.

After decades of large-scale immigration, and with large illegal immigration flows in addition, we need to get serious and establish a principled policy of immigration and consistently enforce it, a policy that is honorable, that we can be proud of, and that serves the interests of all Americans—especially working Americans. These are the people who have made our country great. They deserve our attention and compassion, too. Middle

America has been decent and right on this issue from the beginning.

For 40 years American people have called on Congress and called on their Presidents to create a lawful immigration system they can be proud of that serves the national interests and serves their interests. But what have they gotten? Nothing but more illegality and more demands for amnesty. The leaders of their country have not listened to them, and they aren't listening now. It appears to me the leaders of this country are not very interested in what the American people think.

The President plans to dramatically exceed his powers. It is the latest example of rejecting what the American people have asked for and it is a breathtaking violation of congressional power. It cannot be allowed to happen. We need to defend our Constitution, we need to defend the rule of law, and we need to defend the powers of Congress—and, at bottom, to defend legitimate rights, interests, and desires of the people who sent us here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I know the Chair serves as a member of the Budget Committee, as I am the ranking Republican on that committee. We have gotten a CBO, Congressional Budget Office, analysis—our official scorekeeper of spending—on the part of the proposal the President has presented to spend $4.346 billion to deal with the Southwest border crisis. What CBO has done is provided its cost estimates of the President's recent supplemental request for the Southwest border.

Significantly, CBO's analysis suggests that only $25 million of the $4.346 billion request will be spent this year. This indicates clearly that the agencies are not in dire need of supplemental funding from this Congress, certainly not in the degree asked for.

Again, CBO's analysis suggests that only $25 million out of the $4.3 billion request will be spent this year. What does that mean? It means we ought to slow down. There is no basis to demand a $4.3 billion increase in emergency spending. Every dollar borrowed—because we are already in debt. To spend $4 billion more is to borrow every penny of it. We should not do that until we find out more about what is happening at our border.

Twenty-five million dollars is a lot of money in itself. The Homeland Security and other agencies, Health and Human Services, have monies they can apply to these problems.

I am not saying no money is needed now, because we want to treat children and be helpful and treat them in a humanitarian way and a compassionate way. But we don't need $4 billion. That is clear. And we are not to be doing that. Thank goodness, the House of Representatives is looking at it carefully. They need to reject this request out of hand.

Colleagues, the fundamental problem here is that when the President of the United States did his DACA bill, when he did his DREAM Act Executive order, what did he do? He basically said: We are not going to deport young people. Then we began to see this surge of young people coming to America, and we are not deporting them effectively. They are being taken in, turned over to HHS, found housing, turned over to whoever comes and picks them up even if they are not citizens and not lawfully here. They are not being deported. So more have come in record numbers.

I guess, first of all, the very idea that we would spend—I guess for that project—$3.7 billion is a stunning amount of money. It is a huge amount of money at a time when we don't need to be borrowing money more than we have to. So I believe and would say to our colleagues, this plan does not call for the expenditure of money this year except for $25 million, and therefore we are not in a crisis that demands us to produce billions of dollars in revenue for this President to continue to carry out policies that only encourage more people to come to America and cost us even more in the time to come.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, from the beginning of our Nation we have had our challenges. We have had big challenges and little challenges, and somehow, some way, America has always risen to those challenges and addressed those in a way that was in the best interest not only of the present generation but future generations as well.

During those times, it was not true that our leaders always saw things the same way or agreed with each other 100 percent, but they saw greater value in trying to solve the Nation's problems rather than just saying: This is too hard; we can't agree, so we quit. That is not our tradition. That is not our heritage.

But looking at the present situation here in Washington, DC—and in particular the Senate—I find myself sometimes wondering whether those days have passed us by. I hope not, but I sometimes wonder whether the youth of America will witness in their lives some of the great attempts to address our Nation's challenges they read about in their history books.

Right now we know we have an urgent humanitarian crisis on the U.S.-Mexico border, more specifically in the State of Texas. I was back in McAllen, TX, on Friday, and I was grateful to see a number of our colleagues who were there: Senator HIRONO, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator MURKOWSKI, as well as a number of House Members, seeing for themselves what the crisis consists of and exploring what might be some of the possible solutions.

I was meeting with Congressman CUELLAR, who is from Laredo, TX, and with a number of local officials in the Rio Grande Valley. Many of them have expressed the same wish that I had expressed and Congressman CUELLAR had expressed. They wished the President would come down to the Rio Grande Valley and see for himself what we have seen. We know he had an opportunity to do that a couple weeks ago and chose not to do so, but they said the invitation is still outstanding. They would love to see him. The least you think the President might consider doing is congratulating the professional efforts of our Border Patrol and other law enforcement specialists who were down there doing an amazing job. Of course, FEMA and other Federal agencies are on the ground as well. That invitation is still outstanding, and I think the President would benefit from seeing this crisis for himself.

What I saw were children packed into detention facilities that were filled to overflowing, some with only a single toilet in the room, and conditions you would not want your children to be in. We learned even more about the horrific journey from Central America through Mexico up to South Texas that many of these children had endured, and the truth is some of them didn't make it. Some of them who started this horrific journey from Central America simply died in the process. Those who did not die were subjected to horrific abuse, kidnapped, being held for ransom, women and girls being sexually assaulted enroute, because these corridors are controlled by transnational criminal organizations is what we call them—in other words, gangs, cartels—that view these children and migrants as commodities.

For a long time they have been selling drugs because drugs make them a lot of money. Now they realize they can transport children and adults because they make them a lot of money too. And if you just figure it out, if they can figure a way to move tens of thousands—or so far 57,000 children since October of last year—at $5,000 each, that is a lot of money. So these criminal organizations are reaping riches as a result of this sordid trafficking of human beings, and communities are being overrun and government resources are being strained.

The administration has said there is a humanitarian crisis, and I agree. They have also said—and this is Secretary Johnson among others—that a loophole in a law passed in 2008 is one source of the problem. Is it the only source of the problem? No, I don't think that is true. I think there is also an impression that somehow the United States and this administration are less than fully committed to enforcing our immigration laws.

If you read the intelligence gathered by the Department of Homeland Security from many of the migrants, including children who have been detained, many of them report being told there would be a permiso or basically a permission slip or visa issued to them if they were able to make it to the United States. So there is the combination of lack of detention facilities and the requirement of the Department of Homeland Security to turn these children and others over to Health and Human Services, but then they would be released based upon their promise to return at a future court date. This is what has been interpreted as permission to enter the country and stay.

So I know Secretary Johnson of the Department of Homeland Security understands the problem, although the President has a political problem. Many of the President's most ardent supporters are saying: We hope the President will just request money, but in the end we hope he will go even further with the deferred action Executive order that he issued in 2012 for the so-called DREAMers. Those are kids who obviously came into the United States at a young age with their parents but are boxed in; while they can get an education, they cannot get a job.

Rather than asking for a solution to this problem, the President has indeed asked for a blank check, and I for one am not for giving it to him. I am for doing what is compassionate. I am for treating these children and all immigrants and all human beings, for that matter, with the dignity and respect they deserve by virtue of their status as human beings. But we also need to realize that America cannot endlessly accept a flood of humanity from countries around the world who want to come to the United States, especially through an illegal smuggling system that does not respect their dignity as human beings or our laws. We simply cannot absorb or assimilate into America an uncontrolled flow of people from around the world.

Americans are the most generous people in the world when it comes to our immigration policies. We naturalize about 800,000 people a year, accept them into this great country and accept them as American citizens. But we simply cannot allow this sort of uncontrolled wave of humanity and expect to be able to deal with them in a dignified and appropriate way. We simply cannot continue to feed this business model of transnational criminal organizations and cartels that profit from their own criminality and for exploiting these children and other migrants.

I know in this political environment putting forth a solution is tough because usually what happens is you get attacked from the right and the left, which usually tells you that you are probably doing the right thing. But it is worth the effort to try to find a solution to this problem. It requires all of us to take our responsibilities when it comes to serving the public seriously; and it requires us to put forward solutions knowing that we are not going to come up with a perfect solution, but if we can come up with one that moves the ball 80 percent down the field, that is not bad. That is not a bad day's work. Certainly if we can help make somebody's life a little bit better or protect them from some of the horrific consequences of inaction, it is worth it.

I have—as the Presiding Officer knows—partnered with one of my colleagues in the House who happens to be a Democrat, HENRY CUELLAR, in a bipartisan, bicameral solution to this human crisis. If somebody has a better idea, we are all ears. But all I can hear is crickets. I don't hear a lot of other ideas. There are some and we ought to consider those, but mainly I haven't heard anybody come up with another solution to this loophole that is being exploited by these transnational criminal cartels other than the one that Congressman CUELLAR and I have proposed.

There have been some who have expressed concerns about the legislation. On the right there are some who have said this bill would make it easier for unaccompanied minors to achieve legal and asylum status. That is wrong. The HUMANE Act, which is what we call this legislation, would not change current law at all with regard to either a claim for asylum or achieving legal status. It would, however, make sure that current law is actually enforced by speeding up court dates and the removal process for unaccompanied children who don't satisfy some of these exceptions.

It is also worth reminding the American people that there are a number of fraud prevention measures in our current asylum laws that the HUMANE Act would not change, and—and this is important—more than 70 percent of those seeking asylum in the United States last year—more than 70 percent of those seeking asylum last year in the United States were ultimately not awarded that status. In other words, this is a rather narrow provision.

Some have also argued that the HUMANE Act would somehow expunge the removal orders that were issued to minors who came to the country illegally during the current surge and have already been released to State-based family members or sponsors. What our bill would actually do is allow the U.S. Government to replace those removal orders with new nonappealable orders that would allow for an expedited repatriation process for the children who were not qualified for asylum status or were not a victim of human trafficking.

On the left we have heard the claim that many of these children will not obtain the necessary legal representation they need. Wrong again. The HUMANE Act would not change current law which requires Health and Human Services to ensure to the greatest extent practicable that legal representation is provided for unaccompanied children.

I have not heard many of my friends on the other side of the aisle who actually supported the 2008 law unanimously complain about this aspect; in other words, what they are complaining about now in terms of inadequate legal representation they actually voted for in 2008.

Some worry that this bill would be a vehicle for comprehensive immigration reform, to which I would ask: Have you witnessed the dysfunction in the U.S. Senate? Do you actually think there is any real chance we will pass comprehensive immigration reform through both Houses of Congress this year?

Well, some have said there is also concern there are not enough protections in the bill for children. Yet we have added protections that don't already exist under current law, such as an expedited court hearing before a judge and for those credible claims, stronger safeguards to ensure children are not released in the hands of dangerous criminals or those who would abuse them. So after identifying a problem and a cause, one would think it would be easy for Republicans and Democrats, Congress and the White House, to come together on a solution. You would think that would be something we would do at a minimum in fulfilling our job description. Sadly, the President has not seen fit to come forward to embrace the solution that is in front of him. Indeed, from press accounts we have learned that while he understands the nature of the problem, as does Secretary Johnson, and what would be necessary to fix it, the President simply does not want to disappoint some of the more radical activists who essentially say we ought to open the floodgates to people from anywhere around the world and let them come in at their will.

Well, I am discouraged to hear the remarks of the majority leader where he said he is not optimistic that we will be able to address this issue constructively and find a solution before we recess in August. I would think that would be a matter of some urgency because as we have seen since 2011, these

numbers seem to double every year. In other words, they start out relatively low. They doubled from 2011 to 2012, from 2012 to 2013, and from 2013 to 2014. It is estimated there could be as many as 90,000 unaccompanied children detained at our southern border this year. So if it is 90,000 this year and we don't do anything about it, what will it be next year—180,000?

This is a bad situation that we have within our capacity to address if we can find a way somehow to do so, but it is going to take a President, it is going to take a majority leader, and it is going to take all of us who choose not to just take the easy way but to take the hard way, one that will lead to a solution to this humanitarian crisis. It won't happen just by throwing money at it without offering any real reforms that will actually fix what is broken in the 2008 law.

I close on this note, again, to plead with my colleagues: If you have a better idea, please come and tell us about it. We may want to embrace it. Is this perfect? No. Does this solve all that is broken in our immigration laws? No, it does not. This is a narrowly targeted solution to a national crisis and one that will, hopefully, positively impact thousands of children.

For those who want to see more, I would say this is a moment to do what we can, when we can and to show we are serious about the job of governing and coming up with responsible solutions.

If we can demonstrate to the American people we can actually do that on a bipartisan basis and fix this, relatively speaking, smaller but nevertheless urgent problem, maybe we can earn their trust enough to tackle some bigger problems in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate begins debate on transportation funding this week, it is clear to me that all sides—Democrats and Republicans—agree that what is needed most is a long-term plan for rebuilding our country's infrastructure.

The reality is we simply cannot have big league economic growth with little league infrastructure. Unfortunately, all over our country, we have potholes and sinkholes, and one of the reasons we are not seeing them filled is because there is no long-term plan or a plan that provides certainty and predictability for all sides—local government and businesses and developers and others—to know the funding will be there.

As we start the discussion that is going to go through the week about a bipartisan plan to go forward on transportation funding—as Senator HATCH and I and the Finance Committee have brought before the Senate today—I want all sides to know it is our view that to get to the long-term road, you have to have a short-term path, and that short-term path is what Senator HATCH and I have pulled together on a bipartisan basis which we hope our colleagues will support before the week is out.

I think all of the Senators understand what is at stake here. Allowing the highway trust fund to run dry would slam the brakes on critical infrastructure projects across the land. Let's be clear: It is nonnegotiable that Congress will prevent that from happening. No Senator wants State and local governments to have to pick and choose which projects move forward and which ones are to be set apart because Congress didn't do its job before the August break.

The reality is a transportation shutdown would be horrendous news for tens of thousands of construction workers facing layoffs. The damages would ripple throughout our economy. Businesses would have a tougher time getting products to market and customers through their doors. Commuters would spend more time sitting in traffic and burning through gas. Car owners would have to fork over more cash to replace their tires and fix their broken suspensions.

With all Americans having something at stake, Congress must act, and that is why it is so important, in my view, to pass the bipartisan PATH Act—Preserving America's Transit and Highways Act—this week.

As I have indicated, the Finance Committee came together on a bipartisan basis to advance this legislation to the Senate floor. Senator HATCH and I met regularly on this matter throughout the spring to reach a solution. When I first proposed a draft of a chairman's mark and announced a committee markup, Senator HATCH and the Finance Committee's Republicans asked for more time to reach a bipartisan consensus, and I agreed. We continued to talk almost each day, with our staffs in constant contact. Every member of the committee pitched in. When the committee reconvened to consider the modified legislation, it passed with virtual unanimity. This is a truly bipartisan plan.

Our colleagues in the other body have offered their own legislation. I wish to take a brief moment to highlight some of the differences between the two bills that, in my view, are quite important. As part of our effort to reach a bipartisan agreement, the Finance Committee agreed to adopt several of the funding sources proposed by the Ways and Means Committee. Those sources included customs user fees and pension smoothing. The Finance Committee's bill leaves room for customs user fees to continue to support vital trade programs. In the committee's view, that is an important tradition to protect.

The Finance Committee's legislation also leaves room for revenue from the pension smoothing provision to help secure multi-employer pension plans that face insolvency.

Finally, the Finance Committee's legislation draws some revenue by improving the enforcement of tax laws that are now on the books. I bring this up because I have seen some inaccurate accusations about what these enforcement provisions would do. Let's be clear: These are not new taxes. They are not tax increases. In fact, the Finance Committee even received a letter from Grover Norquist and the group Americans for Tax Reform saying so. Mr. Norquist is not soft on the question of tax increases, and he has indicated that these provisions are not tax hikes. What these provisions do is crack down on tax cheats and ensure that mortgage lenders provide homeowners with more tax information than they are usually getting today.

By contrast, it is my view that the other body not only missed an opportunity to strengthen tax compliance, but also weakened the solvency of pension plans and leaves no funds in reserve to address that problem down the road. The House approach for paying for transportation funding creates another funding problem for pension plans that Congress will have to solve in the future. In effect, as one colleague indicated to me, we have one challenge on our hands in terms of transportation, and if we now take the House approach, we will have two challenges on our hands: transportation and pension.

The Finance Committee, on a bipartisan basis, decided through the PATH Act to come to the Senate floor as the transportation shutdown approaches with tens of thousands of jobs on the line and advance a bipartisan proposal.

What is needed next after this legislation has passed and is safely in the rearview mirror is what I touched on at the outset: a long-term plan that would rebuild America's infrastructure and end the cycle of stopgap funding. That will require more than the bare minimum of fixing the highway trust fund. Even in the best of times when there is no threat of a transportation shutdown—we are making a little league infrastructure investment of less than 2 percent of our gross domestic product.

Our big league competitors are going a different route. In parts of Canada they put 10 percent of GDP into infrastructure projects, and China invests almost as much.

With such a small investment, it is getting harder for our country to maintain the transportation system it has, much less take up new projects that would help America compete with the world's other heavyweight economies.

For example, in our State the poor condition of many roads costs the average driver almost $175 per year. There are more than 1,300 bridges functionally obsolete, and more than 400 bridges are structurally deficient. The bill for repairs will only grow and grow as Congress waits to get serious about infrastructure.

We ought to look at managing the transportation system like owning a car. Responsible car owners don't let them fall into disrepair. They change the oil, rotate the tires, and fix the transmission when it is needed. It is all part of responsible ownership. Some day, if you want to resell the car or give it to your child, the car will be in good shape. It is time for this generation to be responsible owners of America's transportation system.

The challenge in the weeks and months ahead will be to find policies that can sustain the highway trust fund for good while finding new ways to draw investment dollars into American infrastructure. Priority one, in my view, ought to be to bring private capital off the sidelines and into the game on transportation. With interest rates as low as they are today, now is the time to act.

In that regard, I wish to commend my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, who has joined me in just such an effort. We call them TRIP bonds, transportation and regional infrastructure projects, to get more private capital into infrastructure. Senators WARNER, BLUNT, and BENNET have tried another approach.

As Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, I say to colleagues that all of the long-term approaches will be on the table when we get over this short-term challenge this week.

Our colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL, has a very important idea with respect to transportation, which is to look at repatriation. Senator SCHUMER, my seatmate on the Finance Committee, has another approach. The point is that all of these promising ideas—each of which has the opportunity for bipartisan support—deserves consideration, and as Chair of the Finance Committee, I commit this afternoon to do that.

When the Committee approved the PATH Act, there was unanimous agreement to work together on a long-term solution to our infrastructure challenge. I have talked with a number of Senators on both sides, and the message is clear: The Senate is ready to act. This will not become another extender issue with Congress kicking the can down a crumbling road again and again.

I will close with this. We have an important job to do this week. I hope we will continue the Finance Committee's bipartisan work and pass the PATH Act so we can protect thousands of construction jobs and end the threat of a transportation shutdown.

Some people have said there is no time and no room for compromise with our colleagues in the House—that the House is saying, it's our way or no highway. I disagree. By working together, our colleagues in the House and the Senate can reach a bipartisan agreement very quickly, and then we will move on to the next challenge and solve our infrastructure crisis for the long term.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

UKRAINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to start with my support of the comments of the Senator from Oregon. We need to get a highway bill done this week, and I look forward to working with him, particularly on a long-term plan with some of the concepts he has put forward. We need it for our infrastructure across this great Nation. Again, I look forward to working with the Senator in that endeavor and express my thanks.

I rise to speak on the issue of Ukraine and the need to address that situation and address it with a long-term strategy.

Last week Russian separatists shot down a Malaysian airliner with 298 souls on board. Innocent people were killed because Russia wants to control Ukraine—if not all of Ukraine, certainly Eastern Ukraine.

The Obama administration is struggling to respond. President Obama talks about the need for Vladimir Putin and Russia to be accountable. Meanwhile, Russia continues to deny what is going on. Putin continues to arm Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine, separatists led by Russian special forces, military operatives armed and directed by Moscow.

We need to respond. Our country needs to respond, and we need to respond with a long-term strategy and not just talk and not a short-term strategy, and that is something we can do. We can respond, and we need to respond with a long-term strategy.

We can lead with strong sanctions against Russia—sanctions that would truly affect the banking sector and other sectors of their economy in a meaningful way. We can help Europe follow us with these same sanctions. We can help them by providing energy to the European Union.

Europe is dependent on Russia for its energy. I brought some charts to depict the situation. The first chart shows countries in Europe and how many of them get all or a very large share of their natural gas from Russia. So they are dependent on Russia for their energy, and that is an incredible source of strength for the Putin regime.

Here we see—I know it is somewhat difficult—all of these pipelines coming out of Russia through Ukraine and into the European Union, supplying all of that energy to these European countries. Because of that, we see all of these countries that are dependent on Russia. That is an incredible source of strength and power for Russia, and it is holding up Europe from engaging in the kinds of sanctions that could really stop Russia—stop the Russian economy and stop President Putin in his tracks.

We can break that trend and we can break that stranglehold by allowing more LNG—liquefied natural gas—exports from our country. We have the companies right now, today, that want to build LNG export facilities, but they are being held up from doing so.

I wish to go to my third chart. This isn't all of them, but right here there are 16 companies—13 on our coast, 3 in Canada—and 1 of these actually has received conditional approval. But here are 13 applications for companies that want to build LNG facilities to export natural gas, and they are being held up. All of these have been held up somewhere between 1 and 2 years. They can't even get permitted or approved by the Department of Energy to build those facilities.

What are we talking about? Let me give a specific example of one of them—a company my colleagues have probably heard of—ExxonMobil. They want to build a $10 billion facility at Sabine Pass in Texas. I just pointed this one out on this chart right here, in this area on the gulf. They are ready to go right now. They have been in the application process for maybe 1 or 2 years, and they think they are maybe halfway through it. So they have another year or 2 years before they can build a $10 billion facility that will move natural gas. They will bring it right into the UK, right into Europe. Why aren't we green-lighting this right now, today? Why do we continue to hold this up?

Some critics say it is going to take them some time to build it. Well, of course it is going to take some time to build, but the faster we get these projects permitted, the sooner they are going to get built. The reality is they will not only have an impact as they are able to move gas into the market, they will have an impact today because those European countries will know these other sources of supply are coming.

Also, Vladimir Putin knows we are serious about providing alternative energy to Europe, and I think that will make a big difference in terms of strengthening the European countries' readiness to join us with the kinds of sanctions we need to truly make a difference.

Two weeks ago I introduced legislation to do exactly what I am talking

about—the North Atlantic Energy Security Act. The cosponsors include Senator MCCAIN, Senator BARRASSO, and Senator MURKOWSKI, who is the ranking member on the energy committee. Senator BARRASSO worked to put a lot of the legislation together. Senator MCCAIN has always been very active in the Ukrainian situation. Together we put together this bill with a lot of pieces of this legislation that have already been passed in the House—already passed the House. Quite simply, it will enable us to produce more natural gas, move it to market, and export it to our allies. It increases onshore production of natural gas. It allows us to gather it and move it to market, and it allows it to be exported.

Quite simply, what does that enable us to do? Well, States such as mine today are flaring off, burning off $1.5 million a day of natural gas because we don't have a market for it. So we just burn it. We just burn it because we can't get the kind of legislation we have developed passed. We can't get it to the floor for a vote. So instead of taking that natural gas—millions of dollars a day—that is going up in smoke and moving it down to these facilities and over to our allies, we are burning it.

It would be better for our economy. It would create jobs. It would be better for our environment. It would create jobs. It would certainly be better for our economic growth. It would create revenues to deal with the debt and deficit without raising taxes—just through economic growth. It would make a big difference for the national security of our country and our allies. It is common sense. What are we waiting for? Let's get beyond just talking about what needs to be done in Ukraine and let's get going. Let's get going with a long-term strategy.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the views of my colleague from North Dakota on the importance of developing our great resource of natural gas and turning it into a liquefied form and solving a lot of the problems we face around the world. I also commend Senator HOEVEN and Senator WYDEN for the exchange they had briefly a few moments ago on a bipartisan approach to funding our infrastructure problems in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

I note, as I move to the topic of ObamaCare, the absence of any such bipartisan accord during 2009 when the Affordable Care Act was being debated in the Senate. Thus, we have what in April of 2003 Senate Finance Committee Chairman Baucus called a huge train wreck. He was right in seeing the train wreck coming on the rollout of the Web site, but it also has turned out to be a train wreck in far more ways than the Web site glitches and the ultimate fiasco.

The train wreck of the affordable health care act continues in the way the law is affecting health care coverage and the way it is affecting the pocketbooks of American families. These families were flatly told their health care premiums would go down. They were not told their health care premiums would moderate; they were told their health care premiums would go down. Instead, we have all of the problems we are facing with regard to ObamaCare in the way it affects women, in the way it affects wage-earners, and in the way it affects people who are looking for full-time employment. Frankly, the ObamaCare law continues to drag down our economy and our chances for economic growth.

Instead of seeing premiums drop by $2,500 on average each year as President Obama promised, families and individuals are spending more of their hard-earned dollars on health care costs under this so-called Affordable Care Act. The sticker shock will only worsen, and it is going to happen right around the corner.

In recent weeks several States have announced preliminary estimates for next year's premiums. The Wall Street Journal reports that many of these States' largest health insurers plan to increase premiums by between 8.5 percent and 22.8 percent. These are annual increases coming up right around the corner of 8.5 percent up to 22.8 percent. For many Americans, this means either paying a lot more or simply not being able to have coverage at all. The administration is trying to downplay the costs, but it is clear that once again ObamaCare is failing to live up to its billing.

Some States are particularly vulnerable to higher rates next year because of low enrollment among young adults or because few insurers have joined the exchanges. For example, in my home State of Mississippi 94 percent of enrollees are eligible for Federal subsidies, which means we have little competition to drive down rates. According to this year's numbers, my home State of Mississippi already has the third highest premiums in the Nation, and we can't afford them. Competition cannot flourish when the government is involved in setting mandates for benefits and controlling rates. Without a market-based approach, which I advocated in 2009, consumers lose out on choice and cost.

Particularly hardhit by the President's health care law are women and younger wage earners. With regard to women, for example, they are more likely to pay higher out-of-pocket costs under ObamaCare with plans with high deductibles because they typically visit the doctor more. As 57 percent of the part-time workforce, women are also more likely to have their hours cut because of the employer mandate.

I note that the employer mandate is increasingly unpopular among Democrats and Republicans.

Additionally, the law's limited physician networks have forced many women to choose different specialists for themselves and their children, thus making it less convenient for these women to get care for themselves and their children.

Stories from women across the country underscore these difficult realities. Last year a woman from Columbus, MS, wrote to tell me that her original health care plan was $500 per month before it jumped to $1,500 a month because of the ACA.

One woman from North Carolina gave this reaction to unaffordable premiums. She said:

> I've never worked this hard in my life. But I'm gonna continue working every day and keep hitting the books at night. I'm just trying to keep my head above water.

Another woman from Texas who could not find an obstetrician who would accept her insurance said this:

> It was mind-numbing, because I was just sitting there thinking, I'm paying close to $400 just for me to have insurance that doesn't work. So what am I paying for?

Women make approximately 80 percent of the health care decisions in America. More choices and lower costs would give them the flexibility they need to get the right insurance plan.

With regard to younger workers, they are generally healthier but earn less, and they are faced with daunting realities because of the health care law. Specifically, younger workers are forced to pay higher premiums to subsidize coverage for older Americans.

I was contacted by a constituent from Greenville, MS, whose healthy 27-year-old son lost his health insurance because of ObamaCare. The cost of his coverage went from $70 per month to nearly $350 per month even though the benefits improved only slightly. Although this young man had health insurance for 7 years, since he was 20 years of age, he is now questioning whether he can afford it.

Finally, all Americans are affected by a health care law that destroys jobs. Last month the economy added 288,000 jobs, but only a fraction of them were full time, as we know. The Obama economy is a part-time economy. Millions of Americans want full-time work.

The President's health care law was pushed through with no bipartisan input and in defiance of public opinion. After the Massachusetts special election, this Senate should have gotten

the message that we needed to regroup and rethink this disastrous law, but the majority party pushed forward regardless. So it is no surprise that the law remains deeply unpopular today. According to a recent poll, 55 percent of Americans wish it had never passed and 44 percent said America is now worse off because of the ACA.

In summary, under the affordable health care act women are worse off, younger workers are worse off, and people seeking full-time jobs are worse off.

Elections have consequences, and November will be no different. The American people have an opportunity to change the course of this disastrous law in 106 days.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have the honor to chair the U.S. Helsinki Commission, which is well known for its commitment to human rights. It is also our participating arm in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE.

Starting when I first joined the Helsinki Commission almost 20 years ago, I worked on the issues of antisemitism and trying to deal with combating antisemitism. This is overt actions against Jews and Jewish institutions, which were on the rise. We tried to do something about it. In the early 2000s, working with Congressman HOYER and Congressman HASTINGS and Congressman SMITH and others, we made a commitment in the Helsinki Commission to bring up the increasing episodes of antisemitism and what we needed to do about it.

We saw increased episodes of violence against Jews and Jewish institutions. We saw that world events were used to try to justify antisemitic activities. As a result of the work of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, the OSCE determined that it was important enough to do a special conference on antisemitism. In 2004, we had the Berlin conference on antisemitism under the leadership of the United States and Germany.

I was proud to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the Berlin conference. Good work was done in that conference. We developed best practices, from dealing with Holocaust education, to police training to deal with identifying hate crimes. We had the first uniform collection of hate crimes statistics in the OSCE region, the responsibility of leaders to speak up against antisemitic activities. We provided technical assistance to countries to deal with antisemitism and to share their best practices. We also recommended a special representative to the chair in office, to put a spotlight on antisemitism and ways to combat it.

Today Rabbi Andrew Baker is that special representative to the chair in office. The chair in office this year is the Swiss chair in office.

Tomorrow, I will chair a Helsinki Commission hearing that deals with antisemitism, racism, and discrimination in the OSCE region. There are now three special representatives, one to combat antisemitism, one to deal with discrimination against Muslims, and one to deal with racism, xenophobia, and other forms of religious intolerance. They are all related. We find that hate crimes are hate crimes; that if a community is susceptible to antisemitic activities, it is also susceptible to anti-Muslim activities or activities against a person because of their race.

There is reason to be concerned. There is reason to be concerned about the rise of antisemitism today. This is 10 years after the Berlin conference. Last year the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency surveyed all of the EU countries. The results were alarming. Forty to forty-eight percent of the Jewish respondents felt it was not safe for them to remain in their country. We are talking about in Hungary, France, and Belgium. In those three countries, ranging between 40 and 48 percent, they were considering emigrating to Israel because they did not feel safe in their own country.

These fears are not without justification. The Anti-Defamation League surveyed over 100 countries and documented persistent antisemitic prejudice. In the EU elections extremist parties espousing antisemitic activities made remarkable progress. In Hungary and Greece extremist parliamentary parties associated with street militias were successful in elections.

In Hungary the extremist party Jobbik is the second most significant party and had erected a monument to a wartime leader and a self-declared antisemite. We also found laws passed in Europe that make it more difficult for Jews to practice their religion because of restrictions on being able to make kosher foods and making it difficult to wear head coverings.

We have seen, unfortunately, violent acts. In Kansas, in the United States, three people were murdered outside of a JCC. In May, in Brussels, three people were murdered at a Jewish museum. I mention this because even as we visit Europe today, we see signs of antisemitism. It is troubling to all of us.

This is the 10th anniversary of the Berlin conference coming up this year. We will be reconvening the OSCE states in order to evaluate the progress we have made over the last 10 years and additional progress that needs to be made. The Helsinki hearing tomorrow will give us an opportunity to concentrate on how the United States can continue to be a leader on this very important issue.

I wanted to share those comments with my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CARNES NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in a few moments the Senate will be called upon to confirm the nomination of the Honorable Julie Carnes to the 11th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Georgia. I stand, along with my colleague Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS, the senior Senator from Georgia, to commend Ms. Carnes to the entire body as an outstanding appointment.

I thank the President. Senator CHAMBLISS and I recommended Ms. Carnes when the openings took place on the 11th Circuit Court. He, with the advice of Kathy Ruemmler, his able assistant in the judicial part of his advisory board, brought the nomination forward to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I thank PAT LEAHY, the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of that committee, and CHUCK GRASSLEY from Iowa, the ranking member of that committee, for doing a judicious hearing, for giving all sides a chance to be heard, and for commending unanimously, on a voice vote, Julie Carnes to the Senate.

I am not going to talk for a long time, but I want to make a couple of very special points. Julie Carnes is a very special lady. For 22 years she has been a judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and the last 5 years she has been the senior judge. Before that she was on advisory panels for judicial sentencing and many other technical and judicial issues.

Her nomination is the nomination of someone with immense capacity, outstanding integrity, and outstanding ability. She is just the type of person the Presiding Officer and I would want to go to the bench. She is, as we call them in Georgia, a ''double dog.'' She graduated from the University of Georgia with her undergraduate degree and got her juris doctor degree from University of Georgia Law School, whose emblem is a bulldog. We call her a ''Double dog.'' She is an outstanding individual and will be an outstanding judge on the bench.

But there is a point of personal privilege I want to take for a minute. Up in

heaven right now, at a sunset, Charlie Carnes is looking down, about to see his daughter Julie confirmed to the United States 11th Circuit Court.

Charlie Carnes was my mentor in the Georgia General Assembly for 12 years before he was appointed to be a State court judge in Fulton County, the largest county in the State of Georgia. Charlie is looking down on the daughter he is so proud of, and he is so proud that she is going to be confirmed by the Senate to one of the highest court appointments she could possibly achieve.

She is a chip off the old block. She is proof that an apple does not fall far from the tree. Charlie was an outstanding Georgian, an outstanding American, an outstanding member of our State and our bar and our bench. I am so proud to be a part of those who recommended this nominee to the President of the United States.

I yield for my colleague, Senator CHAMBLISS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise with my colleague Senator ISAKSON today in support of Judge Julie Carnes, who has been nominated by the President to serve as a circuit court judge for the 11th Judicial Circuit.

Judge Carnes has been a Federal district court judge for the Northern District of Georgia since 1992. She has been the court's chief judge since 2009. Her time on the district court has prepared her well for going to the 11th Circuit.

However, her preparation started long before she was confirmed to her current seat on the Northern District bench. For starters, being a judge is in her blood. As Senator ISAKSON referenced, her father Charlie Carnes was many things to many people. He was a Navy veteran, a State legislator, and a loving father. But for those of us in the Georgia legal community, from whence I came, we remember him best for his 20 years of service as a Fulton County State court judge, the last 17 years of which he served as chief judge.

After growing up in Atlanta, Judge Julie Carnes attended the University of Georgia where she earned both her bachelor and her law degrees. She then went on to clerk for Judge Lewis Morgan on the old Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Once she finished her clerkship, she served as an assistant U.S. attorney for more than a decade before assuming her position on the Northern District court bench. It is difficult to imagine a more qualified circuit court nominee than Julie Carnes.

The Senate Judiciary Committee appears to share my confidence. She was reported out by voice vote without a single objection to her nomination.

Moreover, this is a seat that needs to be filled, and it needs to be filled quickly. The 11th Circuit is the third busiest circuit in the country. Senator ISAKSON and I have been working very closely with the White House to address this vacancy since it came on 2 years ago.

Julie Carnes is my dear friend. I have known her for many years. She is the consummate trial court judge, receiving accolades from every single sector of the bar that regularly appears before her. Senator ISAKSON and I worked very closely with the President, as he indicated. We also worked with Senator LEAHY and Senator GRASSLEY and Kathy Ruemmler, the White House counsel, whom I particularly commend, someone who was very persistent. She was very professional in all of her dealings with us. It was a real pleasure to work with the White House securing a number of nominees, the first of which to come to this floor for confirmation is Judge Julie Carnes. This has been a long and arduous process, but there is no questioning its results.

I am pleased to recommend this highly qualified nominee. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Hagan	Portman
Blumenthal	Harkin	Pryor
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Boxer	Heller	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rockefeller
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johanns	Scott
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Coats	Kaine	Shelby
Coburn	King	Stabenow
Cochran	Kirk	Tester
Collins	Klobuchar	Thune
Coons	Leahy	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Walsh
Cruz	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCain	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Fischer	Moran	
Flake	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—6

Begich	McCaskill	Rubio
Landrieu	Menendez	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL ANDERSON LAWSON FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Anderson

Lawson, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael Anderson Lawson, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF EUNICE S. REDDICK TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to S. 2569. Is that pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; the motion is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion on that matter at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Harry Reid, John E. Walsh, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Carl Levin, Christopher A. Coons.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very proud to be on the floor this evening with colleagues for whom I have a great deal of respect. We have been working so hard across party lines to call the Nation's attention to the problems we are facing funding our transportation system. We all know there are many things in the world we cannot control and many things that are causing tremendous frustration.

I went home this weekend and my constituents came up to me and said: Senator, we cannot even look at our television sets with the tragedies that are unfolding. They feel, as I do and I know our President does, that the tragedies we are witnessing have been born out of historic animosities, and it is very difficult. If we could wave our wand and make things better in all of these areas, we would do so. We will try, and we will push. We are having a meeting with the Foreign Relations Committee, and we are going to move to speak sanity to the world. There is a crisis we can avert and there is a problem we can solve, and that is fixing the highway trust fund shortfall.

For those who don't know, the highway trust fund was created by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1956. He created the trust fund, and it was a brilliant move because he realized and said that we are developing an Interstate Highway System. He said, this is one country, and we have to be united, a physically united country, so we can move goods and people and make this country work. Since then, we have always had bipartisan support for the trust fund.

Why is it in trouble? The trust fund is in trouble because the Federal tax gas receipts have not kept pace with inflation and the rising cost of keeping highways and bridges safe. Some of our bridges are well over 50 years old. I have lived a while, and I can tell you that when you get a little older, you need a little attention, and the fact is our infrastructure is aging and we have to pay attention to it. This is not the time to walk away from this crisis.

Some may wonder why Senator BOXER is showing a photo of a football stadium. This is actually a picture of one of the Super Bowls. There are 100,000 people in this photograph. Do you know there are 700,000 unemployed construction workers? They would fill seven of these stadiums. The good news is there used to be 2 million unemployed construction workers at the height of the recession. We have gotten it down to 700,000, but we still cannot afford this.

What is the economic impact of the failure to act? It is pretty simple—millions of jobs. Because you have the construction jobs, and then you have all the benefits to communities when we have the workers around there—whether it is our cities, being able to have restaurants that are filled, and all the kinds of things which happen when you put people to work in a community.

Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses depend on the highway trust fund and those businesses and those workers are counting on us. You may say: Is there really a problem? Well, 70,000 of our bridges are structurally deficient. Keep these numbers in mind in case you are asked about it at a party—70,000 bridges are deficient and 700,000 construction workers are unemployed and 50 percent of our highways are in less than good condition.

Is this a frivolous issue we are talking about here? The 2012 Urban Mobility Report from Texas A&M said the financial cost of traffic congestion in 2011 was $121 billion, or about $818 per commuter. Of that total, about $27 billion was wasted time and diesel fuel from trucks moving goods on the system.

A 2013 survey by the National Association of Manufacturers says 65 percent answered that our infrastructure is insufficient.

I will tell you some of the ideas to fix it. I am not just out here saying words. I have ideas on how to fix it. One of the

ideas was put forth by Senators MURPHY and CORKER. We will hear from Senator CORKER in a moment.

One of their suggestions was to modify the gas tax to meet current needs, and that is pretty straightforward. We have been doing this forever. It is very simple and supported by the Chamber of Commerce and supported by just about everybody.

There is another way to do it that was thought of by the Republican Governor of Virginia. I support this. Let me be clear, I will support all of these measures.

The second suggestion is to replace the existing cents-per-gallon gas tax with a fee on the wholesale price of gasoline from the refinery. I like that because it is a broader way to pay for it.

I drive an electric hybrid, and as a result, I don't fill my car very often. In 2 years we filled it up 4 times. I am not paying my fair share. This would be a more broad-based fee.

The third suggestion is repatriation, which is a very interesting concept, and I know Senator PAUL supports it. It is complicated in terms of the way it scores, but the fact is it would bring in $23 billion over the first couple of years, and it would give a break to some of our businesses.

So many of my colleagues spent so much time on this. I will not go on except to read the names of the supporters of this legislation.

The supporters of the proposal that Senators MURPHY and CORKER have proposed are the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, AAA, the American Trucking Association. This is huge.

Also, we have received letters from so many people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter I received today from Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx and 11 of his predecessors who served 7 Republican and Democratic Presidents—Johnson, Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—printed in the RECORD. They all wrote an open letter saying that we need to pass a long-term transportation bill.

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

[From the U.S. Department of Transportation Office of Public Affairs, July 21, 2014]

OPEN LETTER FROM SECRETARY FOXX AND 11 FORMER DOT SECRETARIES URGING CONGRESS TO ADDRESS LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

(By Ryan Daniels)

WASHINGTON.—As Congress considers legislation to avoid a shortfall of the Highway Trust Fund, Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx and 11 of his predecessors offered the following open letter to Congress. In addition to Secretary Foxx, Secretaries Ray LaHood, Mary Peters, Norman Mineta, Rodney Slater, Frederico Peña, Samuel Skinner, Andrew Card, James Burnley, Elizabeth Dole, William Coleman and Alan Boyd all signed the letter. Their message: Congress' work doesn't end with the bill under consideration. Transportation in America still needs a much larger, longer-term investment. The text of the letter is below:

This week, it appears that Congress will act to stave off the looming insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund The bill, if passed, should extend surface transportation funding until next May.

We are hopeful that Congress appears willing to avert the immediate crisis. But we want to be clear: This bill will not ''fix'' America's transportation system. For that, we need a much larger and longer-term investment. On this, all twelve of us agree.

Taken together, we have led the U.S. Department of Transportation for over 35 years. One of us was there on day one, at its founding. We've served seven presidents, both Republicans and Democrats, including Lyndon Johnson, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama.

Suffice it to say, we've been around the block. We probably helped pave it. So it is with some knowledge and experience that we can write: Never in our nation's history has America's transportation system been on a more unsustainable course.

In recent years, Congress has largely funded transportation in fits and starts. Federal funding bills once sustained our transportation system for up to six years, but over the past five years, Congress has passed 27 short-term measures. Today, we are more than a decade past the last six-year funding measure.

This is no way to run a railroad, fill a pothole, or repair a bridge. In fact, the unpredictability about when, or if, funding will come has caused states to delay or cancel projects altogether.

The result has been an enormous infrastructure deficit—a nationwide backlog of repairing and rebuilding. Right now, there are so many structurally deficient bridges in America that, if you lined them up end-to-end, they'd stretch from Boston to Miami. What's worse, the American people are paying for this inaction in a number of ways.

Bad roads, for example, are costing individual drivers hundreds of dollars a year due to side effects like extra wear-and-tear on their vehicles and time spent in traffic.

Simply put, the United States of America is in a united state of disrepair, a crisis made worse by the fact that, over the next generation, more will be demanded of our transportation system than ever before. By 2050, this country will be home to up to 100 million new people. And we'll have to move 14 billion additional tons of freight, almost twice what we move now.

Without increasing investment in transportation, we won't be able to meet these challenges. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, we need to invest $1.8 trillion by 2020 just to bring our surface transportation infrastructure to an adequate level.

So, what America needs is to break this cycle of governing crisis-to-crisis, only to enact a stopgap measure at the last moment. We need to make a commitment to the American people and the American economy.

There is hope on this front. Some leaders in Washington, including those at the U.S. Department of Transportation, are stepping forward with ideas for paying for our roads, rails, and transit systems for the long-term.

While we—the twelve transportation secretaries—may differ on the details of these proposals, there is one essential goal with which all twelve of us agree: We cannot continue funding our transportation with measures that are short-term and short of the funding we need.

On this, we are of one mind. And Congress should be, too.

Adequately funding our transportation system won't be an easy task for our nation's lawmakers. But that doesn't mean it's impossible. Consensus has been brokered before.

Until recently, Congress understood that, as America grows, so must our investments in transportation. And for more than half a century, they voted for that principle—and increased funding—with broad, bipartisan majorities in both houses.

We believe they can, and should, do so again.

Mrs. BOXER. We did it in the Environment and Public Works Committee. Senator CARPER and I led the charge with Senators VITTER and BARRASSO. We did our job. We were able to come together with Senator SESSIONS, Senator VITTER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator SANDERS—left to right—in our committee. They came together to agree on a 6-year bill.

So what is the problem? It is ridiculous. Unfortunately, the House—and this is not good—decided to kick the can down the road—I know it is a cliche, but it is true—until the end of May. Do you know what it means? It means we will not do anything until then, and it will be right up against the new construction season. Nobody will enter into a long-term contract between now and then. And so we are hoping we can change the way the House and the Finance Committee thought about it, and my colleagues have been leading on this issue.

I am on the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment that would say: Instead of funding this highway bill through next year, get our work done this year. Who is supporting getting it done this year? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, National Association of Manufacturers, Associated General Contractors, American Trucking Associations, International Union of Operating Engineers, and LiUNA.

If anybody knows politics, they know these groups hardly ever agree on a darn thing, and they agree we should act this year.

I am proud of my friend here, for whom I will yield shortly.

I support their efforts wholeheartedly and will do everything I can to ensure we don't just do smoke-and-mirrors. Explain to me when you do the smoke-and-mirrors—taking the pension and controlling how people get coverage through their pensions—how that has anything to do with transportation.

The gas tax? Yes. A tax on oil? Yes.

Let's think about this. Let's step to the plate and do what is right.

I am very proud to be in concert with my friend, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the leader for her comments and her ability to build consensus around the reauthorization as she did in the committee.

This is the fifth time since 2008—I have been here since January of 2007—that we have done a temporary extension. It is an absolute embarrassment. Not only do we not get the benefit of the economic growth that would come from people knowing there is a program in place where they can enter into long-term contracts and they can buy construction equipment, in addition to that, this is a tremendous problem of absolutely being generational theft.

I will get to those comments, and I thank the Senator from Delaware for his leadership and for being here on the floor. I will be fairly brief and will yield the floor for him.

I think if every Senator were asked if they were opposed to using budget gimmicks, they would say yes. I am sure the Presiding Officer would say the same. They say the budget should not be used as an offset to pay for spending. Time and time again, Congress avoids the tough decision and instead throws our kids under the bus so we can tell people back home that the legislation was passed and paid for. I have long been against the disgraceful practice of spending money today and paying for it in the future. It is shameful, it is irresponsible, and it is generational theft. Yet here we are this week looking for a way to pass a bill that would pay for spending that is already happening by using a blatant budget scheme called pension smoothing.

Pension smoothing is one of the worst kinds of budget gimmicks. Not only does it allow Congress to spend money today and pay through savings accrued in the future, but the gimmick actually loses money. Let me say that one more time. The gimmick actually loses money and drives our Nation deeper into debt.

Pension smoothing is Congress cooking the books. It shifts tax revenue that Treasury would collect in the future to the present. It starts losing money when the smoothing ends and continues beyond the 10-year window—combining a highway trust fund bailout that spends 10 years of revenue in 10 months. Let me say that one more time. What we are going to be voting on this week spends 10 years' worth of revenue in 10 months.

I just want to say that my friends, my Republican friends—all of us—had problems when the President was trying to pass this health care bill because he used 6 years' worth of costs and 10 years' worth of revenues, which is orders of magnitude better than what is getting ready to happen in this bill this week—again, 10 months' worth of spending, 10 years' worth of revenues.

Pension smoothing also increases the chances that taxpayers will be on the hook for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation bailout sometime in the future because it weakens the corporate pension system. So here we are weakening our balance sheet and simultaneously weakening the PBGC. The PBGC deficit already exceeds $30 billion. At the expense of taxpayers and workers who rely on pension plans, this budget scheme benefits big businesses while allowing Congress to avoid real spending decisions.

I understand the conventional wisdom is that in the haste to leave town this August, enough Senators will be here to support the House bill with the pension smoothing gimmick included and not even try to do better. That is the conventional wisdom. I also understand that some will try to scare Members into voting for the House bill by claiming the House cannot pass anything except this short-term patch endorsed by the President with $11 billion in gimmicks to extend the highway funding until June. Although 367 House Members voted for this rushed package, it is the responsibility of the Senate to weigh in and offer an alternative.

As I have done in previous years, I will continue to oppose these short-term patches to the highway trust fund that allow Congress to avoid doing its job in passing a long-term, sustainable solution to reform and pay for the program. At the very least we should cut the gimmicks in this bill by $3 billion and do away with pension smoothing.

I rarely use exhibits, but this is the gimmick of all gimmicks. Look at what happens when we use it to pay for a short-term bill: We collect the money during the window that it is counted, and then from then on we are losing money. This is a double loser.

It is amazing that we could even come up with these kinds of schemes to pay for an already insolvent program, and we do it by putting our country further in debt in the future and, candidly, weakening our corporate pension system.

I am pleased there is bipartisan momentum to change this. I hope my colleagues will support the amendment Senators CARPER, BOXER, and I are offering that would reject the budget gimmicks in this bill and force Congress to stop shirking its responsibility so we can work toward passing a long-term transportation bill.

There is going to be a push by some to say that we shouldn't take up anything the rest of this year. I would think every Member of this Congress who realizes we have allowed ourselves to get into the jam we are in would want to show the responsibility of actually dealing with this this year. We have a number of Members who are retiring. Many of them spent a lot of time on issues such as this. I would like to see them have the opportunity to come up with a long-term solution. I would imagine that if we did that, the House would want to support a more fiscally conservative alternative, which is what our amendment achieves.

I hope we will all back our words with actions and reject this irresponsible pay-for once and for all and do something far more responsible.

Before I yield the floor, I want to say I really appreciate Senator CARPER's continual effort as a former Governor to try to do those things that are common sense, that are pragmatic, and that make our country stronger along the way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee leaves, I wish to thank him very much for joining Senator BOXER and me in this Senate to create a dynamic that will enable us to do our job. He shows time and again the courage to keep out of step when everybody else is marching to the wrong tune. So does BARBARA BOXER. She has shown extraordinary leadership in the Environment and Public Works Committee, on which I serve. I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure. She and Senator VITTER and Senator BARRASSO, with a little help from me, were able to guide through committee and report a secure transportation bill—a plan for the transportation for our country, including roads, highways, bridges, transit systems—and report it out of committee without amendment, without a dissenting vote, and bring it to the floor of the Senate.

If it were that easy, we wouldn't all be here tonight. There is other legislation, companion legislation that came out of the commerce committee for, among other things, freight railroads, passenger railroads. They have jurisdiction over aviation as well. The banking committee has jurisdiction over transit systems. So there is a shared responsibility here, and there is a shared responsibility to figure out how to pay for all of this. How do we pay for this?

We are spending somewhere around $17 billion, $18 billion a year for the Federal share for transportation projects. That is roughly about half of what we are spending if we add in State and local monies during the course of the year. We have run out of money. We literally run out of money next month for the Federal Government to do its share.

So what do we do? Well, I will tell my colleagues what we do. We are not going to continue to put it on our credit card, and we are not going to keep

turning to countries such as China and saying: How about loaning us some more money so we can replenish the general fund, which will replenish the transportation trust fund.

Why do we want to be beholden to China? I don't think we want to be in that situation.

What we need to do is summon the courage to do what people sent us to do, and that is to make tough decisions.

Senator CORKER is—I call him a recovering mayor from Chattanooga. I was the Governor for some years in Delaware. We are a bunch of former Governors and mayors here and some county executives, and we bring those experiences with us. When we are in our State or our city or our county and we are trying to plan and fund and permit contracts for roads, highways, and bridges or transit projects, it takes a long time. People are watching and wondering, why do we need a 6-year bill or why do we need predictability and certainty that the money is going to be there for these projects? It is because they take a long time. It is not uncommon to spend years planning a project.

The problem is, as the Senator from Tennessee said, five times we have done stop-and-go. I think it has actually been 11 times in the last 5 years that we have done stop-and-go funding and we haven't provided the certainty and predictability that State and local governments are begging for and that transportation authorities around the country are pleading for. The road contractors and folks who build these systems and transit systems, the folks who work on them, the labor unions—everybody is pleading with us to do our job. And what we have done—the House, God bless them, reported out a bill that was, unfortunately, a straight party-line vote. They reported out a bill that funds the transportation trust fund to allow projects to be built through May 31 of next year.

Some people say: Well, that is fine.

That is not fine. It is not 6 years, and, frankly, Senator BOXER called it kicking the can down the road. We have done that again and again—11 times over the last 5 years. There is a good chance that when we get to next May 31, we will say: Well, it is too hard to make these tough decisions as to how we are going to pay for this stuff, and we will kick the can down the road again, providing more uncertainty, more unpredictability.

It is wasteful. It is inefficient. It is foolish. We look impotent. It is not the way for us to do business.

What Senator CORKER and I and a number of others who are going to be joining us in this cause will call for doing is pretty simple. Instead of providing $11 billion for the transportation trust fund from what I will call a bunch of different sources of revenue—some of them more equal than others but some of them pretty questionable; but in some cases we are stealing revenues over the next 10 years for stuff that has nothing to do with transportation projects and using that money to fund transportation projects for, I don't know, 7, 8, 9, 10 months instead of actually doing what we have done for years—have a user-pay system where those who use our roads, highways, and transit systems pay for them. That is what we ought to be doing. But the problem with what the House has suggested we do is we will never—maybe never—get back to providing the certainty and predictability we need. We continue to drive up costs and say to all of the folks who are ordering us to do our job: Well, we don't have the courage to do it now. Maybe we will have it next year.

I think that will be a huge mistake.

I like to think of our Nation's economy as a car at the bottom of a steep hill, and 5 years ago our Nation's economy was at the bottom of the steep hill. We could have literally dropped off a cliff. Between July 1 and December 31, 2008, we lost 2.5 million jobs. In the first 6 months of 2009 we lost 2.5 million jobs. Literally the week Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were sworn in as President and Vice President, we had 628,000 people file for unemployment insurance. In 1 week 628,000 filed for unemployment insurance. We know that anytime that number is over 400,000 people filing for unemployment insurance in a week, we are losing jobs in the economy. And that number stayed over 600,000 for too long. But it started to drop, and it dropped down to 550,000, then 500,000, eventually 450,000, and then 400,000, and a year or so ago we got under 400,000, and that number now is about 300,000. We are adding jobs.

Some would say: Well, they are not the kinds of jobs we want or need. But some are—a lot of them. Almost any job is better than nothing. And some of these jobs are very good and pay a fair amount of money. Here is where we were.

We were that car at the bottom of a very steep hill 5 years ago and trying to climb up the hill. It was slow going. We kept going. We kept going. We have added jobs; sometimes, some months, 50,000, some months 100,000. Now we are up to over 250,000 new jobs a month. But that car—if you will, we are that car—is climbing that hill. We are making it to the top. We are at the crest of the hill. As we look at it we can say it is downhill now.

As we add more and more jobs every month, we have the option of doing two things: One, we can mash down on the accelerator, kick it into high gear, kick this economy into high gear, where it needs to go or we can start tapping on the brakes—start tapping on the brakes, slow things down, introduce uncertainty, lack of predictability. What we offer in our amendment, Senator CORKER and Senator BOXER and myself and others, is a better likelihood that we are going to be pushing down on the accelerator next year.

We are not going to just put hundreds of thousands of people to work across our country building roads, highways, bridges and transit centers, but we are actually going to make our transportation system more efficient, which in the long haul is most important, to move product, whether it is from one coast to the other, north to south or just around our States. That is the key. How do we do this in a more efficient way? How do we make our economy work better? So this works at couple of different levels.

If we say we are going to kick the can down the road into next year and we will fund these programs until May 31, I do not know what is going to give us the courage next May 31 to fund a 6-year transportation program. As Senator CORKER said, we have seven or eight people who are leaving at the end of this year. They are not running for reelection. They are retiring. They want to leave, saying: We did this on our watch. It was our job to get this done and we did. That is exactly why people send us in the first place, to make those kinds of decisions.

This is not something Democrats can do by ourselves. This is not something Republicans can do by themselves. What I am very proud of, in both committees, is that the Democrats and Republicans voted for it—the Finance Committee voted for a similar proposal, not quite a majority but a very respectable showing. We have been working and gaining support literally by the day for what we are going to do.

Senator BOXER ran through some of the folks, some of the organizations that are supporting this, a lot of State and local governments, State departments of transportation, folks who build roads, folks who run the road-building companies, folks who do the actual labor for these projects, the American Trucking Associations, AAA, you name it. There is a huge bunch of people out there who want us to do our job. They do not want us to wait until some other time. They want us to do it now. We can do that.

We are not here tonight to say this is how we are going to fund a 6-year plan. There are a lot of good ideas, and Senator BOXER ran through some of those. The idea is to create a situation where we are going to be compelled and we will actually figure out, of all those options—and there may be some other ones—how do we get this done. The idea that we continue to borrow money, to borrow money over the next 10 years—revenue streams have nothing to do with transportation, nothing to do with transportation. If we pretend that is going to fund our transportation budget for 5 or 6 months, that is

just laughing stock. We look so foolish doing that. It is also highly inefficient, as I said.

I wish I could remember exactly what Mark Twain once said—maybe the Presiding Officer can help me on this later—but he once said something like this: Do the right thing. You will please your friends and amaze your enemies—something along those lines. For the record we will correct it. But please your friends and amaze or confound your enemies. Why do we not try that for a change. That would be a great way to finish this year.

I again thank Senator BOXER. I thank Senator CORKER for joining me in what I think is a noble mission. I never take anything for granted, but I think if we work it hard enough, we may surprise some people in a good way.

I see my friend from Texas—whose mother was born in Wilmington, DE, 1 of 17 children—is rising for recognition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

VENEZUELA

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the ongoing crisis in Venezuela. With so many crises happening around the globe these days, political turmoil in Venezuela has slipped from the headlines and sometimes seems easy to forget. The situation commands our attention. In Venezuela the protests against oppression go on, with 6,369 recorded rallies this year, the most in over a decade.

When Hugo Chavez's death was confirmed 15 months ago, there were hopes that his hand-picked successor Nicolas Maduro would prove more moderate and friendly to the United States. These hopes quickly proved groundless, as Maduro doubled down on his predecessor's disastrous socialist economic policies and his close partnership with Castro's Cuba, not to mention Khamenei's Iran.

Earlier this year, as Venezuela endured shortages of basic goods from baby formula to caskets, from beginning of life to end and everything in between, while an increasingly authoritarian regime trampled their constitutional rights, the people finally took to the streets to protest Maduro's corrupt and unjust rule. Demanding freedom, they marched peaceably while Maduro's Cuban-trained militia tried to incite violence.

Following the wide-ranging protests of February 12, 2014, Maduro's regime claimed that opposition leaders were personally responsible for the violence that Maduro's regime had deliberately provoked. Six days later, the leader of the Voluntad Popular Party Leopoldo Lopez demonstrated his respect for rule of law when he voluntarily surrendered to the authorities.

He could have stayed in hiding, he could have gone into exile, but he believes it is only through taking action that change can come to Venezuela. Here is Mr. Lopez. As he surrendered to the authorities to be thrown in prison, hundreds of thousands of supporters accompanied him to the police van. Mr. Lopez has been held in the Ramo Verde military prison ever since. In early June a judge ordered him held for trial, which will begin this week.

His wife Lilian Tintori is in Washington today to draw attention to his case. She spoke powerfully at the National Press Club about how she and her children have missed their dad, have missed Leopoldo while he has been in prison, but they know their daddy is doing what he must to fight for the men and women of Venezuela.

Maduro's so-called evidence against Mr. Lopez includes the claim that he was somehow sending secret subliminal messages inciting violence, when he in fact explicitly called on his followers to protest peacefully. Let me repeat that. Mr. Lopez explicitly asked his followers to protest peacefully against the oppressive regime of Maduro. What does Maduro say? That apparently Leopoldo has the power to subliminally suggest violence when his words say, ''Don't engage in violence.''

This would be comical and absurd were it not the basis for an indictment that Maduro is seeking to lock Leopoldo up for 10 years in prison for daring to speak out against oppression. It is important to understand the trial scheduled this week is no trial in the ordinary term. There will be no jury. There will be no evidence for the defense—not for lack of trying. Mr. Lopez is denied any opportunity to refute these bogus charges about his supposed subliminal powers because Mr. Lopez's defense team asked to submit the testimony of 60 witnesses.

The trial court denied all 60, said no witnesses will be allowed for the defense. Mr. Lopez's team asked to submit 13 videos. The trial court denied all 13. Mr. Lopez's defense team asked to submit the testimony of 12 experts. The trial court denied all 12. So in this so-called trial, which is nothing but a sham, the defense will have no evidence because the trial court has already decided they will allow no evidence in support of someone speaking for freedom, someone speaking for the people. The evidence will be kept out of this show trial.

That is not an unusual path. Dictators, totalitarian regimes from Stalin to Castro throughout the ages have engaged in the same show trials that they use to brutally silence any who would dare to speak out against them. The undeniable fact is that Nicolas Maduro has no interest in justice in this case or in the nation of Venezuela.

The official charges are public incitement, property damage, and criminal conspiracy, but Mr. Lopez's real crime is quite simply the exercise of his rights provided by article 57 of the Constitution of Venezuela, which states:

> Everyone has the right to express freely his or her thoughts, ideas or opinions orally, in writing or by any other form of expression, and to use for such purpose any means of communication and diffusion, and no censorship shall be established.

That is what the Constitution of Venezuela says, but Nicolas Maduro says Leopoldo Lopez goes to prison and wants him to stay there for 10 years because he spoke out and spoke the truth. Mr. Lopez freely expressed his criticism of Maduro's failed leadership, and for that he has been unceremoniously thrown in jail and faces a sham trial that could rob his 4-year-old daughter and his 1-year-old son of having a daddy for the next 10 years.

As his wife Lilian wrote today in the Washington Post:

> No one should doubt why Leopoldo is in prison: Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro is afraid of him, and he has great reason to be. Chavez did not deliver and Maduro has not delivered on their promises, and they have systematically dismantled our fundamental freedoms—free speech, freedom of association, freedom of the press and freedom to vote for candidates of our choosing.

The most basic foundational human rights, and for advocating for those Leopoldo Lopez is in prison.

Every American should take an interest in Mr. Lopez's fate. Not only is he a good friend to our country, having attended both Kenyon College and Harvard, he also advocates the sort of political and economic reforms that would return Venezuela to its historic place as a close partner to the United States, a development that would be of great advantage in our hemisphere.

Mr. Lopez's case also reminds us of the precious freedoms we enjoy in the United States that can all too quickly be taken away.

Article 57 should have particular resonance for us as our right to free speech is enshrined in the First Amendment of our Constitution:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

There is a reason the Framers chose this subject for the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights, because upon these rights all of our liberties are built. No freedom is more vital to true democracy than the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience and the freedom to speak as we choose without government censors, for when these freedoms are restricted citizens lose their ability to express their opposition to the government.

As Venezuela shows us, this process can take place slowly, over time, but the eventual result is that a citizen

who speaks out is silenced and punished.

I have to say Leopoldo Lopez's situation is one that has resonance in my family. Fifty-seven years ago my father was in a prison in another Latin American country, the country of Cuba. My dad was 17 when he was imprisoned and tortured in a Cuban jail. Leopoldo is 43, the very same age I am today.

Leopoldo Lopez's case is, unfortunately, not an isolated case in Maduro's Venezuela. Forty-six people have been killed, thousands have been detained, and more than 100 are still in prison.

His fellow opposition leader, Maria Corina Machado, recently discovered that she too had been charged last month with incitement to violence related to the February protests. She had never been informed there was a criminal case against her and now she faces potentially 6 years in prison as well.

Maduro's actions are those of a dictator who knows he is deeply unpopular, that his policies are a dismal failure, and that to survive he has to silence the voices of those who oppose him and offer a viable alternative, who oppose him and offer freedom.

The people of Venezuela showed in February that they are ready for a change from the long slog into totalitarian socialism that was begun by Chavez and is being continued by Maduro. Now Maduro is trying to use a cloud of censorship to isolate Venezuelans from each other and from the rest of the world. We should not look the other way.

Again, from Lillian's Washington Post op-ed today:

> We need to send a message to the government that it cannot trample on the rights of its people with impunity. Accordingly, I call on President Maduro to release my husband and the more than 100 political prisoners being held in Venezuela. But my actions alone are not enough. My husband needs the support of all countries that stand for freedom.

In this, the United States should lead the way. America should speak with a clarion voice: Free Leopoldo Lopez. As the hashtag #SOSVenezuela has rocketed around the globe, it shows the power of speaking the truth: Free Leopoldo Lopez.

The United States should do everything it can to shine the bright light of truth and freedom on this repression by highlighting Leopoldo Lopez's case.

President Obama should stand and lead, demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

Secretary Kerry should stand and lead, demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

Every Member of this body should join in bipartisan unison demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

We should not and cannot let this unjust persecution pass unnoticed but, rather, we should help the people of Venezuela choose a different path, a path of freedom, a path of prosperity, and a path of friendship that will return this one-time enemy, the nation of Venezuela, to its traditional role of America's partner and friend. All of us should join in demanding and working for the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN EASTERN UKRAINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to address the horrific series of events which have occurred in Eastern Ukraine within the last week. The shooting down of a civilian Malaysian airliner and the killing of 298 innocent people is an unspeakable tragedy and one that, frankly, speaks out for us to address in terms of the responsibility.

In this situation in Eastern Ukraine there are armed thugs who are in control of the territory where this plane was shot down. They have been armed, financed, and inspired by Vladimir Putin and the Russians. That is the grim reality. All signs point to the fact that Putin, the Russians, and their supporters in Eastern Ukraine are responsible for this terrible tragedy—the loss of 298 lives.

I was in Ukraine a few weeks ago with Senator MCCAIN and others, and it was at a time when Crimea was about to fall. It was clear then the Ukrainians did not have the capacity to stop this effort by Putin to take over territory—and he did. Then that wasn't enough. He had to reach into Eastern Ukraine for even more territory, stirring up problems, creating havoc, and, sadly, bloodshed in the process.

It is bad enough the Ukrainian citizens themselves were victims, but now 298 innocent people on a civilian airliner were shot down over this territory. As I have said, the evidence points directly to Moscow and its complicity in this horrible event.

This is a photo which has been distributed showing pro-Russian separatists holding up some of the personal effects of the victims of the Malaysian airline flight that was shot down. What is happening there since the crash is also nothing short of horrific.

At this moment in time in virtually any other place in the world, save perhaps North Korea, international inspectors would be on the scene determining the cause of that plane's crash and, of equal or even greater importance, making certain the recovery effort of the victims of this crash was done by the standards of civilized nations. But the Eastern Ukrainian separatists, inspired by Putin and Moscow, have refused to allow these people in.

What we are hearing in reports is horrible. The corpses of these victims are being taken and placed in refrigerator cars on trains. Imagine the anguish of the families associated with those victims as they hear this—a loved one shot out of the sky in a civilian airliner apparently because of some folly by Eastern Ukrainian, Russian-inspired thugs and now they cannot even recover the remains of the people they love—let alone a serious objective investigation about the cause of that crash.

It is hard to imagine that Vladimir Putin could let it reach this point and harder still to imagine that he doesn't own up to his responsibility. It is horrifying that we have reached this point where this terribly tragic scene goes from bad to worse as Putin's thugs go through the personal effects of the people who were shot down.

There is a list of those who were lost. I know the Presiding Officer from the State of Indiana has a particular attachment to one of the victims—this one—Karlijn Keijzer, a student at Indiana University. This was well publicized in the Midwest—that we lost this beautiful woman, a victim of this tragic crash.

There were more—297 more—who died. They included Quinn Lucas Schansman, a 19-year-old U.S.-Dutch citizen who was born in the United States but whose family moved back to the Netherlands when he was young. He was on his way to visit his grandfather in Indonesia.

This is Joep Lange, a renowned Dutch AIDS researcher traveling with his partner to the International AIDS conference in Australia.

I mentioned Karlijn Keijzer, doctoral student at Indiana University in Bloomington. She was going on vacation with her boyfriend when this plane was shot down.

Sister Philomene Tiernan was a 77-year-old Roman Catholic nun who was returning to her school in Australia where she had taught thousands of students over her 30-year vocation.

Andrei Anghel, 24, was a Canadian medical student going on vacation with his girlfriend.

Sri Siti Amirah, an 83-year-old, was step-grandmother of Malaysia's prime minister. She was heading to Indonesia to celebrate the end of Ramadan.

Shazana Salleh, 31 years old, was a flight attendant on the plane. Her father told the media this was her dream, to be a flight attendant.

And this heartbreaking photo is of Shuba Jaya, 38 years old, Paul Goes, and their 1-year-old daughter Kaela. Shuba was a Malaysian actress, her husband a Dutch businessman. They were returning to Malaysia from Holland after showing their daughter to her husband's parents.

These victims of Mr. Putin's recklessness and their grieving families deserve more than the tragic and revolting actions occurring now in Eastern

Ukraine. The Russian people—not the leadership but the people of Russia—deserve better.

The Russian people have a proud history of accomplishment in so many different fields. But President Putin has created a climate of fear in his country, where those who dissent to his policies will be punished. His use of Soviet-style propaganda and intimidation, shutting down of independent media and voices, and his strong-arming of other peaceful nations are, sadly, an insult to the great achievements and legacy of the Russian people.

I hope Mr. Putin still sees the importance of being a responsible world leader. There is little evidence of it in recent weeks. He can start almost immediately by calling off his shameful proxies who are so disrespecting the victims and their families at this crash site—the site for which he is most certainly responsible.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the victims.

To our Dutch friends who suffered such an overwhelming loss of life in this crash, I express my deepest condolences. And to the people of Ukraine, the Baltics, Poland, and everywhere else facing Russian bullying, we stand with you in your desire for democracy and peaceful relations with the West and Russia.

Earlier this evening we considered three nominations and two passed by voice vote. One of those passed by voice vote was Michael Lawson of California for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The reason I bring that to the attention of the Senate is he was nominated last September and reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee in May. Mr. Lawson has been sitting on the calendar. There was no objection to him. No one had any objection to him, but he was sitting on the calendar because of objection on the Republican side of the aisle. Why was his name called today? Because of this tragedy—because this tragedy pointed out the fact that the United States would not have its representative before this important organization which investigates these airline crashes.

It has reached a point where almost 30 Ambassadors to organizations and nations are being held up on the floor of the Senate over and over until something happens—an upheaval, a tragedy—and then they are brought for a vote.

The United States of America is a better nation than that. We shouldn't be holding up in the Senate these fine men and women who are willing to serve our Nation. I urge my colleagues to reconsider this approach. Let us release these ambassadorial appointments by President Obama. For those that are controversial, so be it; let's hold them. But the vast majority of these are not controversial. Let's give them a chance to serve our Nation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INNOVATIVE MOVIEMAKING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the past few years, Marcelle and I have come to know Christopher Nolan and his wife Emma Thomas, both of whom are extraordinarily talented and have made breakthrough movies.

One of the things that we have enjoyed talking about with both of them is the concept of what movies can be as real entertainment, and that movie theaters provide an audience an experience they would not have otherwise. Recently, Chris wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal explaining just how movie theaters will survive. That was music to my ears, as I too want them to survive. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHRISTOPHER NOLAN: FILMS OF THE FUTURE WILL STILL DRAW PEOPLE TO THEATERS

When Movies Can Look or Sound Like Anything, Says the 'Dark Knight' Director, Extraordinary Work Will Emerge.

In the '90s, newly accessible video technology gave adventurous filmmakers (such as Lars von Trier and his colleagues in the filmmaking movement Dogme 95) an unprecedented wedge for questioning the form of motion pictures. The resulting 20-year process of radical technical and aesthetic change has now been co-opted by the very establishment it sought to challenge.

Hungry for savings, studios are ditching film prints (under $600 each), while already bridling at the mere $80 per screen for digital drives. They want satellite distribution up and running within 10 years. Quentin Tarantino's recent observation that digital projection is the ''death of cinema'' identifies this fork in the road: For a century, movies have been defined by the physical medium (even Dogme 95 insisted on 35mm film as the presentation format).

Savings will be trivial. The real prize the corporations see is the flexibility of a nonphysical medium.

MOVIES AS CONTENT

As streams of data, movies would be thrown in with other endeavors under the reductive term ''content,'' jargon that pretends to elevate the creative, but actually trivializes differences of form that have been important to creators and audiences alike. ''Content'' can be ported across phones, watches, gas-station pumps or any other screen, and the idea would be that movie theaters should acknowledge their place as just another of these ''platforms,'' albeit with bigger screens and cupholders.

This is a future in which the theater becomes what Tarantino pinpointed as ''television in public.'' The channel-changing part is key. The distributor or theater owner (depending on the vital question of who controls the remote) would be able to change the content being played, instantly. A movie's Friday matinees would determine whether it even gets an evening screening, or whether the projector switches back to last week's blockbuster. This process could even be automated based on ticket sales in the interests of ''fairness.''

Instant reactivity always favors the familiar. New approaches need time to gather support from audiences. Smaller, more unusual films would be shut out. Innovation would shift entirely to home-based entertainment, with the remaining theaters serving exclusively as gathering places for fan-based or branded-event titles.

This bleak future is the direction the industry is pointed in, but even if it arrives it will not last. Once movies can no longer be defined by technology, you unmask powerful fundamentals—the timelessness, the otherworldliness, the shared experience of these narratives. We moan about intrusive moviegoers, but most of us feel a pang of disappointment when we find ourselves in an empty theater.

The audience experience is distinct from home entertainment, but not so much that people seek it out for its own sake. The experience must distinguish itself in other ways. And it will. The public will lay down their money to those studios, theaters and filmmakers who value the theatrical experience and create a new distinction from home entertainment that will enthrall—just as movies fought back with widescreen and multitrack sound when television first nipped at its heels.

These developments will require innovation, experimentation and expense, not cost-cutting exercises disguised as digital ''upgrades'' or gimmickry aimed at justifying variable ticket pricing. The theatrical window is to the movie business what live concerts are to the music business—and no one goes to a concert to be played an MP3 on a bare stage.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

The theaters of the future will be bigger and more beautiful than ever before. They will employ expensive presentation formats that cannot be accessed or reproduced in the home (such as, ironically, film prints). And they will still enjoy exclusivity, as studios relearn the tremendous economic value of the staggered release of their products.

The projects that most obviously lend themselves to such distinctions are spectacles. But if history is any guide, all genres, all budgets will follow. Because the cinema of the future will depend not just on grander presentation, but on the emergence of filmmakers inventive enough to command the focused attention of a crowd for hours.

These new voices will emerge just as we despair that there is nothing left to be discovered. As in the early '90s, when years of bad multiplexing had soured the public on movies, and a young director named Quentin Tarantino ripped through theaters with a profound sense of cinema's past and an instinct for reclaiming cinema's rightful place at the head of popular culture.

Never before has a system so willingly embraced the radical teardown of its own formal standards. But no standards means no rules. Whether photochemical or video-

based, a film can now look or sound like anything.

It's unthinkable that extraordinary new work won't emerge from such an open structure. That's the part I can't wait for.

REMEMBERING CHARLEY GREENE DIXON, JR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am saddened to report to my Senate colleagues the passing of a fellow Kentuckian, Mr. Charley Greene Dixon, Jr., who lost his battle with cancer on June 23 of this year. Charley was a consummate public servant who spent his life working to better his community. Knox County, and the entirety of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is poorer for his loss.

The overriding ambition in Charley's life was to help others. His wife Marcia Dixon said, ''He believed that if he could make one life better he was a success.'' This is a bar for success that Charley cleared time and time again.

Born in Barbourville on November 19, 1964, Charley lived in Kentucky his whole life, mostly in his hometown in Knox County. He attended Union College in Barbourville and earned his juris doctorate from Northern Kentucky's Salmon P. Chase College of Law.

Charley started his career working as the Barbourville city attorney, later becoming the Knox County school board and Barbourville city school board attorney.

His most recent position was of Knox County attorney, one that he had held since 2003. In that capacity he played a leading role in creating juvenile, family and adult drug courts in Knox County. Through these courts, Charley helped countless individuals reclaim their lives from the clutches of drug addiction.

Outside of his official duties, Charley continued to work tirelessly to better Knox County. He chaired the Knox County UNITE Coalition an organization that combated illicit drug use through education, law enforcement, and rehabilitation. As chairman he spearheaded events, such as ''Hooked on Fishing Not on Drugs,'' where kids and their families could enjoy themselves in a drug-free environment.

For his selfless work in the community, Charley was named the 2013 Man of the Year by the Knox County Chamber of Commerce a fitting award for a man who helped so many.

Charley is survived by his wife Marcia, his daughter Callie Ann, and his son Charleston Arthur. Knox County was undoubtedly bettered by his life's work, and he will be sorely missed by all who loved and knew him.

I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring the life of Charley Greene Dixon, Jr.

The Mountain Advocate recently published an article chronicling Dixon's life. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Mountain Advocate, June 26, 2014]

''HOMETOWN HERO'' LOSES BATTLE WITH CANCER

(By Melissa Newman)

John Ray Gray sat quietly in the waiting area at the Knox County Attorney's Office Monday morning. He wasn't there because he needed help—at least not this time.

A confessed recovered drug addict, Gray, now 27, first met former Knox County Attorney Charley Greene Dixon six years ago in drug court.

Gray said without Dixon and the drug court program, he'd ''probably be dead.''

''He was good to me,'' Gray's voice quivered as he spoke. ''He went beyond his job to help me.''

Gray came to ''check on'' staff members and offer tight hugs, his tears contagious and shared among the group. His story is only one of the many dozen that include some selfless act or shattered belief that work should end at 5 p.m. Dixon, as most have said, was different.

Dixon, who helped hundreds, like Gray, win battles against drugs, poverty, and domestic violence, lost his own battle to colon cancer early Monday morning.

The former county attorney first learned he was ill while on vacation in May 2013. Not long after, on June 30, he resigned his position to then assistant county attorney Gilbert Holland, to focus on getting better. The community he had served so valiantly came together in prayer vigils around the courthouse square, hoping for a miracle.

''The loss will be felt by this community for a long time,'' Holland said. ''Charley dedicated his life to bettering the lives of the people of Knox County. His efforts were never contained by the traditional role of his office. He invented ways to reach out to the community.''

Along with Dixon's successful drug court program that has graduated thousands, he was well-known for a long list of community-minded projects—many of which he initiated. Reaching youth was at the forefront of his vision for a successful Knox County—Hooked on Fishing Not on Drugs, Faith-Based Basketball Cheerleading, Anti-Drug Abuse Poster Contest, a Car/Bike Show for Youth, and a Prevention Camp.

A new youth-related program will take place next fall one of the last requests Dixon made of long-time friend and colleague Claudia Greenwood, who worked with Dixon on grants and public relations.

''He's already told me that next year he would like for us to do a pumpkin patch event and have a pumpkin decorating contest and display the pumpkins in the banks,'' Greenwood said. ''He was always so creative, coming up with things to do with the kids and the community,'' Greenwood said. ''He thought of that while he was sick and wanted to make sure he told us about it.''

Finding time to grieve in a busy office hasn't been easy for Dixon's staff. The phone calls keep coming—clients and the public are priority as usual. Among the foot traffic, phone calls, and full email boxes, ''it hits'' them that Dixon's guidance is gone. And though the quiet moments are few, that's when the staff members feel the waves of emotion and loss wash over them.

''Yesterday, when the media wanted statements, it hit me hard,'' Greenwood said. ''My first thought was that I needed to ask Charley what to say.''

Dixon, expected to do great things for his community, succeeded in filling the large shoes of his grandfather John Dixon who served as Knox County attorney for several decades. When elected, the younger Dixon brought his grandfather's legacy and one of his employees into office with him.

''I've worked for Charley this October will be 19 years,'' Sherry Vaughn said. ''I worked for his grandfather five and a half years before that until he passed away. I went to school with Charley; he's been just like a brother to me.''

''He loved kids,'' Vaughn said. ''He did everything he could for the children in Knox County. His own children were his whole world. Words can't describe how we feel about the situation. He has struggled for a year and now he's a lot better off. He's up there now looking down at us.''

Dixon's wife, Marcia, like her husband, is active in community service. Often, the couple worked together and at times involved the entire family—the children, Callie Ann and Charleston Arthur, included. The late Dixon's wife knows her community, their hometown, is better off for having had her husband as a leader.

''Charley was very dedicated not only to our family but to our Knox County community as well,'' Marcia Dixon said. ''His goal was to help others, and he believed that if he could make one life better he was a success. I feel blessed to have shared many joyful years with him and want everyone to be able to say as an old Hebrew proverb says, ''Say not in grief: He is no more,' but live in thankfulness that he was.''

Knox County's Chamber of Commerce members named Dixon Knox County's Man of the Year last fall and tagged him a ''hometown hero.''

Dixon's introduction as Man of the Year heralded a long list of community-minded projects that he participated in, implemented, or, in some cases, created.

Dixon served as the chair of the Knox County UNITE (Unlawful Narcotics Investigation, Treatment, and Education) Coalition since May 2005. The former county attorney was also instrumental in securing grant funding through the Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky; a grant from PRIDE; a Coal Severance Grant; a Fatherhood Grant and a EUDL Grant to fund programs for young people that promoted prevention for underage drinking.

Dixon made sure his office staff actively participated in Back to School Expos, PRIDE Pick-Up, Relay for Life, the Child Identification Program, the Knox County Reading Celebration, the local August Arts Adventure, and the annual Redbud festival.

Dixon was an active military advocate—photos of local service men and women lined the hallways leading to his office. He called it ''Faces of Freedom.''

Funeral services for Dixon are at Barbourville First Baptist Church, Friday, June 27 at 2 p.m. Burial will follow in the Barbourville Cemetery.

Visitation is at Barbourville First Baptist Church, Thursday from 5 to 9 p.m. and Friday after 10 a.m. until the funeral hour at 2 p.m. Hopper Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

Dixon's family requests contributions be made to the Knox County Chapter of the American Cancer Society in loving memory of Charley Greene Dixon, Jr.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SHARPE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to honor the long and distinguished career of Jim Sharpe. Now retired, Mr. Sharpe opened his first business in Somerset, KY, in 1947. Since that time he has opened several more, pioneered the houseboat business, and has become an irreplaceable fixture in his community.

Lake Cumberland is known by many as the ''houseboat capital of the world''—a designation that is owed in no small part to Jim Sharpe. Jim was one of the first to pioneer the industry—building his first houseboat in 1953. Much has changed since he sold that first 10-by-24-foot steel boat, and Jim has been there for it all, often leading the way. Houseboats are now much bigger—up to 20 by 100 feet—and are made of aluminum and have onboard heating and cooling systems. One thing that never changed, though, is Jim's passion for building his customer's dream boat.

Despite being one of the founding fathers of the industry, houseboats do not constitute the totality of his life's work. Jim has owned and operated several other businesses in Somerset in addition to Somerset Marine. In 1966, he developed Food Fair groceries, which he grew into a chain of 13 stores. Two year later, he opened up Somerset's first fried chicken restaurant, Kettle Fried Chicken, and in 1974 he bought a car dealership, Pulaski Motor Company.

Although he's now retired, Jim still has plenty to keep him busy. Jim has four children and nine grandchildren, and he has also found time to pick up golf and travel the country. Jim's family is all the stronger for the influence of Jim's dear departed wife, Mary Jo, who left us in 2008. Married in 1950, they were one of the most thriving and generous entrepreneurial couples that Kentucky has ever seen, with distinguished careers in the grocery and food retail business, automobile dealerships, marinas, restaurants, and most notably the houseboat industry which I have already mentioned.

Jim Sharpe's drive and determination in his business, his commitment to his community, and his love of his family can serve as an example to us all. Jim is also a proud veteran of the U.S. Navy, and we are grateful for his service. I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring this upstanding and patriotic Kentucky citizen and veteran.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE BLACKWOOD

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Bruce Blackwood, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Bruce is a graduate of Southern Methodist University, having majored in history. Bruce is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Bruce for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEX CARAMES

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Alex Carames, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Alex is a rising senior at Columbia University in New York, NY. Currently, Alex is majoring in economics and political science. Alex is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alex for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BLAKE MURPHY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Blake Murphy, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Blake is a student at the University of Florida. Currently, Blake is majoring in finance. Blake is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Blake for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALYSSA NIEVES

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Alyssa Nieves, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Alyssa is a rising senior at the University of Florida in Gainesville, FL. Currently, Alyssa is majoring in public relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alyssa for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AUSTIN SCHNELL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Austin Schnell, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Austin is a junior at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX. Currently, Austin is majoring in economics, public policy, and political science. Austin is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Austin for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW SHADID

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Andrew Shadid, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Andrew is a junior at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL. Currently, he is majoring in interdisciplinary studies. Andrew is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Andrew for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

CONGRATULATING MOOREMART

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate MooreMart, a New Hampshire nonprofit organization that sends care packages to servicemembers and children overseas, as it celebrates its 10th anniversary.

MooreMart was born from Moore family members Paul, Carole, and Beverly's desire to send supplies to Brian Moore and his fellow soldiers stationed in Iraq. In the early years of their effort, they strove to send 10 packages a month to U.S. troops overseas. Today, MooreMart ships more than 1,000 packages every 10 weeks. Its mission has grown over the years, and now MooreMart also sends school supplies, toys, and clothing to local children in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Over the last decade, MooreMart has built and shipped more than 61,000 care packages and nearly 8 tons of relief supplies to troops in conflict zones, including to every Armed Forces unit deployed from New Hampshire. Each package includes toiletries, food items like s'mores and Girl Scout cookies difficult to find overseas, and letters and cards from schoolchildren and volunteers. All of the packages are assembled by volunteers and individually addressed to a servicemember.

MooreMart has successfully reached out to organizations both public and private, involving State and local agencies, faith communities, and businesses in its work. More than 11,000 volunteers have helped build the care packages, among them veterans, families of active servicemembers, and families who have lost loved ones in service to our country.

MooreMart represents the very best of New Hampshire, bringing comfort to those who selflessly defend our Nation. I am proud to congratulate this organization and the volunteers who carry out its mission on their 10th anniversary.●

HONORING VANCE HOME GUN

● Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to honor Vance Home Gun, an emerging leader in Montana and member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

As I travel around Indian Country in Montana, I see a lot of challenges that still need to be addressed, but I also see a lot of cause for hope. Vance Home Gun embodies that hope.

Vance was first introduced to a Salish language camp at the age of 11. Inspired by elders and other community members, Vance resolved himself to become a fluent Salish speaker and to encourage his peers to get involved in the preservation of the Salish language.

Vance has taken a leadership role within his tribe to revitalize Native languages through his organization called Yoyoot Skwkwimlt, or Strong Young People, that utilizes peer-to-peer methods to teach language and culture.

I also want to congratulate Vance on receiving a scholarship to attend the University of Oregon this coming fall. On behalf of all Montanans, I wish him luck and look forward to his return home when he finishes his studies to continue making a difference for Montana and his tribe.

Since joining the Senate 5 months ago, I have cosponsored two important pieces of legislation that promote and preserve Native languages for generations to come.

I know that support for comprehensive and culturally-relevant language programs will set our Native children on a path for success in school and life and allows them to reach their full potential.

Vance encapsulated the urgency behind Native language preservation when he stated, ''Time is of the essence, and our young Native people are the key to revitalizing our language. Helping them is revitalizing our identity.''

It will take leaders like Vance to implement these vital language programs for the benefit of cultural preservation and revitalization.

I stand with Vance to help preserve the Native languages and traditions for generations to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6502. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coco alkyl dimethyl amines; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9911–54–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6503. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Cooperative Threat Reduction Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6504. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6505. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6506. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2013 management report and statement on the system of internal controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6507. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Residential and Commercial Water Heaters'' (RIN1904–AC53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6508. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reliability Standard for Geomagnetic Disturbance Operations'' (RIN1902–AE80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6509. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Control of Visible Emissions, Record Keeping and Monitoring'' (A–1–FRL–9910–12–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6510. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9913–62–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6511. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9913–59–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6512. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors'' (NRC–2014–0000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6513. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph E. Martz, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6514. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6515. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the establishment of the danger pay allowance for Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6516. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Company's Balance Sheet as of December 31, 2013; to the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6517. A communication from the Director of External Affairs, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Aged Beneficiary Designation Forms'' (5 CFR Part 1651) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6518. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6519. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; United States and Canadian Military Exercise Jump Training, Lake Erie, Hamburg, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0260)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6520. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Meridian Health Fireworks, Navesink River, Rumson, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0353)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6521. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Charleston Zone, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0471)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6522. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Independence Day Celebration Fireworks, Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6523. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Zone Buffalo'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0081)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6524. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Freeport Chamber of Commerce Fireworks Display, South Oyster Bay; Freeport, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0240)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6525. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone: San Francisco Independence Day Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0283)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6526. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0485)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6527. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; City of Menominee Fireworks; Green Bay, Menominee, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6528. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Atlantic Ocean; Ocean City, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6529. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0160)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6530. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Delaware River; Chester, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0511)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6531. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Summer Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0476)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6532. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0522)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6533. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bullhead City River Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0359)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6534. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Water Ski Show, Fox River, Green Bay, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0536)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6535. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0377)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6536. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6537. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Miles 255.0 to 256.5, Florence, AL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0753)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6538. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Mile 256.0 to 257.5, Florence, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0277)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6539. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Arrival Exception'' ((RIN1625–AC12) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0797)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6540. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9'' (RIN0648–XD329) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6541. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United

States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 25'' (RIN0648–BE07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6542. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Signal Systems Reporting Requirements'' (RIN2130–AC44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6543. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High-Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations'' (RIN2130–AC09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6544. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (RRR)'' (RIN2137–AE38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–312. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the Congress of the United States to support legislation reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 37

Whereas, The Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im) is the official export credit agency of the United States and exists for the purposes of financing and insuring foreign purchases of United States goods for customers unable or unwilling to accept the credit risk; and

Whereas, The mission of the Ex-Im is to create and sustain United States jobs by financing sales of United States exports to international buyers; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im is the principal government agency responsible for aiding the export of American goods and services, and thereby creating and sustaining United States jobs, through a variety of loan, guarantee, and insurance programs for small and large businesses; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im has supported more than $400 billion in United States exports in the past 70 years and helps to cover critical trade finance gaps by providing loan guarantees, export credit insurance, and direct loans for United States exports in developing markets where commercial bank financing is unavailable or insufficient. In Fiscal Year 2012, Ex-Im financing of United States exports exceeded $35 billion, assisting more than 3,400 United States companies and supporting approximately 255,000 export-related American jobs; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im is a self-sustaining agency, which operates at no cost to the taxpayer and, between the 2008–09 to 2011–12 fiscal years, inclusive, the Ex-Im has generated $1.6 billion in excess revenue for United States taxpayers; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im enables United States companies large and small to turn export opportunities into sales that help to maintain and create in the United States jobs and contribute to a stronger national economy. On average, more than 85 percent of the Ex-Im's transactions support United States small businesses; and

Whereas, Exports are particularly important to the California economy as California is currently ranked second in exports among all states. If California's manufacturing base is to grow, we must continue to expand our ability to export goods from California facilities. Given the key role the Ex-Im plays in facilitating export sales, failure to reauthorize it would be devastating to existing industry and to those that we hope to create in the future; and

Whereas, Over the past five years, the Ex-Im has assisted more than 900 California companies to export their products. Nearly 200 of those companies are women or minority owned and 668 are small businesses. These companies export their products and services around the globe totaling more than $19 billion in sales. Fifty-two of the 53 congressional districts in California had companies benefit from the Ex-Im loans; and

Whereas, A reauthorization of the Ex-Im is critical to the ability of many United States exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies; and

Whereas, A failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament in the face of other nations' aggressive trade finance programs that favor their domestic companies over American companies; and

Whereas, Economic growth depends on increasing exports from both small and large manufacturers and service providers in California and reauthorization means support for California exports and California jobs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges Congress to support legislation reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM–313. A resolution adopted by the California State Lands Commission opposing S. 2094, the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM–314. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island urging the United States Congress to support a peaceful unification of Ireland using all possible diplomatic means; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3124

Whereas, Ireland and the Irish people are an ancient nation that have contributed much to western culture, particularly within the spheres of literature, art, music, dance, theater, theology and philosophy: and

Whereas, Ireland is an island nation that eventually evolved into 32 counties. Tragically, in 1922 it was divided against the wishes of a majority of the Irish people who desired a united nation, into the Irish Republic, consisting of 26 counties, and Northern Ireland, composed of the remaining six counties, and

Whereas, A peacefully united and independent Ireland would be the most effective way to grow the economy and would lead to a wealthier nation, with more influence in regional and world affairs. It would also be the best way to ensure that all citizens of Ireland have a just and equal chance at happiness and prosperity; and

Whereas, A united and independent Ireland, with a unified and independent police force and justice system, is more likely to dispense justice in an impartial and fair way, and it would be far more likely to have the trust and respect of its citizenry, including citizens from all socio-economic spheres of life: and

Whereas, The Good Friday Agreement of 1998, negotiated with strong American support, ratified by the British and Irish governments and approved by a vote with the overwhelming support of the entire island of Ireland, provides a framework by which a united Ireland might he achieved through peaceful and democratic means. It also provided for the development and strengthening of North/South institutions and for there to be cross border cooperation amongst the two entities; and

Whereas, The United States and the State of Rhode Island have benefited enormously from the rich contributions Irish immigrants have made to our nation and state; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this Senate of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby respectfully requests that the United States Congress strongly supports a peaceful unification of Ireland using all possible diplomatic means; and be it further,

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation, the President and Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, and the Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of Ireland, Enda Kenny.

POM–315. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island requesting that the United States Congress and the United Nations work together towards finding a peaceful solution to the problems in Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3118

Whereas, This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the illegal Turkish invasion and continued occupation of Cyprus: and

Whereas, The Republic of Cyprus has been divided and occupied by foreign forces since 1974, in violation of numerous United Nations' Resolutions; and

Whereas, The Republic of Cyprus is the only internationally recognized and legal entity on the Island of Cyprus and is a member of the United Nations and the European Union. United States Vice President Joseph Biden re-affirmed these facts and the United States' support for the Republic of Cyprus on his recent visit to the Island of Cyprus; and

Whereas, The international community, with the support of the United States, has repeatedly supported the Republic of Cyprus in this dispute. It has called for the removal of the 43,000 Turkish troops from the Island,

the return of all illegal settlers, and has continuously urged the government of Turkey to engage in good faith negotiations to achieve these ends; and

Whereas, A peaceful, just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would greatly benefit the security and the political, economic and social well-being of all Cypriots, as well as contribute to improved relations between Greece, Turkey and the European Union: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this Senate of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby marks the fortieth anniversary of the unlawful Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus. We furthermore respectfully request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress fully support all United Nations efforts to create a peaceful and democratic solution that will be based on European law and will guarantee all Cypriot citizens equal human rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to President Barack Obama, Vice President Joseph Biden, Jr., Secretary of State John Kerry, the Rhode Island Delegation to the United States Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives John Boehner, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, United States Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, United States Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, and United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon.

POM–316. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California calling upon the United States Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals, and urging the federal government to mandate alternative methods to animal testing of cosmetic products; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

Whereas, For more than 50 years, animals have been used in painful tests to assess the safety of certain chemicals used in cosmetic products; and

Whereas, Modern alternatives to harmful animal testing are increasingly less expensive, faster, and more accurate at predicting human reactions; and

Whereas, Mandating and promoting the use of accepted alternative methods to animal testing has, and will continue to have, a huge positive impact on animal welfare; and

Whereas, Careful evaluation of alternative methods to animal tests ensures that their proper use supports the equal or better protection of people, animals, and the environment; and

Whereas, In 2000, California became the first state in the nation to pass a law restricting the use of animals in product testing by making it unlawful to use animals for testing when an appropriate, validated, alternative method is available; and

Whereas, Our nation's largest trading partner, the European Union, which accounts for nearly half of the global cosmetics market worth an estimated $90 billion a year, prohibits the importation and sale of cosmetics that have been tested on animals as of March 2013; and

Whereas, Norway, India, Israel, and the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil have also banned all animal testing for cosmetics; and

Whereas, Harmonizing international laws that encourage modern science and respond to consumer expectations benefits businesses and consumers in today's global marketplace; and

Whereas, Polls show that the American public overwhelmingly supports alternatives to testing cosmetics on animals. A recent poll conducted by ORC International, a leading global market research firm, found that 72 percent of American adults surveyed believe that testing cosmetics on animals is unethical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the United States Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the federal government to mandate alternative methods to animal testing of cosmetic products, whenever those scientifically satisfactory methods are available, and to prioritize the validation and acceptance of additional nonanimal tests; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2577. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014 (Rept. No. 113–213).

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom (Rept. No. 113–214).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2633. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 509. A resolution honoring the extraordinary and courageous life of Mattie Stepanek; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1153

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1153, a bill to establish an improved regulatory process for injurious wildlife to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of nonnative wildlife and wild animal pathogens and parasites that are likely to cause harm.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1861

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1861, a bill to save taxpayer money and end bailouts of financial institutions by providing for a process to allow financial institutions to go bankrupt.

S. 2030

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2030, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2151

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2151, a bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers.

S. 2253

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2253, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary shift in the scheduled collection of the transitional reinsurance program payments.

S. 2305

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2305, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2360

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 2366

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 2373

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2373, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2541

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2541, a bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 2598

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2598, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2624, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2625

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2625, a bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes.

S. 2630

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2630, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 489

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 489, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week''.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 509—HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY AND COURAGEOUS LIFE OF MATTIE STEPANEK

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 509

Whereas Matthew ''Mattie'' Joseph Thadeus Stepanek, was born on July 17, 1990, in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek was born with a rare form of Muscular Dystrophy—Dysautonomic Mitochondrial Myopathy;

Whereas the siblings of Mattie Stepanek—Katie, Stevie, and Jamie—were diagnosed with the same rare disease;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek began writing poetry, short stories, and essays to deal with grief over the death of his siblings;

Whereas the writings of Mattie Stepanek reflected his deep understanding of our ever-evolving world and the need for hope and peace;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek became a 7-time New York Times best-selling author;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek gave inspiration and educational speeches to audiences ranging from school children to business leaders and politicians;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek spoke about spirituality, disability, education, and health care, delivering a message of hope and peace to his audiences;

Whereas the words of Mattie Stepanek inspired millions of people around the world, including the 39th President of the United States, who was a friend of Mattie and delivered his eulogy;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek engaged in public service, working with Children's Hospice International to improve guidelines for the health and hospice care of children and serving as a 3-term National Goodwill Ambassador for the Muscular Dystrophy Association;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek has been honored with numerous awards, during his lifetime and posthumously, including the Children's Hope Medal of Honor and induction into the Kids Hall of Fame;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek passed away on June 22, 2004, at Children's National Medical Center in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the mother of Mattie continues to raise awareness about the message of hope and peace that Mattie delivered and led the effort to create the Mattie J.T. Stepanek Park in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas the Mattie Stepanek Foundation celebrates July 17th as ''Mattie Stepanek World Peace Day''; and

Whereas recognizing the 24th birthday of Mattie Stepanek honors the compassion and dedication to hope that Mattie embodied: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the extraordinary life and legacy of Matthew ''Mattie'' Stepanek.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3570. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3571. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3572. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3573. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3574. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3570. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 22, line 11, strike ''60 days'' and insert ''1 year''.

SA 3571. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operations of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 13, line 7, strike ''living organism'' and insert ''organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless''.

SA 3572. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 13, line 4, strike ''living organism'' and insert ''organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless''.

SA 3573. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1213. PROHIBITION ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENTS DEVELOPING GROUND-LAUNCHED NUCLEAR-CAPABLE MISSILE SYSTEMS WITH THE CAPABILITY OF STRIKING THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.

Section 102(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''device, or'' and inserting ''device,'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''or'' after ''device,''; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) is in the process of developing or acquiring a ground-launched nuclear-capable

missile system with an assessed range capable of striking the continental United States, and is not a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council,'';

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''required under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)'' and inserting ''required under paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(E)'';

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''this subsection, if the Congress'' and inserting the following: ''this subsection—

''(A) if the Congress'';

(B) by striking ''required under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B) if he'' and inserting ''required under paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(E) if the President'';

(C) by striking ''security. The President shall transmit'' and inserting ''security, and transmits''; and

(D) by striking ''therefor.'' and inserting the following: ''therefor; and

''(B) if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, certifies to Congress that the government of a country subject to sanctions under paragraph (1) solely on the basis of subparagraph (E) of such paragraph is no longer in the process of developing or acquiring a missile system described under such subparagraph, the President may waive such sanctions.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any countries determined in accordance with subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1) to be in the process of developing or acquiring a missile system described under such subparagraph.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(ii) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

SA 3574. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10___. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, railway, bridge, or transit facility that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. DaMara Belson, a NASA fellow, be granted floor privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alex Rosenberg, an intern on the Judiciary Committee staff, be granted floor privileges for July 22, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MATTIE STEPANEK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 509, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 509) honoring the extraordinary and courageous life of Mattie Stepanek.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 509) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 22, 2014

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, July 22, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that at 10:45 a.m. the Senate proceed to executive session as provided under the previous order; further, that following the vote on the deGravelles nomination, the time until 12:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. At 10:45 a.m. there will be a series of three cloture votes on the following nominations: Andre Birotte, Jr., to be United States district judge for the Central District of California; Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the Southern District of Florida; and John W. deGravelles to be United States district judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

If cloture is invoked on these nominations, at 2:15 p.m. the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of each of the nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:24 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION

JAMES L. HUFFMAN, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2014, VICE MICHAEL BUTLER, TERM EXPIRED.

JAMES L. HUFFMAN, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CHARLES H. FULGHUM, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE MARGARET ANN SHERRY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBARA A. LEAF, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.

VIRGINIA E. PALMER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALAWI.

WILLIAM V. ROEBUCK, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ADRI DAVIN JAYARATNE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE BRIAN VINCENT KENNEDY.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

MICKEY D. BARNETT, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EUNICE S. REDDICK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER.

MICHAEL ANDERSON LAWSON, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

THE JUDICIARY

JULIE E. CARNES, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 22, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 23

Time to be announced

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 315, to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008, S. 2154, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, S. 531, to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans, S. 2405, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, S. 2406, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents, S. 2539, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, S. 2511, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations, and any pending nominations.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine meeting the challenges of feeding America's school children.

SR–328A

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed carbon pollution standards for existing power plants.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight

To hold hearings to examine saving for an uncertain future, focusing on how the ''Achieving a Better Life Experience Act'' (ABLE) can help people with disabilities and their families.

SD–215

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine S. 2516, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, focusing on the need for expanded public disclosure of funds raised and spent to influence Federal elections.

SR–301

1:45 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine empowering women entrepreneurs, focusing on understanding successes, addressing persistent challenges, and identifying new opportunities.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

To hold hearings to examine insuring our future, focusing on building a flood insurance program we can live with, grow with, and prosper with.

SD–138

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1804, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, S. 1893, to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, S. 2030, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, and S. 2250, to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009.

SR–253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine H.R. 412, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1189, to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, bills to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1641, to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, S. 1718, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 1750, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 1785, to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, S. 1794, to designate certain Federal land in Chaffee County, Colorado, as a national monument and as wilderness, S. 1866, to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, S. 2031, to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, S. 2104, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 2111, to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, S. 2221, to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan, S. 2264, to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, S. 2293, to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, S. 2318, to reauthorize the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act, S. 2346, to amend the National Trails System Act to include national

discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, S. 2356, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve, S. 2392, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 2576, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and S. 2602, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

SD–366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight

To hold hearings to examine a more efficient and effective government, focusing on the National Technical Information Service.

SD–342

2:45 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine S. 1340, to improve passenger vessel security and safety, focusing on improving consumer protections for cruise passengers.

SR–253

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on the next 25 years.

SD–628

JULY 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

SD–366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine Social Security, focusing on a fresh look at workers' disability insurance.

SD–215

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine Iraq at a crossroads, focusing on options for United States policy.

SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the role of states in higher education.

SD–430

10:15 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephen R. Bough, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, Armando Ormar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Wendy Beetlestone, Mark A. Kearney, and Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

SD–342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia

To hold hearings to examine making the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) more effective for streamlined disaster operations, focusing on the path to efficiency.

SD–342

3:45 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

SD–342

JULY 29

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Francis Tefft, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine increasing economic opportunity for African Americans, focusing on local initiatives that are making a difference.

SD–G50

JULY 30

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the next steps for the ''Violence Against Women Act'' (VAWA), focusing on protecting women from gun violence.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine responses to natural disasters in Indian country.

SD–628

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 22, 2014*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, be attentive to our prayers. Test our thoughts and examine our hearts, as we seek Your wisdom to solve the problems in our Nation and world.

Guide our Senators' thoughts and words so that their speech will glorify You. May their speech engender a spirit of cooperation and a willingness to discover ways to accomplish multiple goals for the common good. Lord, lead them away from divisive rhetoric that provides fuel for chaos and discord.

Shepherd of love, we pray each day to You because we know You will answer our prayers. Continue to show us Your unfailing love in Your constructive and wonderful ways.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, which will run until 10:45. The time will be divided in the usual form between the two leaders or their designees. At 10:45 the Senate will proceed to a series of three rollcall votes: cloture on Andre Birotte to be a judge in California; Robin Rosenberg to be a judge in Florida; and John deGravelles to be a judge in Louisiana. Following the cloture vote on deGravelles, the time until 12:30 will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form. The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 to allow for our weekly caucus meetings. If cloture is invoked on any of the previous nominations, at 2:15 the Senate will begin a series of votes on those nominations.

FAIR SHOT AGENDA

Over the past several months, Americans have heard Democrats speak at length about giving working families a fair shot. What do we mean by a ''fair shot''? A fair shot is about making sure Americans have jobs and good jobs. It is about ensuring that workers receive fair, livable wages so they can put a roof over their heads and take care of their kids and actually put food on the table, make the rent payments, car payments. A fair shot is the idea that each hard-working American deserves an opportunity to achieve a measure of prosperity. But it all begins with a job.

As Senators, it is imperative that we not only promote job growth but also protect the jobs constituents already have. That is why the legislation before the Senate, the Bring Jobs Home Act, is so vitally important. It protects American jobs and encourages future job creation within our borders.

Over the last decade, the last 10 years, our country has been hemorrhaging jobs. American companies have outsourced 2½ million jobs. Outsource—that means ship them overseas. Two and a half million jobs that were here are now overseas, but these losses could potentially skyrocket if we do not address the disturbing trend of outsourcing. Twenty-one million Americans, including 7 million manufacturing workers, are at risk of having their jobs shipped overseas at any time—the risk of losing their fair shot. Almost 150,000 at-risk workers live in Nevada. The home State of my friend from Kentucky could also be on the chopping block to the tune of 235,000 jobs. For the Presiding Officer's State of New Jersey, outsourcing means the loss of 588,000 jobs in New Jersey.

When millions of Americans are looking for work in a recovering economy, few things could be more important than protecting good-paying middle-class jobs.

Every time an American company closes a factory or a plant in America and moves operations to another country, taxpayers pick up part of that moving bill. It is hard to comprehend that, but that is the way our law now exists. We want to change that. That is what the legislation before this body is all about. The Bring Jobs Home Act would end senseless tax breaks for outsourcers. It would end the absurd practice of American taxpayers bankrolling the outsourcing of their very own jobs.

The Bring Jobs Home Act also seeks to bring jobs back to America. This bill would offer a 20-percent tax credit to help with the costs of moving production back to the United States.

In the last few years major manufacturers, such as Ford and Caterpillar, have brought jobs back to the United States from Japan, Mexico, and China. Why? Because we have such productive workers. There are a lot of other reasons, but that is the main reason. Smaller manufacturers, such as Master Lock, have moved facilities home as well. This is a trend we here in Congress should enthusiastically encourage—American companies returning home to employ American workers. They should get a tax break to do that. That is what this legislation does.

The Bring Jobs Home Act is a commonsense strategy to bring back American jobs. To 21 million Americans whose jobs could be the next ones to move to China or Japan, the Bring Jobs Home Act is as serious as it gets. To the 2½ million Americans whose jobs have already been offshored, the bill stands to right a terrible wrong: Bring them back and get a tax benefit for doing that.

I hope Republicans in Congress will finally see the light and join us in giving workers a fair shot at a good, stable job. On this legislation, the Bring Jobs Home Act, I know Senators on the Republican side always say they want amendments; unless they get a guarantee of amendments, they will kill the bill. On that, let me just say what I always say: We want to do something; that is, get something done. We should do what we have done on highway bills in the past, what we did recently on terrorism insurance, what we did on the Workforce Investment Act, and what we have done here for decades. We should work on a list of amendments and a path on getting the bill done. If there is going to be no list, I have no alternative but to procedurally move

forward and get this matter off the floor. That would not be good for American workers. So everyone should know my answer: We need to get a list of amendments and a path for getting the bill done.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

WORKING FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today the President will sign a bipartisan workforce training bill into law. It is commonsense legislation that will help my constituents gain new skills to become more competitive. I was proud to support it. I am glad to see that the President is going to sign it.

Unfortunately, though, bipartisan accomplishments such as this one have become increasingly rare in the Democratic-controlled Senate.

Last week President Obama took to the campaign trail to urge Congress to pass a new highway bill. He really did not need to, though; the Republican-controlled House of Representatives had already passed the highway bill earlier in the week. In fact, it sailed through on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, 367 to 55. The President said he would sign it if Congress sent it to his desk. I expect the Senate will do just that in fairly short order but only if the Democrats who run the Senate can put their never-ending political campaign on hold for just a minute because rather than focus on passing bipartisan legislation, not to mention the dozens of job-creation bills the House has already sent over to us, the Democratic majority seems to spend all of its time on bills designed primarily to create jobs for campaign consultants.

We got an especially vivid glimpse of this earlier this year when Senate Democrats admitted they were working with their campaign committee to craft a so-called agenda that was more about saving their own seats than anything else. Ever since, they have pretty much abandoned governing to use the Senate floor as a campaign studio. We saw the latest example last night when the majority brought up another recycled, designed-to-fail bill that has already been rejected by the Senate. It is a bill that is designed for campaign rhetoric and failure, not to create jobs here in the United States. That is not what it is about. But that is not stopping our friends on the other side from bringing it up yet again, just as they did right before the last election.

So, look. We have seen this movie before. Everyone knows the Democrats are simply not serious here. They specifically want the bill to fail.

What I am saying is let's just skip the campaigning and get something done for the middle class instead. Let's focus on bipartisan bills that can help families and create jobs here at home. Let's focus on things such as repealing the job-killing medical device tax and helping create energy jobs and reducing the tax burden on small businesses and restoring the 40-hour workweek and providing relief to Kentucky's coal families.

If we are going to have a debate about creating jobs here at home, then let's really have a debate about creating jobs here at home. This is not it. Senate Democrats, of course, know that. They also know all of their campaigning is getting in the way of focusing on passing bipartisan legislation—bipartisan legislation such as the highway bill.

Of course, we know the current highway bill is not perfect. Over the long term, Republicans have a lot of good ideas for reforming the highway trust fund in a more permanent way so it can be made sustainable for years to come, but for now we have to at least keep road and bridge projects moving forward in the meantime. The extension of the highway trust fund could be used to fund projects such as the resurfacing of several parkways that many Kentuckians use to commute to work, and it could be used to fund the widening of I–656 between Bowling Green and Elizabethtown. The judge executive of Hart County Terry Martin knows this transportation safety project is important for the Commonwealth, and he notes that the expansion to six lanes would allow for a smoother and safer flow of traffic for Kentuckians.

So let's focus on scoring bipartisan wins and jobs for our constituents instead of scoring political points. If Democrats can do that, then I am confident we will get this done because the American people didn't send us to Congress to campaign 24/7. When Senate Democrats do choose to work with us, there is a lot we can get done for the people of our country.

REMEMBERING JEREMIAH DENTON

I wish to say a brief word about our former colleague Jeremiah Denton, who will be laid to rest today at Arlington National Cemetery.

Admiral Denton is best known for the extraordinary bravery he showed in 1966, when instead of playing along in a propaganda film for his captors in Vietnam, he blinked the word ''torture'' in Morse code to U.S. military leaders.

All told, Admiral Denton would spend 7½ years in the infamous Hanoi Hilton and other camps, enduring terrible torture and barbaric conditions throughout. Later, after earning the deep admiration of Ronald Reagan, he would enlist the future President's help as a first-time political candidate, becoming the first-elected Republican Senator from Alabama since Reconstruction.

A staunch conservative throughout his time in the Senate, Admiral Denton was a man of deep and abiding faith who had an equally deep and abiding love for his country. This was never more clear than on the day he stepped off a plane to freedom at Clark Air Base in the Philippines. Walking up to the microphone, the newly released POW said simply:

> We are honored to have had the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are proudly grateful to our commander-in-chief and to our nation for this day. God bless America.

Admiral Denton was predeceased by his beloved wife of 61 years Kathryn Jane, and survived by their seven children: Madeleine, and Mary Beth, Jeremiah, William, Donald, James, Michael; and by his second wife Mary Belle. We send Mary Belle and the entire Denton family our sincere condolences today as Jeremiah Denton is laid to rest, and we honor the memory of this great man and distinguished former Member of this body.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Washington.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I came to the Senate floor in April to warn my colleagues of a looming crisis in the highway trust fund. I told them if Congress didn't act and the fund reached critically low levels, it would cause construction shutdowns in communities across the country. It would cost jobs and threaten our fragile economic recovery. It would hurt families who depend on safe and efficient roads and bridges.

I had hoped that we could address this issue sooner. I had hoped those of us in Congress who understand the importance of strong infrastructure investments could have come together, not just to avoid a crisis but for a long-term solution. We weren't able to do that.

But today, after 4 months of warning of this looming crisis, I am pleased to come to the floor as we work to do what should be easy but too often isn't in the Senate—to avoid a completely unnecessary and completely damaging crisis. This is a step in the right direction. As many of us here know very well, it is a step that Congress has not taken each time a crisis approached.

For far too many years, Congress has been lurching from crisis to crisis,

from debt limit scares to fiscal cliffs. That dysfunction hit a peak last October with a government shutdown over a misguided attempt to block the Affordable Care Act from covering millions of families and with another Federal default scare. The lurching from crisis to crisis with constant dysfunction and uncertainty hurt workers and our families, and it shook the confidence of people across the country who expect their elected officials to work together to get things done.

But when the government shutdown finally ended last year, I sat down with House Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN in a budget conference. We worked together, we compromised, and we reached a 2-year budget deal that prevented another government shutdown and rolled back devastating cuts from sequestration.

That bipartisan budget deal moved us away from these constant crises and showed the American people that we can do our jobs when we are willing to work together. I believe it showed my Republican colleagues that putting the American people through these constant artificial crises is not only bad for the country overall, it is not good for Republicans either.

Since that bipartisan budget deal, we have been able to build on that bipartisan momentum in some very important ways. I was proud to work with the junior Senator from Georgia and a number of Democrats and Republicans on a bipartisan bill to invest in workforce training.

Our legislation passed both the House and the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support, and this week it will officially become law. That kind of bipartisan work to help our workers and the economy wouldn't be possible if we were still in a constant crisis mode.

That is why I have been so hopeful we could avoid lurching toward yet another needless crisis—this time in our highway trust fund. The consequences of Congress failing to shore up the highway trust fund are clear. In fact, many of our States have already been bracing for a worst-case scenario. Arkansas, for example, has already put the brakes on 15 highway projects that would have widened their highways and repaired their bridges.

In Colorado, State officials are planning a project to ease congestion to give some much-needed relief to drivers between Denver and Fort Collins, but a lapse in our Federal funding could have put that project on hold.

Those are not isolated cases. Across the country more than 100,000 projects would have been at risk next year and 700,000 jobs would have been on the line if Congress failed to replenish the highway trust fund according to the Department of Transportation.

I am pleased Congress is finally coming together and working to avoid a construction shutdown this summer. Republicans in the House have pushed aside the tea party branch and passed a bill to avoid a construction shutdown this summer, with no ransom demands, no programmatic spending cuts, and no tea party policy riders.

I do support the bipartisan Senate proposal from the Finance Committee, which includes provisions to improve compliance with tax laws.

My colleague, the junior Senator from California, is right. We need pressure on Republicans to come back before the end of this Congress to work with us toward a long-term solution, but I am very pleased we are working together to get this done and avoid this unnecessary crisis that would have put jobs and our economy at risk.

This bill will be a step in the right direction, but then we need to take the next step. We need to keep this bipartisanship going, and we need to work together to find a long-term solution to the highway trust fund's revenue shortfall. That is the only way we can truly put an end to constant crises and short-term patches, and it is the only way we can give our States and businesses the certainty they need and deserve to plan projects and invest in their economies.

Once again, I am pleased we are moving toward avoiding a completely unnecessary construction shutdown, and I am pleased that the House Republicans seem to understand that it is better for them and our country to push the tea party aside and work with us—not to push us into another crisis.

I am hopeful we can build on this bipartisan effort and keep working together to create jobs, economic growth, and a fair shot and true opportunity for families across our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Washington is on the floor, I think it is appropriate to note and congratulate her for her work on the Workforce Investment Act.

She and Senator ISAKSON of Georgia led the effort of Senator HARKIN, me, and others in the Senate. Senator SCOTT of South Carolina was the principal sponsor of the House-passed SKILLS Act. Senator ENZI of Wyoming had worked for a long time—and as the Republican leader said, that bill is being signed today by the President of the United States.

It goes directly to the issue that most Americans care about. It is too hard to find a job. What this process showed was that Republicans and Democrats were able to take the nearly $10 billion that we currently spend on job training to give Governors the flexibility to help people develop skills and match job seekers with good jobs in their communities. I remember our former Democratic Governor from Tennessee told me that when he came into office, he threw up his hands when he found out about the $145 million that came to Tennessee through the Workforce Investment Act because it was too complicated.

Senator MURRAY, Senator ISAKSON, and others have worked together with Chairman KLINE in the House, and they produced a law that will be signed today. The Senate is far from functioning the way it ought to. There is too much talent in the Senate and too many pressing problems in the country for us to be anywhere close to satisfied with the result we are getting. But the committee upon which the Senator from Washington and I serve has done a pretty good job in this Congress. We reported to the Senate 20 pieces of legislation; 18 of them have passed the Senate, and 14 of them have been signed into law.

That may be more than the entire Senate put together.

The point is, those are big pieces of legislation. One is the jobs bill. That is the issue we care about more than any other.

Another was the track-and-trace legislation which makes medicines safer for 4 billion prescriptions. Senator BURR and Senator MIKULSKI worked on that.

Another was on compounding pharmacies. It was a terrible problem where we had tainted, sterile injections not being sterile and causing people to catch meningitis and die.

Last year another was the student loan program, where we took all the new loans—that is $100 billion a year—and put a market-pricing system on top and took it out of the political football stunt category.

All of that has happened on a committee which has, on its left, 12 Democrats, and on its right, 10 Republicans. We don't agree on everything by a long shot. But on these issues we came to a result, did the job, and the Senator from Washington has been a conspicuous example of looking for opportunities for us to get a result.

People expect us to come to the Senate, stand on our principles, but not stop there—not stop there—and then put our principles together where we can combine those and get a result for the American people. I am pleased to be a part of that action and I congratulate her for it.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Today I am here to say the world is watching Venezuela. The Senate especially is watching human rights abuse in Venezuela. I especially am watching the case of Leopoldo Lopez, who has been in prison for 5 months. For what? For leading a political party and exercising his constitutional rights.

Senator MENENDEZ, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has spoken out about human rights abuse in Venezuela. Senator CORKER, the ranking Republican on Foreign Relations has spoken out about human

rights abuse in Venezuela. Yesterday, Senator CRUZ of Texas gave an impassioned speech about Leopoldo Lopez in Venezuela and that conspicuous example of human rights abuse. Senator RUBIO of Florida has been at the forefront of this discussion with his leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Today, I wish to speak about human rights abuse in Venezuela and to say to President Maduro in Venezuela that the world is watching. The world is watching him and his efforts to imprison his principal political opponent, Leopoldo Lopez.

Mr. President, many of us have visited Robben Island off South Africa's coast. When my family and I did that a few years ago, there was no moment that impressed me more in that visit than when some of those who were imprisoned there with Nelson Mandela still give tours of Robben Island, about where he lived and where he exercised and how he conducted himself in the 27 years he was there before he came back and was freed and became one of the most important persons in our world history.

It seems to me President Maduro of Venezuela is determined to turn Leopoldo Lopez into the Nelson Mandela of Venezuela by his unconscionable imprisonment of him principally because Leopoldo has spoken out and has expressed his political views about the country he loves.

Leopoldo was born in Venezuela and comes from a patriotic Venezuelan family, but he was educated in the United States which is where I met him. I met him when he was a student at Kenyon College. In fact, I made the graduation speech, when I was Secretary of Education, to the class in which he graduated, and he was a friend of my son who was also a student. I watched him over the years. He went on to Harvard and obtained a master's degree at the Kennedy School. He could have stayed in the United States and had a very successful career, but he chose instead to return to the country he loved, Venezuela. He was elected mayor of a municipality at the age of 28 in an important area outside of Caracas. Four years later he was reelected with 81 percent of the vote. He is a rising star in Venezuela. There is no brighter star rising in the skies of Venezuela.

Hugo Chavez's government knew that someone like Leopoldo, who is well educated, charismatic, purposeful, and honest, with a desire to help his fellow Venezuelans, would do nothing but cause problems for their socialist government, so they barred him from running for public office and accused him of misusing public funds.

I suppose a lot of us would like to bar our principal opponents from running against us. The Senator from New Jersey and I are both in elections this year, but it hasn't occurred to us that in the United States we could actually do that. Elections are the lifeblood of our political system and the lifeblood of this country and the lifeblood of our liberty and freedom, but in Venezuela if you don't like your opponent, you just say they cannot run for office. That is what they did to Leopoldo.

Leopoldo fought back, taking his case all the way to the Inter-American Court for Human Rights and he won. I had an opportunity to see him in 2011 when he did that. I knew he would win his case. Anyone who listened to it believed that. He then stayed in Venezuela. He faced assassination attempts, harassment, threats, but never wavered in his call for the Venezuelan people to take action against the oppressive regime of Hugo Chavez and more recently Nicolas Maduro.

Venezuela is a rich country and has lots of money, but people cannot get toothpaste, people cannot get tissues. The inflation there is more than 50 percent. You would expect there to be a leader demanding change from the government, someone who could express the views of the people. Leopoldo is that person, but he has been in jail for 5 months. He has been barred from running for public office because he is that leader.

He is a husband. He is the father of two young children. He chose to turn himself in to face trial. He could have come to the United States or some other country and said, ''I am in exile. I am a popular Venezuelan and I'll take the brave act of going into exile.'' No, he didn't do that. He turned himself in, with a crowd of hundreds of thousands of people behind him, because he is in the tradition of Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Mandela, and others is focusing his resistance in a nonviolent and a constitutional way. That is his lesson to the people of Venezuela.

However, he is in jail and has been for 5 months, and President Maduro keeps him there to silence the opposition. Or so the President thinks. Leopoldo's trial starts tomorrow. I say trial, although it is not a trial that we would recognize.

The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is on the floor today. He has been a leading spokesman for human rights across the country. He, too, is interested in human rights abuse in Venezuela. He would not recognize this trial.

The defense team of Leopoldo has attempted to bring forward 60 witnesses plus other experts to testify on their client's behalf. However, during a preliminary hearing every single witness for the defense was disqualified.

There is the distinguished lawyer, the Senator from Massachusetts, on the other side of the aisle. She knows what a trial is. She recognizes human abuse when she sees it, just as all of us do. So I think it is important for President Maduro, the people of Venezuela and the people in Venezuela who have been subjected to human rights abuse to know that is not going unnoticed in the United States of America, that there are Senators on the Democratic side and on the Republican side of the aisle who are paying close attention to this; that our State Department is reviewing this very carefully; that this sort of human rights abuse in Venezuela—a country badly in need of political discourse and leadership—is something we should not ignore. We should say to President Maduro: Free Leopoldo Lopez. By locking him up for 5 months you are not silencing him. You are helping to make him the Nelson Mandela of Venezuela.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Tennessee who has said that the trial he described is not a trial. It is a sham, and no honest and civilized country, no country that has even a pretense upon the rule of law should accept that kind of a trial. So I applaud the senior Senator from Tennessee for his comments.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been on this floor many times to talk about the need to support law enforcement and to ensure our criminal justice system serves everyone fairly. I do so again in light of a very disturbing report issued by the Justice Department's inspector general last week which describes serious flaws in some of our Nation's crime labs. The report focused on 13 crime lab examiners whose work was seriously flawed, but the worst part is that their testimony contributed to the convictions of thousands of offenders, including 60 people on death row.

The FBI launched an investigation. They discovered these mistakes, but even after they discovered them, it took them 5 years to notify those who were impacted—5 years that people were sitting in prison. During that time 3 of the 60 people on death row who were convicted and put on death row on potentially flawed evidence were executed and thousands more sat behind bars.

It is shocking and unacceptable. I mention this because even in a country such as ours, our criminal justice system is not infallible, and that is why I again urge the Senate to take up and pass the Justice For All Reauthorization Act. It is a bill I introduced with Senator CORNYN last year. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation which includes the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, which seeks to prevent travesties such as those described in the IG report.

It is named for Kirk Bloodsworth, a man who has become a friend to me over the years. He was convicted and sent to prison and could have been executed. In 1993, he became the first person in the United States to be exonerated from a death row crime through the use of DNA evidence.

Two hundred fifty additional people have been exonerated using this technology. Thomas Haynesworth was exonerated in 2011 after spending 27 years in prison for crimes he did not commit, thanks to a grant provided by the Justice for All Act. He was accused of rape in 1984, and wrongfully convicted. The real perpetrator went on to rape more than a dozen women.

The Justice for All Act takes important steps to strengthen the rights of victims of crime and reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act which has provided significant funding to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits. The program is named for Debbie Smith, who waited years after being attacked before her rape kit was tested and the perpetrator was caught. She and her husband Rob have worked tirelessly to ensure that others will not experience such horror. I thank Debbie and Rob for their continuing help on this extremely important cause.

Just yesterday, a few blocks from here at the DC Superior Court, a man was exonerated by DNA evidence. Now that is the good news. He was exonerated. Kevin Martin was exonerated, but he spent 26 years in prison for the 1982 rape and murder of a Washington woman he had nothing to do with.

We know that in our criminal justice system mistakes are inevitable. But the Justice for All Act reauthorization gives us the chance to fix some of our most grievous errors.

Senator CORNYN and I believe that pursuit of justice is not a partisan issue, which is why we were pleased when our bill was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee back in October. Senate minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL is also a cosponsor of the bill. Every single Senate Democrat has signed off on passing this. Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, called the inspector general's report ''shocking.'' I agree completely, we all agree, which is why it is time for the full Senate to reach an agreement and consider the Justice for All Reauthorization Act.

I thank the many law enforcement, victim services and criminal justice organizations that have helped to pinpoint the needed improvements that this law attempts to solve and I appreciate their ongoing support in seeing it passed.

Let's pass the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO CFPB

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am here today to say happy birthday to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This week marks 4 years since Dodd-Frank was signed into law and 3 years since the consumer agency opened its doors.

The consumer agency was built to be a new kind of regulatory agency, one that would stand up for America's families, not for big banks or credit card companies.

The consumer agency was not popular with big banks and their friends in Washington. The financial services industry spent more than $1 million a day fighting tooth and nail against financial reforms and they vowed to kill the consumer agency before it was ever born. But thanks to the work of grassroots consumer groups across the country that worked very hard and got organized, we pushed back against the big banks' armies of lobbyists and lawyers, and we won. We succeeded in building a strong independent consumer agency with the tools necessary to protect consumers against the tricks and traps hidden in the fine print of mortgages, credit cards, and student loans.

Under Rich Cordray's leadership, the staff of the CFPB has made amazing progress since it opened. This little agency has already forced big financial institutions to return more than $4 billion to 15 million consumers they cheated, and it has helped tens of thousands of consumers resolve complaints about their financial institutions. It has put in place rules to protect consumers from a range of dangerous financial products and to make sure that companies cannot put out the kinds of deceptive mortgages that contributed to millions of foreclosures.

Recently the CFPB shared stories from people all across the country who have reached out to the agency for help with financial issues. One of these stories is from Ari, an Iraq veteran from Hull, MA. Ari and his father Harry told their story to CFPB. While serving in the military, Ari took out a car loan advertised directly to servicemembers. The dealership promised Ari that he would be able to afford the loan, but after Harry read the fine print, he figured out this was a terrible deal. So Harry filed a complaint with the CFPB and the agency's investigation helped to uncover scams targeting men and women in uniform. Ultimately, the consumer agency ordered the auto lenders to refund about $6.5 million to the servicemembers they cheated, and to agree to stop these practices immediately.

This is just one example of how people are fighting back, using the tools of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It is also an example of how the consumer agency is standing up for families who have been targeted by scams and unfair practices. Together families and the agency are starting to clean up the market for consumer credit.

Sure, there is a lot left to do. The consumer agency still has important rules to put in place regarding payday lending, debt collection, and arbitration clauses. The biggest banks are dramatically bigger than they were during the financial crisis, and there is still too much risk in our system and too much need for reform. We need to keep pushing for changes that will make our financial system more stable and more secure to protect consumers and to keep our economy safe.

Stories such as Ari's and Harry's show that the consumer agency works and that the agency empowers people. In a badly tilted financial marketplace, the agency is giving consumers a fighting chance. This week is an opportunity to highlight these accomplishments and a reminder of how we can make Washington work for families all across this country.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 234 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 56, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ANDRE BIROTTE, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. This is Judge Robin Rosenberg who comes through this nonpartisan judicial nominating process Senator RUBIO and I have set up. Senator RUBIO and I certainly commend her for our Members' favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 235 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Baldwin	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Rubio
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	
Harkin	Nelson	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote the yeas are 58, the nays are 42. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ROBIN L. ROSENBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the next cloture vote.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Begich	Boxer	Carper
Bennet	Brown	Casey
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Collins

Coons	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Donnelly	Leahy	Sanders
Durbin	Manchin	Schatz
Feinstein	Markey	Schumer
Franken	McCaskill	Shaheen
Gillibrand	Menendez	Stabenow
Hagan	Merkley	Tester
Harkin	Mikulski	Udall (CO)
Heinrich	Murkowski	Udall (NM)
Heitkamp	Murphy	Vitter
Hirono	Murray	Walsh
Johnson (SD)	Nelson	Warner
Kaine	Pryor	Warren
King	Reed	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Reid	Wyden

NAYS—39

Alexander	Cruz	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Enzi	Isakson
Heller	Levin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 39. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk reported the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

MALAYSIA AIRLINES TRAGEDY

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the tragedy of the civilian airliner shot out of the sky by a Russian surface-to-air missile, cutting short the lives of 298 innocent civilians. Parents, children and spouses of victims have expressed deep anguish, and we all feel their grief.

All of us agree the images we are seeing from the crash site are heartbreaking and sickening. President Obama, Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte, leaders throughout the world, and many others have expressed their outrage at the vicious, uncivilized act that took place at 33,000 feet over the country of Ukraine. A few days ago, British Prime Minister David Cameron stated firmly:

> For too long there has been a reluctance on the part of too many European countries to face up to the implications of what is happening in eastern Ukraine. . . . Elegant forms of words and fine communiques are no substitute for real action. The weapons and fighters being funneled across the border between Russia and eastern Ukraine; the support to the militias; the half-truths, the bluster, the delays. They have to stop.

As the prime minister acknowledged: This is a moment when words of condemnation and expressions of grief are simply not enough. This is a moment when action must follow the outrage and rhetorical condemnation.

The tragedy of Malaysian Airlines 17 will be a defining event in history. It is a defining event for Russia, first and foremost, and for its President, Vladimir Putin. It is no secret that Putin has imperial ambitions, motivated by his pathological insecurities, and a quest to restore lost glory to Mother Russia. These are dangerous delusions. If they are not confronted firmly, they will come to threaten us all.

But it is also a defining event for the United States and its European allies. The festering danger in Ukraine is the result of the civilized world's faltering half-steps as a meager, timid and all too minimal response to Russia's invasion of a neighbor in violation of sovereign borders. This is an opportunity for American leadership, in step with our European allies, to spur the community of nations to act together and be a force for good and be a force for the right change that needs to take place—not later, but now.

It is a defining event for President Obama and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Today these two leaders, the two who are most able to influence this situation, can stand up and demonstrate leadership that will shape history. So this is a pivotal moment—a pivotal moment for the United States, for Germany, for the European Union and for the world. Given the significance of this event in this moment, what are we to do? I do not have all the answers. I have been suggesting harsh sanctions, sanctions that bite, that hit Russia hard ever since their invasion of Crimea.

As I have said earlier, what has been done is far too short of what needs to be done to punish Russia for the breach of sovereignty and now this brutal and terrible tragic result and consequence of what they are doing in eastern Ukraine. So first we need to ask the entire civilized world to join the United States, our European allies, and everyone in condemning this outrageous act.

Events like this tragedy have no place in the modern world. This unassailable fact needs to be acknowledged globally and more than once. It needs to be acknowledged repeatedly until it becomes so loud that Putin and the Russians can hear it in Moscow and in the Kremlin and see that what has taken place is the direct result of their engagement in eastern Ukraine.

Secondly, I think we need to demand complete cooperation with the ongoing investigation. Positive steps are beginning to take place far too late, but at least they are starting to take place.

Our commitment to the rule of law, rules of evidence, and to the demands of justice require that we go through this investigative process, and we must insist on the access to do so. We must demand full, immediate, unhindered access to the site of the tragedy, including all parts of the aircraft, missile battery, site evidence and, most of all, proper treatment of the remains of the many victims. President Putin by himself can ensure that success and that access, and he absolutely must be required to do so.

Third, we need to demand an immediate Russian stand-down in Ukraine. Crimes like Malaysia Airlines flight 17 can only happen in such a lawless wasteland—renegades and desperados with their fingers on the triggers of the world's most advanced weapons. Lawlessness reigns in eastern Ukraine because the government of that nation still does not have sovereign control of its own territory.

The situation is greatly exacerbated as a result of President Putin's outrageous territorial aggression. He has already severed an arm of Ukraine and threatened an entire country's disintegration.

Make no mistake, the Russian separatists in eastern Ukraine have been organized, motivated, trained, equipped, unleashed, guided, and controlled by the forces of the Russian Federation which are controlled themselves—with totalitarian execution—by none other than President Vladimir Putin. Now we see a new tragic result of this aggression, of sponsorship, of ruthless renegades—a blatant act of terrorism inflicted on innocent people. This problem will only get worse unless we demand that Russian behavior change and Putin's aggression stop. It needs to be a voice that resounds from every nation, civilized nation, in the world.

The only solution to the Ukraine problem is doing what is consistent with our national law. The demands of order and civility and the requirements of justice are what Russia must acknowledge and that the Government of Ukraine must have sovereign control over its own territory.

No. 4, the United States and Europe must, at last, act vigorously and in unison if we are to succeed in this effort. Until now, President Obama has sent largely weak signals to Putin about the seriousness of Russia's actions. Our European partners have been reluctant to act, some hypnotized by anxiety about their economic dependency on Russian oil and gas. Let us hope that after this horrific act of terror against 298 innocent passengers on Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, this view is changing and changing quickly.

History will see this event as a watershed moment. Some argue that the

Soviet downing of Korean Airlines flight 007 in 1983 was an event that exposed the true nature of the Soviet regime and hastened its decay. Similarly, Malaysia Airlines flight 17 reveals to any remaining doubters the nature of Putin and his brutal ambitions and ruthlessness.

With illusions stripped away, the inadequacy of half measures revealed, we must now act and act together. We can respond to this tragedy by forming and forging a new unity. But only the most robust and concerted actions to impose economic sanctions on Russia have a chance to change Putin's behavior and end Russian support for the separatist militants and, to be effective, we and the Europeans must do this together, imposing these costs.

We need to target the fragile Russian economy through sanctions on Russia's energy sector and State-backed arms exporter. While it may take time for Russia to feel the effects of sanctions on the energy sector, we can take action today that would have an immediate effect.

I have previously introduced legislation that prohibits all government contracts with Putin's arms dealers. Taking steps to meaningfully obstruct this agency's work and the revenue it provides the Russian State is one of the most effective ways we can condemn Putin's aggression. Through these specific sanctions we can demand that Putin end his support for the separatists and accept and work toward a stable Ukraine. If not, I suggest we do whatever is necessary to bring Russia's economy to its knees. We need to see that stock market plummet. We need to see confidence and support for anything Russia makes or exports denied by the civilized nations of the world. We need to put measures there to prevent their manufacturing and shipment of arms to people such as Assad in Syria, to the Iranians, to the groups that are creating havoc around the world. Russia's arms exports are a major source of their revenue. We need to stop them.

The decision is in their hands. Following this horrific, brutal, tragic event, they have the responsibility to the world's nations to step up and address this issue.

This crisis has reached a point of high tension, great tragedy, and escalated consequences. These potential consequences are dangerous for all of us but, most of all, they are dangerous for Putin's Russia.

Russia's President holds in his hands the ability to de-escalate this crisis or to pay a very steep price. We need to define and implement that steep price if he doesn't take this action.

It is Putin's choice to bring this situation back from the brink. It is our obligation, along with our European partners, to make Putin's choice crystal clear.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. What is the general order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time between now and 12:30 p.m. is equally divided, and the Republicans control 5 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Later this week we are going to have the EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy come to our Environment and Public Works Committee to testify about the greenhouse gas rule being developed for existing fleets of powerplants. We know what the rule is for the new powerplants; this is for the existing.

In light of that, it is important to point out that the Senate has been debating global warming for well over a decade, actually around 14 years. The first cap-and-trade bill the Senate debated was when Republicans were in the majority. I was chairman at that time of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

The first bill was the McCain-Lieberman bill which would have set CO_2 limits on all utilities that emit at least 10,000 tons of greenhouse gases per year. That was defeated October 30, 2003, by a vote of 43 to 55. That was when I was all alone. Actually, everyone thought eventually something was going to pass and they were all afraid of the issue.

Now times have dramatically changed. Since that time we have had other bills come up. In 2005 we had the same bill by the same authors. It was defeated even at that time by a wider range.

Then in 2008 the Lieberman-Warner bill came up, and it failed also. That was actually when the Republicans had lost the majority. So even with the Democrats as the majority, they were not able to get it through.

Most recently, we debated the Waxman and Markey bill of 2009 which said emissions to facilities over 25,000 tons a year. That bill passed the House, but it was never brought to the Senate for a vote because they knew it would fail.

Each of these bills had one thing in common: Their cost was enormous. We found out—and there was testimony quite some time ago—that if we were to pass cap-and-trade, the cost would be in the area of $300 billion to $400 billion a year.

I do calculations every time I hear a large number and I go back. In my State of Oklahoma, I calculate the number of families who actually file Federal tax returns and do the math. That would cost each family in Oklahoma about $3,000 a year. We know it doesn't make any difference, because the testimony of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, Lisa Jackson, who was appointed by President Obama, said in response to my question on the public record that even if we were to pass something it would not have the effect of reducing CO_2 emissions worldwide, because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China and other places.

Since this time—and it is not me saying this—Nature magazine, The Economist, and even the IPCC—the IPCC is the United Nations; they are the ones who started this—they admit for the past 15 years there has been no increase in global temperatures. Meanwhile, the CO_2 emissions have increased a lot. So obviously it is not warming and that is going back into a normal cycle.

Unfortunately, this hasn't deterred the President from making global warming a key part of domestic policy. What he could not have accomplished through legislation he is now doing through regulations at the EPA, but the American people don't want anything to do with this.

I can remember when the polls were something like the No. 1 or No. 2 issue. The last Gallup poll, this past week, had it as No. 14 out of 15 issues. The Pew Research Center—53 percent of Americans, when asked about the cause of global warming, said they don't believe there is enough evidence to blame human anthropogenic gases or to believe that it is caused by natural variation.

This problem explains why it is difficult for Tom Steyer. On the floor I showed his picture and read the comments he had made. He is raising $100 million to put into campaigns. He has already put up $50 million and has been unable to raise anything close to the next $50 million. So people are not rallying to pour money into this lost cause.

The international community is starting to give up too. I was with the Secretary of Defense of Australia last night, and he was one of them who was very strongly in opposition to the cap-and-trade they adopted in Australia and they have now, as of 1 month ago, repealed it. If you look at other countries, and not only Australia but others that were believing this at one time, are dropping off. So the Australian people should thank the Prime Minister.

It is my hope we will be able to protect the American people from the senseless global warming policies in the United States.

Tomorrow we are going to have a committee hearing, and the momentum has actually gone from the other side.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, here we are—another day in the Senate—facing another political gimmick. That is the way things seem to work in the Democratic Senate, and that is what is happening again this week.

Yesterday Democrats introduced their latest designed-to-fail bill, the Bring Jobs Home Act. It is a bill they know is not going to pass. The reason I say the bill is designed to fail is because it has already failed. It has been voted on here before in the previous Congress, but that is not stopping the Democrats.

The Bring Jobs Home Act would supposedly encourage American companies to bring jobs back home to the United States and to discourage companies from sending jobs overseas. But the bill completely ignores the real problem and the reason American companies are sending jobs overseas: America's broken Tax Code and our sky-high tax rate on business. America has one of the highest corporate tax rates in the developed world and many companies simply can't afford to pay it and stay profitable.

If Democrats were truly serious about solving the problem of American jobs going overseas, they would be sitting down with Republicans to hammer out reform of our Tax Code. We should be substantially lowering overall tax rates to allow American businesses to keep jobs here at home while remaining competitive in the global marketplace. Instead of serious reform, however, Democrats have chosen to take up a bill that would do nothing to address the real problem we are dealing with. Democrats are not bringing up this bill in the hopes of actually fixing problems. They are bringing it up in hopes of winning a few votes in the November election. This is not a secret.

When Democrats first brought this bill up 2 years ago ahead of the 2012 election, Reuters described it as an example of Members of Congress ''offering up measures they know will not pass but can be used to fire up their respective supporters in the run-up to November's elections.'' That was from 2 years ago, the last time this was brought up. That has been the Democrats' preferred method of operating in the Senate.

Back in March the New York Times reported that Democrats planned to spend the spring and summer on messaging votes ''timed to coincide with campaign-style trips by President Obama.'' Again, that is from the New York Times earlier this year.

The ''Democrats concede,'' the Times continued, ''that making new laws is not really the point.'' ''Rather, they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them.'' That is also a quote which was in the New York Times story a few months ago. Making new laws is not really the point. What we are talking about here is not fixing problems; it is just creating political opportunities.

So 5½ years of Democratic policies have left American families hurting. Unemployment, which the President's advisers predicted would fall below 6 percent in 2012, is still above 6 percent 2 years later. Almost 10 million Americans are unemployed, and 3.1 million have been unemployed for 6 months or longer. Those numbers would be even worse if so many Americans had not given up on finding work and dropped out of the labor force all together.

Our current labor force participation rate is at lows we have not seen since the 1970s during the Presidency of Jimmy Carter. In fact, if the labor participation rate were today what it was when the President took office, the unemployment rate would not be a little over 6 percent, it would be 10.2 percent. That is how many people have entirely quit looking for work.

Household income has plummeted by more than $3,300 on the President's watch. At the same time, prices have risen. Food prices have increased. The price of gas has nearly doubled, college costs continue to soar, and family health insurance premiums have skyrocketed by almost $3,000, despite the President's promise they would fall. And what do you get when you combine high prices, fewer opportunities for employment and advancement and reduced income? You get a lot of struggling middle-class families.

Instead of spending this year taking up serious legislation to help those families, Democrats—by their own admission—have spent this year on political show votes they hope will win them a few votes in the November election.

Last week the Congressional Budget Office issued its yearly long-term budget outlet. The news on that front was grim. The Congressional Budget Office recorded that as early as 2039, under its baseline scenario, the Nation could see public debt reach 106 percent of GDP, which would be a level of debt seen only once before in our Nation's history.

By 2039, under an alternative fiscal scenario, the debt-to-GDP ratio could rise to more than 180 percent of GDP. By comparison, Greece's current debt-to-GDP ratio is 175 percent. In other words, our economy could go the way of Greece's in just a few short years if nothing is done.

We have to take up significant budget reform and reduce the size of government. We need to look for ways we can make government work more effectively and more efficiently by reforming programs that need to be reformed. Chipping away around the edges is not going to get the job done. It is not going to cut it.

Even before the President came into office, our national debt presented a serious and pressing problem. But over the last 5½ years of the current administration, the problem has gotten exponentially worse. If you look at our total debt—which includes the public and intergovernmental debt—when President Obama came into office, our national debt was $10.6 trillion. Today, just 5½ years later, our national total debt stands at $17.6 trillion. That is a 66-percent increase on the President's watch. That is horrifying. Yet President Obama and his party continue to act as if our country is not hurdling toward a fiscal crisis.

Among the President's many fiscally irresponsible policies, ObamaCare stands out as one of the worst offenders. Former Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin has estimated that the President's health care law will increase the deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars in its first 10 years alone and by more than $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Politico reports that the Congressional Budget Office attributes the coming growth of the debt to—among other things—''rising health care costs'' and ''the expansion of subsidies offered through ObamaCare.'' So much for the President's claim that the health care law would be ''the largest deficit reduction plan in over a decade.'' But that is par for the course for the Affordable Care Act.

The President also promised that the law would reduce Americans' health insurance premiums by $2,500. Instead, as I mentioned, they have already risen by almost $3,000, and they are still going up.

I have a few headlines from this past week that I will read into the RECORD. Yesterday's Kaiser Health News reported: ''Florida's Biggest Health Insurer Signals Rate Hikes Ahead.''

The Nebraska Radio Network had an expert who said: ''Nebraskans' premiums may bounce 30 percent under ObamaCare.''

Last Wednesday, the Nashville Business Journal reported, ''Here come higher premiums: Tennessee's insurance providers request rate increases.''

Last Tuesday, the Associated Press reported: ''Delawareans Could Face Higher Rates Under ACA.''

The New Orleans Times-Picayune reported: ''Some insurance carriers looking for double-digit increases for Affordable Care Act policies.''

Those are just a few of the most recent headlines from newspapers around this country last week. I could go on about the health care law's broken promises. I could also talk about the fact that the President promised that Americans would be able to keep their

doctors and hospitals, but Americans are now finding the new health plans exclude doctors and hospitals they have literally been using for years or the fact that the health care bill was supposed to give more Americans access to health care but that many Americans are struggling to find doctors who will take their ObamaCare insurance.

One doctor reporting on her patient's experience with the ObamaCare plan said: ''We are running into problems with coverage in the same way we were when they were uninsured.'' Let me repeat that. This is from a doctor talking about one of her patient's experiences with the ObamaCare plan: ''We are running into problems with coverage in the same way we were when they were uninsured.'' If that doesn't sum up the law's failure, I don't know what does.

Then there was the President's promise that shopping for health care on the exchange would be like buying a TV on Amazon or a plane ticket on Kayak. As Americans quickly found out or are still finding out almost 10 months later, shopping on the exchanges is a lot more like the world's most nightmarish experience with the DMV.

ObamaCare is failing Americans, and so is the Obama economy. Instead of focusing on making things better, Democrats are focused on trying to get reelected in November.

Republicans have solutions to the challenges facing the American people—solutions such as approving the Keystone Pipeline and the tens of thousands of jobs it would support; repealing the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek provision, which is slashing employees' hours and wages; stopping the job-killing national energy tax which will eliminate hundreds of thousands of jobs and drive up Americans' energy bills; enacting trade promotion authority to open new markets to American farmers, workers, and businesses; repealing the medical device tax which is costing American jobs and increasing the cost of health care; and passing real health care reform—the kind that will lower costs, increase choice, and put Americans back in charge of their health care. If Democrats were serious about helping American families, they would be working with us on these priorities instead of tying up the Senate with partisan legislation, and they would be taking up the 40 House-passed jobs bills currently gathering dust on the majority leader's desk.

Every day the Senate spends on designed-to-fail bills, designed-to-fail legislation—bills we know aren't going anywhere—is a day the Senate is not spending on bills to provide real relief to the American people.

It is high time for Democrats to stop wasting time on partisan legislation and start working with Republicans on real reform. Middle-class, middle-income families around this country have been squeezed for long enough. The American people have been waiting long enough. There are 40 House-passed jobs bills waiting for action here in the Senate. Instead, we are spending week after week of the Senate's time voting on bills designed to fail and designed to do nothing more than score political points heading into an election. That is wrong on so many levels. Most of all, it is wrong for the American people, and it has to change.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:34 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF ANDRE BIROTTE, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Birotte nomination.

If no one yields time, time will be equally charged to both sides.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to support the nomination of André Birotte to be a U.S. district judge for the Central District of California.

I recommended Mr. Birotte to serve as U.S. attorney for this district in 2009. I have been very impressed by his performance in that role since his unanimous confirmation by the Senate in 2010. I believe he will be an outstanding district judge.

Mr. Birotte received his law degree from Pepperdine in 1991 and his bachelor's from Tufts in 1987. He then served as a deputy public defender for the Los Angeles County Public Defender's office. He later spent 4 years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Central District of California, where he prosecuted violent crime, fraud, and narcotics cases.

In 1999, he spent a year in private practice before moving to the Los Angeles Police Commission, where he served as assistant inspector general and later as inspector general until he became U.S. attorney. As inspector general, Birotte built a strong reputation for fairness and earned the respect of all sides, including in the law enforcement community. In 2009, then-LAPD Chief Bill Bratton—who is deeply respected on both sides of the aisle in this body—wrote to me to express his ''strongest endorsement and support'' for Birotte. As Chief Bratton said: ''In the approximately six years that I have known André, our working relationship has been one of transparency, cooperation, trust, and respect.''

In 2009, as I said, I recommended him to the President for appointment as U.S. attorney. He earned high marks from my bipartisan advisory committee and an outpouring of support from a broad spectrum of respected individuals in the Los Angeles community. The Senate soon confirmed him unanimously and he has served in his current position with distinction ever since.

When I introduced Mr. Birotte to my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, I went through the impressive work the U.S. attorney's office has done under his leadership in a number of areas. I will not go into each of those cases today, except to note that they cover very important areas of Federal law enforcement, including: national security, gangs and organized crime, sex crimes and human trafficking, public corruption, and civil rights.

Since his nomination was approved by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote, the U.S. attorney's office has continued its impressive track record of enforcing the law. In one case, a Los Angeles doctor who ran medical clinics pleaded guilty to illegally prescribing addictive painkillers and laundering the cash payments, which amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Last month, the owner and employees of a Los Angeles-area immigration consulting firm were arrested after being indicted for filing fraudulent green card applications. The office's press release states that the defendants quoted fees for their services, but then more than tripled those fees and ''allegedly threatened to contact authorities and have the aliens deported'' after ''several of the foreign nationals sought refunds.''

Just 2 weeks ago, Mr. Birotte's office announced that two men from Long Beach, CA pleaded guilty to ''conspiracy charges arising from a sex trafficking scheme that exploited adult women for prostitution.'' Bill Lewis, assistant director in charge of the FBI Los Angeles field office, stated: ''In this case, the defendants defrauded victims and forced them to work as sex slaves under threat to themselves and their families.'' The office's press release states that both men now face up to life imprisonment.

Let me conclude by saying that throughout his career André Birotte has built a reputation for fairness and for a profound commitment to the rule of law. He has earned the deep respect of people on all sides of difficult issues. In fact, Birotte is supported not only by State and Federal law enforcement, but also by the Central District's Federal Public Defender, Sean Kennedy. Kennedy told my selection committee that Birotte has ''incredible judgment'' and would make a ''wonderful federal

judge.'' It says something very special about the chief Federal prosecutor for the second-largest district in the Nation when the chief Federal Public Defender for the district has such high praise.

This is a nominee I am proud to have recommended, and that the Senate should be proud to confirm.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ROBIN L. ROSENBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Rosenberg nomination.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, just to remind the Senate, Senator RUBIO and I have the nonpartisan process of the Judicial Nomination Commission for our Federal district judges. Robin Rosenberg is a product of that. So I commend to the Senate this bipartisan nominee from the two of us.

Judge Robin Rosenberg is from West Palm Beach, FL. She is a circuit judge for the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit of Florida where she has served since 2007. Prior to her service on the bench, she was a partner at the law firm Rosenberg & McAuliffe from 2001 to 2006.

She worked as an attorney in many capacities including private practice at Holland and Knight, an assistant city attorney for the City of West Palm Beach and as a trial attorney in the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. Judge Rosenberg began her legal career as a law clerk for Judge James C. Paine of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida. She received her juris doctor and a master's degree in 1989 from Duke University and her B.A. in 1983 from Princeton University.

Judge Robin Rosenberg has the support of Senator RUBIO and myself, and was found to be unanimously qualified by the American Bar Association.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the deGravelles nomination.

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana?

Mr. BLUNT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I see several other colleagues on the floor. I

wish to speak for about 3 minutes on behalf of the nominee who was just confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEGRAVELLES NOMINATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, it is truly my distinct privilege to be able to speak on behalf of John Weadon deGravelles, a nominee for the Middle District Court in Louisiana. I am very gratified that my colleagues gave him a very strong vote of approval—a unanimous vote—just a few minutes ago. President Obama nominated Mr. deGravelles earlier this year, and I am very pleased I was joined by Senator VITTER, my colleague from Louisiana, in recommending him for his confirmation today.

He is affectionately known to his friends and family as Johnny. He has the support of a wide cross section of community leaders in Louisiana, and that support is based on an extraordinarily impressive scholarship he received to attend college at Louisiana State University, where he majored in sociology and received his juris doctorate from the law school. He excelled academically and has practiced law now for decades but is still fondly remembered as an extraordinary student.

After graduating from LSU, he served as a clerk at the firm Due & Dodson in Baton Rouge and would later become a partner in that firm. He is now practicing under his own name at deGravelles, Palmintier, Holthaus & Fruge.

As a partner in his well-established firm in Baton Rouge, he has honed his skills as one of the region's most capable litigators in both Federal and State court.

In addition to his work as a lawyer, respected by a broad cross section of leaders, he also taught for 20 years at both Tulane Law School and Louisiana State University. He is very popular, I understand, as a teacher. He is always open to students and his advice is sought after on a regular basis.

He is a very active member of a variety of bar associations, including the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, and the Louisiana State Bar. He was admitted to practice, of course, in the U.S. District Courts for the Western, Middle, and Eastern Districts of Louisiana, the Southern District of Texas, the Fifth, Sixth, and Eleventh U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals, and the U.S. Supreme Court. He has practiced for literally decades in front of the Federal bench.

He has also been recognized for his outstanding leadership by very distinguished organizations, including the Louisiana Trial Bar, the Louisiana Trial Lawyers Association, and the Council for a Better Louisiana.

He has written dozens and dozens of articles for legal publication. He is a sought-after speaker for seminars throughout the country.

Our former chief justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana—also the first woman chief justice—Kitty Kimball described Johnny as ''an exceptional lawyer who enjoys the respect of both bench and bar.''

I think one of the most important aspects of his background is that after the devastating storms of Rita and Katrina in 2005, Mr. deGravelles was one of the real champions in helping to set up the Louisiana Association for Justice Hurricane Relief Committee which assisted many displaced attorneys who had no place to practice, clients who were distributed all over the country, and courthouses that were closed—to help the wheels of justice move forward during that very difficult time of upheaval and destruction.

I have every confidence Mr. deGravelles will serve the people of the Middle District as a fair, wise, and very experienced lawyer who will serve as a judge.

I am very proud that this body voted so overwhelmingly in favor of his confirmation today. I know his wife Jan is extremely proud of him, and he and Jan are proud of both children who followed in their father's footsteps. Kate and Neil are both practicing attorneys in Louisiana.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a piece of commonsense legislation the Senate is preparing to consider this week. The bill, which is called the Bring Jobs Home Act, sets out to do just what that name implies—bring good-paying jobs back to America.

Our Tax Code has a fundamental flaw. Right now a U.S. company can decide to cut American jobs, move them overseas, and then claim those expenses as a tax deduction, thereby lowering the amount of taxes the company pays.

If a company decides to move 75 good-paying U.S. manufacturing jobs overseas, not only do we lose good American jobs, but taxpayers in Colorado and West Virginia and throughout the country are footing the bill for the cost of killing those jobs. American taxpayers literally get billed for the cost of shipping jobs overseas.

I don't think it is right to reward companies for cutting American jobs, and I don't think it is right to ask taxpayers to subsidize the cost of moving those jobs overseas. That is why I am cosponsoring the Bring Jobs Home Act in an effort to provide better incentives for U.S. businesses to bring good-paying jobs back to our country and keep them here. Our country is at its best when we produce here in America.

Simply put, the Bring Jobs Home Act is about looking out for the best interest of Coloradans and not the bottom lines of corporations that want to ship their jobs to places such as China and India.

What is best about this legislation is that not only would it end taxpayer subsidies for outsourcing, it would take the money that is saved and invest it in America by offering a 20-percent tax credit for businesses that decide to bring jobs back to the United States.

This legislation is one piece of a larger conversation Congress ought to have about what the Tax Code should look like in the 21st century economy. What are the values it should reflect? What are the incentives it should provide? These are important questions we need to answer, and the Bring Jobs Home Act is an initial step to achieve fair and reasonable reform.

I have been a long-time proponent of tax reform to streamline and simplify the Federal Tax Code because I am convinced—as I believe the Presiding Officer is—that the certainty and predictability it will create will lead to job growth in our country.

Last week Colorado reported that its unemployment rate was 5.5 percent, the lowest since 2008. But we can do more, and this bill is one of the best places to start.

So let's join together and support this commonsense legislation so that we can reward companies that restore and create made-in-America jobs—jobs that shore up our economy and bolster our global competitiveness.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE DYSFUNCTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the unique and essential role of the Senate in our constitutional system of government. In doing so, I am of course addressing the American people whom we all serve, but my message today is intended especially for my colleagues in this body.

I had the honor of serving here for more than three decades with one of my closest and dearest friends, the late Ted Kennedy. Our friendship inevitably invited others to describe us as the Senate's odd couple given the vast differences in our backgrounds and our outlooks and because of the many fights we had on the floor as well as the many successes we had together. But my friendship with Teddy flourished, as did our legislative partnerships. Even with polar-opposite political philosophies, we were able to find significant areas of mutual agreement, and we both maintained a great affection for the Senate—an institution to which we had each devoted most of our adult lives.

Toward the end of his life, as Teddy suffered through the terrible affliction that eventually took him from us, he watched his beloved Senate with growing concern. He observed a growing dysfunction beginning to overcome this body. He believed this institution, which he loved so dearly, was breaking down. The man rightly described as the liberal lion of the Senate concluded that this body was no longer working as it must.

My friend Teddy was right, and the Senate has only gotten worse since he diagnosed its ills several years ago. The Senate is more dysfunctional today than at any other point during my nearly four decades as a Member of this body.

I am not alone in this assessment. Former colleagues from both political parties—from Chris Dodd to Olympia Snowe—have spoken out with great passion about the breakdown of the Senate as an institution. It would be hard to find a current Member of this body who, in moments of honest reflection, did not feel as if the Senate is in many respects broken.

Most importantly, the American public has lost faith in this body and largely views the Senate as an institution characterized by dysfunction. To say that today Congress is held in low esteem is an understatement. Our approval rating ranges from the teens to the single digits. One survey found that the public has a higher opinion of brussel sprouts, root canals, and used car salesmen than of Congress. In many respects, this popular assessment is justified. Throughout my 38 years of service in this body, I have never seen it this bad.

For the sake of our country and the well-being of our fellow citizens, we must restore order and function to the Senate so we can fulfill our constitutional responsibilities and once again conduct the people's business.

In reflecting on the past four decades in the Senate, I have come to realize that I possess an increasingly unique perspective. I have been in the majority for a total of 16 years and in the minority for a total of 22 years. I have served in this body with eight different majority leaders, four Republicans and four Democrats. By contrast, the majority of my colleagues—56, to be precise—have served in the Senate only during the tenure of the current majority leader. Nearly as many have served alongside only the current President. These numbers will increase in the coming months with the retirement of six of our senior colleagues and the potential electoral defeat of others.

To my colleagues who as a matter of firsthand experience don't know anything different, let me say this: The Senate has not always been as dysfunctional as it is today. Quite the opposite. Until recently, this Chamber often lived up to its reputation as the world's greatest deliberative body. We regularly worked together in an orderly and constructive fashion to advance the common good, and we routinely defended our institutional prerogatives against executive encroachment. Unfortunately, none of that is true of the Senate today.

I intend to speak in greater detail later this week about what I believe ails the Senate and how we can restore the health and dignity of this venerable institution. But to understand where we have come from and just how far we have strayed, we must begin at the beginning.

Remarking on the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, James Madison wisely observed that in determining the form the Senate should take, it was necessary to consider the purposes it would serve. The Framers were clear about these objectives. The Senate was to serve as a necessary fence against what they described as the fickleness and passion that drives popular pressure for hasty and ill-considered lawmaking—what Edward Randolph called ''the turbulence and follies of democracy.'' In fulfilling this purpose, the Senate was to be a place of thoughtful deliberation, an assembly dedicated to careful scrutiny, and a body with great concern for the sovereign States and the individual liberties of all Americans. These were to be the purpose of the Senate. Its institutional design followed directly from these principles.

The relatively small membership of the Senate would amplify the importance of each individual Senator as opposed to Chamber leaders or large voting blocs. Unlike in the House of Representatives, where robust participation by individual Members would be impossibly cumbersome, in this body each Senator could become intimately involved in all aspects of the Chamber's deliberation and debate. Longer terms would allow Senators to resist initially popular but ultimately unwise legislation and allow for vindication of this more measured approach prior to facing reelection. Staggered terms would create a continuing body that could temper unwieldy swings of public passion. Statewide constituencies would require appealing to a broader set of interests than more narrow and homogenous House districts.

In addition, the Senate's authority to determine its own rules would allow the gradual development of traditions and precedents unique to this body and essential to its ends. Building upon the Constitution's defining institutional contours, these historic rules and traditions have shaped the Senate into a body that Gladstone called ''the most remarkable of all of the inventions of modern politics.''

The Senate's most characteristic operating procedure became unanimous consent, which requires the agreement of not just a majority or even a supermajority but of all Senators.

As Senate Parliamentarian emeritus Robert Dove testified before the Rules Committee in April of 2010, the two key features that have come to define the Senate through its history are ''the right of its members to unlimited debate and the right to offer amendments practically without limit.'' With these historic rules and defining modes of operation—unlimited debate and amendments—the Senate rightfully earned the title of the world's greatest deliberative body.

In his 1897 farewell address, the first Adlai Stevenson, then Vice President, captured the essence of the Senate:

> In this Chamber alone are preserved without restraint two essentials of wise legislation and good government: the right of amendment and of debate. Great evils often result from hasty legislation; [but] rarely from the delay which follows full discussion and deliberation.

Stevenson went on to locate in the Senate's time-honored rules and traditions the very foundation of our Republic:

> The historic Senate—preserving the unrestricted right of amendment and debate, maintaining intact the time-honored parliamentary methods and amenities which unfailingly secure action after deliberation—possesses in our scheme of government a value which cannot be measured by words.

In keeping with its institutional design and longstanding traditions throughout most of its history, the Senate has engaged in robust discussion and meaningful debate rather than being dominated by partisan grandstanding and cheap political theater; the Senate has sought to chart a path toward the common good rather than simply messaging to particular interests or serving narrow constituencies; the Senate has acted to cultivate common cause and has enabled constructive compromises and accommodations to advance national priorities even during times of great ideological division; and throughout the Senate's history, individual Members have worked to develop meaningful and enduring partnerships with colleagues on both sides of the aisle rather than marching lockstep with their respective parties and simply heightening the divisions in society.

This institution has served the Nation well when adhering to its enduring principles and characteristic practices. Indeed, for most of the last four decades, as I have witnessed firsthand, the Senate's robust deliberation and open amendment process has facilitated and enabled some of the greatest legislative achievements of the modern era.

One of the most historic of such debates in which I took part occurred in my fifth year as a Senator. President Reagan took office in 1981 facing enormous challenges—stagflation, out-of-control spending, a crushing tax burden, and an underfunded military. His

first legislative priority was to cut marginal tax rates, restrain Federal spending, and bolster our national defense. As part of the vanguard of the Reagan revolution in the Senate, I steadfastly supported these policies and campaigned tirelessly to enact these landmark reforms.

In the Democrat-controlled House, the drama unfolded predictably between party leadership and various voting blocs, with conservative Democrats eventually joining Republicans to support what became the Gramm-Latta budget. But in the Republican-majority Senate, while debate was equally passionate, our deliberation was of a very different sort. We discussed many of the legislative provisions at length and voted on dozens of amendments from Senators of both parties covering a wide range of subjects. Many were tough votes on heart-wrenching issues—from child nutrition to cost-of-living adjustments for seniors—but we took those tough votes and ultimately made the difficult choices necessary to usher in unprecedented economic growth.

By allowing numerous votes on minority amendments, Democrats received the hearing they deserved on the issues about which they cared most, and having had the opportunity to fight for their causes, many of these Senators rightly felt they had done everything possible to improve the underlying bill. So when it came to final passage, the Senate's budget passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 88 to 10.

Given the nature of the reforms, that margin was striking. It demonstrates that the opportunity for extended deliberation and an open amendment process tends to yield a final product that can win broad support by giving Members confidence that the ultimate result represents the considered judgment of the whole Senate.

From the perspective of committed conservatives such as President Reagan and myself, the final amended Senate bill was far from ideal. In the end, while we won support for the tax cuts that spurred growth and for the defense buildup that helped win the Cold War, we could not convince Congress to make meaningful cuts to Federal spending or even to restrain the growth of Federal spending. But to have opposed the final package because it wasn't perfect, because it only achieved some of our goals, would have been madness. Absent passage of the final bill's reforms, the central accomplishments of the Reagan years would never have come to fruition.

In reflecting on how the Senate can and should work, let me also commend the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I am struck by the similarities between the 1996 election and the 2012 election when voters reelected a Democrat to the White House and a Republican majority to the House. Back then, both sides understood the voters' mandate to seek areas of agreement and develop consensus wherever possible—in short, to set aside partisanship and work together for the common good on the critical issues of the day.

Republicans wanted significant tax cuts and spending controls that many Democrats opposed. Democrats—led by my friend Senator Kennedy—had for years sought an expansion of health care to uninsured children who neither qualified for Medicaid nor had families who could afford health coverage. The debate that transpired over these measures seems almost foreign in today's Senate. Rather than being presented with a final bill as a fait accompli, we had a truly deliberative committee process, a meaningful floor debate, and the opportunity to vote on numerous amendments.

Ted Kennedy and I used the opportunity of an open process to make a key step toward consensus. Teddy was wise enough to realize that I shared his desire to provide health care for uninsured kids who were in need, and I recognized that he was open to innovative means of delivering that care and did not insist on an inflexible, big government bureaucracy to control it. Together, we crafted an amendment that created the State Children's Health Insurance Program—fully paid for, with flexible means of delivery and true State authority over the program. SCHIP is not beloved by ideological purists, especially on the right. But I believe its approach is fully compatible with my conservative principles and a model for a basic, efficient social safety net run by the States.

More importantly, our partnership on this issue demonstrates how the Senate ought to work. This Chamber provides a unique environment—its constructive character, its respect for individual Senators' participation in the legislative process, its forum for thoughtful deliberation, and its open amendment process. Without these, we could never have passed SCHIP and the larger 1997 budget—that was a budget compromise—of which it was a part.

The same is true of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which has since served to safeguard fundamental individual liberties, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, which is arguably the most important law enforcement measure of the last half century, and so many other landmark accomplishments of the Senate during my time here.

I am proud to have played a role in shaping each of these laws—as part of a constructive legislative process that was possible only as a direct result of the Senate's longstanding rules and traditions. Without this body's characteristic structure and mode of operation, which facilitates meaningful deliberation and ultimate cooperation between diverse viewpoints, such legislative achievements could never have occurred.

Throughout its history, the Senate has advanced the common good—not simply through refining public opinion and translating it into well-considered legislation but also because this body has defended its institutional prerogatives and essential role in our system of constitutional government.

Senators of both political parties have often stood up to executive encroachment—not for partisan gain or political grandstanding but in defense of Congress as a coordinate and coequal branch of government with its own essential authorities and responsibilities.

Implicit in the constitutional design of separating the Federal Government's powers is the idea that each branch would have the incentive and authority to resist encroachments from the other branches, ensuring that unfettered power is not concentrated in any one set of hands.

The Founders recognized this as indispensable to preserving the individual liberty of all citizens. For as Madison counseled in Federalist 51: ''[T]he greatest security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others.''

Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia embodied this institutional ideal as much as anyone with whom I have served. Although he helped lead this body for more than a half century and left us just 4 short years ago, I was surprised and dismayed to learn that a full third of current Members never served alongside him.

Senator Byrd fiercely defended this body's prerogatives and independence against the encroachments of the executive branch. And he neither censored his criticisms nor weakened his defenses based on the President's political party. Even in his twilight years, when President Obama took office with extraordinarily high approval ratings, Senator Byrd was willing to hold the new President's feet to the fire to defend the Senate's right to give advice and consent to nominees.

He publicly chastised the new White House for its excessive reliance on czars, observing that unconfirmed policy chieftains ''can threaten the Constitutional system of checks and balances. At the worst, White House staff have taken direction and control of programmatic areas that are the statutory responsibility of Senate-confirmed officials.''

In addition to defending the Senate against executive encroachments, Senator Byrd was a stalwart defender of the Senate's most characteristic and historic features. He regularly spoke to newly elected Senators, admonishing each of us before we even took office to

learn about the body to which we had been elected and in which we would serve. Senator Byrd was as good as anyone I have ever known at explaining the direct connection between the design of the Senate and the liberty that all Americans cherish.

In November 1996, for example, when speaking to the incoming freshman Senators, he stressed the two most critical and distinguishing features of the Senate's operation. Like so many other students of the Senate, he steadfastly maintained that ''as long as the Senate retains the power to amend and the power of unlimited debate, the liberties of the people will remain secure.'' That was Robert C. Byrd, one of the leading Democrats of all time. Throughout his time in this body, Senator Byrd never abandoned this message. He stood up for the Senate's defining characteristics, no matter which party was in the majority and no matter who occupied the Oval Office. He even took on his own President from time to time.

A few months before his death in 2010, he wrote to his colleagues identifying the right to amend and the right to debate as ''essential to the protection of the liberties of a free people.''

We need a renewed dedication to the special role of the Senate and its institutional prerogatives that Senator Byrd exemplified so well. He was right to counsel incoming colleagues to ''study the Senate in its institutional context, because that is the best way to understand your personal role as a United States Senator . . . [Y]ou must find the time to reflect, to study, to read, and, especially, to understand the absolutely critically important institutional role of the Senate.''

Many of my colleagues—even those with whom I rarely agree—have the potential to be great Senators and statesmen: worthy stewards of this institution, zealous guardians of its prerogatives, and true defenders of its role in our constitutional system of government.

But, sadly, whether blinded by partisan loyalty to the President or too inexperienced to understand the Senate from any other perspective than having a like-minded Senate majority and President, too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have allowed—even facilitated—the breakdown of the Senate's vital institutions and role.

From our right to debate and amend through regular order, to our role giving advice and consent to the President's nominees, the Senate has emasculated itself. By doing so, we only abandon our responsibilities, discard our authorities, and lay ourselves prostrate before a politically destructive President.

It is past time to restore the Senate's rightful place in our constitutional order. I urge my colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—to join me, to stand and fight for the greatness of this body and start standing for the rights and the powers of the legislative branch. That is what we are here to do, in addition to enacting good laws. But you cannot enact really great laws without full and fair debate, without full and fair right to amendments. This is a great body, but it has gone downhill a long way over the last number of years. No President deserves total fealty by this body or by his or her party Members in this body.

All I can say is, it is time for us to start acting like the Senate. It is time for us to have full and fair debate. It is time for us to have open amendments. And that goes for Democrats and Republicans.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about something that I think we should all be able to agree on; that is, every American—every American worker—deserves a fair shot to get ahead. One of the great things about our country is that has been a fundamental value or belief, and we need to make sure that value still holds in America right now: If you work hard, you have a chance to have your fair shot to get ahead.

American workers are the best in the world. I can tell you that coming from Michigan, where we make things and grow things, and I am very proud of it. They can outcompete anyone and will win in a fair fight. Unfortunately, too often the fight is not fair today. We see a tax system that is really rigged against jobs in America too many times, and we need to fix that.

Right now our Tax Code contains a shocking loophole that forces taxpayers to foot the bill when companies move jobs overseas. I think most Americans would say: What? Say that again. Companies are packing up and leaving the country, and the Tax Code is rewarding it and we are paying for it?

Workers are forced to pay to ship their own jobs overseas to China or Mexico or other places around the world, and that is something that is very difficult to understand and believe.

Not only do you get laid off, but then you turn around and through your taxes, through tax writeoffs, you are forced to pay for sending your own job overseas. Communities see a factory close, and through their taxes they end up paying for that empty factory in the community. Of course, we have seen way too many in Michigan. Our country sees that.

This is outrageous. It is long past due to end. The good news is we have a chance to fix it tomorrow together on a bipartisan basis. I hope we will have 100 votes of people saying: We want to proceed to the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I want to thank Senator WALSH from Montana for taking the lead. He has very specific stories to tell about what has happened in Montana. Senator MARK PRYOR from Arkansas is the same—very passionate about this. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to join with them as we lead this effort to stand with American businesses that want to stay in America, and workers, families, and communities, and that we send a very strong message about what we think our Tax Code should incentivize by passing the Bring Jobs Home Act. We will have a chance to do that tomorrow.

It is very simple. It closes an outrageous tax loophole that forces taxpayers to foot the bill for companies that move job overseas and replaces it with a tax cut that rewards companies for coming home. In the great State of Michigan we make things. We have always done that. It is part of our identity and our source of pride. It is the backbone of who we are. It is the backbone of the middle class, quite frankly. I do not think we would have a middle class unless we made things and grew things, which is what we do in Michigan. I know that is done in West Virginia and around the country. It is certainly what has created the middle class of this country.

But here is what we have seen, because of a number of things. One of those is the Tax Code that does not make sense in terms of keeping jobs here. Between 2000 and 2009, in the last 10 years, 2.4 million jobs were shipped overseas. We have a lot of different ways we want to turn that around. In fact, it is being turned around for a number of reasons now. We are beginning to see them come back. But 2.4 million jobs shipped overseas.

To add insult to injury, the American taxpayers were asked to foot the bill. That is just the bottom line. So what you see is people who have worked all of their lives for a paycheck get a pink slip instead. They played by the rules, but they were left on the sidelines. The company takes the jobs overseas and gets a tax break for shipping jobs overseas.

When the Tax Code creates incentives to ship jobs overseas, it is a sign there is something seriously wrong. We have an opportunity to fix it. It starts tomorrow. Our Chair of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN from Oregon, believes this as fiercely as I do, that we need to fix this. I am so proud to be a part of his committee. I know he is committed to making our system

more competitive in a global economy. We need to do that. But right now we can close a tax loophole. We have to close a tax loophole so we can stop the flow of jobs going overseas. That is the least we can do. In fact, we should be adding to this first step by stop paying for the move.

We ought to be closing the loophole that allows folks to act as though they are moving on paper, an inversion, when they do not actually move the plant. We ought to be focusing instead on how we are all in this ship together in America paying our fair share and moving the country forward, creating jobs, opportunity, strengthening the middle class.

We still have more jobs leaving than coming back, but we do have a number of companies that are doing the right thing. We need to support them. The smart thing they are doing is bringing jobs back. They are bringing them back to Michigan and to States all across the country. We say welcome back and we say thank you. We should reward these companies. For those companies that are still on the fence about whether to bring jobs back to America, we should help them make up their minds by giving them new tax incentives.

The Bring Jobs Home Act will not only end the practice of allowing companies to deduct the expenses of sending a job overseas, it will also allow companies coming back to deduct their expenses and give them an additional 20-percent tax credit for the cost of bringing jobs back.

This is very simple. Stop the subsidy that is paying for shipping our jobs overseas. Allow the tax writeoff to bring jobs back. Add to it an additional tax cut of 20 percent in order to be able to support our companies that are doing the right thing.

We have got a lot of examples of companies doing the right thing right now. For example, Whirlpool realized it needed to respond more quickly to customer requests in the United States and Canada, so they moved their washing machine manufacturing operations back from Mexico and Germany into Ohio.

GE used to make its hybrid water heater in China. The company needed to trim international shipping costs and wanted more control of the product. They brought manufacturing of appliances back to the United States.

But we are not just talking about manufacturing jobs, which of course are so very important. Again, GE realized it needed the kind of IT engineering talent it could only find in Michigan. So work that was being done in India is now being done in Van Buren Township in Michigan, as they brought jobs home.

We know that because of the explosion in natural gas and the current low prices, this is an incentive. I want to thank the Presiding Officer for his understanding of that and the importance of supporting American manufacturing, American businesses. We have a number of advantages right now to bring jobs home, to create jobs in America, including not only low energy costs but the finest workers in the world.

We have creative minds with new ideas and hard work and innovation at university labs, and public research and public-private partnerships that are going on, forging technology, empowering world-class innovation. So there is a lot we can be proud of. Manufacturing is, in fact, coming back.

I am proud that part of that is we stood with our American automobile industry at a time when they needed America to be with them and keep manufacturing jobs.

More than 12 million Americans are working in manufacturing today. We created 7,000 new manufacturing jobs in Michigan last month alone. So we have the right policies. We can continue to keep that going. We are at such a tipping point. We are in a situation where we are saying: Okay, you can write off the move; hey, you do not even have to move; you can just change the paperwork, going through these changes of the inversion, and still get all of the benefits of America: the cleanest air and water, and our innovation, education, and roads, and all of the things that are great about America but you are allowed to just change the paperwork and avoid contributing as Americans, to strengthening and being a part of our country.

We are at a tipping point. We have to make some changes that make it very clear whose side we are on. If we want everybody to have a fair shot, part of that is starting with a Tax Code that actually incentivizes a fair shot, not a system that is rigged against the people going to work every day, working hard, trying to get ahead, playing by the rules, all of that which we have grown up believing was the right thing to do in America. We have to make sure the Tax Code reflects the right values and the right policies.

So we are at a point now where we need to put in place the Bring Jobs Home Act. That is going to nudge some of those companies. We need to make some other changes that are going to make it very clear that we want and are committed to jobs in America, manufacturing in America, IT innovation in America, all the other work we can do so well.

You know, if we do not speed this up, at the current rate of jobs coming home, it is going to take us 100 years to bring back all of the jobs we have lost throughout this time. We can do better than that. We have to do better than that. The good news is, we have the power to speed up this process by putting in place the right policies, giving the companies that want to do the right thing the right incentives, the incentives to bring jobs home.

It is time for our Tax Code to stop working against workers, families, communities, and the businesses that are in America, and start working for Americans, for the American middle class. It is smart tax policy we are talking about. I think it is plain old common sense. People in Michigan kind of look at this and go: Why are you even debating this? Why do you have to have a motion about proceeding to this bill? Why is that not something everyone agrees to on a voice vote? People cannot believe we are doing this in our Tax Code. So this is a very important step. We can do this on a bipartisan basis.

I know we have colleagues who are concerned about what is happening on both sides of the aisle. Now is the time to show we can come together and make sure we have the jobs we want for our children and our grandchildren, the next generation. I hope we see an overwhelming bipartisan vote tomorrow.

I cannot think of a single reason why anybody would be opposed to the Bring Jobs Home Act. Why would anyone be opposed to giving every American a fair shot, giving every worker a fair shot to a good job and the ability to care for their families and get ahead? A strong bipartisan vote would send a wonderful message that we can work together, that we get it, that this country will not succeed if it is just about a privileged few and everybody else losing ground, losing the grip to the middle class or having no chance to get into the middle class.

This is an opportunity, with our vote tomorrow, to not only bring jobs home but support the American middle class.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the 60th anniversary of a Rhode Island institution, the Newport Jazz Festival. At this time, I wish to yield to my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE for his reflections on the Newport Jazz Festival. After he speaks, I will give my statement on this remarkable Rhode Island event. I yield now to my colleague.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am delighted that Senator REED organized for the two of us to come down to the floor today.

Newport, RI, is a venue for many wonderful and remarkable events, from

the America's Cup of the old day, to the Volvo Around the World ocean races now, to the Newport Folk Festival, and, of course, what we are here to celebrate today is the Newport Jazz Festival, celebrating its 60th anniversary.

Since 1954, this festival has provided generations of Rhode Islanders and visitors with the opportunity to experience some of the world's finest jazz music, and it has brought countless visitors to our Ocean State to witness these performances and enjoy our other great Rhode Island beaches and other amenities.

The Newport Jazz Festival began as the brainchild of Elaine and Lewis Lorillard, who financed the first festival as a way to bring some outdoor excitement and activity to Newport in the summer. In what would become a historic partnership, they reached out to George Wein, a Boston jazz club owner, to help them organize the event. Their creation became one of the first dedicated jazz festivals in the United States and ultimately came to shape the genre in ways they never could have anticipated.

The first festival was held on July 17 and 18, 1954, and included some of the finest performers ever to grace the stage, including Ella Fitzgerald, Billie Holiday, and Dizzy Gillespie. Held at the Newport Casino in Newport's Bellevue Avenue Historic District, that first festival included outdoor performances that allowed attendees to sit on the lawn and enjoy a beautiful Rhode Island summer day while reveling in the music. The event garnered national media attention, and it drew over 13,000 people to Newport on its very first start.

In the 60 years since that first festival, Newport has served as the backdrop for some of the most notable performances in the history of jazz. It was at the Newport Jazz Festival that Miles Davis first introduced the world to what would become known as hard bop jazz, mixing in sounds from the blues and gospel music. Duke Ellington's performance at the 1956 festival of ''Diminuendo and Crescendo in Blue'' is considered one of the greatest single performances in the history of jazz and revitalized Ellington's career. A number of performances at the festival have gone on to be released as independent albums, including acts from Ella Fitzgerald, Ray Charles, Nina Simone, and Miles Davis. The list of legendary performances goes on, with every year bringing a new crop of inventive jazz musicians to put their own mark on the festival's history and on their original art form.

Since his original partnering with the Lorillards in 1953, George Wein has gone on to replicate his success in Newport throughout the country, while maintaining Rhode Island's event as the flagship in the industry. He will do so again this year, still going strong as he closes in on his 89th birthday.

Under his leadership, on Friday, August 1, Newport will welcome thousands of eager music lovers looking to hear the best performers in modern jazz. The ticket this year includes Wynton Marsalis, Trombone Shorty, David Sanborn, and many others.

Additionally, in commemoration of this 60th anniversary, the festival will for the first time run for 3 full days, with shows lasting through the weekend.

The festival no longer takes place at the Newport Casino, as it has outgrown that original home and it has expanded to three stages that are set up on Narragansett Bay at the historic Fort Adams State Park, looking out on the Newport Bridge and the East Passage, with the ships sailing by. However, the Newport Jazz Festival still provides guests with the same opportunity it did 60 years ago to come and enjoy the Rhode Island summer and hear up close some of the finest jazz in the world.

I join my senior colleague Senator REED in applauding the city of Newport for its outstanding commitment to the arts, and I thank so many dedicated individuals who have worked so hard over those 60 years to keep this wonderful tradition alive. I look forward to another 60 years of amazing jazz in Rhode Island. I once again thank my senior Senator for organizing us to be on the floor together for this recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his eloquent remarks about the jazz festival, which is a great Rhode Island institution. Indeed, it is a great American invention.

The Newport Jazz Festival owes its beginnings to the vision and financial backing of Elaine and Louis Lorillard, who in 1954 wanted to do something with jazz in their community in Newport. Through their collaboration with George Wein, a jazz pianist and club owner with a vision, the jazz festival was born. Today the festival has grown to be one of the largest and most well-known jazz festivals in the Nation—indeed, I would say the world—attracting a whole new generation of artists and music fans. It also helped pave the way for the creation of the Newport Folk Festival—another pillar of the music festival community.

George Wein, in producing the Newport Jazz Festival, did not set out to change the world; he set out to make great music. But, as history has shown, great music and great art can change the world. What George Wein did over many summers was produce something more than extraordinary festivals; he produced the soundtrack of freedom for a generation of Americans.

Since its founding, the Newport Jazz Festival has seen an eclectic range of performers—emerging and established—many at the peak of their art—all embellishing their credentials through their performances. From Duke Ellington, to Frank Sinatra, to Led Zeppelin, the Newport Jazz Festival has seen them all. Its ongoing mission is to celebrate jazz music and to make the case for its relevance.

The 60th anniversary festival stays true to its core mission. It will kick off on August 1, 2014, and is scheduled to feature a variety of talent over 3 days, including Wynton Marsalis playing with the Jazz at Lincoln Center Orchestra, Trombone Shorty, and Dr. John. It will also include one musician who played at the inaugural Newport Jazz Festival, Lee Konitz.

Newport continues to attract top-notch performers and is still a must-see event for jazz and music aficionados alike.

I would also like to recognize the impact the Newport Jazz Festival has had and continues to have in our great State of Rhode Island. Each year, the thousands who flock to Newport to witness the festival also have an opportunity to experience the treasure of a Rhode Island summer. In this way the Newport Jazz Festival has served as a major source of tourism—an important industry for our State—and should be viewed as a model for other communities to follow.

I am proud to call the Newport Jazz Festival a home State event. On this milestone anniversary, I wish to congratulate my dear friend George Wein, the festival board, and all those who have worked and those who continue to work to put this outstanding event forward each year. Best wishes on a successful 60th anniversary festival and for continued success in the future.

CONGRATULATING THE NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 510, submitted earlier today by Senator WHITEHOUSE and me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 510) congratulating the Newport Jazz Festival on its 60th anniversary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 510) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. REED. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about a pressing issue—really, a crisis, and I don't use that word lightly—of some 52,000 unaccompanied alien children streaming across our southern border with Mexico, coming into our country, and that number is continuing to grow. In fact, the Obama administration itself says that number could reach 90,000 or more by the end of the fiscal year on October 1—in just a few months.

Again, this is a crisis on many levels. It is a border crises. It is a national security crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis. It is a fiscal issue for our country. It is a very serious situation.

I talked about it on the floor last week and laid out, broadly speaking, the policy response I think we need to have so this flow does not continue to grow. Today I come back to the floor, and I wish to speak about two things—specifics I have learned about how this crisis is specifically affecting Louisiana. I am really concerned about that. I am sure every Member here is concerned about the direct impact on their State.

No. 2, there is legislation I have introduced to directly respond to this crisis. Again, it is a real crisis.

In Louisiana, just in the last week or so, I have learned a number of specifics that are significant and continue to raise my concerns. I wrote the Secretary of Homeland Security asking a number of detailed questions some time ago, including about impacts on Louisiana. Unfortunately, I have heard nothing from the Department. I have received no response yet to that letter. I will follow up and get a response. In the meantime, these are specifics I am hearing from other reliable sources:

First of all, the Hirsch Memorial Coliseum in Shreveport, LA, has been apparently contacted by the Department of Homeland Security about locating space for the housing of illegal minors—setting up a camp, a facility specifically for that. No Member of our delegation was contacted. I had asked specific questions about any activity impacting Louisiana. I wasn't told, but they were contacted directly.

This isn't happening. It is impractical. It can't happen at the Hirsch Memorial Coliseum. They have many commitments and a lot of things they need to do there. So I don't think there is any chance of this sort of detention facility being set up there. But they were contacted.

In addition, there are thousands of new ICE cases regarding unaccompanied alien children. First of all, before the current crisis began there was a backlog of these UAC cases being sent to Louisiana with family members or sponsors. So there is a backlog of about 2,000 cases. Apparently, since this crisis started developing in the last several months, we have 1,259 new juvenile cases for Louisiana alone. That is a significant number for a State the size of Louisiana.

We believe these are folks being sent through the Chicago detention facility to be united with family members or other sponsors in Louisiana. Again, this is exactly the sort of thing I had asked the Department of Homeland Security about. I haven't received any response to my letter. I haven't received any official formal response to my specific questions. We have had to learn this through other sources, talking to some ICE officials and others directly. This is really concerning. If this is going on in Louisiana, this is going on in every State of the country, and it underscores what a serious situation and in fact a crisis on many different levels this is.

That is why last week I introduced legislation to try to address this very serious situation, this border crisis. I introduced S. 2632 to address specifically the UAC issue. I will outline broadly what it will do.

Broadly speaking, it will make sure we detain these individuals, don't release them to relatives, family members, sponsors—don't release them out into society but detain them, and have a much quicker, more efficient process for deporting them and returning them to their home countries. Specifically, we would have mandatory detention of all unaccompanied alien children—UACs—upon apprehension.

No. 2, we would amend TVPRA to bring parity between UACs from contiguous and noncontiguous countries. As most Senators know, we have a more streamlined, workable process for unaccompanied alien children from contiguous countries—namely, Mexico as well as Canada—but it is much more of an issue with Mexico. We would bring noncontiguous countries—Central and South American countries apart from Mexico—into the same category and treat those aliens the same way.

Third, those UACs that do not voluntarily depart—which is part of the process dealing with Mexican UACs—will be immediately placed in a streamlined removal process and detained by the Department of Homeland Security. Currently, UACs are transferred to HHS and their Office of Refugee Resettlement, where they, quite frankly, disappear into the United States. They are reunited with parents or sponsors living in the United States, often illegally. What that means as a practical matter is they essentially disappear into our country.

Fourth, anyone with gang affiliations, whether those affiliations are renounced or not, will be immediately placed in expedited removal proceedings under INA 235(b). Therefore, that would make them ineligible for asylum status.

Fifth, we would raise the standard for asylum determinations, from a standard where it is now ''credible fear,'' which is extremely subjective and, quite frankly, a standard that is too easy for these folks to meet, simply by repeating the right magic words which they learn about as they come here. We would raise that standard from ''credible fear'' to ''substantiated fear of persecution.''

Sixth, within 72 hours of an initial screening, all UACs found not to have a claim for asylum will be given a final removal order and placed on the next available flight to their home country, subject to determinations of cost, feasibility, and any repatriation agreements with their home country.

Seventh, a final order of removal is not subject to review and sets, as a minimum, a 10-year bar to reentry.

Eighth, upon apprehension, biometric data—including, but not limited to, photographs and fingerprints—will be collected for future enforcement use.

Ninth, and finally, the Department of Homeland Security will report annually to Congress on the number of apprehensions, the number of removals, the number of voluntary departures, et cetera. And specifically, in no event shall a voluntary departure be counted as a deportation.

Now, what does all this mean? It is a very detailed bill. We put great time and effort into the specifics of the legislation. We need to get the specifics right. But what does it mean? It means we are stopping catch and release. It means we are stopping simply releasing these folks out into the country, to family members or to sponsors, where they are usually never heard from again. They don't show up for court dates and they don't respond to any enforcement actions. Catch and release is a complete failure because it essentially means being released in the country for an extended period of time, and it means we retain control and detention and then have a quick, efficient process for removing them from the country. That is the only way we will stem this increasing flow—still increasing. The number of unaccompanied alien children is still mounting and mounting and mounting.

I called this a crisis at the beginning of my remarks, and it is. It is a crisis on many different levels. It is a border crisis, it is a law enforcement crisis, and it is a fiscal issue. As many folks have correctly said—particularly on the left—it is a humanitarian crisis.

The biggest threat to these individuals in humanitarian terms is the fact

that they are entrusted and put in the hands of outright criminal gangs, often drug lords and drug gangs, coyotes—folks who do not have their best interests in mind, and very often in that process they are abused in multiple ways. That is a humanitarian travesty and it is a humanitarian crisis.

The problem is we have a policy right now that encourages that treatment and allows for those numbers to grow and not to be brought back down to zero. We need a different policy that discourages and stops that. Fundamentally, the way to do that is to apprehend these individuals, and instead of releasing them into the country—which means the illegal gang smuggling operation has been successful—quickly and efficiently deport them back to their home country. That is the only action which will reverse the message that has gone out far and wide in Central and South America, which is to send your minors because President Obama has an Executive order that says we won't prosecute them. That is the message that has been heard and the fundamental message we have to reverse, and you only reverse that message if you reverse the policy through specific actions such as what I have described.

This is a graph which very clearly shows that deportations of this class of illegal aliens have plummeted under President Obama. President Obama often points to a change in the law in 2008 that was part of that equation. He complained about that for weeks and weeks when this crisis first hit the front page of the paper. The problem is when it comes to his proposal which was sent to Congress about how to deal with the crisis, he didn't ask to change the law. He didn't ask for any new authority to expedite the removal process. All he asked for was $3.9 billion, largely for the housing and feeding of these aliens and not for expedited and effective removal. That is what we need to change. This trendline is what we need to change in order to address the problem and stop this mounting flow and crisis at our border.

I hope we act in a responsible way by adopting this sort of policy and catch and release and detain these folks. Of course we need to treat them humanely and provide what we need to provide for them in the limited period of time we have them detained, but don't release them into the country with family members and often other illegals or sponsors. Detain them and deport them to their home countries. That is the only appropriate response which will stop this crisis from continuing to grow and stop the abuses and humanitarian crisis from continuing to grow.

I encourage my colleagues to come around to this commonsense solution. The American people have already done that. Have a townhall meeting on this. I don't care what State you come from. Look at the polling on this issue. The American people have already reached this commonsense consensus. The question is, is Washington going to catch up and follow? Are we going to reach the same commonsense consensus and respond in a commonsense way that solves the problem rather than just growing it or throwing money at it?

I encourage all of us from both sides of the aisle to come around to this sort of consensus approach. Of course I favor the specific legislation I have filed, S. 2632, but it doesn't have to be exactly that vehicle. It does have to be that general approach in order to stop this mounting flood of illegals at our southern border and to deal with this crisis—including the humanitarian crisis—effectively rather than continuing to deal with it in a way where the numbers, the burden, the crisis, and the abuses continue to grow.

In closing, I will say I am, again, very concerned, as I am sure every Member in this body is, about the specific impact to my State. I mentioned some of those impacts. I didn't get those details from the Department of Homeland Security even though I specifically asked for that from the Department. I have had no real cooperation or information from the Department. I had to search out that information from other reliable sources. I will continue to do that, and I will continue to get the word out to Louisianans because they deserve to know what our State and communities may be dealing with.

In the meantime I hope the Department of Homeland Security will actually answer my letter, answer my questions, and give us the details directly so we all know exactly what we are dealing with as a country and in our individual States.

I thank the Presiding Officer, yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORTING DISABILITY RIGHTS MILESTONES

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, this is a very important week for Americans with disabilities. Just a few hours ago, at the White House, the President signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act which includes a reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act. This will ensure that young people with disabilities have the skills and experiences to enter into competitive integrated work settings and will be ready to be economically self-sufficient—one of the key goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

This bill received extraordinary bipartisan support from an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans. The final vote in the House was 415 to 6 and the final vote in the Senate was 95 to 3. This is a great testament to the bipartisan support in Congress for advancing the rights and opportunities of people with disabilities in the United States.

Also this week, on Saturday, July 26, we will celebrate the 24th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act by then-President George Herbert Walker Bush. As the chief Senate sponsor of that law in 1990, I worked closely with Senate and House colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance the bill. Again, we couldn't have succeeded without the strong and active support of a Republican President, George H.W. Bush, and key members of his cabinet.

When we passed the ADA, as it is known, 24 years ago, the vote was overwhelmingly bipartisan. In the Senate, we passed it by a vote of 91 to 6, and in the House it was 403 to 20. So not only were the votes bipartisan, the arduous work of crafting the ADA and getting it to that point was also bipartisan. I worked shoulder to shoulder with indispensable partners, including Boyden Gray, President Bush's White House Counsel; Richard Thornburgh, Attorney General of the United States at that time; and here in the Senate Senator Bob Dole, who was so key in helping us to move this legislation forward at that time.

Senator Dole was instrumental. In fact, I always remind my colleagues the first speech Senator Dole ever gave on the Senate floor when he was elected to the Senate—his maiden speech—was on that topic, the topic of people with disabilities and their rights and how there should be more opportunity for people with disabilities. It was a great speech.

I think it is also known that today is Senator Dole's birthday. So I, and I am sure my colleagues will join with me, am wishing Senator Dole a very happy birthday today and asking to recommit ourselves, as he did at that time, to work in a bipartisan fashion to make sure people with disabilities not only in this country but around the world have more opportunities to live a full and meaningful life. So happy birthday, Bob Dole. We worked together for a long time on these issues.

Today is another interesting day. Today, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on a bipartisan vote of 12 to 6, passed out of the committee the United Nations treaty on disabilities, formally known as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. A major part of my remarks today is about the United Nations treaty, now known as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities—or the shorthand version is CRPD as it is known here and globally.

For most of our recent history, support for disability rights, as I have just mentioned, has been across the political spectrum. But now, as the full Senate looks ahead to the consideration of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, we are beginning to see an unfortunate erosion of the bipartisan support for disability policy.

Now, again, I wish to make clear that the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill out this morning on a 12-to-6 vote. It was bipartisan. A couple things are in order: first, a recap of the history; and secondly, a very profound thank you to Senator BOB MENENDEZ, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his tremendous leadership in crafting and getting this bill through this Congress in his committee. I have spoken with Senator MENENDEZ many times about this issue. He has been dogged in his pursuit of getting a bill and getting it through the committee and to the Senate floor. And it hasn't been easy, quite frankly. Again, I will recap a little bit of that history for the benefit of my fellow Senators who may not follow this as closely as I follow it.

Again, this convention came through the committee this morning. It is now awaiting a 24-hour layover before it can go on the executive calendar. As I said, there has been some erosion in the bipartisan support for disability policy, but it is limited because I think most Republicans and Democrats agree there is no objective reason for partisan discord when it comes to disability rights. Senator JOHN MCCAIN is a tremendous supporter of disability rights and was with us when we passed the ADA in 1990 and was, again, a strong supporter at that time. He has been a strong supporter of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and other legislation dealing with disability rights, including disability rights amendments we passed in 2008. So Senator MCCAIN has long been a strong supporter of enhancing and improving the rights of people with disabilities to have a full and meaningful life—to be able to have the opportunity to go to school, to learn, be educated, and to have people work and to live independently.

So here is what Senator MCCAIN said this morning in support of this disability treaty. He said: ''Ratifying this treaty affirms our leadership on disability rights and shows the rest of the world our leadership commitment continues.''

Senator MARK KIRK is not a member of the committee but he said this about the disability treaty:

I want to say as a recently disabled American . . . how important it is to adopt this Convention . . . Too often we have a problem of thinking of our veterans as victims. They are victors. . . . This convention allows people to become victors instead of victims.

And again, one of the true giants of the Senate, former Senator Bob Dole, who, as I mentioned, celebrates a birthday today—had this to say about this disability treaty:

U.S. ratification of the CRPD will increase the ability of the United States to improve physical, technological, and communication access in other countries, thereby helping to ensure that Americans—particularly, many thousands of disabled American veterans—have equal opportunities to live, work, and travel abroad.

The fact is this treaty is supported by many respected, thoughtful, conservative Republican leaders. I can cite many more statements from colleagues and other Republicans. The simple truth is that Republican leaders who care deeply about our Nation's sovereignty are equally impassioned in their support of this disability treaty.

So the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities does not need to be and should not be a partisan issue, despite the misguided efforts of some to make it so. It is deeply unfortunate that narrowly focused opposition from groups with special interests that are far afield of the bipartisan consensus in support of disability rights have tried to drag this treaty into partisan warfare. These groups have spread fear about some imaginary, hypothetical, unreal loss of U.S. sovereignty. They try to scare parents into thinking they are going to lose control of the education of their children or that they won't be able to home school their children or they have raised the issue of abortion, which has nothing whatsoever to do with this treaty. None of these things are relevant to or are embedded in the treaty.

What we are seeing here is an action by some narrow special interest groups to advance their intentions by making utterly unfounded claims about the disability treaty.

So, again, this is rhetoric we should not be listening to. We should listen to the voices of the better angels of our nature. This is an important convention, an important treaty.

Even as recently as this morning I heard that in the Foreign Relations Committee someone raised the issue of sovereignty. Well, we passed a lot of treaties here in the past—lots of treaties over the lifetime of our Nation. Are we less sovereign today than we were 10 years ago? Are we less sovereign than we were 30, 50, 100 years ago? I would have to have someone prove to me how we have lost our sovereignty. We haven't—not at all. And in every treaty that we have signed in the past, there is always a clause in the reservations, understandings, and declarations that attaches to the resolution we pass here on the treaty. There is always one clause that is attached and I will read it to my colleagues. It says:

Supremacy of Constitution. Nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the United States.

That is it. That goes on every treaty we sign. It says, look, we are signing the treaty, but our Constitution is supreme.

Continuing:

Nothing in this treaty requires or authorizes any action by the United States prohibited by the Constitution as interpreted by the United States of America.

Who interprets the Constitution? The Supreme Court. But then we can always pass amendments and change it—by the United States of America.

So we have offered that this is the same language we ought to attach to this convention—the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Someone said: We don't know what the United Nations is going to do in the future. We don't know how they might want to change it.

It makes no difference. It makes no difference what the U.N. does in the future. Our Constitution is still supreme, and this is the clause we put on there to say so. We do it on every treaty.

We just passed a treaty here in 1999 that I was involved in—a treaty on the convention on the worst forms of child labor. It has that clause in it. We didn't give up any of our sovereignty by agreeing to that convention on child labor, and we won't give up any of our sovereignty here. So for anyone who is saying they are concerned about our sovereignty on this convention, we can put that clause in, as we have with every other treaty.

There are some Senators here who were here when we passed that treaty in 1999, and they didn't say anything about sovereignty or that they were concerned about sovereignty. But now some are saying they are concerned about sovereignty when it deals with people with disabilities. Why? Why? Why?

In 1999 we passed a convention dealing with the worst forms of child labor—a good treaty, by the way. No one here raised the issue of sovereignty. Today—what, 15 years later—we have a Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and a number of people say: Oh, no, we are worried about sovereignty.

Someone please explain this to me. It is not about sovereignty. Anyone who is hiding behind that issue does not want to vote for this treaty for some other reason, but it cannot be the reason of sovereignty.

Now, again, we have to look a little bit at the history of this treaty. The drafters of the convention modeled it after the Americans with Disabilities Act. In fact, if you read it, and you look at the ADA, we informed the United Nations—and I talked to people who have been involved in this in the U.N.—we, our laws, informed the U.N.

as to what they ought to do in drafting this convention. Why shouldn't we then be a part of it, take the expertise we have and apply it globally?

So it was drafted. It was sent out to the nations for their adoption. It was sent to our President. Under our system, the President sends this proposed treaty out to all of the Departments of the executive branch, including the Office of Management and Budget to see what budget impact it will have, and their charge is to see what laws do we have to change in order to comply with this treaty or what budget impact does it have.

Well, it takes about a year to get this through all the Departments and agencies. But then, when it came back to the President, guess what: We do not have to change one law—not one—to conform to this treaty because the treaty is based on, basically, the Americans with Disabilities Act. So we do not have to change any laws. And, secondly, there is no budget impact.

So then the President sent it down to the Senate for ratification under our Constitution. Then Senator Kerry, who was the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, had hearings. In fact, the two leadoff witnesses were Senator JOHN MCCAIN and me. Well, then there were other witnesses from the business community, from the disability community—from all over.

The treaty was reported out of the committee, I believe, in July of 2012. We were not able to get it on the floor until December 2012. Thirty-eight Republican Senators had signed a letter saying we should not vote on a treaty—on a treaty—in a lameduck session. Then there were some other things that came up about home schooling and stuff like that.

To make a long story short, when we brought it on the floor, and we thought we had the votes, we fell six votes short. We had 61 votes. We needed 67. We fell six votes short. A lot of Senators told me at that time we should not be voting on this in a lameduck session. In fact, if you check the RECORD, you will see remarks made by a lot of Members on the Republican side saying we should not vote on this in a lameduck session.

Well, OK. That Congress dies. We now have a new Congress starting in 2013. Then Chairman Kerry becomes Secretary of State and our new chairman is Senator BOB MENENDEZ of New Jersey. So we started working to bring it back. Now again, it all has to come right back from the White House. It has to go back through the hurdles. It has to go back to the committee.

I talked a couple times with the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he wanted to have some more hearings. So I talked to Senator MENENDEZ about it. Senator MENENDEZ agreed, and he held more hearings on it in this Congress—in this Congress—and a lot of voices were heard. A lot of people testified on it.

Then it has to work its way through the committee. The committee has been very busy on a lot of things, but Senator MENENDEZ never gave up, and so this morning, as I stated earlier, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out the treaty. I am so grateful to Senator MENENDEZ for not giving up, for being dogged in providing that kind of leadership to get this treaty through. So now it is ready for us to bring up here.

Well, guess what. We are not in a lameduck session, so that excuse has gone by the wayside. And we have answered, I believe, the questions on sovereignty and other issues. Now we have to look at who supports this.

Well, I know some people were kind of nervous about the treaty and voting for it because they were concerned, quite frankly, for their political life. I guess some people in the tea party were making this sort of a litmus test, which I thought was kind of interesting. Why? Why this, of all things?

So what we did was we wanted to see how broad the support was out there. It is immense. The support for this treaty cuts across all lines. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Tom Donohue—are strong supporters of it, wrote a very strong letter and has been contacting Senators about the Chamber of Commerce's support for this treaty.

I spoke a couple months ago with former Governor John Engler, who is now the head of the Business Roundtable, and informed him about it. He said they would look at it, they would consider it. He took it to his Business Roundtable about a little over a month ago, I believe, if I am not mistaken, and the Business Roundtable wrote a very strong letter of support.

So two of the leading business groups in America are supporting this strongly. Every veterans group supports it. The American Legion, the VFW, the PVA—you name it—the Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans all support this. Every major religious group supports it. All the disability groups support it.

So what are we afraid of? Some people say, well, they are concerned about this sovereignty issue again. Are you telling me that former President George H.W. Bush is not concerned about our sovereignty? Are you telling me that former President George W. Bush is not concerned about our sovereignty? Are you trying to tell me that the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable are not concerned about our sovereignty or that Tom Ridge, former Governor of Pennsylvania, the first Director of Homeland Security, who strongly supports this treaty—are you telling me he does not care about our sovereignty?

Are there just a few people on this side of the aisle who know what sovereignty means? Of course not. Former President George H.W. Bush, former President George W. Bush, former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, Boyden Gray, former counsel of the President—Steve Bartlett, former Congressman, a Republican from Dallas, a mayor of Dallas, came back and ran the Financial Services Roundtable, is a strong supporter—strong supporter—of this. Are you telling me Steve does not care about our sovereignty? I would like you to tell Steve that. He cares very much about our sovereignty. That is why it is a phony issue—a fraudulent phony issue.

We have it within our power now to join the rest of the world. I think 148 nations—148 countries—have now signed this.

I was recently in China, and I was meeting with disability groups there. China signed the convention. I met with some disability groups that are not governmental, NGOs, which is interesting. This is now springing up in China.

I also met with a person who is the head of the federation of disability groups in China. Madam Zhang, Haidi Zhang, is a very prominent woman in China, known all over the country because she is a famous author. She now heads this federation. They all told me they want the United States to be a part of this because it would strengthen them in working to change in their country, to make their country better and more supportive of disability rights.

I questioned that because some people said to me here: Well, we do not need to join this treaty. We can work with countries one-on-one. You are going to work with 100 countries one-on-one? I do not think we have the personnel to do that.

But here is what someone said to me who brought it home to me. They said: Look, if you come to our country and you want to discuss disability policy from the standpoint of your laws—the Americans with Disabilities Act—and we are a part of the CRPD, then we are talking two different languages. But if you are a part of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, we speak the same language. Then we can start talking about how we work together to enhance the rights and opportunities of people with disabilities, not just in China but in Africa.

Earlier this year, 21 countries met in Malawi on this issue. I was asked to come to speak. I could not because I was here in the Senate. They desperately want the Americans—us—to be a part of this, to lend our expertise, our leadership—not as a single country but with other countries—to, again, advance the cause of the rights of people with disabilities in accommodations, accessibility.

This spring I was in Colombia—Cartagena—on a trip with other Senators, Congressmen, and I remember

our colleague Senator JOHNSON from South Dakota and his wife were there. I remember Mrs. Johnson—Barbara—saying: Boy, I can't wait to get back to the United States because it is hard for Tim using his wheelchair to get around anywhere.

This is what I mean. We have to start working with these other countries to help them change their systems, their accessibility.

I have talked to many veterans who would like to travel with their families or maybe even work overseas. They cannot do it. They are not accessible. I have talked to students who got a Fulbright scholarship or one of those things to go to another country, but since they were disabled, they could not take advantage of it because there were not accessible places for them to live or to get around.

So if we are proud—and we should be—proud of the work we have done as a nation, bipartisanly—there has never been a partisan hint to anything we have ever done with disability policy in this country. So if we are proud of what we have done in this country to enhance the well-being of people with disabilities, to make sure they have a full and meaningful life, that they contribute to the best of their ability, to get them out of institutions, living in the community, working in jobs—not subminimum-wage, dead-end jobs, but I mean real jobs; and we have come a long way—so if we are proud of it, why shouldn't we be proud enough to join with the rest of the world in saying: Let's work together. Let's work together to provide in other countries that same kind of support and accessibility for people with disabilities?

It is not going to happen overnight. I understand that. Sometimes these things take a long time. This weekend will be the 24th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

As I travel around, one thing that always catches my eye—when I see new buildings, new housing, and stuff—is it accessible? I just saw some this weekend—new housing, multifamily housing—not accessible. Well, someone said to me: Well, you know, maybe people with disabilities can't live here, but there are plenty of other places. I said: Well, that is not the point. What if I want to live there and I want to invite my nephew who is a paraplegic to come visit me and have dinner? He can't even get in the door. Oh, well, that kind of puts a different color on it. I cannot even associate with people with disabilities because they cannot even come over to my house.

So while we have come a long way, we have things we have to do. But we have to, again, be a part of this global effort to advance the cause of people with disabilities. Other countries are starting to catch on. They are starting to do things—some countries more than others. This treaty, and our joining it, means that we join with them in common effort—in common effort—to make sure people with disabilities are not shunted aside any longer.

I think it is beneath us as Senators, beneath us as a nation, to somehow not accede to this treaty because of phony issues such as sovereignty.

We can take care of that, as we have in other treaties. Or homeschooling or abortion. We can take care of that. We can say our laws are supreme. If someone says, ''Well, the U.N. might change it in the future,'' so what? It does not make any difference what they change. It does not affect our sovereignty whatsoever. So I think it is beneath us if we do not adopt this treaty, if we do not become a part of this global effort.

Ronald Reagan referred to America as the ''shining city on a hill.'' Well, I think it is. Nowhere is America more of a shining city on a hill than in how we treat our citizens with disabilities. We have the gold standard. Now it is time to empower us to work throughout the world, to assist countries as they implement the treaty founded on the rights and principles embedded in the Americans with Disabilities Act.

It is time for us to reassert our global leadership in disability policy. So let's rise above partnership. Let's rise above some unknown fear that something might happen in the future. Let's rise above those narrow interests that say ''Well, we will lose our sovereignty'' or something like that or all of those other phony issues that are coming up because they want to undermine the treaty. We can rise above that, just as we have done many times in the past, just as we did in 1999 when we became a part of a convention on the worst forms of child labor. We put reservations and we put understandings and declarations in that convention, by the way. So we spelled out how we were adapting that to our own Nation. We can do the same with this one too.

I have been told—I do not know if this is true—I have been told that some say: Well, it does not make any difference what we put in there; there are some people who will not vote for it, period.

Well, are those the same people who would not vote for the Americans With Disabilities Act if we were to bring it to the floor today? Would they say: No, we should not change our policies that people with disabilities had to be institutionalized; that they do not deserve to work in the workplace; that they do not deserve the freedom to travel on buses that are accessible and trains that are accessible or subways that are accessible; that we do not need curb cuts and we do not need widened doors. No, we do not need to do any of that stuff.

Would that be what they would say today if the Americans with Disabilities Act were on the floor? Any Senator who says: I like the Americans with Disabilities Act, and I think it has done a good thing for our country—anyone who says that ought to be voting for this treaty. That is what we intend. That is what we would do—reject that kind of fear and be a part of this global effort.

Again, I commend Senator MENENDEZ for his great leadership on this issue. I am hopeful that before we leave here next week, we might reach a time agreement with the other side to have a meaningful debate, have amendments. There is nothing wrong with having some amendments on this if people have amendments that are germane to the treaty. Let's debate those in a timely fashion and then have a vote on it. We need to do this. We need to do this to reassert America's leadership worldwide on disability policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, before I speak on a different topic, let me acknowledge my colleague and friend from Iowa and thank him for a lifetime of service in the House of Representatives and the Senate. He has announced his retirement at the end of this year. That is a loss for our great institution and for our country.

TOM HARKIN, more than any other Senator today, as much as any other Senator, has been a clarion voice for the disabled across generations and across country borders for decades. He has changed America and he has changed the world. There are not many people who serve in this Chamber who can say that. But when he joined with Bob Dole, a Republican World War II disabled veteran from Kansas—when this Democratic Senator from Iowa, a Navy veteran himself, joined with Bob Dole and passed the Americans with Disabilities Act, it held America to a higher standard. It guaranteed that our values we express so often would be values we live by.

Now he is calling on us to join a family of nations that have admired our leadership in disability rights and wonder why we have not approved this basic treaty or convention on disabilities. I was honored today to vote for that in the Foreign Relations Committee again. We had bipartisan support. We are going to continue to strive for it.

I thank the Senator for his unmatched contribution when it comes to speaking out for the disabled across America and around the world.

THE TAX CODE

Dickens wrote ''A Tale of Two Cities.'' I come to the Senate floor this evening to tell a tale of two Illinois corporations. One of them is a corporation which I visited recently called Wheatland Tube in Chicago. It is a division of JMC Steel. It employs about

2,000 people nationwide, 600 in Chicago, which I represent. JMC Steel is a good company. It is more than good; it is a great company. The average starting wage at Wheatland is $15 an hour. The company offers generous health care benefits with low deductibles. It offers various retirement benefits. Newer employees get a 401(k) with a company match up to 6 percent.

I tell this story because I want to salute a company that takes its mission seriously and treats its employees fairly. I believe a company such as JMC Steel and Wheatland should be encouraged and rewarded when it comes to our Tax Code and our laws.

We are hearing a lot from our Supreme Court across the street. They have come up with a new theory about businesses and corporations in America. Time and again they have told us that they now view corporations to be virtual flesh-and-blood citizens entitled to constitutional rights. They decided corporations have freedom of speech under the Bill of Rights and that corporations could spend unlimited amounts of money in an effort to elect or defeat candidates. They even went so far to say closely held corporations had religious freedoms that needed protection to the point where the owner of a closely held for-profit corporation could determine the contraception and birth control programs available to the employees of that company under their health insurance plans.

So we are told over and over by this Supreme Court that we should view corporations in a human context. Well, I am going to stick with that chain of thought for a moment and talk about another company that is much different from Wheatland Tube, which I have just described. It is a company known as AbbVie. That is the new name; it used to be known as Abbott Labs. It is roughly the eighth largest pharmaceutical company in America. It is headquartered in Illinois, in the city of North Chicago. AbbVie recently made the news because its board of directors sat down and made a decision about the future of this company.

First, let me tell you a little bit about AbbVie as a pharmaceutical company. AbbVie is a company which, like virtually every other pharmaceutical company, relies a great deal on our Federal Government. The National Institutes of Health—the leading biomedical research agency in the world—does basic research that our pharmaceutical companies use to develop new drugs and products. We pray that they will. When they find these drugs and products, pharmaceutical companies such as AbbVie go to the patent office run by our Federal Government to protect their property rights in their discoveries and their drugs. When they turn around to sell these drugs in America, after approval by a Federal agency, the Food and Drug Administration, they by and large sell them to programs such as Medicare and Medicaid—government-supported insurance programs.

The reason I tell this background is that AbbVie recently made a decision that they were going to renounce their American corporate citizenship and, in fact, at least on paper, move their corporate headquarters to an island off Ireland. Why would a great American corporation, the eighth largest pharmaceutical company, want to pick up and move to an island off Ireland? To avoid paying U.S. taxes. To avoid paying U.S. taxes, AbbVie is engaging in something known as inversion—in other words, relocating their corporate headquarter offices and declaring themselves to no longer be an American corporation. Does it not strike you as strange that a company that makes billions of dollars in profit based on America and the strength of our own system of government now is deserting America?

This inversion is not unique to AbbVie. We estimate that 50 or 60 corporations are doing the same. I think it is time for us as Members of Congress to put an end to this. These companies that are deserting America and heading overseas to avoid paying U.S. taxes have to be stopped.

Allan Sloan, whom I have heard a lot on radio and other places, is a writer for Fortune magazine. On July 7 he published an article in Fortune magazine entitled ''Positively un-American tax dodges.''

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

Let me quote one paragraph from Allan Sloan about these ''Positively un-American tax dodges,'' such as the inversion planned by AbbVie of North Chicago. Here is what Sloan writes:

> Inverters don't hesitate to take advantage of the great things that make America America: our deep financial markets, our democracy and rule of law, our military might, our intellectual and physical infrastructure, our national research programs, all the terrific places our country offers for employees and their families to live. But inverters do hesitate—totally—when it's time to ante up their fair share of financial support for our system.

Exhibit A: AbbVie, a company that has been profitable and made billions of dollars in America, now wants to lessen its American tax bill by moving overseas—on paper.

I think this has to come to an end. I think that when we sit down and make decisions about a tax code and tax policy, we need to be rewarding companies such as Wheatland Tube. Wheatland Tube, with 600 employees in Chicago, is an American corporation and proud of it. They are not planning on moving overseas. They are not trying to cut corners when it comes to their employees. They are treating them fairly. They are getting a good work product for it.

What I propose is called a patriot employer's tax. If you have a corporation that is, in my view, patriotic, with its headquarters in America, that has not moved employees overseas, that pays its employees at least $15 an hour—why did I pick $15? Because at $15 an hour, most American workers would not qualify for government benefits.

Perhaps the WIC program is one exception, but the only one I can think of. But these are employees who are paid enough in the workplace that they don't qualify for food stamps to supplement their income. So we chose $15 an hour. We said if the company goes on to provide good health insurance, a good retirement plan, where the employer contributes at least 5 percent of an employee's income toward retirement, and the company will give a preference to hiring veterans, I think that company is entitled to a patriot employer tax credit. Wheatland Tube isn't the only company in Illinois that would qualify nor the only company in this country.

So should we be bending our Tax Code today so AbbVie and the other corporate deserters get a break by moving overseas or should we be changing our Tax Code to encourage good companies, such as Wheatland Tube, to stay in America, to pay a fair wage, to make a good product and make us proud. It seems a pretty simple choice as far as I am concerned. We are going to start debating that on the floor of the Senate this week—at least we are going to try.

There is going to be a bill coming before us that has been offered by Senator JOHN WALSH of Montana and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan called the Bring Jobs Home Act. It is a variation on the theme that I just spoke of, but the bottom line is the same—to create Tax Code incentives for companies to bring jobs back into the United States. I can't think of a higher priority than to create and keep good-paying jobs in America.

We are going to vote on moving forward on this bill, creating an incentive to bring jobs home.

Here is what it will do. If a company moves a production line, trade or business outside of the United States back into the United States, it is eligible for a tax credit under the Walsh-Stabenow bill—a credit for the cost of moving the jobs back home.

To pay for it, companies that ship jobs overseas—jobs going in the wrong direction—will no longer be allowed to deduct the costs associated with outsourcing U.S. jobs from their tax bill.

Why would we want to incentivize a company to ship American jobs overseas? Why would we want to create a deduction to make it easier and cheaper to do that? It defies common sense.

The Walsh-Stabenow bill reverses it and says we will no longer incentivize

shipping jobs overseas; we are going to incentivize shipping jobs home from overseas. It is pretty simple.

I would like to take that basic question to any town meeting in any town in my State and ask the folks sitting there whether they think that makes sense. I am very confident they will agree that it does. This is a commonsense approach to reward companies that are doing the right thing and eliminate tax breaks for companies that are doing the wrong thing.

The patriot employer tax credit I hope I can offer as an amendment. I want to give a break to those companies that pay a good wage, keep the jobs in the United States, and don't ship their headquarters overseas. I think they deserve an incentive to stay.

I guess I am old-fashioned, but a lot of Americans are old-fashioned the same way.

I like walking into the store and seeing products that say ''Made in the U.S.A.'' Sure, I buy things made overseas. It is hard to avoid them. And I don't consciously avoid them. But given a choice, I would love to see the ''Made in the U.S.A.'' label on these products so I have a choice to make this country stronger. That is what the Walsh-Stabenow bill does. That is what the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act does. And that is what we need to do when it comes to these inversions.

There was an article that was printed in Fortune magazine after Allan Sloan's article on July 15 the following week. It quoted a man whom I have come to know and once worked with in Chicago. His name is Jamie Dimon. Jamie Dimon is the CEO of JPMorgan Chase.

It turns out JPMorgan Chase is the investment adviser to AbbVie, the company I mentioned earlier. They have been advising them about moving overseas to avoid tax liability.

Mr. Dimon, in this Fortune magazine piece said: '' . . . it was inappropriate for anyone to moralize against deals in which U.S. companies seek lower tax rates through mergers.''

And then he went on to say ''an inversion.'' He characterized moving your corporate headquarters overseas to avoid taxes as basically saying it is an acknowledgment how bad our Tax Code is today. It is a way of protesting what the Tax Code is doing to corporations.

Our Tax Code today has resulted in the highest corporate profits in history. Our Tax Code today has resulted in paychecks for Mr. Dimon and other CEOs unparalleled in the history of the world. For Mr. Dimon and the corporate CEOs to argue about this unfair Tax Code as a reason or rationale for picking up and deserting America doesn't square with the reality of corporate compensation or corporate profits.

Some people critical of what I have spoken to today will say: Well, now, don't go picking winners and losers in the Tax Code.

I have news for you. The Tax Code is all about picking winners and losers. Sadly, the losers too many times are working families in this country and the winners are the people in higher-income categories and the largest corporations.

Look at what the Tax Code incentivizes. It incentivizes drilling for oil, building wind turbines. It incentivizes holding stock for a longer period rather than a shorter period. It incentivizes saving for your retirement. It incentivizes buying health insurance. The Tax Code is full of incentives.

So let's rewrite that Tax Code. Let's create an incentive to keep jobs in America. Let's create an incentive to make sure that companies which pay a fair wage and make sure their operations are good for working people get a tax break, and let's disincentivize the effort to move American jobs overseas and to move American corporate offices overseas.

That to me is a Tax Code with the right incentives for building not only a strong American economy with good-paying jobs here at home but building our middle class and our working Americans into a strong entity, a strong force for progress and economic growth.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the articles I referred to earlier.

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

[From @FortuneMagazine, July 7, 2014]

POSITIVELY UN-AMERICAN TAX DODGES

(By Allan Sloan)

Bigtime companies are moving their ''headquarters'' overseas to dodge billions in taxes . . . that means the rest of us pay their share.

Ah, July! What a great month for those of us who celebrate American exceptionalism. There's the lead-up to the Fourth, country-wide Independence Day celebrations including my town's local Revolutionary War reenactment and fireworks, the enjoyable days of high summer, and, for the fortunate, the prospect of some time at the beach.

Sorry, but this year, July isn't going to work for me. That's because of a new kind of American corporate exceptionalism: companies that have decided to desert our country to avoid paying taxes but expect to keep receiving the full array of benefits that being American confers, and that everyone else is paying for.

Yes, leaving the country—a process that tax techies call inversion—is perfectly legal. A company does this by reincorporating in a place like Ireland, where the corporate tax rate is 12.5%, compared with 35% in the U.S. Inversion also makes it easier to divert what would normally be U.S. earnings to foreign, lower-tax locales. But being legal isn't the same as being right. If a few companies invert, it's irritating but no big deal for our society. But mass inversion is a whole other thing, and that's where we're heading.

We've also got a second, related problem, which I call the ''never-heres.'' They include formerly private companies like Accenture, a consulting firm that was spun off from Arthur Andersen, and disc-drive maker Seagate, which began as a U.S. company, went private in a 2000 buyout and was moved to the Cayman Islands, went public in 2002, then moved to Ireland from the Caymans in 2010. Firms like these can duck lots of U.S. taxes without being accused of having deserted our country because technically they were never here. So far, by Fortune's count, some 60 U.S. companies have chosen the never-here or the inversion route, and others are lining up to leave.

All of this threatens to undermine our tax base, with projected losses in the billions. It also threatens to undermine the American public's already shrinking respect for big corporations.

Inverters, of course, have a different view of things. It goes something like this: The U.S. tax rate is too high, and uncompetitive. Unlike many other countries, the U.S. taxes all profits worldwide, not just those earned here. A domicile abroad can offer a more competitive corporate tax rate. Fiduciary duty to shareholders requires that companies maximize returns.

My answer: Fight to fix the tax code, but don't desert the country. And I define ''fiduciary duty'' as the obligation to produce the best long-term results for shareholders, not ''get the stock price up today.'' Undermining the finances of the federal government by inverting helps undermine our economy. And that's a bad thing, in the long run, for companies that do business in America.

Finally, there's reputational risk. I wouldn't be surprised to see someone in Washington call public hearings and ask CEOs of inverters and would-be inverters why they think it's okay for them to remain U.S. citizens while their companies renounce citizenship. Imagine the reaction! And the punitive legislation it could spark.

WATCH: INVERSION: HOW SOME MAJOR U.S. COMPANIES ARE DODGING TAXES

Fortune contacted every company on our list of tax avoiders and asked why they incorporated overseas. Four of them—Carnival, Garmin, Invesco, and XL—said they were never U.S. companies. In other words, they are never-heres. Five more—Actavis, Allegion, Eaton, Ingersoll Rand, and Perrigo—said they inverted mainly for strategic purposes. The tenth, Nabors, refused to respond to our multiple requests.

Companies that have gone the inversion or never-here route but that act American include household names like Garmin, Michael Kors, Carnival, and Nielsen. Pfizer the giant pharmaceutical company, tried to invert this spring, but the deal fell through. Medtronic, the big medical-device company, is trying to invert, of which more later. Walgreen is talking about inverting too—it's easier to boost earnings by playing tax games than by fixing the way you run your stores.

Then there's the ''Can you believe this?'' factor. Carnival, a Panama-based company with headquarters in Miami, was happy to have the U.S. Coast Guard, for which it doesn't pay its fair share, help rescue its burning Carnival Triumph. (It later reimbursed Uncle Sam.) Alexander Cutler, chief executive of Eaton, a Cleveland company that he inverted to Ireland, told the City Club of Cleveland, without a trace of irony, that to fix our nation's budget problems, we need to close ''those loopholes in the tax system.'' Inversions, I guess, aren't loopholes.

Before we proceed, a brief confessional rant: The spectacle of American corporations

deserting our country to dodge taxes while expecting to get the same benefits that good corporate citizens get makes me deeply angry. It's the same way that I felt when idiots and incompetents in Washington brought us to the brink of defaulting on our national debt in the summer of 2011, the last time that I wrote anything angry at remotely this length. (See ''American Idiots.'') Except that this is worse.

Inverters don't hesitate to take advantage of the great things that make America America: our deep financial markets, our democracy and rule of law, our military might, our intellectual and physical infrastructure, our national research programs, all the terrific places our country offers for employees and their families to live. But inverters do hesitate—totally—when it's time to ante up their fair share of financial support of our system.

Inverting a company, which is done in the name of ''shareholder value''—a euphemism for a higher stock price—is way more offensive to me than even the most disgusting (albeit not illegal) tax games that companies like Apple and GE play to siphon earnings out of the U.S. At least those companies remain American. It may be for technical reasons that I won't bore you with—but I don't care. What matters is the result. Apple and GE remain American. Inverters are deserters.

Even though I understand inversion intellectually, I have trouble dealing with it emotionally. Maybe it's because of my background: I'm the grandson of immigrants, and I'm profoundly grateful that this country took my family in. Watching companies walk out just to cut their taxes turns my stomach.

Okay, rant over.

The current poster child for inversion outrage is Medtronic Inc., the multinational Minnesota medical-device company that once exuded a cleaner-than-clean image but now proposes to move its nominal headquarters to Ireland by paying a fat premium price to purchase Covidien, itself a faux-Irish firm that is run from Massachusetts except for income-taxpaying purposes. For that, it's based in Dublin. That's where the new Medtronic PLC would be based, while its real headquarters would remain on Medtronic Parkway in Minneapolis. Of course, the company is unlikely to return any of the $484 million worth of contracts the federal government says it has awarded Medtronic over the past five years.

If the Medtronic deal goes through, which seems likely, it will open the floodgates. Congress could close them, as we'll see—but that would require our representatives and senators to get their act together. Good luck with that.

Now let's have a look at some of the more interesting aspects of the proposed Medtronic-Covidien marriage. I'm not trying to pick on Medtronic—but its decision to become the biggest company to invert makes it fair journalistic game.

Medtronic is one of those U.S. companies with a ton of cash offshore: something like $14 billion. That's money on which U.S. income tax hasn't been paid. Medtronic told me it would have to pay $3.5 billion to $4.2 billion to the IRS if it brought that money into the U.S.: That's the difference between the 35% U.S. tax rate and the 5% to 10% it has paid to other countries. Among other things, inverting would let Medtronic PLC use offshore cash to pay dividends without subjecting the money to U.S. corporate tax.

I especially love a little-noticed multimillion-dollar goody that Medtronic is giving its board members and top executives. Years ago, in order to discourage inversions, Congress imposed a 15% excise tax on the value of options and restricted stock owned by top officers and board members of inverting companies. Guess what? Medtronic says it's going to give the affected people enough money to pay the tax.

We're talking major money—major money that I'm glad to say isn't tax-deductible to Medtronic. The company wouldn't tell me how much this would cost its stockholders. So I did my own back-of-the-envelope math, starting with chief executive Omar Ishrak. Using numbers from Medtronic's 2014 proxy statement and adjusting for its stock price when I was writing this, I figure that his options and restricted shares are worth at least $40 million, and the ''equity incentive plan awards'' that he might get are worth another $23 million. Allow for the fact that Medtronic will ''gross up'' Ishrak et al. by giving them enough money to cover both the excise tax and the tax due on their excise tax subsidy, and you end up with $7.1 million to $11.2 million just for Ishrak. And something more than $60 million for Medtronic as a whole.

Why does Medtronic feel the need to shell out this money? The company's answer: ''Medtronic has agreed to indemnify directors and executive officers for such excise tax because they should not be discouraged from taking actions that they believe are in the best interests of Medtronic and its shareholders.''

But you know what, folks? These people are fiduciaries, who are legally required to put shareholders' interests ahead of their own. If they believe that inverting is the right thing to do (which, it should be obvious by now, I don't) they ought to pay any expenses they incur out of their own pockets, not the shareholders'. It's not as if these people lack the means to pay—the directors get $220,000 a year (and up) in cash and stock for a part-time job, and Ishrak gets a typical hefty CEO package.

One more thing: Normally, a company's shareholders don't have to pay capital gains tax if their firm makes an acquisition. But because this is an inversion, Medtronic shareholders will be treated as if they've sold their shares and will owe taxes on their gains. However, the deal won't give them any cash with which to pay the tab.

The company asked me to mention that its executives and directors, like other holders, will be subject to gains tax on shares that they own outright, and Medtronic won't compensate them for it. Okay. Consider it mentioned.

Second, the company contends that this deal will be so good for shareholders that it will more than offset their tax cost triggered by the board's decision to invert. Well, we'll see.

A major barrier to inversion used to be that companies moving offshore were kicked out of the Standard & Poor's 500 index. Given that more than 10% (by my estimate) of the S&P 500 stocks are owned by indexers, getting tossed out of the index—or being added to it—makes a big, short-term difference in share price. In 2008 and 2009, S&P, which has a few never-heres, tossed nine companies off the 500 for inverting. But four years ago, S&P changed course, for business reasons. Companies were angry at being excluded, and index investors wanted to own some of the excluded companies. Moreover, S&P feared that a competitor would set up a more inclusive, rival index.

So in June 2010, S&P changed its definition of American. Now all it takes to be in the S&P 500 is to trade on a U.S. market, be considered a U.S. filer by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and have a plurality of business and/or assets in the U.S.

The result: S&P now has 28 non-American companies in the 500.

How much money are we talking about inverters sucking out of the U.S. Treasury? There's no number available for the tax revenue losses caused by inverters and neverheres so far. But it's clearly in the billions. Congress's Joint Committee on Taxation projects that failing to limit inversions will cost the Treasury an additional $19.5 billion over 10 years—a number that seems way low, given the looming stampede. But even $19.5 billion—$2 billion a year—is a lot, if you look at it the right way. It's enough to cover what Uncle Sam spends on programs to help homeless veterans and to conduct research to create better prosthetic arms and legs for our wounded warriors.

Rep. Sandy Levin (D–Mich.) and his brother, Sen. Carl Levin (D–Mich.), have introduced legislation that would stop Medtronic in its tracks by making inversions harder. Under current law, adopted in 2004 as an inversion stopper, a U.S. company can invert only if it is doing significant business in its new domicile and shareholders of the foreign company it buys to do the inversion own at least 20% of the combined firm.

The Levins propose to require that foreign-firm shareholders own at least 50% of the combined company for it to be able to invert and also that the company's management change. This would really slow down inversions—but the chances of Congress passing the Levin legislation are somewhere between slim and none.

Conventional wisdom holds that companies are inverting now because they've despaired of getting clean-cut reform that would widen the tax base and lower rates. But John Buckley, former chief Democratic tax counsel for the House Ways and Means Committee, has a different view. Buckley thinks that we're seeing an inversion wave not because there's no prospect of tax reform but because there is a prospect of reform. If reform comes, he says, there will be winners and losers—and it's the likely losers-to-be that are inverting. ''Even minimal tax reform would hurt a lot of these companies badly,'' he says.

For example, Buckley says, a company that inverts before reform takes effect will be able to suck income out of the U.S. to lower-tax locales much more easily than if it were still a U.S. company. ''A revenue-neutral tax reform requires there to be winners and losers,'' Buckley says. ''But by inverting, the companies that would be losers are taking themselves out of the equation . . . They're taking advantage of both U.S. individual taxpayers and other corporations.''

If you're a typical CEO who has read this far, about now you're shaking your head and thinking, ''What a jerk! Just cut my tax rate and I'll stay.'' To which I say, ''I wouldn't bet on it.'' In the widely hailed 1986 tax reform act, Congress cut the corporate rate to 34% (now 35%) from 46%, and closed some loopholes. Corporate America was happy—for awhile. Now, with Ireland at 12.5% and Britain at 20% (or less, if you make a deal), 35% is intolerable. Let's say we cut the rate to 25%, the wished-for number I hear bandied about. Other countries are lower, and could go lower still in order to lure our companies. Is Corporate America willing to pay any corporate rate above zero? I wonder.

So what do we need? I'll offer you a bipartisan solution—no, I'm not kidding. For starters, we need to tighten inversion rules

as proposed by Sandy and Carl Levin, who are both bigtime Democrats. That would buy time to erect a more rational corporate tax structure than we have now—bolstered, I hope, by input from tough-minded tax techies.

We also need loophole tighteners along the lines of proposals in the Republican-sponsored, dead-on-arrival Tax Reform Act of 2014. One part would have imposed a tax of 8.75% a year on cash and cash equivalents held offshore, and 3.5% a year on other retained offshore earnings.

Another thing we need to do—which the SEC or the Financial Accounting Standards Board could do in a heartbeat, but won't—is require publicly traded U.S. companies and U.S. subsidiaries of publicly traded foreign companies to disclose two numbers from the tax returns they file with the IRS: their U.S. taxable income for a given year, and how much income tax they owed. This would take perhaps one person-hour a year per company.

That way we would know what firms actually pay instead of having to guess at it. Then we could compare and contrast companies' income tax payments.

What we don't need is another one-time ''tax holiday,'' like the one being proposed by Sen. Harry Reid (D–Nev.), to let companies pay 9.5% rather than 35% to bring earnings held offshore into the U.S. It would be the second time in a decade we've done that, and would signal tax avoiders that they should keep sending tons of money offshore, then wait for a tax holiday—presumably not on the Fourth of July—to bring it back.

Until—and unless—we somehow get our act together on corporate tax reform, companies will keep leaving our country. Those that try to do the right thing and act like good American corporate citizens will come under increasing pressure to invert, if only to fend off possible attacks by corporate pirates—I'm sorry, ''activist investors''—who see inversion as a way to get a quick uptick in their targets' stock price.

Now, two brief rays of sunshine: one in England, one here.

Starbucks, embarrassed by a 2012 Reuters exposé showing that it paid little or no taxes in England despite telling shareholders it made big profits there, has recently apologized and now makes substantial British tax payments. And eBay, God bless it, decided to bring $9 billion of offshore cash into the U.S. and pay taxes on it.

So I'm feeling a bit better about July than when I started writing this. In any event, a happy summer to you and yours.

JAMIE DIMON: COMPANIES SHOULD FEEL FREE TO BAIL ON THE U.S.

(By Stephen Gandel)

The JPMorgan CEO gave a thumbs up to inversions, the growing practice where American companies buy smaller foreign companies to relocate overseas and avoid paying U.S. taxes.

JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon says he's okay with companies using a hot tax dodge that could cost the U.S. tens of billions of dollars over the decade.

Dimon's public thumbs up for inversions—the growing practice where American companies buy smaller foreign companies to relocate overseas and avoid paying U.S. taxes—came in response to a question from Fortune on a media conference call after JPMorgan JPM 0.74% released its second quarter results. He said the real problem was the tax code, not CEOs trying to shirk their responsibilities.

''You want the choice to be able to go to Wal-Mart to get the lowest prices,'' Dimon said on a conference call with reporters on Tuesday morning. ''Companies should be able to make that choice as well.''

Dimon did not elaborate on the difference between choosing where to buy your underwear and where a corporation calls home. In a recent cover story for Fortune, Allan Sloan argued that U.S. companies are ''positively unpatriotic'' when they move their corporate headquarters overseas to pay lower taxes because of the benefits they receive by being (except for tax purposes) American companies. What's more, Sloan argued undermining the U.S. tax base will be bad for all shareholders in the long run.

Dimon seemed to brush aside those concerns. He said it was inappropriate for anyone to moralize against deals in which U.S. companies seek lower tax rates through mergers. No large U.S. bank has proposed an inversion deal. Since the financial crisis, there has been a debate about the size of the subsidizes that large banks like JPMorgan receive from U.S. taxpayers.

At least for now, inversions are good for Dimon and his shareholders. The firm has been an advisor on 19 inversion deals that have been announced since last year. The bank is advising drug maker AbbVie on its $53 billion bid for Dublin-based Shire, which was announced on Monday.

''I love America. I'm just as patriotic as anyone,'' said Dimon. ''But we have a flawed corporate tax code that is driving U.S. companies overseas.''

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TAX REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I was listening to my colleague from Illinois talking about the need for us to have economic patriotism and to keep people from moving jobs offshore.

I couldn't agree more, but the way to do it is to fix a broken Tax Code. It is frustrating to me that we have the President of the United States, we have Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have talked and talked and talked about the fact that we need to lower our tax rate and come up with a more competitive international tax system, and yet we do nothing about it. Instead, we are for these one-off political debates that we are going to have on the floor this week, apparently, that unfortunately aren't going to make any difference to the workers in America who are seeing this erosion of their wages, of their benefits, and often of their jobs because Washington is abdicating its responsibility. Washington is not doing what it has to do in order to meet its fiduciary responsibilities.

There is a lot of talk about that with these corporations. Our responsibility is to the people—to have the right tax system in place so that people can succeed so that if they work hard and play by the rules, the Tax Code is actually going to reward them and American companies can be competitive. That is simply not what is happening now. We need to do a lot of things too, such as to be sure we have a regulatory system that works, to have an international trading system that works for the workers of America, and to be sure we deal with our debt, deficit, and other issues.

But because the discussion of taxes is on the floor this week, I thought it would be helpful to talk just generally about where we are. We had a hearing today in the Finance Committee on this topic. We had experts in from across the spectrum. Although they disagreed on some of the specifics about what we ought to do today, they all agreed with one thing, which is that our Tax Code is broken. It is not working.

By the way, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the nonpartisan group that advises us on the economic impact of things, has looked at the Tax Code and said if you did deal with our high tax rates in this country and improved the corporate code, who benefits? It is the workers, and it is in terms of higher wages, better benefits, a job. This Congress has let the American people down, and it is time for us to deal with this issue and to deal with it in a way that can be nonpartisan.

We have, again, both sides of the aisle agreeing this is broken, and yet we can't seem to find that common ground to fix it. I would suggest there is common ground out there if we just get off the politics and start working on how we actually help people to be able to get ahead.

The issue that has come to the attention of all of us in Congress in the past few months the most is companies that are—what they call—inverting. These inversions are when a company in the United States buys a company overseas, merges with it, and then it becomes an overseas company. Often these companies they are buying are smaller than the U.S. company, and they become a foreign company because they are trying to get as far away from our Tax Code as they can. They want to become domiciled—they want to have their headquarters—in a foreign country because that country has a better Tax Code for a corporation to be able to succeed.

Again, there have been discussions on the floor recently about fiduciary responsibility. People do, if you are in corporate America, have a fiduciary responsibility to the shareholders. So they are making these decisions, and Washington sits by the sidelines and lets it happen.

I think the answer is to reform the Tax Code. I think we know what we have to do. I think we have to get busy on it.

Last week we saw another example of this. It was a Chicago drug company called AbbVie. Their bid to acquire a company called Shire looks like it is going to go through, and their combined company is going to move its tax headquarters to the UK, to England. This is hardly the first company to do this, and it won't be the last unless we change the code.

In fact, according to the Congressional Research Service, 35 companies have inverted in the past 5 years alone. I think the United States is still the best place to do business.

Despite our bad Tax Code, we have the most productive workforce; we have the best infrastructure; we have the rule of law; we have some great research institutions; we have a lot going for us; and we can compete and attract business from around the world.

So why are these companies going to England? Why are they going to the UK? Well, it turns out they have a tax code that was designed for this century, this decade—unlike here in America, where our international Tax Code was actually developed back in the 1960s. Things were a lot different then.

Our Tax Code itself and the rates of taxation were established in 1986. That is 25 years ago. The international system back to the 1960s, the rate we paid back to 1986—in 1986, ''Top Gun'' was the top at the box office. People still communicated by telegraph. The Mets were World Series champions. Pete Rose was playing for my hometown team, the Cincinnati Reds. That is how long ago it was.

A lot has changed since then. The world has changed. The global economy is far more competitive. It is very difficult for us in the United States of America to have a policy that is not affected by that global economy. And yet while every other one of our global competitors has reformed their tax code, we have not. They all have.

By the way, after the reform, the United Kingdom has a 21-percent corporate tax rate and they have a so-called territorial tax system. That basically means it taxes income in the UK if it is made in the UK, but otherwise it is taxed in the country where it is done. That means they have a competitive global tax system. By the way, about 93 percent of the companies that American companies compete with have that kind of more competitive international system. We have the old-style system.

We also have a higher rate. So we have a deadly combination—a higher rate, 39-percent tax rate, which is now the highest among all the developed countries in the world—not a No. 1 you want to be—but we have also got this international system that is not competitive.

So it is not a mystery why companies are leaving. When we look at the side-by-side, they are making decisions based on what is best for their shareholders. When we look at the changes in the tax rate since the 1990s and 2000s, we can see the United States is falling further behind.

Here is an interesting chart. This shows, just in 2004, what the tax rates were and now what they are in 2014. That is just 10 years ago. The United States is the same, 39 percent. And that 39 percent includes the Federal rate plus the State rate.

People say, well, the effective rate is less than that. Yes, it is less than that because people do take advantage of some of the so-called tax preferences. But even so, our rate is higher than these other countries.

We go from 39 percent to 39 percent; the UK, 30 to 21; Canada, 34.4 to 26, and they are going even lower at the Federal level; Netherlands, 34.5 to 25 percent; Ireland, 12.5; Switzerland, 24 to 21. And they have gone to these territorial tax systems that we talked about.

What has happened? Well, these are the companies that have left the United States of America to go to these countries. We mentioned Abbvi. That is the latest one last week. Medtronic, that was a couple weeks ago. On and on. There are companies in here from the State of Ohio. There is a company listed there from my home State of Ohio that chose to incorporate somewhere else because of the Tax Code. Guess what. They are going to save about $160 million on their tax bill this year. That is a pretty darned good savings, and that is wrong. We have to reform this Tax Code.

In 1960, 17 of the world's largest 20 companies were U.S.-headquartered. By 2010, only six were headquartered in the United States. In 2012 alone, our global 500 companies, the bigger companies' share fell from 36 percent to 26 percent.

I am not saying it is all due to taxes, but a lot of it is. If we talk to these companies, we find that out.

Again, I don't think anyone in the Senate—or in the White House, for that matter—disputes that tax reform is needed. I don't think so. Yet we aren't seeing it. Instead, again, we are hearing about these one-offsies, these small things that seem politically popular but aren't going to make a difference in terms of truly bringing the jobs back and attracting more jobs—attracting companies that want to headquarter here in the United States of America.

It is an admission that the United States is no longer the best place in the world to invest if we say we are going to require companies to do certain things so they can't follow the Tax Code. I think it is a futile effort to try to keep companies here with these new requirements, because ultimately if we do that and make it more disadvantageous to be an American company—so you have companies competing not just with one hand tied behind their back but with two hands tied behind their back in a global economy—what will they do? Well, they will probably sell, because foreign companies can come in and buy them. And that has happened and is happening.

If you are a beer drinker, like I am, try to find an American beer these days. The largest share is probably Sam Adams, with about 1.4 percent market share. The rest are all foreign-owned. Yuengling is up there too at about 1.4 percent. But all of them. And foreign companies have come in here and bought these companies because they can pay a premium for them, because their aftertax profits are greater because their tax code in their country is more advantageous. Who does that hurt? It hurts American workers.

I am not saying they don't have facilities here. They do. But when they move their corporate headquarters out of the United States, the tax headquarters out of the United States, the history is, when you look at this, that jobs follow—including the higher paid executive jobs.

Also, an intangible but really important thing to American communities is, when you have a U.S. company headquartered here, they tend to invest in the communities. So think of the nonprofits involved with charities we help out with. There are probably some companies that help out there too and probably it is an American company.

So of course we have to keep up with the times, and we aren't doing that. If we don't, we are going to see more and more companies leave our shores. I don't think these companies want to leave our shores. I think they are doing it because Washington is letting them down.

Let's imagine for a second that a company did decide not to do one of these inversions because we did some one-off things, including to say: You ought to stay here. You ought to not take advantage of a company with a $160 million a year benefit.

I think what is going to happen is we will see more and more companies become foreign companies. American workers and American jobs are going to be lost because we are going to see foreign companies come in and buy these U.S. companies.

If we are truly patriots, economic patriots, we need to look at tax reform, and we need it as soon as possible. This can't, by the way, be just a Republican or Democrat priority. It needs to be an American priority. And it should be, because as far as I can tell in talking to people, the consensus is that it is broken. We have a pretty good sense of what we ought to do to try to fix it.

One, I think we have a pretty good sense that we ought to reduce the rate. So the corporate rate ought to be reduced. I think it has to get down to at least 25 percent for us to be competitive. Back when we last did this in 1986, we purposefully lowered the rate under Ronald Reagan to get it down to 34 percent so it would be below the average of the other developed countries of the world. That is what we have to do again. So, at least 25 percent.

And we need to do this, by the way, at the same time we eliminate some of these preferences, the deductions, the

credits, the exclusions. I know that is tough, and some people are going to say: Well, gosh, I am going to lose my special preference or this is going to hurt my company. If they get a lower rate, one, they get a benefit. But, second, it helps the whole economy to have a lower rate.

Economists who look at this all agree, this will generate economic growth and will result, by the way, in more revenues coming in through growth as well. So we broaden the base by getting rid of a lot of the preferences, take those savings to lower the rate.

Then, finally, we need to do something about this international side. If we don't, we are not going to be able to be competitive. Even if we have a low tax rate, if we don't figure out a way to ensure we go to a system that is more like these other countries have all gone to—about 93 percent of the companies that we compete with have this what is called territorial system where you tax income where it is earned. If we don't do that, then I think we are going to end up making this problem worse, not better, by some of these proposals that say let's just kick the can down the road and immediately do something to create a requirement on companies to do this or that.

With regard to the anti-inversion rules, we are going to talk about that now. Let's not reform the Tax Code; let's just do something on inversions to make it harder to invert. We did that back in 2004. We enacted anti-inversion rules that were supposed to stop companies from moving overseas. As we saw in the first chart, that didn't work. Companies did anyway. And I don't think it is going to work today. In fact, I think it could make the problem worse, again, because those companies could then be targeted for foreign acquisition.

So if businesses are more valuable overseas than the United States and businesses can't move under the U.S. themselves, I think the foreign corporations will step in and buy them.

The Bring Jobs Home Act is a great title, and that is legislation we are going to consider here on the floor tomorrow. I think we ought to have a debate on it, so I am going to vote to proceed to have that debate. It is a great title, but I don't think there is anything in the legislation that is going to help to actually bring jobs back. I don't think anything in this legislation is going to address the fact that we have this high tax rate. I don't think there is anything in this legislation that is going to address the fact that we have a worldwide system that is way out of step with all our competitors.

It claims to remove deductions and tax credits and incentivize companies to move overseas. Unfortunately, that is not as easy as it sounds because, according to the Joint Committee on Taxes, which is the group here that advises us, under present law there are no targeted tax credits or disallowance of deductions related to relocating business units inside or outside the United States. There aren't any. So it is sort of tough to say we are going to do something with regard to credits or disallowances of deductions when there are none that relate directly to that.

There have been claims to the contrary that the media, looking at it routinely, says that is just false or misleading.

Finally, when it comes to proposed deductions for bringing jobs back to our shores, the proposal would likely pose some really serious administrative difficulties for an Internal Revenue Service that already has plenty of problems. The legislation, as I read it, gives the IRS authority to subjectively judge whether the IRS thinks that business deductions were made specifically for the purpose of bringing jobs to the United States or moving jobs overseas. Because there are no specific targeted tax deductions for this, the IRS would have to somehow subjectively determine whether that was true. That is going to be tough, because multinational businesses create and close businesses around the globe every day, most times because it is the most economically efficient thing to do from a business perspective. They start a company, close a company, move them around. Asking the IRS to determine whether those decisions were made specifically to move jobs to the United States or to move jobs overseas I think is going to be impossible. That is why this legislation, if passed, is not going anywhere.

I do appreciate my colleagues' hard work in trying to come up with real legislation to address the problem. Senator WYDEN, who is the Democratic Chair of the Finance Committee, has been working on that, as have others. But this particular one is just not going to help. It is just not going to help. That fact should serve as a stark reminder that the only way we are going to stop these so-called inversions, the only way we are going to stop people from saying I would rather be a foreign company than a U.S. company is to make it more attractive to be here—to do what we should have done over the last couple decades—and the rest of the world has; all of our competitors have—which is to reform our Tax Code so that it is good for American workers and good for American investors. If we do that, I think America's best days are ahead of us. I really do.

There are a lot of things we need to do, as we talked about earlier, to make this country more competitive and to be sure we are creating the best jobs and the greatest opportunities here for everybody. But one thing we can do that will give the economy a shot in the arm right away is this comprehensive tax reform. When people have analyzed this from a macroeconomic basis, they say: If we did this—lower the rate by broadening the base, go to this competitive international system—we would generate a lot more investment and business in America. That would in turn generate a lot more investments, a lot more business here in America. That would in turn generate more revenue.

So it is growth revenues, which is exactly what we want to see. We want to see more jobs, and we want to see us being able to have the kind of growth and prosperity so we can help to get out of this debt and deficit, which is a real problem. And, going forward, it is a problem we are going to have to deal with, both because it affects the economy and because it affects what we are doing to future generations.

As legislators, it is our job to fix this problem. That is what we were hired to do. I know it is not easy. I know corporate tax reform is tough to do, because we would take away benefits from one company or another by lowering that rate. But, by the way, when we do this—when we do lower that rate and get rid of some of these preferences to do so, guess what. Everybody has to pay taxes.

People talk about it is unfair that some American companies in some years, because they get a tax break, don't pay taxes. Well, if they can't be as creative because there aren't all these deductions and credits and exemptions to be able to use, they are going to have to pay taxes. Everyone will pay. There will be a lower rate and they will be more competitive, and they won't be having this incentive to move offshore. But everybody will be paying taxes. And I think that is part of what we ought to be doing.

To be able to compete and to succeed and to help American workers, it is time for us to make tax reform a reality. Let's not do things that might feel good politically and do some of these one-offs and half steps that in the end could inadvertently actually make it worse, not better—because, again, if we make it even more difficult to be an American company, we are just not going to have as many American companies because they will be bought by foreign companies that can pay more for them and pay a premium. Let's instead get busy doing what we were elected to do, which is to work across the aisle to come up with sensible tax reform, lowering that rate, a competitive international system, and ensuring that we do create more opportunities for American workers to be able to compete—not just survive but thrive in the global economy.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MALAYSIAN AIRLINE FLIGHT 17

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I rise to talk about the deteriorating situation in Syria and in Iraq. However, before I address the situation in the Middle East, I wish to speak briefly about Russia and the downing of the Malaysian Airline flight 17.

Last week we all watched in horror as news came in of the almost 300 civilians who were callously murdered. I have seen the intelligence on this attack, and it is very clear Russia bears the responsibility for the death of these civilians. Vladimir Putin should be held accountable, regardless of whether it was a Russian soldier or a Russian-sponsored separatist who pulled the trigger. Russia either shot down the plane itself or directly gave separatists the order and the ability to do so.

Russia and its proxy separatists in eastern Ukraine are well armed, as was clearly demonstrated last week, and they are also very irresponsible. President Putin continues to flout the international community by sending heavy weapons and fighters into eastern Ukraine. In addition, Russia is supporting Bashar al-Assad's regime in Syria and failing to comply with some of its international arms control obligations.

The limited sanctions put in place so far have done little to deter Putin. In addition to simply increasing sanctions, President Obama must show strength and leadership and rally the international community to secure the crash site, conduct a thorough investigation, and hold the Russians, and particularly Putin, accountable for this unthinkable attack. Now is not the time for half measures. Swift and decisive action is needed to deal with this situation.

THE MIDDLE EAST

With regard to the Middle East, the rise of the al-Nusra Front and ISIL—the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant—presents a serious and credible threat to the security of the region, to the United States of America, and to our allies. Yet despite repeated requests from me and other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, the administration has yet to present a compelling plan to counter this growing threat. The administration seems determined to keep its head in the sand, but this threat simply cannot be ignored. This same wait-and-see mentality is just more of what got us into this mess with Syria in the first place.

ISIL is gaining strength, capturing arms and equipment, and closing in on Baghdad. ISIL in recent weeks has purportedly garnered hundreds of millions of dollars, thousands of fighters, and countless weapons. We have seen ISIL parade around with 4 U.S.-made howitzers and MRAPs. In the absence of resistance from MRAPs and other forces, ISIL is able to consolidate its gains, redistribute its captured material, and recruit additional fighters. As ISIL has taken territory, it has also ransacked several prisons, providing it with an even larger fighting force, all of this in preparation for an assault on Baghdad.

ISIL is clearly preparing to attack Baghdad, which will inevitably include terrorist attacks against Western interests and possibly including the international airport and the U.S. Embassy. ISIL fighters have plotted and conducted terrorist attacks in Baghdad over the past decade and it is naive to think they will not continue. We can wait for ISIL to descend on Baghdad with its newly acquired weaponry or we can take the fight to them before they reach the Capitol.

In addition to closing in on Baghdad, ISIL has its sights set on Jordan, Lebanon, Israel, and other parts of the region. On June 25 of this year, we saw an ISIL suicide bomber detonate himself in a Beirut hotel after being discovered by security forces. This is not the only attack we have seen outside of Iraq and Syria. Lebanon in recent months has been besieged by violence linked to the conflict in Iraq and Syria, and it is only a matter of time before these attacks spread to Jordan as well as to Israel.

ISIL not only represents a credible threat to the region but to Europe and the United States as well. Earlier this year we witnessed an armed attack on a Jewish Museum in Brussels. The attacker, a 29-year-old French national, had returned from fighting in Syria and was arrested with an ISIL flag wrapped around his rifle. Alarmingly, the cell's leader had been arrested in Afghanistan in 2001 and was also a former Guantanamo Bay detainee. Individuals linked to ISIL and Syrian extremist groups have been arrested in other parts of Europe, including Germany and France.

ISIL's aspirations don't end in Europe but extend to the United States. The group's leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, has been clear about the group's ultimate goal of confronting the United States, and as a country we must be prepared for this threat. Many of ISIL's leaders have threatened the United States for years under the banner of Al Qaeda and Iraq. These fighters have been planning attacks against Baghdad and are responsible for the deaths of many U.S. servicemembers over the last decade.

One of the biggest lessons we learned from the September 11 attacks was that we cannot give terrorists a sanctuary from which to plan attacks against us. Arguably, ISIL now has control of the largest territory ever held by a terrorist group. This safe haven provides ISIL with the time and space they need to train fighters and plan operations. It also has provided them with access to weapons and a network that can be used to support external operations. We knew about the threat we faced from Al Qaeda prior to 9/11, but we failed to act. I just hope we don't make the same mistake again.

ISIL isn't the only threat we face in Iraq and Syria. Experienced fighters and jihadists have flocked to Syria, forming several groups that could threaten the United States, including the Al Qaeda-affiliated al-Nusra Front. Several U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents have traveled to Syria to join the al-Nusra Front and other groups. In May we witnessed Moner Mohammad Abusalha, the first American suicide bomber in Syria, carry out an attack that is believed to have killed almost 40 Syrian personnel.

A Florida native, Abusalha was eulogized by a recruitment video featuring images of the September 11 attack on the World Trade Center and a burning American flag.

The White House recently announced plans to increase support for the Syrian opposition, including a $500 million plan to train and equip vetted elements of the Syrian opposition. Despite the announcement, few details are available on how this training would actually take place, and it may be quite some time before this program begins. It is also unclear how this new program to train Syrian opposition fighters will actually help counter the growing terrorist threat in Syria as opposed to simply countering the Assad regime. It is clear the administration has not prepared any plan that will fit into a cohesive and compelling foreign policy in the region.

The Middle East over the last 3 years has been besieged by a resurgence of instability, violence, and terrorism. The administration, unfortunately, has done little to stop it. Instead of focusing on countering rising groups in Iraq and Syria, the administration has been focused on ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which appears to have had the unfortunate consequence of letting America's enemies grow stronger.

Al Qaeda, its affiliates, and other terrorist groups are determined to attack the United States. We constantly face new plots and operatives looking for ways to murder Americans, such as the foiled May 2012 AQAP plot to put another IED on a U.S.-bound commercial aircraft. Thankfully, this plot and others have not materialized, but we are not going to always be so fortunate.

Just this month TSA was forced to institute new security measures to mitigate the terrorist threat to commercial aviation. The administration must come to grips with the terrorist threats we face and put policies in place that will effectively counter them. I would encourage the administration to act immediately before another act of terrorism against our country occurs.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, that following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2569 on Wednesday, July 23, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 802, 786, and 599; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session; further, that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2569, all time consumed while in executive session under the terms of this agreement count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, we expect the nominations to be considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAMELA HARRIS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 929.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Bernard Sanders, Dianne Feinstein, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Edward J. Markey, Tom Harkin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk reported the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE BRENT T. ADAMS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the career of the Honorable Brent T. Adams, who is retiring from the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada.

For more than 25 years, Judge Adams has been the presiding judge in Department Six of the district court. Since being appointed to the distinctive position by Governor Bob Miller on July 4, 1989, his consistent leadership and responsiveness to the public and the court have not gone unnoticed, as he successfully won four elections to maintain his seat. Judge Adams' dedication to his profession was reflected in the Washoe County Bar Association's biennial surveys, where he consistently received exceptional judicial performance evaluations and high retention ratings.

Beyond his remarkable career at the district court, Judge Adams has had a tremendous impact on the entire legal community. He has served as a faculty member of the National Judicial College for 20 years, where he conducts national and international legal and judicial training on a wide array of topics. Judge Adams initiated the Washoe County drug court, the court services program, and the Washoe County Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, which he chaired from 1993 to 2002. He is also an active member of the Nevada Board of Continuing Legal Education and has served on the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline, the Judicial Assessment Commission, the Nevada Supreme Court Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee, and the Washoe County Law Library Board.

In addition to his impressive work in the legal community, he has worked to serve the greater Reno community by serving on the University of Nevada, Reno College of Liberal Arts Advisory Council, and the Reno Diocese Review Board of the Roman Catholic Church.

Through his years of professional and voluntary service, Judge Adams has become a fixture in the Reno community. I congratulate him on his many successes and decades of dedicated public service, and I wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DICK CLARK

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I served with Dick Clark and traveled with him to different parts of the country, including a very cold day in the winter in Vermont. One of the finest Senators I served with was Dick Clark from Iowa and I still think of all I learned from him. I was so happy to see David Rogers' article about him in Politico. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Politico, Dec. 20, 2013]

A NELSON MANDELA BACKSTORY: IOWA'S DICK CLARK

(By David Rogers)

Dick Clark was Mandela when Mandela wasn't cool.

A one-term Democratic senator from Iowa and for years afterward a leader of congressional discussions on apartheid, Clark is now 85 and long gone from the public scene. But the ups and downs of his career are an intriguing back story—and counterpoint—to the outpouring of praise for Nelson Mandela, the black liberation leader and former president of South Africa who died Dec. 5.

It wasn't always that way in Washington.

Indeed, Mandela turned 60 in South Africa's Robben Island prison in the summer of 1978 even as Clark—chairman of the African Affairs panel on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—was fighting for his own re-election in Iowa.

It was a time when Republican challenger Roger Jepsen felt free to taunt the Democrat as ''the senator from Africa.'' Tensions were such that the State Department called in a South African Embassy official in May for making disparaging remarks about Clark in Iowa. And after Clark lost, South Africa's ousted information secretary, Eschel Rhoodie, said his government invested $250,000 to defeat Clark, who had become a thorn in the side of the white regime.

Jepsen denied any knowledge of South Africa's alleged role. Nor does Clark accuse him of such. But 35 years after, Clark has no doubt that the apartheid government led by Prime Minister B. J. Vorster wanted him out—and had a hand in his defeat.

Clark's liberal record and support of the Panama Canal Treaty, which narrowly cleared the Senate in the spring of 1978, also hurt his chances in Iowa. But the fatal blow was a fierce wave of late-breaking ground attacks from anti-abortion forces—something even conservative writers like Robert Novak had not anticipated in a published column weeks before.

''Abortion was the issue, and how much effect this apparent $250,000 had to do with promoting it more, I have no way of evaluating it,'' Clark said in a recent interview at his home in Washington. ''No question that they did it. They said they did, and I think they did.''

Clark had made himself a target for South Africa with his high-profile chairmanship of the Africa subcommittee. In Washington as well, he was not without critics who accused him of being too puritanical, too quick to fault U.S. policy. But like no senator before him, Clark used the panel to raise the visibility of human rights issues in the southern regions of the continent.

The roster of prior Africa subcommittee chairs reads like a Who's Who of national Democrats: John Kennedy in the late 1950s; Tennessee Sen. Albert Gore, father of the future vice president; future Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield; and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey after his return to the Senate. But all stayed for just one Congress before moving on. Clark stuck, challenging Cold War policies that he believed hurt the larger struggle against apartheid that Mandela symbolized.

''He was the icebreaker here,'' says his friend Rep. George Miller (D–Cal.). ''He was out breaking ice on Africa issues for the country and certainly for the Senate.''

What's more, after losing his Senate seat, Clark didn't stop. Instead, he found a new classroom via the Aspen Institute, where the former professor began what amounted to his own graduate program in 1983 to educate members of Congress about different policy issues.

Russia had been Clark's early academic interest and was as well in his first years at Aspen. But Africa tugged and he set out ''to try to get a cadre of Congress who would know about South Africa and what was going on in South Africa.''

These typically were nearly weeklong seminars—held at choice locales overseas to lure members of Congress but also to provide neutral ground for the warring parties inside South Africa.

Bermuda, for example, served as a meeting place in 1989. The island allowed officials from the South African government to shuttle in and out before the arrival of outlawed representatives for Mandela's African National Congress, which was operating then from outside South Africa.

''All of them were there, making their pitches,'' Clark said. And once Mandela was released from prison in 1990, the venue shifted to South Africa itself. ''We got Mandela, who had just gotten out of jail not long before, to come,'' Clark recalls of an April 1991 session in Cape Town a seminar that also included F. W. de Klerk, South Africa's white president.

Most striking here was Clark's impact on Republicans—the party that helped to throw him out of the Senate.

''He is a wonder,'' says former Sen. Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.). ''I had been told he was a lefty, the stereotype, but he just drew out people. He never showed bitterness toward the right or promoting one side.''

Just as ''Mandela made a difference, Dick Clark made a difference in awareness'' at home in Congress, Simpson adds.

Former Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.) remembers an Aspen meeting in Cape Town at which Clark surprised the participants on the last day by sending them out to walk through the neighborhoods of a black township to meet with families. ''Dick Clark would do things like that,'' Porter said.

''This was before all the big changes in South Africa when we were debating sanctions,'' said former Sen. John Danforth (R-Mo.). ''He was just so dedicated to it and knew all the players.''

In fact, Clark says he knew very little about Africa before coming to the Senate after the 1972 elections. But when a seat opened up on Foreign Relations in 1975, he grabbed it and fell into the Africa post just ahead of his classmate Sen. JOSEPH BIDEN (D-Del.), the future vice president.

Timing is everything in Congress and it was Clark's good fortune in this case. The legendary but very controlling Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) had just left the Senate at the end of 1974 and this allowed subcommittee chairs like Clark to act more on their own.

''Fulbright's attitude was the subcommittees couldn't do anything. Everything ought to be done by the full committee,'' Clark said. ''I was next to last on seniority. When it got down to me, the only thing left was Africa about which I knew very little. Some would say none. So I just figured: Here's a chance to learn something and I spent a lot of time doing hearings and learning about Africa.''

He also traveled venturing into southern, sub-Saharan Africa which was then unfamiliar to many on the Senate committee.

''Humphrey told me that he got as far south as Ethiopia,'' Clark said. ''It was new territory and interesting and of course we were putting a lot of covert money in Africa, as were the Russians.''

In the summer of 1975, Clark and two aides left Washington for what was to be a trip to just Tanzania, Zambia and Zaire. But that itinerary quickly expanded to include the two former Portuguese colonies, Mozambique and Angola.

The Angola detour was pivotal and included face-to-face meetings with Central Intelligence Agency personnel on the ground as well as the leaders of the three rival factions in Angola's post-colonial civil war. The Soviet Union and Cuba were then actively backing the new leftist government under Agostinho Neto. The CIA and South Africa had begun a covert partnership assisting rebel factions: chiefly Jonas Savimbi in the south, but also Holden Roberto, whose base was more in the north and Zaire.

Soon after Clark returned, the debate broke into the open after news reports detailing the U.S. and South African operations. Congress cut off new funding in a December 1975 appropriations fight. It then quickly enacted a more permanent ban the so-called Clark amendment prohibiting future covert assistance for paramilitary operations in Angola.

Signed into law in February 1976, the Clark amendment was repealed under President Ronald Reagan in 1985. Conservatives long argued that it was always an overreach by Congress, reacting to Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon's handling of the Vietnam War.

''The danger now is the pendulum will swing too far the other way,'' Secretary of State Henry Kissinger warned Clark's panel in a January 1976 hearing.

But for all the echoes of Vietnam, Clark says he saw his amendment more as a way to separate the U.S. from South Africa's apartheid regime.

''The reason the amendment passed so easily in both houses was because of Vietnam, so I certainly related the two,'' Clark said. ''But my interest was really in Africa and South Africa. We were aligning ourselves with apartheid forces. The reason for my amendment was to disassociate us from apartheid and from South Africa.''

''Kissinger had really no feeling for human rights that I could ever discern and certainly not in South Africa,'' Clark said. ''His association with South Africa was obviously very close.''

A year later, visiting South Africa, Clark got a taste of how closely the white government under Vorster had been watching him.

That trip included an important meeting in Port Elizabeth with the young black leader, Steve Biko, who had just been released from jail and would die 10 months later after a brutal interrogation in the summer of 1977. Clark said he became a courier of sorts, taking back a Biko memorandum to Jimmy Carter's incoming administration.

But while in South Africa, Vorster himself wanted to see Clark and spent much of an hour quizzing the senator on his past public comments—even down to small college appearances in the U.S.

''He spent an hour with me,'' Clark said. ''They obviously had followed me to each of these, much to my surprise.''

''He would quote me. And then he would say, Did you say that on such and such a date and such and such a place?' ''We went through this for an hour. He just wanted the opportunity to tell me how wrong I was about everything I was saying.''

''He was the last great Afrikaner president,'' Clark said. ''In fact, he ultimately resigned over the embarrassment of the Muldergate thing years later.''

The Muldergate thing—as Clark calls it—was a major scandal inside South Africa in the late 1970s when it was revealed that government funds had been used by the ruling National Party to mount a far-reaching propaganda campaign in defense of apartheid.

This went well beyond placing favorable articles or opinion pieces in the press. Tens of millions of dollars were invested to try to undermine independent South African papers. There was even a failed attempt in the U.S. to buy the Washington Star in hopes of influencing American policy.

Muldergate got its name from Connie Mulder, South Africa's information minister at the time. But just as Watergate had its John Dean, Rhoodie—a top deputy to Mulder—proved the top witness: a suave propagandist who later gave detailed interviews and wrote his own book on the subject filling 900-plus pages.

Rhoodie, who was prosecuted for fraud but cleared by an appeals court in South Africa, ultimately relocated to the U.S., where he died in Atlanta in 1993. But by his account, the Vorster government had used its contacts with a Madison Avenue public relations firm, Sydney S. Baron & Co. Inc., to undermine Clark's reelection.

Rhoodie describes a meeting early in 1978 in South Africa attended by Mulder, Vorster and Baron at which Clark's election was specifically discussed, and the $250,000 was later moved into one of Baron's accounts ''to make sure that Clark was defeated.''

As South Africa's information secretary, Rhoodie was in fact the signatory of contracts with Baron, according to filings with the Justice Department. These show the New York firm initially received about $365,000 annually under a contract signed in April 1976. This was increased to $650,000 a year later. In August 1977, the same arrangement was extended through January 1979, including a $250,000 payment in April 1978.

Whether this $250,000 is a coincidence or what Rhoodie was speaking on is not clear. At this stage, most of the major players are dead and New York state corporate records show Baron's firm was dissolved in 1993—the year that Rhoodie died.

Watching it all is Clark's friend, old boss in the House and later Senate colleague, John Culver. The two met in 1964, when Clark signed on to help Culver win his first House election and then worked with Culver in Washington until 1972, when Clark went back to Iowa to run for the Senate.

A Harvard-educated Marine Corps veteran, Culver said he had his own fascination with Africa as a young man in the 1960s. But he remembered that era as a time of greater optimism, as new countries across the continent were emerging from colonial rule.

''Dick came to it when there was less political reward,'' Culver said. ''But he stuck to it.''

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN STEVEN J. RAIRDON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a minute to recognize CPT Steve Rairdon of Leslie County, KY. Captain Rairdon is a member of the 173rd Airborne Brigade and participated in commemorating the 70th anniversary of the D-day invasion in Normandy, France, last month.

As an airborne soldier, Captain Rairdon understands the indispensable role his predecessors—the first soldiers of their kind—played in the D-day invasion. In the earliest hours of June 6, 1944, Allied paratroopers dropped behind enemy lines in advance of the amphibious invasion to disrupt German lines of communication and to secure key roads and bridges. The success of their mission proved vital to the success of the invasion as a whole.

By participating in the 70th anniversary ceremonies, which included a jump into Normandy, Captain Rairdon and all those who joined him paid a wonderful tribute to our veterans who fought 70 years ago. It is these acts of remembrance that continue to illuminate the unimaginable sacrifices made by the members of the ''greatest generation''. Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Captain Steve Rairdon.

The Leslie County News recently published an article detailing Captain Rairdon's time spent in Normandy. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Leslie County News, July 3, 2014]

TELLING THE AMERICAN MILITARY STORY . . . ONE SERVICE MEMBER AT A TIME

NORMANDY, France.—Army Captain Steven J. Rairdon stands on hallowed ground, as he and hundreds of other American service members are here commemorating the 70th anniversary of the Normandy D-day invasion in 1944 that changed the course of World War II and history. ''Honoring our history, securing our future'' is the reason the American service members are here today. Rairdon is a member of C Company, 173rd Brigade Support Battalion from Vicenza, Italy, and spent approximately a week in the Normandy region, participating in ceremonies and representing the Americans who fought here 70 years ago.

''I'm extremely honored to have been given the opportunity to jump here. It's very humbling. I'm proud of our American World War II veterans. They made great sacrifices for our nation, and paved the way for today's airborne community. Thank you to all of our veterans and their families for their sacrifices they've made to keep our country and our NATO allies free,'' Rairdon said.

Soldiers such as Rairdon remain indebted to the veterans whose service demonstrated the selfless actions of the ''greatest generation'' who not only served to protect and defend our nation, but were part of a global force to defend peace and strengthen our ties with an emerging Alliance. The selfless actions by all allies on D-day continue to resonate 70 years later as U.S. forces in Europe remain steadfast in our commitment to our European partners and NATO Allies.

Rairdon is the husband of Myra Sizemore Rairdon, a 1992 graduate of Leslie County High School and the son-in-law of former Leslie County Superintendent Tommy Sizemore of Hyden, KY. Rairdon is the son of Steve Rairdon of Dewitt, Iowa, and Theresa Reeves of Tyler, Texas.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, on July 16, 2014, I was absent from votes on the confirmation of Mr. Ronnie L. White to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri Vote No. 227 and on S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act of 2014 Vote No. 228.

I wish to state for the record my strong support for Mr. White's nomination and the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act. I also wish to state that I would have voted aye on Mr. White's nomination and the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act had I been present.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT VINSON B. ADKINSON III

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to Army SGT Vinson B. ''Trinity'' Adkinson III. Sergeant Adkinson and three other soldiers died August 31, 2010, when an improvised explosive device blew up next to their vehicle near Forward Operating Base Shank, Logar province, Afghanistan.

Known by family and friends as ''Trinity'' because he was the third Vinson in his family, he was born on December 13, 1983, and grew up in Empire City, OK, before moving in his junior year of high school to live with an aunt in Kansas. His father recalled interest in the Armed Forces was stoked early for Trinity as the first toys his son played with were G.I. Joes.

''He played army outside, he trick or treated as an armyman,'' Adkinson Jr. said. ''Me and him spent a lot of time outside in the woods. He was born to be a soldier.'' Trinity enlisted in the Army immediately after graduating from Chaparral High School in Harper, KS, in 2003.

He started his career with the 82nd Airborne Division followed by serving with the Honor Guard of the 4th Infantry Division. Later assigned to the 173rd Brigade Support Battalion, 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team based in Bamberg, Germany, Trinity served three tours in Iraq and was on his second tour in Afghanistan.

''I begged him not to go back,'' said grandmother Mary Adkinson after seeing her grandson earlier this year. She said he told her he needed to return to Afghanistan so that the people of that nation could have peace in their lives.

He was preceded in death by his grandfathers, Vinson Bryon Adkinson, Sr., and Robert Allen Morgan, Sr., and is survived by his wife Veronica, father Vinson Bryon Adkinson, Jr., of Comanche, OK, brother Jacob Aaron Adkinson of Stillwater, OK, sister Mary Kay Adkinson of Wichita, KS, his paternal grandmother Mary Ellen Adkinson of Duncan, OK, and maternal grandmother Sharon Kay Morgan of Wichita, KS.

SGT David Shearouse served with Trinity and was given the task of escorting his remains home. ''He always wanted to take point, he wanted to be the leader,'' he said of his fallen comrade. ''Everybody wanted to be like him. He was a good man. I lost my friend, my brother and my hero.''

The family held a funeral service for Sergeant Adkinson on September 13, 2010, and he was laid to rest with full military honors in Fort Sill National Cemetery in Elgin, OK.

Today we remember Army SGT Vinson B. Adkinson III, a young man who

loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT JASON L. MCCLUSKEY

Madam President, I would also like to pay tribute to SGT Jason L. McCluskey. Jason was tragically killed in action on November 4, 2010, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit with small-arms fire in Zarghun Shahr, Mohammad Agha district of Afghanistan.

Jason was born September 12, 1984, to Jimmy and Delores ''Darby'' McCluskey in Stockton, CA, and later moved to McAlester, OK. As a wrestler at McAlester High School he went to the State championship tournament several times before graduating in 2004. Quoting James Dean in his senior quote, he wrote: ''Dream as if you will live forever. And live as if you will die today.''

Upon enlisting in the Army in April 2006, he was assigned as a paratrooper to the 27th Engineer Battalion, 20th Engineer Brigade, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, NC. ''SGT McCluskey was a true hero to us all,'' said 1SG Randolph Delapena, his company first sergeant. ''He was like my son that I saw come up the ranks to become an elite non-commissioned officer. He was the edge of the sword, he led from the front, and he cared deep down for not only his Soldiers, but every Soldier he came in contact with.''

His mother, Delores Oliveras, said shortly after her son's death that Jason was dedicated to serving in the Army. ''I asked him plenty of times to leave the Army,'' she said. ''But all he would say was, 'No, Mom, I really love what I do.' '' Shortly before his death, he was named his battalion's Noncommissioned Officer of the Year.

McCluskey is survived by his son Landon McCluskey, mother Delores Darby McCluskey Oliveras and her husband Ray, father Jimmy McCluskey, brother Joshua Stambaugh, stepfather Charlie Stambaugh, grandmother Anita McCluskey, grandmother Wilma Kohl and her husband Doyle, mother of his son, Cassie Wright, and many aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces and nephews, as well as many other relatives, friends, and loved ones too numerous to mention.

A funeral was held on November 12, 2010, at Chaney Harkins Funeral Home, and he was laid to rest in Tannehill Cemetery in McAlester, OK.

''Our Army and nation will be forever indebted to SGT McCluskey for his service,'' said Major General Rodney O. Anderson from Fort Bragg. ''SGT McCluskey laid down his life for his friends, his battle buddies, his unit, our Army and our nation.''

Today we remember Army SGT Jason L. McCluskey, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CAPTAIN DAVID J. THOMPSON

Madam President, I am also honoring the life and sacrifice of a true American hero, Army CPT David J. Thompson. Captain Thompson died on January 29, 2010, at Forward Operating Base Nunez, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained while supporting combat operations.

Known as John Paul—JP for short—by many, he was born on May 25, 1970, and listed Hooker, OK, as his home of record. In 1989 he enlisted in the Army and completed basic combat training and advanced individual training at Fort Jackson, SC.

John Paul served in a wide variety of jobs during his military career. His first assignment was as a radio telephone operator and team chief for the Regimental Signal Detachment, 75th Ranger Regiment and communications sergeant for the Regimental Reconnaissance Detachment with the 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. From 1995 to 1998, he served in AK as a rifle squad leader and platoon sergeant with the 1st Battalion, 501st Parachute Infantry Regiment. He later served as a staff noncommissioned officer with the Command Operations Center, U.S. Army AK.

From January 1999 to May 2002, while attending East Carolina University, he served with the 514th Military Police Company, NC Army National Guard. In May 2002 he completed a bachelor of arts degree in chemistry and was commissioned as a chemical officer. Following his officer basic course, he was assigned to 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY, as the division chemical logistics officer. In March 2003 he was assigned to 1st Battalion, 87th Infantry Regiment and served as a battle captain and rifle platoon leader for his first deployment supporting Operation Enduring Freedom. Then, from June 2004 to November 2005, he served as the battalion adjutant and rear detachment commander. From August to December 2008 he served as executive officer for Company C, 3rd Battalion, 3rd Special Forces Group (Airborne) and held that position until taking command of Operational Detachment Alpha 3334, Company C, 3rd Battalion, 3rd Special Forces Group, Fort Bragg, NC, in January 2009.

Captain Thompson was laid to rest with full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, VA, on February 15, 2010.

John Paul is survived by his wife Emily and their two daughters, Isabelle and Abigail of Pinehurst, NC; parents Charles and Freida Thompson of Hinton, OK; and sister Alisa Mueller.

Today we remember Army CPT David J. Thompson, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

REGARDING U.S. SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, as the conflict in Gaza continues to escalate, we mourn the tragic loss of lives and hope for a speedy and peaceful resolution. Israelis and Palestinians have both seen far too much bloodshed and destruction.

I cosponsored S. Res. 498 because I stand by Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas' indiscriminate attacks. No country in the world would be expected to stand by as its people are threatened with rocket fire. But both sides should do everything possible to deescalate and end this battle. I urge Hamas to end its attacks and to renounce its mission of annihilating Israel, and I urge Israel to exercise restraint and proportional force, tailoring its tactics to protect innocent lives.

There can and must be an end in sight for the violence that is now engulfing the region. I support calls for an immediate ceasefire. The United States must continue to stand ready to help facilitate a solution and a path forward toward both security and economic development, which are essential elements for any enduring peace.

BOOTHBAY, MAINE 250TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President. I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the Town of Boothbay, ME. Boothbay was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Boothbay's incorporation, 1764, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress, a journey that is inextricably linked to the sea. For thousands of years the Boothbay Peninsula was a fishing grounds of the Etchemin Tribe, and the extensive shell middens and other archeological sites are today a treasure trove of this ancient history.

Drawn by one of the finest natural harbors in New England, English settlement began within a few years of the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth in 1620. The early English influence is underscored by the fact that some of the first deeds granted to the settlers were signed by the Etchemin Sagamore, who was called Chief Robinhood by the newcomers. By 1764, Boothbay was a growing town with an economy driven by fishing, shipbuilding, and tidal-powered sawmills. The wealth produced by the sea and by hard work was invested in schools and churches to create a true community.

Boothbay was a vital center for revolutionary activity during America's fight for independence. The strategic

importance of the harbor put the small town under frequent enemy attack, and more than 100 patriots rose to its defense. During the war Captain Paul Reed established himself as one of our young nation's ablest and most courageous naval commanders. The Reverend John Murray was an eloquent and fearless voice for freedom, and his powerful words called many to its cause.

In the decades that followed, Boothbay became a place of industry and innovation with such endeavors as fish processing, canning, and fish-oil production. During the 1830s, Boothbay's bracing sea breezes and crystal-clear waters made it an early health spa, and by the end of the 19th century the town became a favorite destination for vacationers and summer residents.

Today the people of Boothbay continue to build on those traditions. Fishing and lobstering are mainstays of the economy. Fine hotels, inns, and restaurants support a thriving tourism industry. Boatyards build luxury yachts, fishing boats, and advanced vessels for military and law-enforcement purposes. Since its founding in 1974, the Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences has become a global leader in oceanographic research. Lobster boat races, the annual Windjammer Days, and the Fishermen's Festival celebrate the town's maritime heritage, and the restored Opera House provides a beautiful venue for arts and entertainment.

This 250th anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is about human accomplishment, an occasion to celebrate the people who for more than two and a half centuries have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a community. Thanks to those who came before, Boothbay has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL WILLIAM L. SHELTON

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I wish to recognize Gen. William L. Shelton, commander of Air Force Space Command, on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force.

Over the course of his 38-year career in the U.S. Air Force, General Shelton has served with great distinction and made countless sacrifices for our country. I join with all Coloradans in commending his service, the sacrifices of his family—including his wife Linda and their two children, Sara and Joel—and I offer my great personal appreciation for his leadership and devotion to our Nation's security.

A graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy, General Shelton's selection as the commander of Air Force Space Command in January 2011 culminates a distinguished career that began in 1976 at the Space and Missile Test Center at Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA. In a career dedicated to the space enterprise, he commanded units at Falcon-Schriever, F.E. Warren, Offutt, Vandenberg, and Peterson Air Force Bases. He also provided valuable leadership and counsel to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Joint Staff during multiple headquarters U.S. Air Force assignments. His positive leadership had a direct and positive impact on countless men and women in our Armed Forces, and his legacy will benefit the United States and our space policy for generations to come.

Throughout his career, General Shelton has been a vigilant advocate for our national security space programs. As the commander of Air Force Space Command, he was responsible for organizing, training and equipping more than 40,000 military and civilian personnel to assure space and cyberspace capabilities for the combatant commands and for the Nation. While those capabilities clearly contribute to our military's technological and strategic superiority, they also have become essential in humanitarian and disaster relief efforts—and they are now vital assets for the global community and world economy. As a result of his leadership, the Air Force has established a truly impressive record of successful space launches while developing an acquisition regime that has led to greater mission assurance and simultaneous cost savings across the Department of Defense. Further, his vision of future space capabilities will position the military to provide resilient, capable, and affordable space operations for the joint forces and the Nation well into the future.

General Shelton established and sustained an unmatched level of success during a time of increasing challenges. He has worked closely with the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, which I am proud to chair. It has been our great privilege to work with him. His frank and informed discussions of our space systems, including the global positioning satellite system, have helped leaders and citizens around the world appreciate the value and need to protect our Nation's foundational space capabilities. I am personally grateful for General Shelton's wise counsel and firm resolve to always do what is best for the Nation and for the airmen he has led. He is a leader of exceptional intellect, candor, and integrity, and his deeply held commitment to doing the right thing for the right reasons is clear to all who have been fortunate enough to work with him.

With nearly four decades of exemplary service to our Nation, Gen. William L. Shelton deserves our most heartfelt gratitude and praise. He and his family have my very best wishes for a long, happy, and well-deserved retirement. Our Nation and our Air Force are better for his leadership and distinguished service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HOWARD COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Howard County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $12.4 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include their tremendous success in obtaining funds from a variety of programs I fought for including farm bill funding, public safety programs, and firefighter safety equipment.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new

schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Howard County has received $91,360 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Howard County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $35,000.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Howard County has received over $2.7 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Howard County has received more than $7.6 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Howard County's fire departments have received over $1.5 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment and over $337,000 in public safety dollars.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Howard County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Howard County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Howard County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

WRIGHT COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Wright County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $9.5 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the tremendous success that the Iowa Specialty Hospital Belmond had in obtaining a $21.6 million Community Facility Grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Office to renovate the hospital facility.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Wright County has received $967,434 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Wright County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $25,000.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Wright County has received over $5

million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Wright County has received more than $22 million from a variety of farm bill loan and grant programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Wright County's fire departments have received over $168,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Wright County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Wright County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Wright County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA BARRON

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Jessica Barron, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jessica is a rising senior at the University of South Florida in Tampa, FL. Currently, she is majoring in mass communications. Jessica is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jessica for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR IGOE

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Trevor Igoe, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Trevor is a graduate of University of Tampa, having majored in government and world affairs. Trevor is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Trevor for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID FONSECA

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize David Fonseca, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

David is a freshman at Liberty University in Lynchburg, VA. Currently, he is majoring in political science. David is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to David for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN GODOY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Jonathan Godoy, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jonathan is a student at the University of Chicago in Chicago, IL. Currently, Jonathan is majoring in political science. Jonathan is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jonathan for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SAM GRECO

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Sam Greco, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Sam is a junior at Georgetown University in Washington, DC. Currently, he is majoring in international politics. Sam is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Sam for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:51 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4719. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 4719. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6545. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): Implementation of the Agricultural Act of 2014'' (RIN0584–AE31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6546. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0088; FV14–985–2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6547. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0015; FV14–906–2 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6548. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pistachios Grown in California, Arizona, and New Mexico; Modification of Aflatoxin Regulations'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–12–0068; FV13–983–1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6549. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas in New Jersey'' (Docket No. APHIS–2013–0078) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6550. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9913–35–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Polyoxyalkylated Trimethylopropanes; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9912–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6552. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6553. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense (DoD) intending to assign women to previously closed positions in the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6554. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6555. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Terry G. Robling, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6556. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6557. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's 2014 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6558. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6559. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6560. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6561. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Bureau of Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House'' (RIN1530–AA05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6562. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnace Fans'' (RIN1904–AC22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6563. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho Franklin County Portion of the Logan Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory'' (FRL No. 9913–97–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6564. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines'' (FRL No. 9913–79–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6565. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Auto Exhaust Emission Controls'' (FRL No. 9913–81–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6566. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Grant County Sulfur Dioxide Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9913–94–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6567. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Conformity of General Federal Actions'' (FRL No. 9913–92–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6568. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9914–11–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6569. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York State; Transportation Conformity Regulations'' (FRL No. 9913–73–Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6570. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Idaho: Portneuf Valley PM10 Maintenance Plan Amendment to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 9913–84–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6571. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Administrative Wage Garnishment'' (FRL No. 9913–63–OCFO) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6572. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a lease prospectus that supports the Administration's fiscal year 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6573. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: RFS Pathways II, and Technical Amendments to the RFS Standards and E15 Misfueling Mitigation Requirements'' ((RIN2060–AR21) (FRL No. 9910–40–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6574. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''RFS Renewable Identification Number (RIN) Quality Assurance Program'' ((RIN2060–AR72) (FRL No. 9906–55–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6575. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Comprehensive Medicaid Integrity Plan for Fiscal Years 2014–2018''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6576. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nonqualified Deferred Compensation from Certain Tax Indifferent Parties'' (Rev. Rul. 2014–18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6577. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2014–43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6578. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Debt Collection'' (RIN1400–AD60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6579. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closing of the Jamieson Line, New York Border Crossing'' (CBP Dec. 14–08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6580. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2013 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6581. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6582. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4022; 29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6583. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priorities. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133B–6; CFDA No. 84.133B–7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6584. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0416)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6585. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1419)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6586. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0724)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6587. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0482)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6588. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Celebrate The Amboys Fireworks; Raritan Bay, Perth Amboy, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0188)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6589. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The New York North Shore Helicopter Route'' ((RIN2120–AJ75) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0302)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6590. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened and Endangered Status for Distinct Population Segments of Scalloped Hammerhead Sharks'' (RIN0648–XA798) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–317. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to follow Federal Housing Administration guidelines as they apply to site condominiums and view them as single-family homes as long as they meet certain criteria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 371

Whereas, Financing condominium ownership using government-backed loans is challenging. Traditional condominium units can be riskier for lenders because of the rights

afforded to condominium associations, how associations are structured, and deed restrictions. This has made loans backed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) difficult to obtain unless the condominium development meets occupancy requirements and is approved by the agency; and

Whereas, Site condominiums are single-family condominium developments that have the benefit of reducing some lending risks. Here, condominium units are stand-alone structures similar to single-family dwellings where owners are responsible for the upkeep of the entire structure rather than the interior alone and the association is responsible for maintaining the grounds; and

Whereas, In 2009, the FHA began allowing site condominium buyers in certain non-approved condominium developments to receive FHA financing so long as the development met certain criteria. This included requiring each unit to be a detached single-family unit where the entire structure is considered the condominium unit. The unit owner is also responsible for all insurance and maintenance costs of the structure; and

Whereas, The VA has not yet adopted a similar policy. The FHA's site condominium policy has been beneficial to low- and medium-income home buyers and would be beneficial to veterans as well. Allowing VA-backed loans to finance site condominiums ownership without needing condominium developments to be approved by the agency will help connect elderly and disabled veterans unable to perform day-to-day property maintenance with affordable housing in desirable neighborhoods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to follow Federal Housing Administration guidelines as they apply to site condominiums and view them as single-family homes as long as they meet certain criteria; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–318. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan condemning certain individuals for their violent attacks on civilian targets in Nigeria, and supporting efforts by the President of the United States and the United States Congress to assist the Nigerian government in the safe return of the abducted women and girls in Nigeria, to prevent further attacks, and to promote the human rights of women and girls in Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 396

Whereas, Boko Haram is an acknowledged militant, terrorist organization. Since 2011, it has claimed responsibility for a series of bombings, killing nearly 4,000 innocent people in Nigeria It has targeted schools, mosques, churches, villages, agricultural centers, and government facilities in its escalating armed campaign to create an Islamic state in northern Nigeria: and

Whereas, On April 14, Boko Haram abducted at gunpoint 276 teenage girls from the Government Girls Secondary School in the Federal Republic of Nigeria. While as least 53 girls immediately escaped, the remaining girls remain missing. Boko Haram has a history of kidnapping girls in the past for use as cooks and sex slaves, and there are reports that the abducted girls have been sold as brides to Islamist militants for the equivalent of $12 each: and

Whereas, In support of the Nigerian government, the United States dispatched drones over Nigeria to search for the abducted girls and deployed 80 soldiers to guard the drone base in nearby Chad. Other nations have also pledged support to help safely bring back the abducted girls. Despite these cooperative efforts, the abducted girls remain missing, and on June 9, Boko Haram abducted at least 20 additional women and girls from a village just miles from the earlier incident: and

Whereas, Boko Haram's increasingly bold attacks must be countered by a strong initiative to recover the abducted women and girls and prevent future attacks. This extremist group represents a growing threat to peace and stability in this region and to the United States' interests in this region. There are legitimate fears that Boko Haram may be emboldened to carry out attacks against Western targets, such as the U.S. Embassy and hotels frequented by Westerners: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we condemn Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets in Nigeria and call for the immediate, safe return of the women and girls abducted by them: and be it further

Resolved, That we express strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the abducted women and girls, and encourage the Nigerian government to strengthen efforts that protect children seeking to obtain an education and to hold those who conduct violent acts against them accountable; and be it further

Resolved, That we support offers of United States assistance to the Nigerian government in the search for the abducted women and girls and courage the U.S. Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to continue support for initiatives that promote the human rights of women and girls in Nigeria; and be it further

Resolved, That we support our nation's efforts to hold terrorist organizations, such as Boko Haram, accountable and urge the President of the United States to provide a comprehensive strategy to counter the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups in West Africa, the Sahel, and North Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–319. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 388

Whereas, According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, mental illness is defined as ''health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired function.'' The National Institute of Mental Health states, ''While mental disorders are common in the United States, the burden of illness is particularly concentrated among those who experience disability due to serious mental illness (SMI)''; and

Whereas, In a given year, approximately ten million Americans experience serious mental illness, such as schizophrenia, major depression, or bipolar disorder. Furthermore, approximately four million Americans experiencing serious mental illness do not receive treatment in a given year. Laws, regulations, and misinterpretations frequently shut out families attempting to get effective appropriate treatment for their loved ones in a mental health crisis; and

Whereas, There are ten times more individuals with serious mental illness in jails and prisons than in state psychiatric hospitals. Federal laws and billing policies restrict the ability of persons on Medicaid to receive high-quality inpatient and outpatient mental health treatment; and

Whereas, Current spending needs to be more focused on the most effective services and most severe mental illnesses. United States Congressman Tim Murphy of Pennsylvania has introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 (H.R. 3717). The act would create a new Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance-Abuse Disorders to coordinate funding between agencies, collect increased data on treatment outcomes, and drive evidence-based care. To address issues regarding the shortage of psychiatric professionals, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 would advance alternatives to inpatient care and prioritize early intervention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Crisis Act of 2013; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 1219, a bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–215).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1818. A bill to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Partrick J. Donahue II, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Lee E. Payne, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Ricky N. Rupp, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Walter J. Lindsley, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. John L. Gronski, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark A. Brown, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Roger W. Teague, to be Major General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., to be General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Joseph L. Votel, to be General.

*Army nomination of Gen. John F. Campbell, to be General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. William E. Gortney, to be Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. James K. McLaughlin, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Gen. Daniel B. Allyn, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Mark A. Milley, to be General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Sean B. MacFarland, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Lori J. Robinson, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Gen. Herbert J. Carlisle, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederick B. Hodges, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with John T. Aalborg, Jr. and ending with Michael A. Zrostlik, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Roy G. Allen III and ending with John M. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Mark D. Levin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Craig H. Rhyne and ending with David E. Vizurraga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Steven E. Koehl and ending with Christopher Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Curtis L. Abendroth and ending with Michael J. Wise, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 2014.

Army nomination of Brian C. Copeland, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Paul E. Linzey and ending with Gary L. Taylor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Joel R. Burke and ending with Michael J. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 2014.

Army nomination of Norman A. Hetzler, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Steven F. Finder and ending with Daniel H. Aldana, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 2014.

Army nomination of Jason S. Hetzel, to be Major.

Army nomination of Felipe O. Blanding, Sr., to be Major.

Army nomination of Douglas T. Mo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ruben J. Vazquez, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Jody M. Powers, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of James R. Powers, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher D. Snyder, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Richard Jimenez, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Jaime A. Quejada and ending with Stephen S. Donohoe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 2014.

Navy nomination of Timika B. Lindsay, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Christopher A. Middleton, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Joseph S. Gondusky and ending with Hasan A. Hobbs, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2014.

Navy nomination of Richard A. Portillo, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Henry S. Thrift III, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Leah M. Tunnell, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Travelyan M. Walker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BENNET, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2634. A bill to provide tax relief for major disaster areas declared in 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2635. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions of real property for conservation purposes by Native Corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 2637. A bill to modify the small business intermediary lending program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. 2638. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 2639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the number of graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2640. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 2641. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide that residential mortgage loans held in portfolio qualify and qualified mortgages for purposes of the presumption of the ability to repay requirements under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2642. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation, and to ensure that employers consider these requests; and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain growing low-wage occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2643. A bill to require a report by the Federal Communications Commission on designated market areas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 510. A resolution congratulating the Newport Jazz Festival on its 60th anniversary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 511. A resolution establishing best business practices to fully utilize the potential of the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 114

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 544

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 544, a bill to require the President to develop a comprehensive national manufacturing strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 714

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 714, a bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1330

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to delay the implementation of the employer responsibility provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 2033

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2033, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2301

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes.

S. 2406

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2406, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

S. 2441

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2441, a bill to extend the same Federal benefits to law enforcement officers serving private institutions of higher education and rail carriers that apply to law enforcement officers serving units of State and local government.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2549

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2549, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to extend and modify the pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2624, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2631

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2631, a bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

S. 2633

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2633, a bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 38

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Galvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Galvez.

S. RES. 420

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 420, a resolution designating the week of October 6 through October 12, 2014, as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'' to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care.

S. RES. 499

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 499, a resolution congratulating the American Motorcyclist Association on its 90th Anniversary.

AMENDMENT NO. 3377

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3377 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2635. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

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

S. 2635

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO PUBLISH ON INTERNET BASIS FOR LISTINGS.

Section 4(b) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PUBLICATION ON INTERNET OF BASIS FOR LISTINGS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the Internet the best scientific and commercial data available that are the basis for each regulation, including each proposed regulation, promulgated under subsection (a)(1), except that, at the request of a Governor or legislature of a State, the Secretary shall not make available under this paragraph information regarding which the State has determined public disclosure is prohibited by a law of that State relating to the protection of personal information.''.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 2637. A bill to modify the small business intermediary lending program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Small Business Intermediary Lending Program Act of 2014.

This bill would make permanent a successful small business financing program which provides startups and growing small businesses with access to capital. As a long-time member of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, I have been a strong supporter of efforts to help small firms expand and thrive so they can create jobs and grow the economy.

The need for creative and effective ways to expand access to capital for small businesses is greater than ever. According to a study issued by the Brookings Institute in May, entrepreneurship is experiencing a troubling decline in the United States, a trend the authors document over the last 30 years, across all 50 States and almost all metropolitan areas. They conclude that we need to pursue policies that better foster entrepreneurship if we want to create more jobs.

One way we can foster entrepreneurship and address the lingering unemployment affecting so many of our communities is to make permanent the Small Business Intermediary Lending Pilot Program.

I proposed and helped enact the Intermediary Lending Pilot Program into law in 2010. Over the last three years, the program has provided loans of $1 million to nonprofit intermediary lenders to make small to mid-sized loans to small businesses. The program gets financing to small businesses that are not being served by banks or conventional loan programs currently available through the Small Business Administration. Small businesses seeking this flexible debt financing may have graduated from the Small Business Administration's Microloan Program, and for a variety of reasons, especially lack of adequate collateral, do not qualify for guaranteed 7(a) loans or other private capital.

Given the slow economic recovery, high demand exists for the Intermediary Lending Pilot Program. In the short life of the program, intermediaries in 20 States across the country have already made more than 300 small business loans, totaling more than $26 million. If not for the Intermediary Lending Pilot Program, the small businesses receiving these loans would have been hard-pressed to find this financing elsewhere. Almost 90 percent of the loans were in the $50,000–$200,000 range, making these loans larger than microloans. The average loan size in the pilot has been about $88,000.

The loans facilitated by the Intermediary Lending Program have done more than help small businesses; they have created or retained thousands of jobs. Building on this success and keeping the program going will strengthen our economy, get small businesses sorely-needed capital, and catalyze job creation.

Merit Hall, a full service staffing firm located in downtown Detroit, provides services and staffing to construction, landscape and facility maintenance contractors throughout southeastern Michigan. In 2013, Merit Hall received a $200,000 ILP loan to support the company's growth. Merit Hall used those funds to retain and create 10 office jobs and 300 jobs in the field. In addition, this loan allowed Merit Hall to grow their revenues to the point where they were bankable and were able to receive a $350,000 loan from a commercial bank and pay off their ILP loan.

Rubber Technologies of Coleman, Michigan, recycles tires to create premium recycled products such as playground surfacing and rubber mats. The Intermediary Lending Program loan they received will help strengthen their business, allowing them to add equipment and retain 12 jobs. Roaming Harvest, a small business in Traverse City, Michigan, started out as a food truck and now thanks to a loan from the Intermediary Pilot program has opened a café featuring local food, retaining two jobs and creating two new jobs.

These small loans can add up. An intermediary lender in the state of Washington, Craft3, has already made 34 loans through the program and created 98 jobs as a result.

Intermediary lenders do more than provide loans; they provide technical assistance and counseling which often does not accompany conventional loans, helping business owners start and grow successful enterprises.

The Intermediary Lending Program is modeled after the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Loan Program, which has existed since 1988. Like the USDA program, this SBA counterpart is a decentralized initiative relying on the capacity and market expertise of local, nonprofit intermediary lenders, but it expands this approach, serving both rural and urban areas.

The legislation I am introducing today makes the Intermediary Lending Program permanent and authorizes a funding level of $20 million for each of the next three fiscal years. The legislation authorizes nonprofit lending intermediaries, chosen on a competitive basis, to participate in the program. As in the pilot, each intermediary will receive a loan of up to $1 million at a low interest rate to create a revolving loan fund through which they will make small business loans.

The nonprofit lenders who participate in this program already tap a variety of financing programs to meet the needs of the small businesses in their states and localities. SBA has observed that one of the benefits of the Intermediary Lending Program as compared to the Microloan Program is the longer repayment term, 20 years versus 10 years, respectively. This patient capital helps to facilitate larger loans that some businesses need, up to $200,000, and it allows the revolving loan fund to revolve about 2.5 times before the intermediary fully repays the initial SBA loan.

In addition to authorizing the program, this bill makes a technical correction to the language of the pilot program. While the pilot program limited the amount that an intermediary can borrow under the Intermediary Lending Program to $1 million, it did not intend to take into account money an intermediary borrowed through other SBA programs. Unfortunately, SBA interpreted the language in a way that placed an overall cap on how much a participating intermediary can borrow from the SBA under all SBA programs. The result was that more experienced lenders with higher loan volumes, especially many strong microlenders, were unable to participate. That was simply not the intent of Congress. Rather, this program was designed to complement the microloan and 7(a) programs and add another tool to the portfolio of nonprofit community-based lenders. The bill I am introducing today changes the language to clarify our intent, maintains the $1 million loan limit, and increases the overall amount intermediaries can have outstanding from SBA under the Intermediary Lending Program to $5 million.

The Intermediary Lending Program is a small program which has already made a big difference. It is modeled on a program which has been operating successfully for almost 30 years, and it shields the government from any risks involved in lending to small businesses by having experienced intermediaries take on that risk. As we all look for ways to bolster our economy, we should build on this record of success. The Intermediary Lending Pilot is addressing a lending gap and helping create jobs across the nation. If we adopt my legislation, this program will continue to be an engine for small business growth. I urge its swift enactment.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 2641. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide that residential mortgage loans held in portfolio qualify and qualified mortgages for purposes of the presumption of the ability to repay requirements under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the importance of community banks to our financial system and economy. Community banks are critical to the economic recovery and success of our local economies and small businesses. As our Nation continues to recover from the worst recession since the Great Depression, we need to do everything possible to provide measured, targeted regulatory relief for community banks, who were not part of the problem during the financial crisis.

America's nearly 7,000 community banks are the primary source of lending for our Nation's small businesses and farms. Though they compose just 10 percent of the banking industry by assets, community banks make over 57 percent of outstanding bank loans to small businesses. In Louisiana, we have approximately 140 community banks. These institutions are vital parts of their local communities; their boards are often made up of local citizens who are personally invested in advancing the interests of the towns and cities in which they live.

Today I am offering a very simple, common sense provision that would cut back on some of the onerous regulations community banks are facing without compromising the safety and soundness of our financial system or

important consumer protections. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, released its final rule on consumers' ability to repay mortgage loans under Dodd-Frank in January 2013. The final rule, implemented in 2014, defines the qualities of a ''qualified mortgage'', QM, which presume that the lender has satisfied the ability to repay requirements. While I was encouraged by many aspects of the rules, I feel there is more to be done to ensure that community banks and Main Street lenders are not stifled by onerous regulations.

My bill will allow any residential mortgage held in portfolio by lenders with less than $10 billion in total assets to qualify as a ''qualified mortgage.'' A strong indication of a bank's view of the credit risk of a loan is the decision to hold a loan in portfolio. When a bank holds a loan in portfolio, rather than selling in on the secondary market, it assumes 100 percent of the credit risk, so it has the incentive to ensure that each and every loan is well underwritten and affordable to the borrower. Community banks are in the business of knowing their borrowers, understanding their ability to repay and structuring loans accordingly. This protects the financial health of borrowers, lenders, and the economy as a whole.

I am proud to also serve as a cosponsor of S. 1349, the Community Lending Enhancement and Regulatory, CLEAR, Relief Act, which was introduced by my colleagues, Senators MORAN and TESTER and contains a number of other regulatory relief measures for small and community-based lenders. I encourage my colleagues to support these provisions to help community banks serve their customers, protecting the well-being of borrowers, and spur economic growth in local communities across the Nation.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2642. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation, and to ensure that employers consider these requests; and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain growing low-wage occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to bring to our attention a large and growing problem laced by American workers today that has negative consequences for working families and our national economy. They are hourly service workers holding jobs that we all rely on—the folks who are serving customers in stores and restaurants, who are cleaning our offices and hotels, who are making sure that shelves are stocked, food is cooked properly, and businesses run smoothly. They are also white collar workers: professionals, managers, teachers, and more. All of these workers want to go to work and be successful at their jobs. But today, too many do not have access to one of the most basic parts of a job: a stable, predictable schedule.

For hourly service workers, jobs are often scheduled on a ''just in time'' basis. This means that schedules are given out last minute, workers are often required to be on call, and schedules and the number of assigned hours vary week to week and month to month. Schedules are often made with no input from workers or consideration for family needs or even sleep time. A worker may have 8 hours of work one week, 24 hours the next week, and no hours for the next two weeks. A worker may have the night shift followed by the day shift, or a split shift with a few hours in the morning and a few more hours in the evening. A worker may show up after arranging and paying for child care and taking a 2 hour trip by public transportation, only to be sent home for lack of work. Assigned time on schedules is a perk, while being left off the schedule is a punishment.

These abusive scheduling practices mean that workers often can't predict their income, which makes it very difficult to budget and pay bills. It also wreaks havoc on family life. Working parents can't be home for family dinner, help with afternoon homework, or put kids to bed. Workers with elderly parents or relatives who are in need of care cannot be available when they are needed. And the inability to predict a schedule means that taking classes or getting a second job to further one's career or increase income become difficult to impossible. And yet, because these practices have become so common among hourly service jobs, moving to a different job is not an option. Workers are simply stuck.

Meanwhile, white collar workers are working longer than ever. They have to stay late long into the night and come in on the weekends. If they want a 40–hour workweek or time with family, they are too often criticized as uncommitted to the job. They, too, miss family dinners and other family events. They, too, are unable to be with children or elders when their care is required.

What these workers have in common is their lack of control over their hours and their schedules. That is why I have joined with Senator WARREN and Representatives GEORGE MILLER and ROSA DELAURO to introduce the ''Schedules That Work Act.'' This bill will help workers to meet scheduling challenges in ways that respect their needs and the needs of businesses.

First, the bill will allow all workers, both hourly and salaried in any job or industry, to make requests about their schedules, and it will prohibit retaliation against them for doing so. Employers will be required to engage in an interactive process in response to scheduling requests—much like that required to determine reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act. An employer has to consider a request, consider alternatives, and provide an answer to a worker's request. Certain requests will have some extra consideration: if an employee makes a request because of caregiving duties, to deal with a serious health condition, to take a career-related training or education course, or to meet the demands of a second job in the case of part-time workers, then an employer must have a bona fide business reason to deny the request. This ''right to request'' will open a line of communication that ensures workers have a voice but respects employers' business needs.

Second, the Schedules That Work Act will ensure that workers in retail, food service, and janitorial and cleaning jobs are paid when they are required to report in or be on call. If a worker is scheduled for at least four hours and reports to work, the worker must be paid for at least four hours, even if she is sent home early. An employer will have to provide an extra hour's pay if he requires an employee to be on call. If an employer schedules a ''split shift''—with non-consecutive shifts within a single day—a worker will earn an extra hour's pay.

Finally, this bill will require 2 weeks' advance notice of schedules for workers in retail, food service, and janitorial jobs. If changes are made with less than 24 hours' notice, employers will be required to provide an extra hour's pay. While employers can continue to make changes to schedules, we hope that this requirement will reduce the chaos that can be created by continual last-minute scheduling.

A schedule should be a basic part of almost any job. Predictability and stability in hours helps workers meet their personal and family demands. In turn, workers are more likely to stay in their jobs, reducing the expensive turnover that can cost businesses dearly. A simple consideration like advance notice of a schedule goes a long way toward creating good will, fostering loyalty, and raising morale among employees.

What this bill is really about, at its heart, is respect. Respect for workers' lives and businesses' needs. I encourage all of my Senate colleagues to join me on this bill.

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

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

S. 2642

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Schedules That Work Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The vast majority of the United States workforce today is juggling responsibilities at home and at work. Women are primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners in 63 percent of families in the United States and 26 percent of families with children are headed by single mothers.

(2) Despite the dual responsibilities of today's workforce, workers across the income spectrum have very little ability to make changes to their work schedules when those changes are needed to accommodate family responsibilities. Only 27 percent of employers allow all or most of their employees to periodically change their starting and quitting times.

(3) Although low-wage workers are most likely to be raising children on their own, as more than half of mothers of young children in low-wage jobs are doing, low-wage workers have the least control over their work schedules and the most unpredictable schedules. For example—

(A) roughly half of low-wage workers reported very little or no control over the timing of the hours they were scheduled to work;

(B) many workers in low-wage jobs receive their schedules with very little advance notice and have work hours that vary significantly from week to week or month to month;

(C) some workers in low-wage jobs are sent home from work when work is slow without being paid for their scheduled shift;

(D) in some industries, the use of ''call-in shift'' requirements—requirements that workers call in to work to find out whether they will be scheduled to work later that day—has become common practice; and

(E) at the same time, 20 to 30 percent of workers in low-wage jobs struggle with being required to work extra hours with little or no notice.

(4) Unfair work scheduling practices make it difficult for low-wage workers to—

(A) provide necessary care for children and other family members, including arranging child care;

(B) qualify for and maintain eligibility for child care subsidies, due to fluctuations in income and work hours, or keep an appointment with a child care provider, due to not knowing how many hours or when the workers will be scheduled to work;

(C) pursue workforce training;

(D) get or keep a second job that some part-time workers need to make ends meet; and

(E) arrange transportation to and from work.

(5) Unpredictable and unstable schedules are prevalent in retail sales, food preparation and service, and building cleaning occupations, which are among the lowest-paid and fastest-growing occupations in the workforce today. For workers in those occupations, often difficult and sometimes abusive work scheduling practices combine with very low wages to make it extremely challenging to make ends meet.

(6) Retail sales, food preparation and service, and building cleaning occupations are among those most likely to have unpredictable and unstable schedules. According to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 66 percent of food service workers, 52 percent of retail workers, and 40 percent of janitors and housekeepers know their schedules only a week or less in advance. The average variation in work hours in a single month is 70 percent for food service workers, 50 percent for retail workers, and 40 percent for janitors and housekeepers.

(7) Those are among the lowest-paid and fastest-growing occupations, accounting for 18 percent of workers in the economy, some 23,500,000 workers. The median pay for workers in those 3 occupations is between $9.15 and $10.44 per hour, and women make up more than half of the workers in those occupations.

(8) Employers that have implemented fair work scheduling policies that allow workers to have more control over their work schedules, and provide more predictable and stable schedules, have experienced significant benefits, including reductions in absenteeism and workforce turnover, and increased employee morale and engagement.

(9) This Act is a first step in responding to the needs of workers for a voice in the timing of their work hours and for more predictable schedules.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) BONA FIDE BUSINESS REASON.—The term ''bona fide business reason'' means—

(A) the identifiable burden of additional costs to an employer, including the cost of productivity loss, retraining or hiring employees, or transferring employees from one facility to another facility;

(B) a significant detrimental effect on the employer's ability to meet organizational needs or customer demand;

(C) a significant inability of the employer, despite best efforts, to reorganize work among existing (as of the date of the reorganization) staff;

(D) a significant detrimental effect on business performance;

(E) insufficiency of work during the periods an employee proposes to work;

(F) the need to balance competing scheduling requests when it is not possible to grant all such requests without a significant detrimental effect on the employer's ability to meet organizational needs; or

(G) such other reason as may be specified by the Secretary of Labor (or the corresponding administrative officer specified in section 8).

(2) CAREER-RELATED EDUCATIONAL OR TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ''career-related educational or training program'' means an educational or training program or program of study offered by a public, private, or nonprofit career and technical education school, institution of higher education, or other entity that provides academic education, career and technical education, or training (including remedial education or English as a second language, as appropriate), that is a program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential (as identified under section 122(d) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act), and provides career awareness information. The term includes a program allowable under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), or the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), without regard to whether or not the program is funded under the corresponding Act.

(3) CAREGIVER.—The term ''caregiver'' means an individual with the status of being a significant provider of—

(A) ongoing care or education, including responsibility for securing the ongoing care or education, of a child; or

(B) ongoing care, including responsibility for securing the ongoing care, of—

(i) a person with a serious health condition who is in a family relationship with the individual; or

(ii) a parent of the individual, who is age 65 or older.

(4) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis to that child, who is—

(A) under age 18; or

(B) age 18 or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability.

(5) COVERED EMPLOYER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered employer''—

(i) means any person engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more employees (described in paragraph (7)(A));

(ii) includes any person who acts, directly or indirectly, in the interest of such an employer to any of the employees (described in paragraph (7)(A)) of such employer;

(iii) includes any successor in interest of such an employer; and

(iv) includes an agency described in subparagraph (A)(iii) of section 101(4) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611(4)), to which subparagraph (B) of such section shall apply.

(B) RULE.—For purposes of determining the number of employees who work for a person described in subparagraph (A)(i), all employees (described in paragraph (7)(A)) performing work for compensation on a full-time, part-time, or temporary basis shall be counted, except that if the number of such employees who perform work for such a person for compensation fluctuates, the number may be determined for a calendar year based upon the average number of such employees who performed work for the person for compensation during the preceding calendar year.

(C) PERSON.—In this paragraph, and paragraph (7), the term ''person'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(6) DOMESTIC PARTNER.—The term ''domestic partner'' means the person recognized as being in a relationship with an employee under any domestic partnership, civil union, or similar law of the State or political subdivision of a State in which the employee resides.

(7) EMPLOYEE.—The term ''employee'' means an individual who is—

(A) an employee, as defined in section 3(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)), who is not described in any of subparagraphs (B) through (G);

(B) a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16c(a));

(C) a covered employee, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301), other than an applicant for employment;

(D) a covered employee, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(E) a Federal officer or employee covered under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code;

(F) an employee of the Library of Congress; or

(G) an employee of the Government Accountability Office.

(8) EMPLOYER.—The term ''employer'' means a person—

(A) who is—

(i) a covered employer, as defined in paragraph (4), who is not described in any of clauses (ii) through (vii);

(ii) an entity employing a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991;

(iii) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995;

(iv) an employing office, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(v) an employing agency covered under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code;

(vi) the Librarian of Congress; or

(vii) the Comptroller General of the United States; and

(B) who is engaged in commerce (including government), in the production of goods for commerce, or in an enterprise engaged in commerce (including government) or in the production of goods for commerce.

(9) FAMILY RELATIONSHIP.—The term ''family relationship'' means a relationship with a child, spouse, domestic partner, parent, grandchild, grandparent, sibling, or parent of a spouse or domestic partner.

(10) GRANDCHILD.—The term ''grandchild'' means the child of a child.

(11) GRANDPARENT.—The term ''grandparent'' means the parent of a parent.

(12) MINIMUM NUMBER OF EXPECTED WORK HOURS.—The term ''minimum number of expected work hours'' means the minimum number of hours an employee will be assigned to work on a weekly or monthly basis.

(13) PARENT.—The term ''parent'' means a biological or adoptive parent, a stepparent, or a person who stood in a parental relationship to an employee when the employee was a child.

(14) PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP.—The term ''parental relationship'' means a relationship in which a person assumed the obligations incident to parenthood for a child and discharged those obligations before the child reached adulthood.

(15) PART-TIME EMPLOYEE.—The term ''part-time employee'' means an individual who works fewer than 30 hours per week on average during any 1-month period.

(16) RETAIL, FOOD SERVICE, OR CLEANING EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''retail, food service, or cleaning employee'' means an individual employee who is employed in any of the following occupations, as described by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Standard Occupational Classification System (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act):

(i) Retail sales occupations consisting of occupations described in 41–1010 and 41–2000, and all subdivisions thereof, of such System, which includes first-line supervisors of sales workers, cashiers, gaming change persons and booth cashiers, counter and rental clerks, parts salespersons, and retail salespersons.

(ii) Food preparation and serving related occupations as described in 35–0000, and all subdivisions thereof, of such System, which includes supervisors of food preparation and serving workers, cooks and food preparation workers, food and beverage serving workers, and other food preparation and serving related workers.

(iii) Building cleaning occupations as described in 37–2011, 37–2012 and 37–2019 of such System, which includes janitors and cleaners, maids and housekeeping cleaners, and building cleaning workers.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the term ''retail, food service, or cleaning employee'' does not include any person employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, as defined for purposes of section 13(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(1)).

(17) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Labor.

(18) SERIOUS HEALTH CONDITION.—The term ''serious health condition'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611).

(19) SIBLING.—The term ''sibling'' means a brother or sister, whether related by half blood, whole blood, or adoption, or as a stepsibling.

(20) SPLIT SHIFT.—The term ''split shift'' means a schedule of daily hours in which the hours worked are not consecutive, except that—

(A) a schedule in which the total time out for meals does not exceed one hour shall not be treated as a split shift; and

(B) a schedule in which the break in the employee's work shift is requested by the employee shall not be treated as a split shift.

(21) SPOUSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''spouse'' means a person with whom an individual entered into—

(i) a marriage as defined or recognized under State law in the State in which the marriage was entered into; or

(ii) in the case of a marriage entered into outside of any State, a marriage that is recognized in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least 1 State.

(B) SAME-SEX OR COMMON LAW MARRIAGE.—Such term includes an individual in a same-sex or common law marriage that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A).

(22) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(23) WORK SCHEDULE.—The term ''work schedule'' means those days and times within a work period when an employee is required by an employer to perform the duties of the employee's employment for which the employee will receive compensation.

(24) WORK SCHEDULE CHANGE.—The term ''work schedule change'' means any modification to an employee's work schedule, such as an addition or reduction of hours, cancellation of a shift, or a change in the date or time of a work shift, by an employer.

(25) WORK SHIFT.—The term ''work shift'' means the specific hours of the workday during which an employee works.

(26) VARIOUS ADDITIONAL TERMS.—

(A) COMMERCE TERMS.—The terms ''commerce'' and ''industry or activity affecting commerce'' have the meanings given the terms in section 101 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611).

(B) EMPLOY.—The term ''employ'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

SEC. 3. RIGHT TO REQUEST AND RECEIVE A FLEXIBLE, PREDICTABLE OR STABLE WORK SCHEDULE.

(a) RIGHT TO REQUEST.—An employee may apply to the employee's employer to request a change in the terms and conditions of employment as they relate to—

(1) the number of hours the employee is required to work or be on call for work;

(2) the times when the employee is required to work or be on call for work;

(3) the location where the employee is required to work;

(4) the amount of notification the employee receives of work schedule assignments; and

(5) minimizing fluctuations in the number of hours the employee is scheduled to work on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis.

(b) EMPLOYER OBLIGATION TO ENGAGE IN AN INTERACTIVE PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an employee applies to the employee's employer to request a change in the terms and conditions of employment as set forth in subsection (a), the employer shall engage in a timely, good faith interactive process with the employee that includes a discussion of potential schedule changes that would meet the employee's needs.

(2) RESULT.—Such process shall result in—

(A) either granting or denying the request;

(B) in the event of a denial, considering alternatives to the proposed change that might meet the employee's needs and granting or denying a request for an alternative change in the terms and conditions of employment as set forth in subsection (a); and

(C) in the event of a denial, stating the reason for denial.

(3) INFORMATION.—If information provided by the employee making a request under this section requires clarification, the employer shall explain what further information is needed and give the employee reasonable time to produce the information.

(c) REQUESTS RELATED TO CAREGIVING, ENROLLMENT IN EDUCATION OR TRAINING, OR A SECOND JOB.—If an employee makes a request for a change in the terms and conditions of employment as set forth in subsection (a) because of a serious health condition of the employee, due to the employee's responsibilities as a caregiver, or due to the employee's enrollment in a career-related educational or training program, or if a part-time employee makes a request for such a change for a reason related to a second job, the employer shall grant the request, unless the employer has a bona fide business reason for denying the request.

(d) OTHER REQUESTS.—If an employee makes a request for a change in the terms and conditions of employment as set forth in subsection (a), for a reason other than those reasons set forth in subsection (c), the employer may deny the request for any reason that is not unlawful. If the employer denies such a request, the employer shall provide the employee with the reason for the denial, including whether any such reason was a bona fide business reason.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORTING TIME PAY, SPLIT SHIFT PAY, AND ADVANCE NOTICE OF WORK SCHEDULES.

(a) REPORTING TIME PAY REQUIREMENT.—An employer shall pay a retail, food service, or cleaning employee—

(1) for at least 4 hours at the employee's regular rate of pay for each day on which the retail, food service, or cleaning employee reports for work, as required by the employer, but is given less than four hours of work, except that if the retail, food service, or cleaning employee's scheduled hours for a day are less than 4 hours, such retail, food service, or cleaning employee shall be paid for the employee's scheduled hours for that day if given less than the scheduled hours of work; and

(2) for at least 1 hour at the employee's regular rate of pay for each day the retail, food service, or cleaning employee is given specific instructions to contact the employee's employer, or wait to be contacted by the employer, less than 24 hours in advance of

the start of a potential work shift to determine whether the employee must report to work for such shift.

(b) SPLIT SHIFT PAY REQUIREMENT.—An employer shall pay a retail, food service, or cleaning employee for one additional hour at the retail, food service, or cleaning employee's regular rate of pay for each day during which the retail, food service, or cleaning employee works a split shift.

(c) ADVANCE NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) INITIAL SCHEDULE.—On or before a new retail, food service, or cleaning employee's first day of work, the employer shall inform the retail, food service, or cleaning employee in writing of the employee's work schedule and the minimum number of expected work hours the retail, food service, or cleaning employee will be assigned to work per month.

(2) PROVIDING NOTICE OF NEW SCHEDULES.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if a retail, food service, or cleaning employee's work schedule changes from the work schedule of which the retail, food service, or cleaning employee was informed pursuant to paragraph (1), the employer shall provide the retail, food service, or cleaning employee with the employee's new work schedule not less than 14 days before the first day of the new work schedule. If the expected minimum number of work hours that a retail, food service, or cleaning employee will be assigned changes from the number of which the employee was informed pursuant to paragraph (1), the employer shall also provide notification of that change, not less than 14 days in advance of the first day this change will go into effect. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit an employer from providing greater advance notice of a retail, food service, or cleaning employee's work schedule than is required under this section.

(3) WORK SCHEDULE CHANGES MADE WITH LESS THAN 24 HOURS' NOTICE.—An employer may make work schedule changes as needed, including by offering additional hours of work to retail, food service, or cleaning employees beyond those previously scheduled, but an employer shall be required to provide one extra hour of pay at the retail, food service, or cleaning employee's regular rate for each shift that is changed with less than 24 hours' notice, except in the case of the need to schedule the retail, food service, or cleaning employee due to the unforeseen unavailability of a retail, food service, or cleaning employee previously scheduled to work that shift.

(4) NOTIFICATIONS IN WRITING.—The notifications required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be made to the employee in writing. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting an employer from using any additional means of notifying a retail, food service, or cleaning employee of the employee's work schedule.

(5) SCHEDULE POSTING REQUIREMENT.—Every employer employing any retail, food service, or cleaning employee subject to this Act shall post the schedule and keep it posted in a conspicuous place in every establishment where such retail, food service, or cleaning employee is employed so as to permit the employee to observe readily a copy. Availability of that schedule by electronic means accessible by all retail, food service, or cleaning employees of that employer shall be considered compliance with this subsection.

(6) EMPLOYEE SHIFT TRADING.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent an employer from allowing a retail, food service, or cleaning employee to work in place of another employee who has been scheduled to work a particular shift as long as the change in schedule is mutually agreed upon by the employees. An employer shall not be subject to the requirements of paragraph (2) or (3) for such voluntary shift trades.

(d) EXCEPTION.—The requirements in subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply during periods when regular operations of the employer are suspended due to events beyond the employer's control.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS.—It shall be unlawful for any employer to interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise or the attempt to exercise, any right of an employee as set forth in section 3 or of a retail, food service, or cleaning employee as set forth in section 4.

(b) RETALIATION PROHIBITED.—It shall be unlawful for any employer to discharge, threaten to discharge, demote, suspend, reduce work hours of, or take any other adverse employment action against any employee in retaliation for exercising the rights of an employee under this Act or opposing any practice made unlawful by this Act. For purposes of section 3, such retaliation shall include taking an adverse employment action against any employee on the basis of that employee's eligibility or perceived eligibility to request or receive a change in the terms and conditions of employment, as described in such section, on the basis of a reason set forth in section 3(c).

(c) INTERFERENCE WITH PROCEEDINGS OR INQUIRIES.—It shall be unlawful for any person to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any individual because such individual—

(1) has filed any charge, or has instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding, under or related to this Act;

(2) has given or is about to give, any information in connection with any inquiry or proceeding relating to any right provided under this Act; or

(3) has testified, or is about to testify, in any inquiry or proceeding relating to any right provided under this Act.

SEC. 6. REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To ensure compliance with this Act, or any regulation or order issued under this Act, the Secretary shall have, subject to paragraph (3), the investigative authority provided under section 11(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(a)).

(2) OBLIGATION TO KEEP AND PRESERVE RECORDS.—Each employer shall make, keep, and preserve records pertaining to compliance with this Act in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary under section 8.

(3) REQUIRED SUBMISSIONS GENERALLY LIMITED TO AN ANNUAL BASIS.—The Secretary shall not under the authority of this subsection require any employer to submit to the Secretary any books or records more than once during any 12-month period, unless the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe there may exist a violation of this Act or any regulation or order issued pursuant to this Act, or is investigating a charge pursuant to subsection (c).

(4) SUBPOENA POWERS.—For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this section, the Secretary shall have the subpoena authority provided for under section 9 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 209).

(b) CIVIL ACTION BY EMPLOYEES.—

(1) LIABILITY.—Any employer who violates section 5(a) (with respect to a right set forth in section 4) or subsection (b) or (c) of section 5 (referred to in this section as a ''covered provision'') shall be liable to any employee affected for—

(A) damages equal to the amount of—

(i) any wages, salary, employment benefits (as defined in section 101 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611)), or other compensation denied, lost, or owed to such employee by reason of the violation; or

(ii) in a case in which wages, salary, employment benefits (as so defined), or other compensation have not been denied, lost, or owed to the employee, any actual monetary losses sustained by the employee as a direct result of the violation;

(B) interest on the amount described in subparagraph (A) calculated at the prevailing rate;

(C) an additional amount as liquidated damages equal to the sum of the amount described in subparagraph (A) and the interest described in subparagraph (B), except that if an employer who has violated a covered provision proves to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission which violated the covered provision was in good faith and that the employer had reasonable grounds for believing that the act or omission was not a violation of a covered provision, such court may, in the discretion of the court, reduce the amount of liability to the amount and interest determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(D) such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion.

(2) RIGHT OF ACTION.—An action to recover the damages or equitable relief set forth in paragraph (1) may be maintained against any employer (including a public agency) in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and on behalf of—

(A) the employees; or

(B) the employees and other employees similarly situated.

(3) FEES AND COSTS.—The court in such an action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff, allow a reasonable attorney's fee, reasonable expert witness fees, and other costs of the action to be paid by the defendant.

(4) LIMITATIONS.—The right provided by paragraph (2) to bring an action by or on behalf of any employee shall terminate on the filing of a complaint by the Secretary in an action under subsection (c)(3) in which a recovery is sought of the damages described in paragraph (1)(A) owing to an employee by an employer liable under paragraph (1) unless the action described is dismissed without prejudice on motion of the Secretary.

(c) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.—The Secretary shall receive, investigate, and attempt to resolve complaints of violations of this Act in the same manner that the Secretary receives, investigates, and attempts to resolve complaints of violations of section 6 and 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206 and 207), and may issue an order making determinations, and assessing a civil penalty described in paragraph (3) (in accordance with paragraph (3)), with respect to such an alleged violation.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—An affected person who takes exception to an order issued under paragraph (1) may request review of and a decision regarding such an order by an administrative law judge. In reviewing the order, the administrative law

judge may hold an administrative hearing concerning the order, in accordance with the requirements of sections 554, 556, and 557 of title 5, United States Code. Such hearing shall be conducted expeditiously. If no affected person requests such review within 60 days after the order is issued under paragraph (1), the order shall be considered to be a final order that is not subject to judicial review.

(3) CIVIL PENALTY.—An employer who willfully and repeatedly violates—

(A) paragraph (1), (4), or (5) of section 4(c) shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount to be determined by the Secretary, but not to exceed $100 per violation; and

(B) subsection (b) or (c) of section 5 shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount to be determined by the Secretary, but not to exceed $1,100 per violation.

(4) CIVIL ACTION.—The Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction on behalf of aggrieved employees to—

(A) restrain violations of this Act;

(B) award such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion; and

(C) in the case of a violation of a covered provision, recover the damages and interest described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of subsection (b)(1).

(d) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an action may be brought under this section not later than 2 years after the date of the last event constituting the alleged violation for which the action is brought.

(2) WILLFUL VIOLATION.—In the case of such action brought for a willful violation of section 5, such action may be brought within 3 years of the date of the last event constituting the alleged violation for which such action is brought.

(3) COMMENCEMENT.—In determining when an action is commenced by the Secretary under this section for the purposes of this subsection, it shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed.

(e) OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS.—

(1) BOARD.—In the case of employees described in section 2(7)(C), the authority of the Secretary under this Act shall be exercised by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

(2) PRESIDENT; MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.—In the case of employees described in section 2(7)(D), the authority of the Secretary under this Act shall be exercised by the President and the Merit Systems Protection Board.

(3) OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—In the case of employees described in section 2(7)(E), the authority of the Secretary under this Act shall be exercised by the Office of Personnel Management.

(4) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—In the case of employees of the Library of Congress, the authority of the Secretary under this Act shall be exercised by the Librarian of Congress.

(5) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—In the case of employees of the Government Accountability Office, the authority of the Secretary under this Act shall be exercised by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 7. NOTICE AND POSTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each employer shall post and keep posted, in conspicuous places on the premises of the employer where notices to employees and applicants for employment are customarily posted, a notice, to be prepared or approved by the Secretary (or the corresponding administrative officer specified in section 8) setting forth excerpts from, or summaries of, the pertinent provisions of this Act and information pertaining to the filing of a complaint under this Act.

(b) PENALTY.—Any employer that willfully violates this section may be assessed a civil money penalty not to exceed $100 for each separate offense.

SEC. 8. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) through (f), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act.

(b) BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act with respect to employees described in section 2(7)(C).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In prescribing the regulations, the Board shall take into consideration the enforcement and remedies provisions concerning the Board, and applicable to rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.), under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.).

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) to implement this Act shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary to implement this Act, except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations issued by the Board, that a modification of such substantive regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this Act.

(c) PRESIDENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act with respect to employees described in section 2(7)(D).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In prescribing the regulations, the President shall take into consideration the enforcement and remedies provisions concerning the President and the Merit Systems Protection Board, and applicable to rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, under chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code.

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) to implement this Act shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary to implement this Act, except to the extent that the President may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations issued by the President, that a modification of such substantive regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this Act.

(d) OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Personnel Management shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act with respect to employees described in section 2(7)(E).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In prescribing the regulations, the Office shall take into consideration the enforcement and remedies provisions concerning the Office under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) to implement this Act shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary to implement this Act, except to the extent that the Office may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations issued by the Office, that a modification of such substantive regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this Act.

(e) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Librarian of Congress shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act with respect to employees of the Library of Congress.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In prescribing the regulations, the Librarian shall take into consideration the enforcement and remedies provisions concerning the Librarian of Congress under title I of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.).

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) to implement this Act shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary to implement this Act, except to the extent that the Librarian may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations issued by the Librarian, that a modification of such substantive regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this Act.

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act with respect to employees of the Government Accountability Office.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In prescribing the regulations, the Comptroller General shall take into consideration the enforcement and remedies provisions concerning the Comptroller General under title I of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) to implement this Act shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary to implement this Act, except to the extent that the Comptroller General may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations issued by the Comptroller General, that a modification of such substantive regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this Act.

SEC. 9. RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide information and technical assistance to employers, labor organizations, and the general public concerning compliance with this Act.

(b) PROGRAM.—In order to achieve the objectives of this Act—

(1) the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, shall issue guidance on compliance with this Act regarding providing a flexible, predictable, or stable work environment through changes in the terms and conditions of employment as provided in section 3(a); and

(2) the Secretary shall carry on a continuing program of research, education, and technical assistance, including—

(A)(i) conducting pilot programs that implement fairer work schedules, including by promoting cross training, providing three weeks or more advance notice of schedules, providing employees with a minimum number of hours of work, and using computerized scheduling software to provide more flexible, predictable, and stable schedules for employees; and

(ii) evaluating the results of such pilot programs for employees, employee's families, and employers;

(B) publishing and otherwise making available to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, educational institutions, the various communication media, and the general public the findings of studies regarding fair work scheduling policies and other materials for promoting compliance with this Act;

(C) sponsoring and assisting State and community informational and educational programs; and

(D) providing technical assistance to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, and other interested persons on means of achieving and maintaining compliance with the provisions of this Act.

(c) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(A) the impact of difficult scheduling practices on employees and employers, including unpredictable and unstable schedules and schedules over which employees have little control, and particularly how these scheduling practices impact absenteeism, workforce turnover, and employees' ability to meet their caregiving responsibilities;

(B) the prevalence in occupations not described in section 2(16)(A) of employees routinely receiving inadequate advance notice of the shifts or hours of the employees, being assigned split shifts, being sent home from work prior to the completion of their scheduled shift without being paid for the hours in their scheduled shift, being assigned call-in shifts (where the employee is required to contact the employer, or wait to be contacted by the employer, less than 24 hours in advance of the potential work shift to determine whether the employee must report to work), or being called into work outside of scheduled hours;

(C) the effects on employees in occupations not described in section 2(16)(A) of providing advance notice of work schedules, reporting time pay when employees are sent home without working their full scheduled shift or are assigned to call-in shifts but given no work for those shifts, and split shift pay when employees are assigned split shifts; and

(D) the effects on employers in occupations not described in section 2(16)(A) of providing advance notice of work schedules, reporting time pay when employees are sent home without working their full scheduled shift or assigned to call-in shifts but given no work for those shifts, and split shift pay when employees are assigned split shifts.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning the initial results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1). Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall prepare and submit a follow-up report to such committees concerning the results of such study.

SEC. 10. RIGHTS RETAINED BY EMPLOYEES.

This Act provides minimum requirements and shall not be construed to preempt, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any other law, regulation, requirement, policy, or standard that provides for greater rights for employees than are required in this Act.

SEC. 11. EXEMPTION.

This Act shall not apply to any employee covered by a bona fide collective bargaining agreement if the terms of the collective bargaining agreement include terms that govern work scheduling practices.

SEC. 12. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as creating or imposing any requirement in conflict with any Federal or State law or regulation (including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.), the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.), and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.)), nor shall anything in this Act be construed to diminish or impair the rights of an employee under any valid collective bargaining agreement.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2643. A bill to require a report by the Federal Communications Commission on designated market areas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Let Our Communities Access Local TV Act, or the LOCAL TV Act.

I am pleased that I've had the opportunity to collaborate with my friend and colleague, Senator FISCHER, and I know we both look forward to working with our fellow colleagues on the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee to see that this legislation is enacted.

The LOCAL TV Act directs the Federal Communications Commission to study the impact of media market areas and to assess their impact on the ability of individuals to receive relevant, local news and information.

The current structure of media markets is one in which market areas can sprawl across State lines, creating situations in which you can live in one State, but be exclusively saddled in the media market of another.

My state of New Jersey is particularly affected by this situation because it is one of only two States in the entire Nation that is served exclusively by out-of-state media markets. We are served by New York and Pennsylvania—both great places but not New Jersey.

Why does this matter? When someone in Patterson, Freehold, or Cape May, New Jersey turns on their local broadcast station—they are lucky when they find stories about their community's latest news, schools, and our local governments. This kind of New Jersey news, unfortunately, takes a back seat to that of neighboring Philadelphia and New York.

These pre-determined media markets often stifle our ability to hear about what's happening back home. We hear more about Philadelphia and New York City than we do about Morristown, Montclair, Camden and Jersey City.

To be sure, broadcast TV plays an important role in communities. It is particularly essential during emergencies and extreme weather events—for instance during Hurricane Sandy in 2012. Even while technology continues to grow and change the way we receive information, still 74 percent of adults get their news from their local broadcast stations, or from their broadcasters' websites.

Because of the existing digital divide, the number of people who rely on broadcast television is even higher when we look at low income communities. We owe them quality coverage of the local news and information they care about.

It is my hope that with further study and recommendations from the Federal Communications Commission we can continue the dialogue on how stations can best serve local communities, especially those who find themselves in media markets that cross state lines. I urge my colleagues to support the LOCAL TV ACT so that we can obtain more data and information on these markets.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 510—CONGRATULATING THE NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 510

Whereas, in 1954, the first Newport Jazz Festival featured icons of American jazz such as Ella Fitzgerald, Billie Holiday, and Dizzie Gillespie;

Whereas the Newport Jazz Festival has provided some of the most memorable moments in jazz history, including the Duke Ellington Orchestra's 1956 performance of ''Diminuendo and Crescendo in Blue'', featuring a 27-chorus saxophone solo by Paul Gonsalves;

Whereas the ongoing mission of the Newport Jazz Festival is to celebrate jazz music and to make the case for its relevance;

Whereas the Newport Jazz Festival has become a world-renowned event featuring established and emerging artists and bringing together music lovers, musicians, academics, and critics;

Whereas for the past 60 years, the Newport Jazz Festival and the Newport Folk Festival have made a difference in the cultural life of the people of the United States and have provided a soundtrack of freedom for generations; and

Whereas, from August 1, 2014, through August 3, 2014, thousands of people will come together in Newport, Rhode Island, to celebrate the 60th Newport Jazz Festival: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 60th Newport Jazz Festival taking place from August 1, 2014, through August 3, 2014, in Newport, Rhode Island;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of the Newport Jazz Festival and the role the festival has played in celebrating jazz music and making it relevant to generations of people in the United States; and

(3) recognizes the musicians, sponsors, volunteers, and the community of Newport, Rhode Island for continuing the tradition of the Newport Jazz Festival.

SENATE RESOLUTION 511—ESTABLISHING BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES TO FULLY UTILIZE THE POTENTIAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 511

Whereas the Rooney Rule, formulated by Daniel Rooney, chairman of the Pittsburgh Steelers football team in the National Football League (referred to in this preamble as ''NFL''), requires every NFL team with a coach or general manager opening to interview at least 1 minority candidate;

Whereas the Rooney Rule has been successful in increasing minority representation among the higher leadership positions in professional football, as shown by the fact that in the 80 years between the hiring of Fritz Pollard as coach by the Akron Pros and the implementation of the Rooney Rule in 2003 there were only 7 minority head coaches but since 2003 there have been 13 minority head coaches;

Whereas the Rooney Rule has shown that once highly qualified and highly skilled diversity candidates are given exposure during the hiring process their abilities can be better utilized;

Whereas the RLJ Rule, formulated by Robert L. Johnson, founder of Black Entertainment Television (commonly known as ''BET'') and of The RLJ Companies, and based on the Rooney Rule from the NFL, similarly encourages companies to voluntarily establish a best practices policy to identify minority candidates and minority vendors by implementing a plan to interview a minimum of 2 qualified minority candidates for managerial openings at the director level and above and to interview at least 2 qualified minority businesses before approving a vendor contract;

Whereas, according to Crist-Kolder Associates as cited in the Wall Street Journal, at the top 668 companies in the United States, only 27 Chief Financial Officers are African-American, Hispanic, or of Asian descent;

Whereas underrepresented groups contain members with the necessary abilities, experience, and qualifications for any position available;

Whereas business practices such as the Rooney Rule or the RLJ Rule are neither an employment quota nor Federal law but rather a voluntary initiative instituted by willing entities to provide the human resources necessary to ensure success;

Whereas experience has shown that people of all genders, colors, and physical abilities can achieve excellence;

Whereas increased involvement of underrepresented workers would improve the economy of the United States and the experience of the people of the United States; and

Whereas ensuring the increased exposure and resulting increased advancement of diverse qualified candidates would result in gains by all people of the United States through stronger economic opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate encourages corporate, academic, and social entities, regardless of size or field of operation, to—

(1) develop an internal rule modeled after a successful business practice such as the Rooney Rule or RLJ Rule and, in accordance with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), adapt that rule to specifications that will best fit the procedures of the individual entity; and

(2) institute the individualized Rooney Rule or RLJ Rule to ensure that the entity will always consider candidates from underrepresented populations before making a final decision when searching for a business vendor or filling leadership position.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3575. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3576. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3577. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3578. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3579. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3580. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3581. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3575. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROCUREMENT OF ADVANCED THREAT EMITTERS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Joint Threat Emitter system provides vital electronic warfare training for combat aircrews by simulating the multiple threat scenarios of a hostile integrated air defense system; and

(2) the Department of the Air Force should prioritize the acquisition of the Joint Threat Emitter system beyond the one unit requested in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget and evaluate ways to accelerate the fielding of these systems.

SA 3576. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 531 and insert the following:

SEC. 531. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO OBTAIN PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''professional accreditation'' and all that follows through ''certification'' and inserting ''State-imposed licenses, Federal occupational licenses, and professional certification''.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The authority'';

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) The authority under subsection (a) may not be used to pay the expenses of a member to obtain professional credentials unless such credentials are recognized and approved by the armed force concerned as necessary to meet—

''(A) readiness requirements or professional occupational development goals of such armed force; or

''(B) the self-development requirements of the member.

''(3) Except as provided in paragraph (4), the authority under subsection (a) may not be used to pay the expenses of obtaining professional credentials unless—

''(A) such credentials are accredited under International Organization for Standardization/International Commission (ISO/IEC) Standard 17024-2012, entitled 'General Requirements for Bodies Operating Certification of Persons'; and

''(B) the entity accrediting such credentials provides documentary evidence to the Secretary of Defense that it complies International Organization for Standardization/International Commission Standard 17011, entitled 'Conformity assessment–General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies'.

'' '(4) During the three-year period beginning on the date of the authorization of the Credentialing agency by the Department of Defense, the authority under subsection (a) may be used to pay the expenses of obtaining professional credentials from an entity not complying with the Standards referred to in paragraph (3) if the entity certifies in writing to the Secretary of Defense that the entity agrees to seek to obtain certification of compliance with the Standards before the end of such period.'.

(c) FUNDS AVAILABLE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''may pay'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''may, using funds described in subsection (c), pay''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

SA 3577. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for

military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFORTS TO REMOVE JOSEPH KONY FROM THE BATTLEFIELD AND END THE ATROCITIES OF THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY.

Consistent with the provisions of the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–172), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ongoing United States advise and assist operation in support of regional governments in Central Africa and the African Union to remove Joseph Kony and his top commanders from the battlefield and end atrocities perpetuated by the Lord's Resistance Army, also known as Operation Observant Compass, has made significant progress in achieving its objectives;

(2) the Department of Defense should continue its support of Operation Observant Compass, particularly through the provision of key enablers, such as mobility assets and targeted intelligence collection and analytical support, to enable regional partners to effectively conduct operations against Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army;

(3) Operation Observant Compass must be integrated into a comprehensive strategy to support security and stability in the region; and

(4) the regional governments should recommit themselves to the Regional Cooperation Initiative for the Elimination of the Lord's Resistance Army authorized by the African Union.

SA 3578. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1047. USE OF SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE BY NON-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, may authorize use of Special Use Airspace by any department or agency of the Federal Government if the use of such Airspace by such department or agency—

(1) either—

(A) directly supports the Department of Defense;

(B) provides a direct or indirect benefit to the Department; or

(C) directly supports a specific national security interest; and

(2) does not interfere with the assigned mission of the commander of the installation, or the use, for which such Special Use Airspace was established.

SA 3579. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 830. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2338. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not enter into any contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(b) DEFINITION OF INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity has, directly or indirectly, acquired—

''(i) most of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) most of the assets of, or most of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) either—

''(i) after the acquisition at least 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii)(I) the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition conducts most of its business activities in the United States; and

''(II) the management and control of the entity (or of any other member of the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition includes the entity and to which this subclause applies under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate) occurs, directly or indirectly, mostly within the United States.

''(2) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subclause (II) of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an entity is to be treated as occurring mostly within the United States.

''(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall provide that—

''(i) the management and control of an entity shall be treated as occurring mostly within the United States if most of the executive officers and senior management of the entity who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the entity are located mostly within the United States; and

''(ii) individuals who are not executive officers and senior management of the entity (including individuals who are officers or employees of other members of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity) shall be treated as executive officers and senior management if such individuals exercise the day-to-day responsibilities of the entity described in clause (i).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item related to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations.''.

SA 3580. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 830. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4713. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not enter into any contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(b) DEFINITION OF INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity has, directly or indirectly, acquired—

''(i) most of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) most of the assets of, or most of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) either—

''(i) after the acquisition at least 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii)(I) the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition conducts most of its business activities in the United States; and

''(II) the management and control of the entity (or of any other member of the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition includes the entity and to which this subclause applies under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate) occurs, directly or indirectly, mostly within the United States.

''(2) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subclause (II) of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an entity is to be treated as occurring mostly within the United States.

''(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations required under subparagraph (A) shall provide that—

''(i) the management and control of an entity shall be treated as occurring mostly within the United States if most of the executive officers and senior management of the entity who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the entity are located mostly within the United States; and

''(ii) individuals who are not executive officers and senior management of the entity (including individuals who are officers or employees of other members of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity) shall be treated as executive officers and senior management if such individuals exercise the day-to-day responsibilities of the entity described in clause (i).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item related to section 4712 the following new item:

''4713. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations.''.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2338. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not enter into any contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(b) DEFINITION OF INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity has, directly or indirectly, acquired—

''(i) most of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) most of the assets of, or most of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) either—

''(i) after the acquisition at least 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii)(I) the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition conducts most of its business activities in the United States; and

''(II) the management and control of the entity (or of any other member of the expanded affiliated group which after the acquisition includes the entity and to which this subclause applies under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate) occurs, directly or indirectly, mostly within the United States.

''(2) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subclause (II) of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an entity is to be treated as occurring mostly within the United States.

''(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall provide that—

''(i) the management and control of an entity shall be treated as occurring mostly within the United States if most of the executive officers and senior management of the entity who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the entity are located mostly within the United States; and

''(ii) individuals who are not executive officers and senior management of the entity (including individuals who are officers or employees of other members of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity) shall be treated as executive officers and senior management if such individuals exercise the day-to-day responsibilities of the entity described in clause (i).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item related to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Prohibition on contracts with inverted domestic corporations.''.

SA 3581. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 531 and insert the following:

SEC. 531. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO OBTAIN PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''professional accreditation'' and all that follows through ''certification'' and inserting ''State-imposed licenses, Federal occupational licenses, and professional certification''.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The authority'';

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) The authority under subsection (a) may not be used to pay the expenses of a member to obtain professional credentials unless such credentials are recognized and approved by the armed force concerned as necessary to meet—

''(A) readiness requirements or professional occupational development goals of such armed force; or

''(B) the self-development requirements of the member.

''(3) Except as provided in paragraph (4), the authority under subsection (a) may not be used to pay the expenses of obtaining professional credentials unless—

''(A) such credentials are accredited under International Organization for Standardization/International Commission (ISO/IEC) Standard 17024-2012, entitled 'General Requirements for Bodies Operating Certification of Persons'; and

''(B) the entity accrediting such credentials provides documentary evidence to the Secretary of Defense that it complies International Organization for Standardization/International Commission Standard 17011, entitled 'Conformity assessment–General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies'.

''(4) During the three-year period beginning on the date of the authorization of the Credentialing agency by the Department of Defense, the authority under subsection (a) may be used to pay the expenses of obtaining professional credentials from an entity not complying with the Standards referred to in paragraph (3) if the entity certifies in writing to the Secretary of Defense that the entity agrees to seek to obtain certification of compliance with the Standards before the end of such period.'.

(c) FUNDS AVAILABLE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''may pay'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''may, using funds described in subsection (c), pay''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) FUNDS AVAILABLE.—Payments may be made under the authority under subsection (a) by the Secretary making such payments from amounts available to such Secretary for tuition assistance for members under the jurisdiction of such Secretary. Payments for funds are not limited to eligible programs, as that term is defined in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088).''.

(d) COVERED EXPENSES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXPENSES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'expenses' means expenses for class room instruction, hands-on training (and associated materials), manuals, study guides and materials, text books, processing fees, and test fees and related fees.''.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or

by e-mail to sallie_derr@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Sallie Derr at (202) 224–6836.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before Subcommittee on National Parks. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

H.R. 412, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S.1189, to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes;

S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System;

S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

S. 1641, to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes;

S. 1718, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 1750, authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes;

S. 1785, to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes;

S. 1794, to designate certain Federal land in Chaffee County, Colorado, as a national monument and as wilderness.

S. 1866, a bill to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy;

S. 2031, to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes;

S. 2104, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown;

S. 2111, to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area;

S. 2221, to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan;

S. 2264, A bill to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, and for other purposes;

S. 2293, to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes;

S. 2318, to reauthorize the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act.

S. 2346, to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes;

S. 2356, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve;

S. 2392, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

S. 2576, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 2602, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to John Assini@ienergy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact David Brooks (202) 224–9863 or John Assini (202) 224–9313.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 29, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The title of this hearing is ''Breaking the Logjam at BLM: Examining Ways to More Efficiently Process Permits for Energy Production on Federal Lands.''

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Kristen_Granier@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Jan Brunner at (202) 224–3907 or Kristen Granier at (202) 224–1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Leveraging America's Resources as a Revenue Generator and Job Creator: A View from State and Local Partners.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The U.S. Tax Code: Love It, Leave It, or Reform It!''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Coal Miners' Struggle for Justice: How Unethical Legal and Medical Practices Stack the Deck Against Black Lung Claimants.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 3 p.m. in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Abuse of Structured Financial Products: Misusing Barrier Options to Avoid Taxes and Leverage Limits.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Building Economically Resilient Communities: Local and Regional Approaches.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND PEACE CORPS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 22, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold an International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs, International Environmental Protection, and Peace Corps subcommittee hearing entitled, ''U.S. Security Implications of International Energy and Climate Policies Issues.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Anne Marie Lewis, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Anita Grassl and Angela West, interns with the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 4719

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand H.R. 4719 has been received from the House, is at the desk, and is due for a first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Mr. REID. I would ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2014

Mr. REID. We have waited here now for hours trying to work out an agreement to move forward on the highway bill, but one of the Senators has not been found. So I am not going to wait any longer. I have waited quite a few hours—and all the staff—and it is not fair to anybody.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 23, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and, finally, that at 11 a.m. the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, at 11 a.m. tomorrow there will be a roll call vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the Bring Jobs Home Act, followed by three voice votes on confirmation of the Clark, Schapiro, and Creedon nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE TRACIE STEVENS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT P. MCCOY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL E. COGHLAN

To be major

AJAY K. OJHA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

NEALANJON P. DAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

BARRY C. BUSBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

YONG K. CHO
JOSEPH W. GREEN
THOMAS A. STARKOSKI, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ADAM J. RAINS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

ANDRE BIROTTE, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

ROBIN L. ROSENBERG, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 22, 2014*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

23 IN 1—HONDO

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District, I would like to travel to a small town some 40 miles west of San Antonio. That would be Hondo, Texas.

It is about 9.6 square miles of iconic America, and as you pass the city boundary, you are kindly reminded by a sign: ''This is God's country. Please don't drive through it like hell.'' That sign, erected by the local Lions Club in 1930, deters speeders. It has been featured on postcards; it has been the subject of many photos sent home by tourists; and it even made the cover of National Geographic magazine.

I remember that sign even as a little kid, long before I–10 was built and when Highway 90, through Hondo, was still the main thoroughfare—the east-west highway—from L.A. to Florida.

Actually, the original sign just read: ''This is God's country. Don't drive through it like hell,'' but as you might imagine, it was a somewhat controversial sign for the 1930s. So, finally, in the 1940s, the word ''please'' was added to soften the tone and to placate those in town who found the sign a bit too harsh. Today, some 84 years after its installation, that sign still serves as a not-so-subtle reminder to slow down and, perhaps, to take a breath from the everyday rush of life and enjoy the little things, like family and friends and God and country.

Though settled in 1891, the Hondo area, which is now located in Medina County, was first explored by Cabeza de Vaca in 1519, only some 27 years after Columbus arrived in the New World. It displaced Castroville as the county seat, and Hondo shares a place in history with the many early Americans who built this Nation through sheer sweat and determination.

With the construction of the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railway, which was built through the county from the east in 1881, Hondo quickly transformed from a small, 25-resident settlement into a trade and shipping center for agriculture and ranching. Hondo was the scene of two bank robberies in the early 1920s. The crooks were the famed Newton Gang, the most successful outlaws in American history. Interestingly, both bank heists occurred on the same night.

Hondo, itself, was incorporated as a city in 1942, and at that time, Hondo applied for a U.S. Army air training facility to be built there. When our Nation was in need, they stepped up. The Hondo Army Airfield was constructed with local funding in 89 days, and it opened on July 4, 1942. The airfield would become the largest air navigation school in the world and would eventually train over 15,000 navigators to serve in World War II.

That airfield still exists, and though it is no longer affiliated with the U.S. military, today, it is a regional facility and is one of the busiest small commercial airports in Texas. Mayor James Danner and city leadership have done a phenomenal job of developing the airfield into a center of transportation and commerce. If your business needs a small airport near San Antonio and not too far from Eagle Ford Shale country, check out the airport in Hondo.

In addition, that airfield is home to one of the largest and most fun and entertaining air shows in Central Texas—and certainly the best air show in all of Congressional District 23. Each year, thousands of airplane enthusiasts descend on Hondo for the air show, which last year featured more than 20 or so World War II-era airplanes. Another feature of the air show was an exhibition called, ''Tora, Tora, Tora,'' a smaller but incredibly well-done reenactment of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, a reenactment which was done using these vintage airplanes. It is a great event to take your kids and your grandkids to.

Hondo is a town of living history as many of its residents are descendants of the original 25 settlers. It is a town not lost in the rush of everyday life, and like much of Texas' 23rd District, its connection and commitment to the U.S. military run deep through its veins.

I invite everyone to take a trip to Hondo and experience iconic America. Remember, this is God's country. Please don't drive through it like hell.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor again to talk about the waste of American taxpayers' money in Afghanistan.

Just last week, we in the House Armed Services Committee heard testimony from Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work, along with other DOD officials, regarding the Department's request for an additional $58.6 billion to be used overseas, primarily in Afghanistan.

While speaking to Mr. Work, I mentioned the following three headlines, which, I believe, accurately describe the American situation in Afghanistan: the headline from CBS News, ''Is the Pentagon wasting taxpayer money in Afghanistan?''; from the Center for Public Integrity, ''The U.S. military was no match for Afghanistan's corruption''; then from the World Affairs Journal, ''Money Pit: The Monstrous Failure of U.S. Aid to Afghanistan.'' All of these reports detail a shocking misuse of the American taxpayers' dollar with little to no accountability.

My question to Mr. Work was this:

How can the Pentagon, in good conscience, request this money given the waste, fraud, and abuse that we continue to see with American resources in Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, this is money that we could be using right here in America to care for our many wounded veterans, to rebuild our country, our schools, our roads, our infrastructure, and yet, every day, we continue to spend billions and billions overseas with, as I said earlier, just little accountability.

As my good friend Pat Buchanan has said: ''Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so we can defend the world?'' Let me repeat that one more time: ''Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so we can defend the world?''

I would even insert the word ''stupidity'' instead of ''senility,'' and it would sound this way: ''Is it not a symptom of stupidity to be borrowing from the world so we can defend the world?''

Mr. Speaker, beside me, I have a poster of a young Army soldier who lost both legs and an arm. This was from the front page of our Raleigh paper, Mr. Speaker—the News & Observer—about 5 years ago. Why do I have it on the floor today? Four weeks ago, I went to Walter Reed at Bethesda. I saw three Army soldiers from Fort Bragg, which is not in my district, but I chatted with them. All three had lost one leg in Afghanistan. My main purpose of going to Walter Reed was to see two marines from Camp Lejeune who had been severely wounded, but I thank God I had a chance to talk to the three soldiers and to thank them for their gift of their legs for our country.

As I went over to the young marine from Camp Lejeune, who was 23, he was like this soldier in the poster. The young marine had lost both legs and an arm. I looked in the face of his father, who probably was 50 or 51 years of age, and all I saw was pain and worry and trouble in the eyes of the father because, like this young soldier who had lost both legs and an arm, you can only hope the best for their futures.

The second marine I saw from Camp Lejeune had stepped on a 40-pound IED and had lost both legs. He has a wife—I did not meet her—and an 8-month-old baby girl whom I did not meet, but he was very proud of his wife and his child. I wonder what his future is going to be? I can only hope the best—that God will look after all of these men and women who have given so much for our country.

It brings me back to this, Mr. Speaker: Congress needs to have debates and to stop wasting money in Afghanistan, because it costs our soldiers and their families so much—the lives, the limbs—and there is nothing we have to show for it but pain and a waste of money.

May God bless America.

GENOCIDE

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the international legal definition of the crime of genocide is found in article II of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide.

It says:

Genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

I believe that what is happening to the Christian community in Iraq is genocide. I also believe that it is a ''crime against humanity.''

Last Thursday, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, more commonly referred to as ISIS, gave the few remaining Christians in Mosul until Saturday to leave or be killed.

From The New York Times, it reads:

Some went on foot, their cars having been confiscated. Others rode bicycles or motor scooters. Few were able to take anything of value as militants seized their money and jewelry. Some—just a few because they were not healthy enough to flee—submitted to the demands that they convert to Islam to avoid being killed.

ISIS is systematically targeting Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq for extinction.

I will submit for the RECORD the complete article from The New York Times and an editorial from today's Wall Street Journal for history to see what is happening.

[From the New York Times, July 21, 2014]

CONCERN AND SUPPORT FOR IRAQI CHRISTIANS FORCED BY MILITANTS TO FLEE MOSUL

BAGHDAD.—A day after Christians fled Mosul, the northern city controlled by Islamist extremists, under the threat of death, Muslims and Christians gathered under the same roof—a church roof—here on Sunday afternoon. By the time the piano player had finished the Iraqi national anthem, and before the prayers, Manhal Younis was crying.

''I can't feel my identity as an Iraqi Christian,'' she said, her three little daughters hanging at her side.

A Muslim woman sitting next to her in the pew reached out and whispered, ''You are the true original people here, and we are sorry for what has been done to you in the name of Islam.''

The warm scene here was an unusual counterpoint to the wider story of Iraq's unraveling, as Sunni militants with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria gain territory and persecute anyone who does not adhere to their harsh version of Islamic law. On Saturday, to meet a deadline by the ISIS militants, most Christians in Mosul, a community almost as old as Christianity itself, left with little more than the clothes they were wearing.

The major players in the Iraq and Syria crisis are often both allies and antagonists, working together on one front on one day and at cross-purposes the next.

Some went on foot, their cars having been confiscated; others rode bicycles or motor scooters. Few were able to take anything of value, as militants seized their money and jewelry. Some—just a few, and because they were not healthy enough to flee—submitted to demands that they convert to Islam to avoid being killed.

''There are five Christian families who converted to Islam because they were threatened with death,'' said Younadim Kanna, a Christian and a member of Iraq's Parliament. ''They did so just to stay alive.''

On Sunday, outrage came from many corners of Iraq, and beyond.

In a public address, Pope Francis expressed his concern for the Christians of Mosul and other parts of the Middle East, ''where they have lived since the beginning of Christianity, together with their fellow citizens, offering a meaningful contribution to the good of society.''

He continued: ''Today, they are persecuted. Our brothers are persecuted and hunted away; they have to leave their homes without being allowed to take anything with them.''

Ban Ki-moon, the United Nations secretary general, released a statement condemning ''in the strongest terms the systematic persecution of minority populations in Iraq'' and particularly the threat against Christians.

And Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, who is struggling to remain in power as Iraq's political factions negotiate to form a new government, said Sunday, ''The atrocities perpetrated by ISIS against our Iraqi citizens, the Christians in Nineveh Province and the attacks on the churches and houses of worship in the areas that fall under their control, reveal without any doubt the terrorist and criminal nature of this extremist group that poses a dangerous threat to the humanity and the heritage and legacy that has been preserved over centuries.''

He called on the ''whole world to tighten the siege on those terrorists and stand as one force to confront them.'' That was perhaps a reference to the influx of foreign fighters into Iraq, many of whom have also fought in Syria's civil war. On Sunday, ISIS issued a statement claiming responsibility for two suicide attacks in Baghdad on Saturday, and said that one had been carried out by a German citizen, and the other by a Syrian.

The gathering on Sunday at St. George Chaldean Church, built in 1964 and situated in a Shiite Muslim neighborhood, was as much about Iraqi solidarity as it was a gesture of condemnation for the persecution of Christians. In many ways Iraq's struggle today is the same as it has been since the country was founded nearly a century ago, at the end of World War I: how to establish a national identity larger than a particular faith or ethnicity.

In the pews Muslims and Christians alike held signs that read, ''I'm Iraqi. I'm Christian.'' Muhammad Aga, who organized the event over Facebook, spoke, and listed Iraq's many narrower identities: Christians, Arabs, Kurds, Shabaks, Turkmen, Yazidis, Sunnis and Shiites. ''All of those people who carry Iraqi identity,'' he said.

The church's patriarch, Louis Raphael Sako, said, ''I carry every Iraqi in my heart.''

After the service, two men, cousins in their 60s, stood in the church courtyard. They grew up in Mosul, and moved to Baghdad as teenagers. They have witnessed much of Iraq's traumatic history of coups, revolutions, wars and sectarian cleansing, and have stayed the whole time.

''You have to be angry,'' said Faiz Faraj, 65, a retired teacher. ''You must cry.''

But, he said, ''Iraqis have suffered for a long time, but this will pass.''

His 9-year-old granddaughter, Lana Fanar, recited at the service a poem written by a well-known Iraqi poet in 2006, as Iraq was in

the grip of sectarian killings. Its words could be spoken of any of Iraq's previous traumas, or today:

''I cry for my country. I cry for Baghdad. I cry for the history and the glory days. I cry for the artists, for the water, for the trees. I cry for my religion. I cry for my beliefs.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 21, 2014]

THE CHRISTIAN PURGE FROM MOSUL

THE ISLAMIST ATTACKS ON NON-MUSLIMS ARE A PROBLEM FOR ISLAM

Imagine if a fundamentalist Christian sect captured the French city of Lyon and began a systematic purge of Muslims. Their mosques were destroyed, their crescents defaced, the Koran burned and then all Muslims forced to flee or face execution. Such an event would be unthinkable today, and if it did occur Pope Francis and all other Christian leaders would denounce it and support efforts by governments to stop it.

Yet that is essentially what is happening in reverse now in Mosul, as the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham drives all signs of Christianity from the ancient city. Christians have lived in Mosul for nearly 2,000 years, but today they are reliving the Muslim religious wars of the Middle Ages.

They have been given a choice either to convert to Islam or flee. They were warned before a weekend deadline that if they remained and didn't convert, they would be killed. Thousands—often entire families—have had to leave the city with nothing more than their clothes as militants robbed them of money or jewelry. Crosses have been destroyed across the city.

That such violent bigotry in the name of religion can exist in the 21st century is hard for many in the Christian world to believe, but that is part of the West's problem. Jews know all too well that anti-Semitism can inspire murderous behavior. But Christians or post-Christian secularists who are content in their modern prosperity often prefer to turn their heads or blame all religions as equally intolerant.

Today's religious extremism is almost entirely Islamic. While ISIS's purge may be the most brutal, Islamists in Egypt have driven thousands of Coptic Christians from homes they've occupied for centuries. The same is true across the Muslim parts of Africa. This does not mean that all Muslims are extremists, but it does mean that all Muslims have an obligation to denounce and resist the extremists who murder or subjugate in the name of Allah. Too few imams living in the tolerant West will speak up against it.

As for the post-Christian West, most elites may now be nonbelievers. But a culture that fails to protect believers may eventually find that it lacks the self-belief to protect itself.

Mr. WOLF. With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions, and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. The patriarch Abraham came from a city in Iraq called Ur. Isaac's bride, Rebekah, came from northwest Iraq. Jacob spent 20 years in Iraq, and his sons—the 12 tribes of Israel—were born in northwest Iraq. A remarkable spiritual revival as told in the Book of Jonah occurred in Nineveh. The events of the Book of Esther took place in Iraq, as did the account of Daniel in the Lions' Den.

Monday's New York Times' piece also quotes a Muslim woman at a prayer service on Sunday at a church in Baghdad, whispering to a Christian woman sitting in the pew next to her: ''You are the true original people here. We are so sorry for what has been done to you in the name of Islam.''

On June 16, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no mass said in Mosul.

Pope Francis on Sunday expressed concern about what was unfolding in Mosul and in other parts of the Middle East, noting that these communities since the beginning of Christianity have ''coexisted there alongside their fellow citizens, making a significant contribution to the good of society. Today, they are persecuted,'' the Pope said. ''Our brothers are persecuted. They are cast out. They are forced to leave their homes without having the chance to take anything with them.''

The United Nations released a statement attributed to Ban Ki-moon that, in part, said: ''The Secretary General reiterates that any systematic attack on the civilian population or segments of the civilian population because of their ethnic background, religious beliefs or faith may constitute a crime against humanity, for which those responsible must be held accountable.''

Where is the Obama administration?

In June, 55 Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats—urged the Obama administration to actively engage with the Iraqi central government and the Kurdistan Regional Government to prioritize additional security support for especially vulnerable populations, notably Iraq's ancient Christian community, and provide emergency humanitarian assistance to these communities.

□ 1215

I want to read the last lines of our letter: ''Absent immediate action, we will most certainly witness the annihilation of an ancient faith community from the lands they have inhabited for centuries.''

It is happening, Mr. Speaker. They are almost all gone, just as we predicted.

The Obama administration has to make protecting this ancient community a priority. It needs to encourage the Kurds to do what they can to protect those fleeing ISIS and provide safe refuge.

It needs to ensure that, of the resources going to the region, a portion be guaranteed to help the Christian community. It needs to have the same courage as President Bush and former Secretary of State Colin Powell when they said genocide was taking place in Darfur.

The United Nations has a role too. It should immediately initiate proceedings in the International Criminal Court against ISIS for crimes against humanity.

The time to act is now.

IMMIGRATION TAKES AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the June jobs report says America's unemployment rate dropped to 6.1 percent. While 1,115,000 new part-time jobs were created, a staggering, 827,000 full-time jobs were lost, and America's labor participation rate remained at 62.8 percent, the worst since President Carter.

A recent Center for Immigration Studies report, based on data from the Census Bureau and Homeland Security and Labor Departments, offers a startling and sobering insight concerning people in the 16–65 age bracket, so startling that I instructed my staff to double-check the report's data, and it checked out as factually accurate.

First, the report determined the American economy created 5.6 million new jobs in the 16–65 age bracket over the past 14 years.

Second, ''the total number of working-age immigrants (legal and illegal) holding a job increased 5.7 million from 2000 to 2014, while declining 127,000 for American-born citizens.''

Over the past 14 years, although the American economy created 5.6 million net new jobs in the 16–65 age bracket, American-born citizens lost 127,000 jobs. All job gains, and more, went to immigrants.

Third, even though the American economy created 5.6 million net new jobs over the past 14 years, population growth and job losses caused 17 million more American citizens to not be working in 2014 than in 2000.

Fourth, and contrary to what amnesty proponents and their media allies would have you believe, ''Immigrants have made gains across the labor market, including lower-skilled jobs such as maintenance, construction, and food services; middle-skilled jobs like office support and health care support; and higher-skilled jobs, including management, computers, and health care practitioners.''

Immigrants swept the jobs field and had jobs gains in virtually every segment of the American economy. The argument that immigrants only do jobs Americans won't do is not supported by the facts.

Immigrants gained jobs while Americans lost jobs in each of the following high paying industries: architecture and engineering; transportation and material moving; installation, maintenance, and repair; sales; construction and excavation; office and administrative support.

Fifth, Americans of all major races lost ground. Black Americans lost, Hispanic Americans lost, White Americans lost. The percentage of working Black American-born citizens dropped 9.2 percentage points. The percentage of

working Hispanic Americans dropped 7.7 percentage points, and the percentage of working White Americans dropped 6.1 percentage points.

Sixth, America's immigration policies over the past 14 years have been both a war on women and a war on men. The percentage of working female American-born citizens dropped 5.5 percentage points, while male American-born citizens did even worse, dropping 9.1 percentage points.

Mr. Speaker, I have two comments on the Center for Immigration Studies report. First, lawful immigrants have done well. Everyone would do well to learn from lawful immigrants' work and study habits.

Second, President Obama must start vigorously enforcing America's immigration laws. A Pew Hispanic Center study determined that illegal aliens hold roughly 8 million jobs in America. That is 8 million job opportunities illegally taken from Americans, thereby suppressing wages, causing unemployment, and creating income inequality among far too many struggling American families.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for anyone else but me, but as for me, MO BROOKS, the Congressman from Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, I will fight for the economic interests of American citizens as Washington works its way through the immigration debate.

VETERANS' CLINICS IN THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge House and Senate conferees to send bipartisan veterans' legislation to the President's desk before we break for August. This legislation would authorize new community-based outpatient clinics for Lake Charles, Lafayette, and others around the country.

Our veterans have waited long enough. They have waited since 2008, and they have been blocked because of bureaucratic roadblocks. This is unacceptable. And now we are even closer to honoring this promise, because the House and Senate have passed legislation.

It is time to act on behalf of our veterans who have served this country. If Congress fails to act, we will continue forcing veterans to drive hours to Houston or Alexandria, Louisiana, for specialty care or even primary care or, even worse, they will be forced to go without care.

This is just unacceptable, and I will not stand until we get this legislation done. That is not the standard of care and accessibility these men and women deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman JEFF MILLER for his strong leadership on this issue. He has fought beside me and others to get these clinics.

I urge conferees to work together. Put veterans' medical care ahead of election-year politics, and let's get this done.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

Give them generosity to enter into their work. May they serve You in the work they do as You deserve; give of themselves and not count the cost; fight for what is best for our Nation and not count the political wounds; toil until their work is done and not seek to rest; and labor without seeking any reward, other than knowing that they are doing Your will and serving the people of this great Nation.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COSTA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

SUPPORTING ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO SELF DEFENSE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, each of us, as Americans, has a God-given right to defend ourselves. Those rights should apply to all people everywhere, including Israel.

I visited Israel last year and saw, firsthand, the life-and-death reality ordinary Israelis face every day. Prime Minister Netanyahu impressed upon us the very real possibility that Israel could cease to exist if it failed to respond forcefully to violence and threats from those that seek its destruction.

That is why I rise today to share my support for Israel's efforts to defend itself from the existential threat it faces from Hamas. History has shown that Israel has been America's most steadfast ally in a very dangerous part of the world.

Let's pray for peace and for the innocent lives lost on both sides of this conflict. But let's never waver from supporting our friend and ally, Israel, in its fight for freedom.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ELI SETENCICH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Eli Setencich, a captain in the American Army Air Corps during World War II, a journalist, and a friend to so many of us.

Eli was an unsung American hero, a veteran of America's Greatest Generation. Eli hardly ever discussed, nor did he brag about, his World War II experiences, like many of those who served at that time.

However, he flew 142 combat missions in P–49s during the war. Eli's amazing courage and heroism was recognized with two Distinguished Flying Cross ards.

When the war ended, like most American veterans of that era, Eli returned to his hometown to begin his career, in this case, Sanger, California.

For 41 years, Eli worked for The Fresno Bee, a major paper in the West, first as a reporter, and then a columnist. His insightfulness and biting humor always made the point.

Eli was a mentor to many young writers and a friend to all who knew him. He will be greatly missed by his wife, Yvonne; his daughter, Amy; and his two grandchildren.

It is with great respect that I ask my colleagues of the United States House of Representatives to honor the life of Eli Setencich, a true American hero and a distinguished journalist.

CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, breaking news. This morning the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit upheld a challenge to the ObamaCare health insurance subsidies being granted in Federal exchanges.

So what does this mean?

The Affordable Care Act was written so that tax subsidies for insurance premiums were only allowed in State-based exchanges. But so far, 14 of the 50 States have set up State-based exchanges. Many others, including Texas, are in Federal fallback exchanges.

Today's ruling said that these States are getting subsidies illegally. This means that 7½ million people could potentially owe the Federal Government thousands of dollars that they would have to pay back.

Mr. Speaker, this law was a disaster from the start. It was a rough draft written in a Senate committee, came over here and was rubberstamped by the House, and then it went to rulemaking at the Federal agency.

So is it really any surprise that it is being dialed back by the courts?

Between this and the Hobby Lobby decision 2 weeks ago, it is clear that the drafting was all wrong, and 7½ million people are now paying the consequences.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today's D.C. Court of Appeals decision in Halbig v. Burwell held that the text of ObamaCare clearly ''makes tax credits available as a form of subsidy to individuals who purchase health insurance through exchanges established by the State.''

Since 36 States have declined to establish exchanges, and many policies offered in the Federal exchange are untenable without subsidy, this ruling creates more problems for the already catastrophic implementation of ObamaCare.

The poorly reasoned and partisan drafting of this law has led to massive hardship, disruption, and waste. I wish my colleagues across the aisle had worked with Republicans on sensible health care reforms that we could have passed, amended, and implemented on a bipartisan basis. But they chose not to do that, and today's ruling is yet more bitter fruit of that choice.

ObamaCare, as implemented, is dramatically at odds with ObamaCare as written and is, thus, at odds with the rule of law. I commend the court for recognizing this.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COUNCILMAN AL BRADLEY

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with sadness to remember an outstanding public servant and a model citizen, and a good personal friend of mine, Orange Beach City Councilman Al Bradley.

Councilman Bradley, or Al, as he always asked to be called, passed away at the hospital in Foley, Alabama, on July 17 due to health complications. Al was 64 years old.

A native of Texas but a huge University of Alabama football fan, Al and his family and his wife, Linda, owned a house in Orange Beach, Alabama, since 1993.

He was a certified public accountant, and often was described as the financial rock of Orange Beach, serving as the chairman of the city's finance committee for 6 years.

But Al had a true servant's heart. I saw it myself. He put in more time and effort on things for Orange Beach than just about anyone I know, and he never sought any recognition in return.

So to his wife, Linda, his three children, his grandchildren, whom I know he loved very much, I want you to know that you are in the thoughts and prayers of thousands of people in southwest Alabama. We will miss Al very much.

CONDITIONS IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, in Israel right now, there is a battle for peace. They are being embattled by a group who teach their children, in the educational materials we help pay for, to hate Jews, to hate Israelis. They teach the people to hate Israelis as well. They name streets and holidays after people who kill innocent people.

It is time to cut off every dime of American money going to anyone who has any kind of relationship with Hamas or those killing in the Middle East, and especially in Israel.

It is time to bomb Iran's nuclear capabilities. It is time for the United States, if we are not going to stop Iran's nukes, then let Israel do it. A friend will not put another friend in this kind of jeopardy.

EMPOWERING FAMILIES

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this week, House Republicans are introducing tax bills that can change the lives of thousands of American families. The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014 and the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act will directly impact American families.

Helping families pay for everyday costs is essential if we want to build a stronger America. This is how we do it, not through mandated health care or required taxes, but by cutting costs for those who need it most.

This is another example, another way that House Republicans are working for Americans. Americans are looking for us to bring change to them and bring hope to them, and this is how we can make it happen.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATTA) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H. RES. 646, DIRECTING ATTORNEY GENERAL TO TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011

Mr. HOLDING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–545) directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Justice that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

STELA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4572) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4572

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act, or the amendments made by this Act. This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

TITLE I—COMMUNICATIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''January 1, 2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2020''.

SEC. 102. RETRANSMISSION CONSENT NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) prohibit a television broadcast station from coordinating negotiations or negotiating on a joint basis with another television broadcast station in the same local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) to grant retransmission consent under this section to a multichannel video programming distributor, unless such stations are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted under the regulations of the Commission.''.

(b) MARGIN CORRECTION.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is further amended by moving the margin of clause (iii) 4 ems to the left.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 103. DELAYED APPLICATION OF JSA ATTRIBUTION RULE IN CASE OF WAIVER PETITION.

In the case of a party to a joint sales agreement (as defined in Note 2(k) to section 73.3555 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendment to Note 2(k)(2) to such section made by the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Report and Order adopted by the Commission on March 31, 2014 (FCC 14–28), and who, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submits to the Commission a petition for a waiver of the application to such agreement of the rule in such Note 2(k)(2) (as so amended), such party shall not be considered to be in violation of the ownership limitations of such section by reason of the application of such rule to such agreement until the later of—

(1) the date that is 18 months after the date on which the Commission denies such petition; or

(2) December 31, 2016.

SEC. 104. DELETION OR REPOSITIONING OF STATIONS DURING CERTAIN PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 614(b)(9) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(b)(9)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) REVISION OF RULES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise section 76.1601 of its rules (47 CFR 76.1601) and any note to such section by removing the prohibition against deletion or repositioning of a local commercial television station during a period in which major television ratings services measure the size of audiences of local television stations.

SEC. 105. REPEAL OF INTEGRATION BAN.

(a) NO FORCE OR EFFECT.—The second sentence of section 76.1204(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, shall have no force or effect after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REMOVAL FROM RULES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete all actions necessary to remove the sentence described in subsection (a) from its rules.

SEC. 106. REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS IMPLICATIONS OF STATUTORY LICENSING MODIFICATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that analyzes and evaluates the changes to the carriage requirements currently imposed on multichannel video programming distributors under the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the regulations promulgated by the Commission that would be required or beneficial to consumers, and such other matters as the Comptroller General considers appropriate, if Congress implemented a phase-out of the current statutory licensing requirements set forth under sections 111, 119, and 122 of title 17, United States Code. Among other things, the study shall consider the impact such a phase-out and related changes to carriage requirements would have on consumer prices and access to programming.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations for legislative or administrative actions. Such report shall also include a discussion of any differences between such results and the results of the study conducted under section 303 of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 1255).

SEC. 107. LOCAL NETWORK CHANNEL BROADCAST REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the 270th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and on each succeeding anniversary of such 270th day, each satellite carrier shall submit an annual report to the Commission setting forth—

(A) each local market in which it—

(i) retransmits signals of 1 or more television broadcast stations with a community of license in that market;

(ii) has commenced providing such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(iii) has ceased to provide such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(B) detailed information regarding the use and potential use of satellite capacity for the retransmission of local signals in each local market.

(2) TERMINATION.—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall cease after each satellite carrier has submitted 5 reports under such paragraph.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''local market'' and ''satellite carrier'' have the meaning given such terms in section 339(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 339(d)); and

(2) the term ''television broadcast station'' has the meaning given such term in section 325(b)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(7)).

SEC. 108. REPORT ON DESIGNATED MARKET AREAS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an analysis of—

(1) the extent to which consumers in each local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) have access to broadcast programming from television broadcast stations (as defined in section 325(b)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(7))) located outside their local market, including through carriage by cable operators and satellite carriers of signals that are significantly viewed (within the meaning of section 340 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 340)); and

(2) whether there are technologically and economically feasible alternatives to the use of designated market areas (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) to define markets that would provide consumers with more programming options and the potential impact such alternatives could have on localism and on broadcast television locally, regionally, and nationally.

SEC. 109. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

TITLE II—COPYRIGHT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REAUTHORIZATION.

Chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 111(d)(3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''clause'' and inserting ''paragraph''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''clause'' and inserting ''paragraph''; and

(2) in section 119—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 202. TERMINATION OF LICENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 of title 17, United States Code, as amended in section 201, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) TERMINATION OF LICENSE.—This section shall cease to be effective on December 31, 2019.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107(a) of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (17 U.S.C. 119 note) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, we are offering a bill that will ensure that 1.5 million subscribers in hard-to-reach areas, including many in my home State of Oregon, will continue to receive vital news and information through the television. The STELA Reauthorization Act extends the copyright and retransmission consent provisions for distant signals retransmitted by commercial satellite providers for 5 years.

Our committee has worked hard on this bill. We have engaged members of industry and consumer groups, and we have talked about the difficult policy matters that affect all consumers when it comes to video programming. Every member of our committee, on both sides of the aisle, has engaged with industry and consumers to figure out the right policy and to get to the right outcome, which we bring to you today.

Our bill not only reauthorizes the compulsory copyright and retransmission exemption for 5 years, but it also targets and, in some areas, gives much-needed reforms to our communications law.

Specifically, this bill repeals the FCC's integration ban on cable-leased set-top boxes. That clears the way for innovation and investment by lifting an unnecessary regulatory burden that has cost the cable industry and its consumers who pay the $1 billion—$1 billion, Mr. Speaker—since 2007.

I especially want to thank my friend, the extraordinary, terrific vice chair of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, Mr. LATTA of Ohio, and my Democratic colleague from Texas, GENE GREEN, who brought this issue to our attention and helped us in this bipartisan lift to get rid of the integration ban.

Our bill also evens the playing field for cable operators and broadcasters during sweeps weeks by removing a government restriction on cable's ability to drop broadcast signals during the Nielsen sweeps.

Additionally, broadcast stations in a single market will no longer be able to negotiate jointly with pay-TV providers. Pay-TV subscribers will no longer have to worry about losing more than one signal should a programming distributor be unable to reach its retransmission consent agreement with a broadcast station.

These can be very contentious matters, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to say that the STELA Reauthorization Act is yet another example of working together, getting true bipartisanship, with support from all sectors of the communications industry.

This type of collaboration has long been the hallmark of our subcommittee and full committee, and I am pleased to see this legislative result. I can only urge the Senate to act swiftly and pass this bill into law before the end of the year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act, a bill that allows satellite providers to continue to offer broadcast television programming to their subscribers.

Americans across the country will benefit from reauthorizing the expiring communications and copyright statute that allows satellite customers to have access to broadcast content, but it particularly benefits rural communities, a concern of many of us in this body. Folks from Vermont are going to benefit by this. They rely heavily on satellite for access to video programming.

The STELA Reauthorization Act is the work product of two committees, the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Because of the bill's complexity, both substantively and procedurally, the Communications and Technology Subcommittee held a series of hearings starting early last year to examine the various issues affecting our Nation's ever-evolving video marketplace. As a result, H.R. 4572 includes several targeted provisions designed to improve regulatory parity in the video marketplace.

One, the bill prohibits two noncommonly owned broadcasters from jointly negotiating for retransmission consent with cable and satellite companies.

Two, the bill also includes a compromise on the deadline for broadcasters to unwind certain joint sales agreements in an attempt to keep intact the FCC's local broadcast ownership rules.

The final provision we are voting on today strengthens the waiver process both for the broadcasters seeking to maintain their joint sales agreements, as well as for the FCC looking to streamline waiver applications.

In addition, the bill eliminates the FCC's integration ban for cable set-top boxes, a rule that was designed to help promote a retail market for cable set-top boxes that regrettably is not working as intended.

To allow independent manufacturers of set-top boxes a chance to compete, the FCC requires both cable companies and third-party set-top box manufacturers to rely on the same piece of technology to decrypt their signals, called the CableCARD.

Not only has this regime not resulted in the kind of competition Congress envisioned, energy experts told us that the CableCARD actually creates significant energy inefficiencies. So our bill takes this rule off the books, but does not place any forward-looking restrictions on the FCC's authority to continue to promote retail competition for set-top boxes.

These narrow changes only begin to scratch the surface of the broken video marketplace. In my view, Congress should revisit the entire video regime and update the corresponding laws to better represent the 21st century marketplace, to drive competition, and, most importantly, to provide more benefits to consumers.

The various stakeholders, from distributors to programmers to broadcasters and content providers, have all been able to reap financial rewards, as they should, in this video marketplace, but my concern and the concern of many of us is that the consumer has been left out of the equation.

They have paid, on average, twice the rate of inflation annually for cable over the past 20 years. I understand there are a lot of costs that go into the overall rate to consumers, but it is time for the consumers' concerns to be heard and responded to.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN for working with Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO and Democrats—thank you, gentlemen—on the bipartisan compromise on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill today, but I do hope

that this is only the beginning, and we can work together on a more comprehensive bill to address the broken aspects of the video marketplace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the leader of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the STELA Reauthorization Act is a very important piece of must-pass legislation that ensures that millions of satellite TV subscribers continue to receive broadcast TV programming from their chosen satellite provider.

The bill represents the best of what our committee does—work together to produce a bipartisan bill that does indeed strengthen our economy and streamline our laws for the innovation age.

In addition to extending the laws that permit satellite providers to bring broadcast signals to hard-to-reach customers, the bill also makes targeted reforms to our Nation's woefully outdated communications laws.

As our committee prepares for an updated Communications Act, these reforms are small examples of some of the deregulatory changes that we can make to spur investment and communications networks and promote competition.

□ 1515

The bill eliminates the costly cableCARD integration ban that has increased the cost of cable-leased settop boxes and made them less energy efficient, evens the playing field for cable and satellite providers when it comes to protecting broadcast signals during Nielsen sweeps, brings fairness to retransmission consent negotiations by barring broadcast stations from jointly negotiating with programing distributors, and ensures that broadcasters who have had their business models upended by recent FCC actions indeed have adequate time to make the changes necessary to comply with the new rules.

This bill is good policy, and we hope that the Senate will take quick action to enact this must-pass law for the millions depending on satellite television.

I want to particularly thank Subcommittee on Communications and Technology Chairman WALDEN from Oregon, Ranking Members HENRY WAXMAN and ANNA ESHOO, and our respective staffs for their bipartisan work from the start on this very important legislation.

I am proud of this product. As we work toward the Comm Act update to modernize our Nation's communications law for the innovation era, continued cooperation will be very critical to our success. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleague from New York (Mr. NADLER), rise in support of this bipartisan legislation for several reasons.

To begin with, section 119 of the Copyright Act expires on December 31. It is particularly important for unserved households, namely, customers who can't receive an over-the-air-signal of a local network. Thus, if Congress fails to act, millions of Americans stand to lose access to their broadcast television service.

H.R. 4572 responds to this problem, in pertinent part, by extending for 5 years the section 119 license authorization, thereby ensuring continued service to millions of Americans.

The other reason that I support this bill is that it is a good example of how Congress can work on a bipartisan basis and produce legislation offering effective solutions.

There are many issues regarding the relationship between broadcast television stations and distributors that would benefit from similar efforts by stakeholders working together to see if consensus can be obtained. In particular, I have long argued that content creators should be compensated appropriately for their works. Negotiations in the free market can often best ensure that artists and content creators are fairly compensated. In some cases, we have seen consumers pulled into the middle of such negotiations. No one wants this to happen. It is not good for consumers, nor is it good for the parties involved.

Finally, this legislation comports with two important guiding principles: consumers should be protected, and competition should be safeguarded.

All of us consumers benefit from increased competition because it typically facilitates lower prices, while also generating more innovation, variety, and options. Consumers want the flexibility to watch programming on their choice of television sets, phones, and tablets, no matter where they are.

We should also recognize that many consumers very much value local news and sports programming and the need for local channels to deliver community service and emergency information. Thus, we should continue to consider ways to increase programming options for subscribers to cable or satellite television.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONYERS. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the House is considering joint Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committee legislation to ensure that our rural constituents continue to have access to network channels on America's two satellite carriers.

Title II of the legislation extends the expiring section 119 copyright license for another 5 years, as this committee has done on previous occasions, most recently in 2010. This license ensures that when our constituents do not have access to a full complement of local network television stations, they can have access, through satellite television carriers, to distant network television stations. This helps ensure that consumers in rural areas, like my congressional district, have the same access to news and entertainment options that consumers in urban areas enjoy.

Without enactment of this legislation, many of our constituents would potentially lose access to certain networks altogether on December 31 when the current license expires. I would like to point out that, although numerous stakeholders interested in video issues have contacted the Judiciary Committee on a variety of issues, they all agree that this license should not expire at the end of this year.

Other issues of interest in this area will be the subject of further discussions as the Judiciary Committee continues its ongoing review of our Nation's copyright laws.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON, and the chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, Mr. WALDEN, for their efforts on this reauthorization as well, and I look forward to continuing to work with them on this issue that is important to all of our constituents.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014, as amended, which renews for another 5 years the statutory license that allows satellite providers to retransmit distance signals into a local broadcast area in certain circumstances.

The satellite distant-into-local license contained in section 119 of the Copyright Act is set to expire on December 31 of this year. Among other things, that license allows satellite carriers to provide an out-of-market station to customers who are not served by local television broadcasts.

Enacted in 1988 when the satellite industry was in its infancy, the section 119 license was intended to foster competition with the cable industry and also to increase service to unserved households, those subscribers who cannot receive an over-the-air signal of a local network. In 2010, as was the case on three prior occasions, Congress extended the section 119 license for another 5 years.

In granting cable and satellite providers the statutory right to retransmit copyrighted content at a government-regulated rate, Congress created an exception to the general rule that creators have exclusive rights to their works, including the right to determine when and how to distribute them.

This licensing system replaces the free market, something that we are generally reluctant to do. When we did so for cable and satellite providers, these industries were just starting up and the licenses were intended to encourage growth, foster competition, and enhance consumer access.

On these fronts, the system has been a tremendous success. It is estimated that nearly 90 percent of American households now subscribe to a pay-TV service provided by multichannel video programming distributors, in most cases, cable or satellite operators. Nearly all households have a choice of at least three different providers.

Nonetheless, the dramatic recent changes in marketplace dynamics, as well as technological advantages that revolutionize ways of distributing video content, raise legitimate questions about whether the statutory licensing system in the Copyright Act is still needed or should be changed.

I support this 5-year reauthorization of the section 119 distant-into-local satellite license. We still need answers as to how many households would actually lose one or more of the four major network channels if section 119 were not renewed. I, nonetheless, support this 5-year reauthorization because it will ensure that consumers who are receiving service by virtue of the section 119 license retain that service when the agreements providing for that service expire at the end of the year.

I hope we use the time afforded by this renewal to make the modifications to see if we have to keep the statutory license and keep away from the free market or modify the statutory license in the future. For the time being, we ought to extend it and renew this license now.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 4572.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act.

For the last several months, Members of Congress have been earnestly engaged in collaborative discussions and a great deal of work regarding the reauthorization of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act. This must-pass legislation is key to ensuring that over 1.5 million consumers of satellite television service do not lose access to programming they rely on when the current measure is set to expire at the end of this year.

Through Chairmen UPTON'S and WALDEN'S thoughtful leadership, the STELA Reauthorization Act also includes a few discrete and narrow reforms to laws governing the video marketplace. These reforms represent a critical step forward in modernizing our communications laws to reflect the rapidly evolving, dynamic, and competitive communications marketplace we have today.

I am especially pleased that a provision from my bipartisan bill, H.R. 3196, with Congressman GENE GREEN was included in this measure to eliminate the current set-top box integration ban. Repealing this outmoded technological mandate will foster greater investment and innovation in the set-top box market but, more importantly, will help decrease the cost of delivery to consumers.

Since the FCC adopted the integration ban, we have seen a tremendous amount of progress and competition in the video marketplace organically developed outside the set-top box retail market, all absent government regulation. Now, given the myriad devices and means through which consumers can access video content, the integration ban is an unnecessary regulation that does not reflect the state of competition, technological advancements, or consumer demands of today.

The elimination of the integration ban, along with the few other targeted reforms included in STELA, underscores the bipartisan commitment to ensuring that our communication laws maximize the potential for investment, innovation, and consumer choice.

I once again commend Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN for their leadership in this effort.

Our priority in reauthorizing STELA has long been to ensure a continuity of service for satellite subscribers, and today's vote marks a critical step toward fulfilling that responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. LATTA and Mr. GREEN for their very good work in making a good bill better. I want to also salute Mr. UPTON and Mr. WALDEN for their good work, working closely in partnership with Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. ESHOO.

We have no further speakers, so I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for his kind words and his good work on this legislation. Certainly, I recognize our counterparts on the Democratic side, Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. ESHOO, who have worked tirelessly on this bill, as well as their staff: Shawn Chang, Margaret McCarthy, and David Grossman. Also, our staff, David Redl; my senior policy adviser, Ray Baum; and Grace Koh, all of whom have spent a lot of time working this through.

It seems interesting that we get to this point and it kind of goes naturally, but there is a lot of work that went in to getting it to this point. So I thank our staff and the Members who worked with us in a very good-spirited way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to approve this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Seventeen months ago, the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology embarked on a process to reauthorize the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (STELA), a law ensuring that approximately 1.5 million satellite subscribers can continue accessing broadcast television signals. By reauthorizing STELA for a period of five years, H.R. 4572 ensures that these mostly rural households do not lose access to broadcast programming when the statute expires on December 31, 2014.

H.R. 4572 also offers several meaningful reforms to the video marketplace. First, the legislation ensures broadcasters cannot team up against pay-TV providers for leverage during retransmission consent negotiations. As retrans revenue is projected to rise to an estimated $7.6 billion by 2019, this provision is an important step toward rebalancing the playing field and ultimately protecting consumers from unacceptable blackouts and increased rates.

Second, the bill eliminates a provision dating back to the 1992 Cable Act which has prevented a cable operator from dropping a broadcast signal during a Nielsen ratings ''sweeps week.'' With no such prohibition for a broadcaster that pulls their signal during a retrans dispute, H.R. 4572 creates regulatory parity and ensures a more level playing field for cable operators and broadcasters.

Finally, while I support provisions intended to modernize the video marketplace, I continue to have deep concerns about repealing the cable set-top box integration ban prior to the industry-wide adoption of a successor to the CableCARD. With an eye to the future, we can fulfill a goal I set out to achieve nearly 20 years ago and that is to give consumers an alternative to renting a set-top box from their local cable company each month.

I thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN for their leadership in bringing H.R. 4572 to the House floor and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act.

The Energy and Commerce Committee worked several months to put together this bipartisan legislation that will reauthorize the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act through the end of this decade. It is necessary that the House and Senate reauthorize STELA, which governs our nation's retransmission regulations, before it expires at the end of this year.

Included in this bipartisan bill is language that closely resembles legislation that I introduced with my Republican colleague, Rep. BOB LATTA, that will repeal the FCC's integration ban.

Once enacted, this provision will end the burdensome integration ban, which has cost consumers and businesses over $1 billion since 2007 and has impeded innovation and energy efficiency.

Section 6 of this legislation is a surgical approach that will end this antiquated tech mandate while preserving FCC's authority in the retail set-top box market.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 4572 today. It balances the needs of competing stakeholders and most importantly, protecting what's in the best interest of the American people, while reauthorizing must-pass legislation and waiting for a more appropriate vehicle to address our nation's retransmission consent laws and regulations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 4572, the Satellite Reauthorization Act or ''STELA Act.''

First, I would like to thank Chairman COBLE and Ranking Member NADLER for holding two Judiciary Committee hearings in the past year where we have examined the laws and related issues relating to satellite television codified in Title 17 of the United States Code.

The relevant part of STELA expires at the end of the year but I am sure that those in the industry would have us do something before then, preferably before the lame duck session after November.

I would note the inclusion of a provision in this bill which some consumer groups find objectionable because it repeals the integration ban which deprives consumers of choice.

This is from the Energy and Commerce Committee—though hopefully it will be worked out before the President signs—because consumers must not be deprived of choices.

And now that the Supreme Court has decided the Aereo case, we have another set of variables on the table.

I mention the Aereo case because it is the seminal case due to its timing but it also reminds us of how ephemeral our work can be in this Committee and this Congress.

Back in 1992 and through all of the other reauthorizations of STELA and the concurrent surge of innovation from the late 1990s until present day—who could have contemplated the existence of an Aereo, HULU, Netflix, or Pandora?

In doing so we are able to take a walk down the memory lane of analog and digital television, the role of cable and satellite providers, vis-a-vis their network partners.

It is useful to note that in the 18th Congressional District of Texas my constituents are able to avail themselves of DISH, Comcast, ATT, and even Phonoscope which I believe is one of the oldest in the nation and a Houston, Texas company since 1953.

In looking at these laws, we must note the role of the Copyright Office which released a widely-read report on the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act in August 2011 as ordered by the last reauthorization, and the GAO report which focused on consumer issues.

Americans from Houston, Texas, Chicago, New York, the Bay Area, and all across this great nation benefit from a broadcast system which consists of the laws which undergird the system, buffeted by the policy and practices by which transmitters, providers, artists, writers, musicians, and other creators of all stripes benefit.

The system stands on principles of balance and fairness which allow for continued innovation while not infringing on the property rights of others.

In my state, I see satellite dishes in urban and rural areas but it seems like a higher percentage of rural homes have DISH or DIRECTV than in the cities and towns. Is that an accurate observation and if so, why?

What is the justification for a 30-foot outdoor rooftop antenna being the standard for measuring whether a home can get a broadcaster over-the-air signal?

Who has 30-foot antennas on their rooftops these days? Can folks even go out and buy those and install them easily?

Shouldn't the standard reflect the consumer realities and be changed to a regular indoor antenna that can be picked up at most electronics stores?

What are the criteria for a household to be considered ''unserved''? Does the current definition of unserved households adequately account for those homes that do not receive over-the-air signals?

This will be the 6th reauthorization of STELA but to my knowledge there has never before been a discussion of these blackouts, because they simply didn't happen in the past like they do today. We've gone from zero blackouts to 12 in 2010 and now 127 in 2013.

Viewers in my state have experienced their fair share of blackouts and I stand with them in saying: we don't like them.

We must all agree that blackouts must stop.

The statutory framework for the retransmission of broadcast television signals has been based on a distinction between local and distant signals.

The signals of significantly viewed stations and the signals of in-state, out-of-market stations in the four states that satellite operators were allowed to import into orphan counties under the exceptions in SHVERA, originate outside the market into which they are imported; in that regard, they are distant signals and they have been subject to the Section 119 distant signal statutory copyright license.

Since significantly viewed stations and the ''exception'' stations can be presumed to be providing programming of local or state-wide interest to counties in particular local markets, arguably that content could be viewed as local to the counties into which they are imported and should be treated accordingly.

STELA modified the Copyright Act to treat those signals as local, moving the relevant provisions from Section 119 to Section 122.

If a broadcaster opts to negotiate a retransmission consent agreement, cable companies are no longer required to broadcast that signal pursuant to the must-carry requirement.

Furthermore, if negotiations for retransmission consent fail, cable companies are not permitted to retransmit the broadcast signals that they have not been granted a license to retransmit. This is precisely what has happened in the dispute between Time Warner Cable and CBS Broadcasting.

My concern is that when retransmission consent negotiations fail, consumers often look to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to mediate the dispute. However, the FCC actually has very little authority over retransmission consent negotiations.

The Communications Act requires that programming be offered on a non-discriminatory basis, and that the negotiations be conducted in good faith.

The FCC has the authority to enforce both of these requirements, but does not appear to have the authority to force the companies to reach an agreement, or the ability to order the companies to continue to provide programming to consumers who have lost access while the dispute is being resolved.

Therefore, as was seen in the debacle that was the TWC–CBS negotiation, unless negotiations are not occurring in ''good faith'' the FCC has little power over retransmission consent agreements.

STELA clarified that a significantly viewed signal may only be provided in high definition format if the satellite carrier is passing through all of the high definition programming of the corresponding local station in high definition format as well; if the local station is not providing programming in high definition format, then the satellite operator is not restricted from providing the significantly viewed station's signal in high definition format.

The United States Copyright Office has proposed that Congress abolish Sections 111 and 119 of the Copyright Law, arguing that the statutory licensing systems created by these provisions result in lower payments to copyright holders than would be made if compensation were left to market negotiations.

According to the Copyright Office, the cable and satellite industries no longer are nascent entities in need of government subsidies, have substantial market power, and are able to negotiate private agreements with copyright owners for programming carried on distant broadcast signals.

Congress must have a role in the broadcasting space but whether that is doing away with compulsory licensing or becoming even more involved is what needs to be discussed.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose suspending the rules to pass H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act.

In many rural areas—including large portions of my district—satellite television carriage of local stations is one of the only sources for up-to-the-minute news and weather. It is vital we maintain this link.

Currently, a number of counties in Nebraska are assigned to designated market areas based in another state. Consumers within these ''orphan'' counties, such as Cherry County, are unable to receive local broadcast programming from within the State of Nebraska.

While H.R. 4572 makes improvements to existing law, this satellite reauthorization is another missed opportunity to address the needs of orphan county consumers who wish to receive in-state broadcast programming over satellite. I am disappointed the STELA Reauthorization Act was again considered under suspension of the rules, whereby no member was able to address this issue on the floor through the amendment process.

It was my hope the House would consider satellite reauthorization under a rule which allowed us to consider proposals like H.R. 4635, the Orphan County Telecommunications Rights Act, of which I am a cosponsor. Under this legislation, orphan counties could petition the FCC to modify which channels are considered to be part of their local DMA.

Unfortunately, the current system for determining DMAs forces some of my constituents in Nebraska to watch local broadcast programming from cities in Colorado or South Dakota which are often hundreds of miles away.

I understand STELA must be reauthorized by the end of this year to ensure satellite television viewers have continued access to local stations. However, because I believe the STELA Reauthorization Act should have been brought up under a rule to enable us the opportunity to consider needed changes to the bill for my constituents, I would have opposed the motion to suspend the rules had a recorded vote been called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4572, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

SECURING ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENTS AND AMERICAN JOBS ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1022) to develop an energy critical elements program, to amend the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1022

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate Congressional committees'' means the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) CENTER.—The term ''Center'' means the Critical Materials Information Center established under section 102(b).

(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Energy.

(4) ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENT.—The term ''energy critical element'' means any of a class of chemical elements that have a high risk of a supply disruption and are critical to one or more new, energy-related technologies such that a shortage of such element would significantly inhibit large-scale deployment of technologies that produce, transmit, store, or conserve energy.

(5) HUB.—The term ''Hub'' means the Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub authorized in section 102(a).

(6) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(7) PROGRAM.—The term ''program'' means the program authorized in section 101(a).

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

TITLE I—ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENTS

SEC. 101. ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENTS PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized in the Department a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to assure the long-term, secure, and sustainable supply of energy critical elements sufficient to satisfy the national security, economic well-being, and industrial production needs of the United States. This program may be carried out primarily by the Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub authorized in section 102(a).

(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The program shall focus on areas that the private sector by itself is not likely to undertake because of technical and financial uncertainty and support activities to—

(A) improve methods for the extraction, processing, use, recovery, and recycling of energy critical elements;

(B) improve the understanding of the performance, processing, and adaptability in engineering designs using energy critical elements;

(C) identify and test alternative materials that can be substituted for energy critical elements and maintain or exceed current performance; and

(D) engineer and test applications that—

(i) use recycled energy critical elements;

(ii) use alternative materials; or

(iii) seek to minimize energy critical element content.

(3) EXPANDING PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall encourage multidisciplinary collaborations of participants, including opportunities for students at institutions of higher education.

(4) CONSISTENCY.—The program shall be consistent with the policies and programs in the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980 (30 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(5) INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall collaborate, to the extent practicable, on activities of mutual interest with the relevant agencies of foreign countries with interests relating to energy critical elements.

(b) PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a plan to carry out the program.

(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(A) the research and development activities to be carried out by the program during the subsequent 2 years;

(B) the expected contributions of the program to the creation of innovative methods and technologies for the efficient and sustainable provision of energy critical elements to the domestic economy; and

(C) how the program is promoting the broadest possible participation by academic, industrial, and other contributors.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In preparing each plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with appropriate representatives of industry, institutions of higher education, Department of Energy national laboratories, professional and technical societies, other Federal agencies, and other entities, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that the activities carried out under this title are coordinated with, and do not unnecessarily duplicate the efforts of, other programs within the Federal Government.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act the following sums:

(A) For fiscal year 2015, $25,000,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2016, $25,000,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2017, $25,000,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2018, $25,000,000.

(E) For fiscal year 2019, $25,000,000.

(2) Availability. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 102. CRITICAL MATERIALS ENERGY INNOVATION HUB.

(a) CRITICAL MATERIALS ENERGY INNOVATION HUB.—To carry out the program, the Secretary is authorized to maintain a Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub.

(b) CRITICAL MATERIALS INFORMATION CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To collect, catalogue, disseminate, and archive information on energy critical elements, the Hub shall establish and maintain a Critical Materials Information Center.

(2) CENTER ACTIVITIES.—

(A) In general. The Center shall—

(i) serve as the repository for scientific and technical data generated by the research and development activities funded under this section;

(ii) assist scientists and engineers in making the fullest possible use of the Center's data holdings;

(iii) seek and incorporate other information on energy critical elements to enhance the Center's utility for program participants and other users;

(iv) provide advice to the Secretary concerning the program; and

(v) host conferences, at least annually, for participants in the program and other interested parties to promote information sharing and encourage new collaborative activities.

(B) RESTRICTION.—Not more than 2.5 percent of the amounts made available pursuant

to this section may be used for hosting conferences under subparagraph (A)(v).

(c) REVIEW AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—An award made to operate the Hub shall be for a period not to exceed 5 years, after which the award may be renewed, subject to a rigorous merit review. A Hub already in existence on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that Hub. Following this process, if the Secretary determines that award renewal for the Hub is justified, then the Secretary must submit a report to the appropriate Congressional committees at least 30 days prior to the award renewal which explains the Secretary's determination and describes the Department's review process.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—No funds provided pursuant to this section may be used for construction of new buildings or facilities for the Hub. Construction of new buildings or facilities shall not be considered as part of the non-Federal share of a Hub costsharing agreement.

SEC. 103. SUPPLY OF ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENTS.

The President, acting through the Critical Material Supply Chain Subcommittee of the Committee on Environment, Natural Resources, and Sustainability of the National Science and Technology Council, shall—

(1) coordinate the actions of applicable Federal agencies to promote an adequate and stable supply of energy critical elements necessary to maintain national security, economic well-being, and industrial production with appropriate attention to a long-term balance between resource production, energy use, a healthy environment, natural resources conservation, and social needs;

(2) identify energy critical elements and establish early warning systems for supply problems of energy critical elements;

(3) establish a mechanism for the coordination and evaluation of Federal programs with energy critical element needs, including Federal programs involving research and development, in a manner that complements related efforts carried out by the private sector and other domestic and international agencies and organizations;

(4) promote and encourage private enterprise in the development of an economically sound and stable domestic energy critical elements supply chain;

(5) promote and encourage the recycling of energy critical elements, taking into account the logistics, economic viability, environmental sustainability, and research and development needs for completing the recycling process;

(6) assess the need for and make recommendations concerning the availability and adequacy of the supply of technically trained personnel necessary for energy critical elements research, development, extraction, and industrial production, with a particular focus on the problem of attracting and maintaining high quality professionals for maintaining an adequate supply of energy critical elements; and

(7) report to the appropriate Congressional committees on activities and findings under this section.

TITLE II—NATIONAL MATERIALS AND MINERALS POLICY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL MATERIALS AND MINERALS POLICY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1980.

(a) PROGRAM PLAN.—Section 5 of the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980 (30 U.S.C. 1604) is amended—

(1) by striking ''date of enactment of this Act'' each place it appears and inserting ''date of enactment of the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2014'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology'' and inserting ''National Science and Technology Council'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''the Federal Emergency'' and all that follows through ''Agency, and'';

(B) by striking ''appropriate shall'' and inserting ''appropriate, shall'';

(C) by striking paragraph (1);

(D) in paragraph (2), by striking ''in the case'' and all that follows through ''subsection,'';

(E) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(F) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(G) by amending paragraph (2), as redesignated, to read as follows:

''(2) assess the adequacy and stability of the supply of materials necessary to maintain national security, economic well-being, and industrial production.'';

(4) by striking subsection (d); and

(5) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(b) POLICY.—Section 3 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Congress declares that it'' and inserting ''It''; and

(2) by striking ''The Congress further declares that implementation'' and inserting ''Implementation''.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The matter before paragraph (1) of section 4 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 1603) is amended

(1) by striking ''For the purpose'' and all that follows through ''declares that the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(2) by striking ''departments and agencies,'' and inserting ''departments and agencies to implement the policies set forth in section 3''.

SEC. 202. REPEAL.

The National Critical Materials Act of 1984 (30 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1022, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2014, addresses the supply of energy critical elements in the United States.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee, for his diligent work on this legislation.

I also want to thank Mr. HULTGREN, who introduced his own critical elements bill in the last Congress, for his initiative on this subject.

Energy critical elements are important to energy-related technologies, communications technologies, and America's weapons systems. These technologies range from photovoltaic cells and fluorescent lighting to fiber optics, aircraft engines and turbines, computers, and electric vehicles. Energy critical elements encompass a broad set of the elements, including rare earth elements.

Growth in demand for rare earths in a volatile market warrants particular attention and concern. China currently produces more than 90 percent of the global supply of rare earths. This is a result of a deliberate and decades-long strategy to develop its geologic reserves, undercut market prices, and drive out competition. Testimony before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee indicated that China has manipulated the market in recent years. It has reduced its export quotas and increased levies on rare earth oxides. This has caused wild price swings, market instability, and supply uncertainty.

This behavior is a potential threat to the United States' ability to acquire many rare earths that both our energy sector and military rely upon. While a responsive market will continue to move towards solutions, there are reasonable and proper steps that the Federal Government can and should pursue in this area. These are reflected in this bipartisan bill.

This bill establishes a program under the Department of Energy that supports activities to improve the methods of extraction, use, and recycling of energy critical elements. It improves the understanding of performance, processing, and adaptability in the engineering of these elements, and it identifies and tests alternative materials that could replace energy critical elements. However, the legislation stipulates that the program shall only focus on areas where the private sector is unlikely to undertake these activities because of technical or financial uncertainty.

It also authorizes the Secretary of Energy to establish a Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub that maintains a critical materials information center. This center collects, stores, and disseminates information on energy critical elements for scientists and researchers. In carrying out this program, the Secretary is directed to ensure that the activities are coordinated and do not duplicate other programs within the Federal Government.

Finally, the legislation requires the President, through the National

Science and Technology Council, to coordinate the actions of involved Federal agencies. The administration also will identify and monitor the supply of energy critical elements, encourage private sector development, and promote the recycling of these elements.

This bill helps ensure that the United States remains globally and economically competitive and that our energy sector and military have the critical elements that they need.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for their efforts on this legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2014.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH for working with me on this bill for over a year. We introduced this in March 2013. We have talked a number of times about this bill, and I appreciate the attention the majority staff has shown to get this bill to the floor. I also appreciate the work of our ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, on the minority side, and that of Congressman HULTGREN, as well as the work of Mrs. LUMMIS, the chair of the Energy Subcommittee. We have truly worked in a bipartisan manner to move this bill to the floor.

Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that energy critical elements are crucial to powering our cell phones? to powering our airplanes and to producing renewable energy?

They include elements, many of which I never learned about in my chemistry class in high school, like cobalt, lanthanum, and helium. These elements are critical to the innovation economy and to our national defense, but here is the problem. Today, almost entirely all of them are imported from other countries like China. It is time to get America into the game.

I introduced this bill to help ensure that the United States continues to have access to materials that are essential to technologies we rely upon every day. These materials are also crucial to developing new technologies that will help make us leaders in the clean energy economy of the future, helping to create good jobs here in America.

I also want to note an important distinction from this bill and a bill that passed in the House in the 111th Congress in 2010. There are three big differences: one, this bill does not have any loan guarantees; two, this bill does not spend a single new dollar; and three, this bill does not create a new program. Those are important distinctions from the bill that passed in the 111th Congress.

Many Americans may not realize just how dependent we are upon energy critical elements. One of these elements, No. 3 on the periodic table and represented here on this poster, is lithium. The cell phones, laptops, and other mobile devices upon which we all greatly rely and use—not to mention the energy storage systems for many commercial aircraft—all require lithium to function effectively. To make these products here in America and not cede leadership across the world, we need to have access to lithium.

We also can't lose sight of how important these elements are in enabling a new era of energy production and use. From advanced solar energy technologies to natural gas and wind turbines, nuclear reactors, and state-of-the-art batteries for electrical and hybrid vehicles, a series of specific elements in limited supply are currently irreplaceable, and we need to ensure continued access to them even as we work to develop substitute materials wherever possible.

It is not just about commercial products and explicit energy production. Rhenium, No. 75 on the periodic table, which is represented here on this poster, is used to make parts for jet engines, including the jets that provide America's air superiority for our Air Force and Navy. Having access to this metal, thus, has an important national security component.

A subset of these critical elements, with names like neodymium and terbium, is what are considered rare earth elements. Incidentally, there is nothing rare about these elements in the sense that they are only found in one or two places in the world but, rather, that, in many instances, they aren't found in sufficient quantities to make them minable and, where they are, doing so would be cost prohibitive and a very long-term endeavor.

As one example, I have a poster here representing terbium, No. 65 on the periodic table. It is a silvery metal. Most people probably have never heard of it, but it is used in high-efficiency lighting and, as exemplified on this poster, in wind turbines, among many other energy uses.

One country, China, has recognized the importance of these rare earth elements, and it has put vast amounts of resources into becoming the world's leading supplier of them. As a result, China is currently responsible for the mining and distribution of 97 percent of rare earth elements. Predictably, China hasn't been shy about using this monopoly as leverage against its international competitors. In fact, just a few years ago, China temporarily cut off rare earth supplies to Japan, the European Union, and the United States, further highlighting the potential consequences of relying so heavily upon a single nation for rare earth production and driving up the costs for American manufacturers.

The bipartisan version that we are discussing here today, H.R. 1022, provides a strong and sustainable path forward for helping ensure that the United States maintains a sufficient, reliable supply of energy critical elements. It explicitly authorizes in law the Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub—a collaboration among national laboratories, universities, research institutes, and private companies that has been up and running since early last year—and subjects this hub to a rigorous merit review process prior to renewal for an additional 5 years. Essentially, there are tight controls in place to make sure we always have the oversight of this hub.

Let me pause here and emphasize this point as there seems to be some confusion. There are tight controls that will be in place in authorizing this hub. Again, I want to remind the Speaker that there are no new programs, no loan guarantees, and not a new dollar spent.

My bill requires the Department of Energy to develop and regularly update a strategic plan in this area, and it authorizes the hub to maintain a critical materials information center to aid in the collection and dissemination of data to ensure that all of our Nation's researchers in the public and private sectors have access to the most up-to-date information. Finally, my bill charges the National Science and Technology Council with ensuring the appropriate interagency coordination with research activities.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time, there are no other individuals on this side who wish to speak on this bill, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1022 and two other Science, Space, and Technology bills being considered today.

Earlier this year, all of my Democratic committee colleagues joined me in introducing H.R. 4159, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2014. Two of the bills being considered today are similar or identical to provisions we included in our COMPETES bill, and the third bill similarly reflects a longstanding bipartisan effort, and I will speak briefly about each of the three bills.

First, I would like to speak in support of H.R. 1022, a bill that would authorize a research and development program to explore ways to sustain our supply of materials that is critical to a wide range of advanced energy technologies.

According to a recent study by the American Physical Society and the Materials Research Society, the U.S. is currently dependent on other countries for more than 90 percent of most of these types of materials. We are particularly dependent on China, which has demonstrated a willingness to at least temporarily cut off our supply of these energy critical elements in the recent past, so this bill is a timely contribution to our national, economic, and energy security.

I would like to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. SWALWELL, for introducing this important piece of legislation, as well as Chairman SMITH and his staff for working diligently with us to bring it to the floor today.

□ 1545

Next, I want to thank Mr. BUCSHON for introducing H.R. 5035, a bill to reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

NIST is our Nation's oldest science agency and plays a very important role in U.S. innovation and competitiveness through advancing measurement science and providing unique measurement facilities to industry.

While we don't often think about measurement science, it is critically important. Anytime a technology is developed, measurement science is needed to ensure that the technology is working as intended and is compatible with existing systems. NIST plays a role in fields from bioscience to forensics to automobile safety technology.

NIST has also taken leadership roles in crosscutting Federal efforts in cybersecurity and advanced manufacturing.

H.R. 5035 reauthorizes and makes important updates to the program at NIST, including the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, which helps small- and medium-sized manufacturing companies create and retain American jobs.

My one concern with H.R. 5035 is the low authorization level. I hope that when this bill goes to conference with the Senate we can agree to give NIST an authorization level that allows it to fully realize its critical role in U.S. innovation and competitiveness. In the meantime, because the policy changes in this bill are good and important, I support it.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. KILMER for introducing H.R. 5120, a bill to provide important new tools to accelerate commercialization of new technologies developed by DOE laboratories and programs in partnership with the private sector.

This bill closely mirrors several critical provisions in the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2014, as well as the Senate's bipartisan America INNOVATES Act sponsored by Senators COONS and RUBIO.

It also reflects a number of recommendations found in a recent report produced by the Center for American Progress, the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, and The Heritage Foundation, three groups that you don't often find in the same line of authors.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH and many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as the other side of the Capitol, for working with us to produce a strong bill that we can support. All three of these bills are products of strong bipartisan efforts, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas, the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for the comments that she just made. They are much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, but I am prepared to yield back.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker I will include an article from The Wall Street Journal in support of H.R. 1022 in the RECORD. This is a December 5, 2013, Wall Street Journal article titled, ''China Still Dominates Rare-Earth Processing.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 5, 2013]

CHINA STILL DOMINATES RARE-EARTH PROCESSING

(By James T. Areddy)

SHENZHEN, China.—When U.S. Rare Earths Inc. begins mining on the border of Montana and Idaho about two years from now, the U.S. will gain a new domestic, non-Chinese source of minerals essential to making electronic devices and weaponry components.

But at the moment, there's virtually no place for these minerals to be processed into something useful—except China.

China's share of global rare-earth output has been shrinking recently as miners elsewhere capitalized on fears the country controls too much global supply. Even so, China still dominates the complex—and often polluting—middle steps that turn mined material into useful ingredients, including metals and magnets. For example, China supplies about 80% of the specialized magnets produced with rare-earth ingredients like neodymium that are used in everything from elevators to cruise missiles.

''It's amazing people haven't connected these dots,'' said U.S. Rare Earths Chief Executive Kevin Cassidy. His company plans to build facilities in the U.S. to handle difficult middle-stage processes, but that will be expensive and require numerous regulatory approvals.

Three years ago China shocked high-technology industries by tightening export controls on a group of 17 elements called rare earths that sent their prices rising as much as tenfold, prompting then-U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to dub the scare a ''wake up call.''

Miners responded by racing to find new rare-earth sources in the U.S. and elsewhere. Industry authority Dudley Kingsnorth says those new sources already cut China's share of global supply to 86% from 93% between 2011 and 2012. China's export policies are the subject of a continuing dispute between Beijing, Washington and others before the World Trade Organization. The WTO in October ruled illegal certain restrictions on Chinese rare-earth exports, though Beijing is expected to appeal the largely symbolic decision.

But when it comes to processing rare earths, China faces little competition—and Wang Qin's greasy hands illustrate why. The 45-year-old machinist for Feller Magnets Corp. in the southern city of Shenzhen runs dozens of machines that slice magnetic blocks made with rare earth into razor-thin discs that his company says will be installed in mobile phones.

While his computerized saws can meet precision specifications for Feller's high-technology customers, the machines also slick its factory floors with oil. Basins of acids and extreme heat feature in other parts of the facility. The company, which says half its output is sold in China compared with only 30% in recent years, didn't respond to a request for comment on factory conditions.

China's dominance in a field with a poor environmental record illustrates one way it plays key roles more generally in global manufacturing. China tops world output of chemicals and fertilizers, as well as making lead-acid batteries and harvesting of scrap computer parts for metal. Business executives say that China's backbone in intermediate industries, including rare-earth processing, allows it to draw in related businesses that depend on the products and thereby deepening its importance to production supply chains from computers to automobiles.

In 2010 Beijing significantly crimped exports of rare-earth minerals citing environmental reasons to clean up a chaotic industry. Seeing prices of the elements soar, investors funded dozens of mine exploration projects around the world.

Since then, a California mine and one in Australia have ramped up, with others in South Africa, Vietnam, India and Kazakhstan now in the construction phase, according to Gareth Hatch, an industry investor and principal at Illinois-based Technology Metals Research LLC. But he said many prospectors who rushed after 2010 to bring new supplies to market wrongly assumed, ''if you build the mine, the downstream supply chain will magically appear outside of China.''

A number of U.S. defense contractors declined to comment on industry trends. Northrop Grumman Corp. and Lockheed Martin Corp. referred questions to the Aerospace Industries Association, which pointed to a September report from the U.S. Congressional Research Service that said ''most rare earth materials' processing is performed in China, giving it a dominant position that could affect world-wide supply and prices.''

A Defense Department spokesman said the military continually monitors the situation while citing an ''increasingly diverse and robust domestic and global supply chain for rare earth materials.'' A March 2012 military report highlighted positive trends ''for a market capable of meeting future U.S. Government demand.''

While Mr. Kingsnorth, executive director of Industrial Minerals Company of Australia, estimates China's share of world production could slide to 63% by 2016, he points out that China continues to dominate the nine steps between mining rare earths and producing something with the material.

After ore is pried from the ground and unwanted minerals are sifted away to make a

concentrate of minerals, complex acid and chemical treatments are required to separate individual rare earths into quantities that are useful. Many of the 17 rare earths share such similar physical properties that separating individual elements can require several months and 1,000 chemical treatments.

Outside China, few places have the industrial capacity to separate the elements. Companies in the U.S., Russia, France, Japan and elsewhere handle some of these steps, but China is the only place that has the industrial capacity to do them all.

Among those producing fresh output is U.S.-based Molycorp Inc. Yet Molycorp exports some of the neodymium and samarium from its giant deposit in California's Mojave Desert to its processing facilities in China.

''The downstream does take longer to develop,'' says Constantine Karayannopoulos, who until this month was Molycorp's interim chief executive officer and is now vice chairman.

Molycorp said it spent $1.5 billion to build a separation facility in California, and Mr. Karayannopoulos estimates a quarter to a third of that cost is related to ensuring the plant operates to high environmental standards, which include recycling wastewater. Still, Molycorp says it is cheaper to make some of its materials at its facilities in China. Mr. Karayannopoulos also estimates around 60% of that output is sold to multinational companies already in China.

''I can't overemphasize how complex supply chains are,'' said Mr. Karayannopoulos.

A big effort to reduce China's role in the intermediate steps of processing rare earths is being undertaken by Australia's Lynas Corp. with a plant opened last year in Malaysia to handle separation processes. But local environmentalists decry the facility as dangerous, and Lynas says it has processed only a fraction of its output there this year. Lynas says none of its material is being sent to China for separation.

Increasingly, China is taking steps to expand into more profitable aspects of the rare-earth business that follow the separation processes, instead of exporting those raw materials. Mr. Kingsnorth likens such efforts to European winemakers: ''France doesn't sell any grapes,'' he said.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, efforts that went into bringing this bill to the floor reflect what our constituents at home want to see from us here in Washington, a bill that was introduced in March of 2013, a bill where revisions were made, compromises were made. The loan guarantee part of the bill was taken out at the request of the majority staff so that we could bring this bill to the floor in a bipartisan way.

I am proud that I can go home and tell my constituents I was able to work with my colleagues on a bill that will advance American innovation, American energy security, and national security.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. If you want to go home and tell your constituents that you were part of a bipartisan bill that protects American innovation, manufacturing, energy security, and national security, vote for this bill.

If you want to go home and tell your constituents that you are a part of seeing jobs go over to China and ceding leadership in energy, critical elements, then you should vote against this bill.

But I think this Congress wants to take back leadership when it comes to where we get our energy. That is why I am supporting this bill. That is why I am grateful that the chairman brought this bill to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan H.R. 1022.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1022, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NIST REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5035) to reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5035

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''NIST Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2014.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce $850,000,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2014.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) $651,000,000 shall be for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) $56,000,000 shall be for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) $143,000,000 shall be for industrial technology services activities, of which $128,000,000 shall be for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce $855,800,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2015.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) $670,500,000 shall be for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) $55,300,000 shall be for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) $130,000,000 shall be for industrial technology services activities, of which $130,000,000 shall be for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l).

SEC. 3. STANDARDS AND CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT.

Section 2 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''authorized to take'' and inserting ''authorized to serve as the President's principal adviser on standards policy pertaining to the Nation's technological competitiveness and innovation ability and to take'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''compare standards'' and all that follows through ''Federal Government'' and inserting ''facilitate standards-related information sharing and cooperation between Federal agencies''; and

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking ''Federal, State, and local'' and all that follows through ''private sector'' and inserting ''technical standards activities and conformity assessment activities of Federal, State, and local governments with private sector''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (21), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (24); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

''(22) participate in and support scientific and technical conferences;

''(23) perform pre-competitive measurement science and technology research in partnership with institutions of higher education and industry to promote United States industrial competitiveness; and''.

SEC. 4. VISITING COMMITTEE ON ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.

Section 10 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''15 members'' and inserting ''not fewer than 11 members'';

(B) by striking ''at least 10'' and inserting ''at least two-thirds''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''The Committee may consult with the National Research Council in making recommendations regarding general policy for the Institute.''; and

(2) in subsection (h)(1), by striking '', including the Program established under section 28,''.

SEC. 5. POLICE AND SECURITY AUTHORITY.

Section 15 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278e) is amended—

(1) by striking ''of the Government; and'' and inserting ''of the Government;''; and

(2) by striking ''United States Code.'' and inserting ''United States Code; and (i) for the protection of Institute buildings and other plant facilities, equipment, and property, and of employees, associates, visitors, or other persons located therein or associated therewith, notwithstanding any other provision of law.''.

SEC. 6. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 18, 19, and 19A and inserting the following:

''SEC. 18. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director may support, promote, and coordinate activities and efforts to enhance public awareness and understanding of measurement sciences, standards, and technology by the general public, industry, and academia in support of the Institute's mission.

''(b) RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may award research fellowships and other forms of financial and logistical assistance, including direct stipend awards, to—

''(A) students at institutions of higher education within the United States who show promise as present or future contributors to the mission of the Institute; and

''(B) United States citizens for research and technical activities of the Institute.

''(2) SELECTION.—The Director shall select persons to receive such fellowships and assistance on the basis of ability and of the relevance of the proposed work to the mission and programs of the Institute.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, financial and logistical assistance includes, notwithstanding section 1345 of title 31, United States Code, or any contrary provision of law, temporary housing and local transportation to and from the Institute facilities.

''(c) POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—The Director shall establish and conduct a post-doctoral fellowship program, subject to the availability of appropriations, that shall include not fewer than 20 fellows per fiscal year. In evaluating applications for fellowships under this subsection, the Director shall give consideration to the goal of promoting the participation of underrepresented students in research areas supported by the Institute.''.

SEC. 7. PROGRAMMATIC PLANNING REPORT.

Section 23(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278i(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The 3-year programmatic planning document shall also describe how the Director is addressing recommendations from the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology established under section 10.''.

SEC. 8. ASSESSMENTS BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

(a) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a single, comprehensive review of the Institute's laboratory programs. The review shall—

(1) assess the technical merits and scientific caliber of the research conducted at the laboratories;

(2) examine the strengths and weaknesses of the 2010 laboratory reorganization on the Institute's ability to fulfill its mission;

(3) evaluate how cross-cutting research and development activities are planned, coordinated, and executed across the laboratories; and

(4) assess how the laboratories are engaging industry, including the incorporation of industry need, into the research goals and objectives of the Institute.

(b) ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENTS.—Section 24 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278j) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 24. ASSESSMENTS BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Institute shall contract with the National Research Council to perform and report on assessments of the technical quality and impact of the work conducted at Institute laboratories.

''(b) SCHEDULE.—Two laboratories shall be assessed under subsection (a) each year, and each laboratory shall be assessed at least once every 3 years.

''(c) SUMMARY REPORT.—Beginning in the year after the first assessment is conducted under subsection (a), and once every two years thereafter, the Institute shall contract with the National Research Council to prepare a report that summarizes the findings common across the individual assessment reports.

''(d) ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENTS.—The Institute, at the discretion of the Director, also may contract with the National Research Council to conduct additional assessments of Institute programs and projects that involve collaboration across the Institute laboratories and centers and assessments of selected scientific and technical topics.

''(e) CONSULTATION WITH VISITING COMMITTEE ON ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.—The National Research Council may consult with the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology established under section 10 in performing the assessments under this section.

''(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of each assessment, the Institute shall transmit the report on such assessment to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.''.

SEC. 9. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

Section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 25. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Director and, if appropriate, through other officials, shall provide assistance for the creation and support of manufacturing extension centers, to be known as the 'Hollings Manufacturing Extension Centers', for the transfer of manufacturing technology and best business practices (in this Act referred to as the 'Centers'). The program under this section shall be known as the 'Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership'.

''(2) AFFILIATIONS.—Such Centers shall be affiliated with any United States-based public or nonprofit institution or organization, or group thereof, that applies for and is awarded financial assistance under this section.

''(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the Centers is to enhance competitiveness, productivity, and technological performance in United States manufacturing through—

''(A) the transfer of manufacturing technology and techniques developed at the Institute to Centers and, through them, to manufacturing companies throughout the United States;

''(B) the participation of individuals from industry, institutions of higher education, State governments, other Federal agencies, and, when appropriate, the Institute in cooperative technology transfer activities;

''(C) efforts to make new manufacturing technology and processes usable by United States-based small and medium-sized companies;

''(D) the active dissemination of scientific, engineering, technical, and management information about manufacturing to industrial firms, including small and medium-sized manufacturing companies;

''(E) the utilization, when appropriate, of the expertise and capability that exists in Federal laboratories other than the Institute;

''(F) the provision to community colleges and area career and technical education schools of information about the job skills needed in small and medium-sized manufacturing businesses in the regions they serve; and

''(G) promoting and expanding certification systems offered through industry, associations, and local colleges, when appropriate.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Centers shall include—

''(1) the establishment of automated manufacturing systems and other advanced production technologies, based on Institute-supported research, for the purpose of demonstrations and technology transfer;

''(2) the active transfer and dissemination of research findings and Center expertise to a wide range of companies and enterprises, particularly small and medium-sized manufacturers; and

''(3) the facilitation of collaborations and partnerships between small and medium-sized manufacturing companies and community colleges and area career and technical education schools to help such colleges and schools better understand the specific needs of manufacturers and to help manufacturers better understand the skill sets that students learn in the programs offered by such colleges and schools.

''(c) OPERATIONS.—

''(1) FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide financial support to any Center created under subsection (a). The Secretary may not provide to a Center more than 50 percent of the capital and annual operating and maintenance funds required to create and maintain such Center.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall implement, review, and update the sections of the Code of Federal Regulations related to this section at least once every 3 years.

''(3) APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any nonprofit institution, or consortium thereof, or State or local government, may submit to the Secretary an application for financial support under this section, in accordance with the procedures established by the Secretary.

''(B) COST SHARING.—In order to receive assistance under this section, an applicant for financial assistance under subparagraph (A) shall provide adequate assurances that non-Federal assets obtained from the applicant and the applicant's partnering organizations will be used as a funding source to meet not less than 50 percent of the costs incurred. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the costs incurred means the costs incurred in connection with the activities undertaken to improve the competitiveness, management, productivity, and technological performance of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

''(C) AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—In meeting the 50 percent requirement, it is anticipated that a Center will enter into agreements with other entities such as private industry, institutions of higher education, and State governments to accomplish programmatic objectives and access new and existing resources that will further the impact of the Federal investment made on behalf of

small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

''(D) LEGAL RIGHTS.—Each applicant under subparagraph (A) shall also submit a proposal for the allocation of the legal rights associated with any invention which may result from the proposed Center's activities.

''(4) MERIT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall subject each such application to merit review. In making a decision whether to approve such application and provide financial support under this section, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) The merits of the application, particularly those portions of the application regarding technology transfer, training and education, and adaptation of manufacturing technologies to the needs of particular industrial sectors.

''(B) The quality of service to be provided.

''(C) Geographical diversity and extent of service area.

''(D) The percentage of funding and amount of in-kind commitment from other sources.

''(5) EVALUATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Center that receives financial assistance under this section shall be evaluated during its third year of operation by an evaluation panel appointed by the Secretary.

''(B) COMPOSITION.—Each such evaluation panel shall be composed of private experts, none of whom shall be connected with the involved Center, and Federal officials.

''(C) CHAIR.—An official of the Institute shall chair the panel.

''(D) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—Each evaluation panel shall measure the involved Center's performance against the objectives specified in this section.

''(E) POSITIVE EVALUATION.—If the evaluation is positive, the Secretary may provide continued funding through the sixth year.

''(F) PROBATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funding unless the Center has received a positive evaluation. A Center that has not received a positive evaluation by the evaluation panel shall be notified by the panel of the deficiencies in its performance and shall be placed on probation for one year, after which time the panel shall reevaluate the Center. If the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the panel, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center or may close the Center.

''(G) ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—After the sixth year, a Center may receive additional financial support under this section if it has received a positive evaluation through an independent review, under procedures established by the Institute.

''(H) EIGHT-YEAR REVIEW.—A Center shall undergo an independent review in the 8th year of operation. Each evaluation panel shall measure the Center's performance against the objectives specified in this section. A Center that has not received a positive evaluation as a result of an independent review shall be notified by the Program of the deficiencies in its performance and shall be placed on probation for one year, after which time the Program shall reevaluate the Center. If the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the review, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center or may close the Center.

''(I) RECOMPETITION.—If a recipient of a Center award has received financial assistance for 10 consecutive years, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center consistent with the plan required in this Act. Incumbent Center operators in good standing shall be eligible to compete for the new award.

''(J) REPORTS.—

''(i) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the NIST Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan as to how the Institute will conduct reviews, assessments, and reapplication competitions under this paragraph.

''(ii) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall contract with an independent organization to perform an assessment of the implementation of the reapplication competition process under this paragraph within 3 years after the transmittal of the report under clause (i). The organization conducting the assessment under this clause may consult with the MEP Advisory Board.

''(iii) COMPARISON OF CENTERS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the NIST Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report providing information on the first and second years of operations for centers operating from new competitions or recompetition as compared to longstanding centers. The report shall provide detail on the engagement in services provided by Centers and the characteristics of services provided, including volume and type of services, so that the Committees can evaluate whether the cost-sharing ratio has an effect on the services provided at Centers.

''(6) PATENT RIGHTS.—The provisions of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply, to the extent not inconsistent with this section, to the promotion of technology from research by Centers under this section except for contracts for such specific technology extension or transfer services as may be specified by statute or by the Director.

''(7) PROTECTION OF CENTER CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the following information obtained by the Federal Government on a confidential basis in connection with the activities of any participant involved in the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership:

''(A) Information on the business operation of any participant in a Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program or of a client of a Center.

''(B) Trade secrets possessed by any client of a Center.

''(8) ADVISORY BOARDS.—Each Center's advisory boards shall institute a conflict of interest policy, approved by the Director, that ensures the Board represents local small and medium-sized manufacturers in the Center's region. Board Members may not serve as a vendor or provide services to the Center, nor may they serve on more than one Center's oversight board simultaneously.

''(d) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to such sums as may be appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies and, under section 2(c)(7), from the private sector for the purpose of strengthening United States manufacturing.

''(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(A) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES.—The Director shall determine whether funds accepted from other Federal departments or agencies shall be counted in the calculation of the Federal share of capital and annual operating and maintenance costs under subsection (c).

''(B) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR.—Funds accepted from the private sector under section 2(c)(7), if allocated to a Center, may not be considered in the calculation of the Federal share under subsection (c) of this section.

''(e) MEP ADVISORY BOARD.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Institute a Manufacturing Extension Partnership Advisory Board (in this subsection referred to as the 'MEP Advisory Board').

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The MEP Advisory Board shall consist of not fewer than 10 members broadly representative of stakeholders, to be appointed by the Director. At least 2 members shall be employed by or on an advisory board for the Centers, at least 1 member shall represent a community college, and at least 5 other members shall be from United States small businesses in the manufacturing sector. No member shall be an employee of the Federal Government.

''(B) TERM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) or (D), the term of office of each member of the MEP Advisory Board shall be 3 years.

''(C) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

''(D) SERVING CONSECUTIVE TERMS.—Any person who has completed two consecutive full terms of service on the MEP Advisory Board shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the one-year period following the expiration of the second such term.

''(3) MEETINGS.—The MEP Advisory Board shall meet not less than 2 times annually and shall provide to the Director—

''(A) advice on Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership programs, plans, and policies;

''(B) assessments of the soundness of Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership plans and strategies; and

''(C) assessments of current performance against Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program plans.

''(4) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In discharging its duties under this subsection, the MEP Advisory Board shall function solely in an advisory capacity, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the MEP Advisory Board.

''(5) REPORT.—The MEP Advisory Board shall transmit an annual report to the Secretary for transmittal to Congress within 30 days after the submission to Congress of the President's annual budget request in each year. Such report shall address the status of the program established pursuant to this section and comment on the relevant sections of the programmatic planning document and updates thereto transmitted to Congress by the Director under subsections (c) and (d) of section 23.

''(f) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish, within the Hollings Manufacturing

Extension Partnership, under this section and section 26, a program of competitive awards among participants described in paragraph (2) for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

''(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Participants receiving awards under this subsection shall be the Centers, or a consortium of such Centers.

''(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this subsection is to add capabilities to the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, including the development of projects to solve new or emerging manufacturing problems as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, the MEP Advisory Board, and small and medium-sized manufacturers. One or more themes for the competition may be identified, which may vary from year to year, depending on the needs of manufacturers and the success of previous competitions. Centers may be reimbursed for costs incurred under the program.

''(4) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for awards under this subsection shall be submitted in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Director shall require, in consultation with the MEP Advisory Board.

''(5) SELECTION.—Awards under this subsection shall be peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The Director shall endeavor to have broad geographic diversity among selected proposals. The Director shall select proposals to receive awards that will—

''(A) improve the competitiveness of industries in the region in which the Center or Centers are located;

''(B) create jobs or train newly hired employees; and

''(C) promote the transfer and commercialization of research and technology from institutions of higher education, national laboratories, and nonprofit research institutes.

''(6) PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION.—Recipients of awards under this subsection shall not be required to provide a matching contribution.

''(7) GLOBAL MARKETPLACE PROJECTS.—In making awards under this subsection, the Director, in consultation with the MEP Advisory Board and the Secretary, may take into consideration whether an application has significant potential for enhancing the competitiveness of small and medium-sized United States manufacturers in the global marketplace.

''(8) DURATION.—Awards under this subsection shall last no longer than 3 years.

''(g) EVALUATION OF OBSTACLES UNIQUE TO SMALL MANUFACTURERS.—The Director shall—

''(1) evaluate obstacles that are unique to small manufacturers that prevent such manufacturers from effectively competing in the global market;

''(2) implement a comprehensive plan to train the Centers to address such obstacles; and

''(3) facilitate improved communication between the Centers to assist such manufacturers in implementing appropriate, targeted solutions to such obstacles.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'area career and technical education school' has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302); and

''(2) the term 'community college' means an institution of higher education (as defined under section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) at which the highest degree that is predominately awarded to students is an associate's degree.''.

SEC. 10. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REPORTS.

(a) ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION STANDARDIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES REPORT.—Section 3 of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 278g–5) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(b) TIP REPORTS.—Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g); and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking paragraph (5).

SEC. 11. MODIFICATIONS TO GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 8(a) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3706(a)) is amended by striking ''The total amount of any such grant or cooperative agreement may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the program.''.

SEC. 12. INFORMATION SYSTEMS STANDARDS CONSULTATION.

Section 20(c)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''the National Security Agency,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5035, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, I would like to thank the full committee chairman, Mr. SMITH, the full committee ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, and the subcommittee ranking member, Mr. LIPINSKI, for their bipartisan work on this bill.

This bill reauthorizes the National Institute of Standards and Technology, also known as NIST. Whether contributing to the technology of the smoke detector or developing X-ray standards for mammograms, NIST has had a substantial impact on our Nation's scientific and technological developments, industry, and economy for over 100 years.

H.R. 5035 authorizes $850 million for NIST in fiscal year 2014 and $855.8 million in fiscal year 2015. This bill implements changes and updates to ensure responsible use of taxpayer funds during tight fiscal times, while still maintaining a competitive edge in the United States.

H.R. 5035 adds language to emphasize NIST's role in advancing our Nation's technological competitiveness and innovation ability, and enables more information sharing related to technological standards. Additionally, this legislation codifies NIST's outreach and education efforts.

Another critical program in this legislation is the Hollings Manufacturing Partnership, or MEP. This program provides assistance to small, U.S.-based manufacturing companies to help identify and adopt new technologies and manufacturing techniques.

This bill answers a need expressed by the manufacturing community and changes the existing cost share structure within the MEP program so that a 1–1 ratio of Federal and matching funds is held throughout the life of the center.

The bill also includes language to ensure centers are reevaluated and face a new competition every 10 years.

In my State of Indiana, Purdue University serves as the MEP of our region. Clabber Girl, a small business I visited in the Eighth District of Indiana, is a prime example of the important impact MEPs have on our economy. This manufacturer of baking powder, baking soda, and cornstarch has utilized Purdue University's Technical Assistance Program, which has assisted over 12,000 organizations and trained over 26,000 employees since 1986.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, as NIST is an agency critical to the advancement of the United States technology and scientific industries.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5035, legislation that would reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology, also known as NIST.

NIST, founded in 1901, is a nonregulatory Federal agency within the Department of Commerce. Its mission is to promote U.S. innovation and competitiveness by advancing measurement science.

H.R. 5035 makes important changes and updates to NIST programs, including the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP, program. MEP centers work with small- and medium-sized U.S. manufacturers and help them create and retain jobs, increase profits, and save money.

In my district, the 15th Congressional District of California, the California MEP center helped Plastikon, a plastic and contract manufacturing company that provides service to medical, automotive, and electronics industries, revisit its business model after one of its largest customers shut down. The MEP center supported market research, strategic planning and

training, and lean manufacturing for Plastikon. The project increased the company sales by 20 percent.

The MEP program has proven to be a very successful public-private partnership for districts across the country. For every dollar of investment, the MEP program generates almost $19 in new sales and $21 in new client investment. This totals more than $2 billion in new sales every year.

H.R. 5035 helps ensure that the MEP program will continue partnering with the full range of small- and medium-sized manufacturing companies, helping them to innovate and create jobs here in America.

I was pleased that when this bill was considered as a section of the FIRST Act in the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we worked in a bipartisan manner to make improvements to it. That section, as improved, is what we are considering today as a stand-alone bill. I appreciate the majority working with us in this new way.

Although I support the important policy provisions contained in this bill, I am also a little disappointed by the low authorization level. NIST is the one of our Nation's most important, yet least known, agencies. Because of its unrivaled expertise in measurement science, its unique research facilities, and its strong industry partnerships, NIST has been asked by Congress and by one administration after another to take on leadership roles in a number of crosscutting Federal efforts, from cybersecurity to advanced manufacturing.

To adequately support their mission and work in these critical areas, the authorization level for NIST should be closer to the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request and the Senate Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations fiscal year 2015 bill. My hope is that when this bill goes to conference with the Senate we can work on a higher authorization level for NIST.

That said, H.R. 5035 is an important bill that contains sound policy provisions that were developed, again, on a bipartisan basis and that will help ensure NIST's ability to promote U.S. innovation and competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 5035, a bill to reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of the Science, Space, and Technology House Committee for their work in advancing innovation and technology that will keep America strong and competitive into the future.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and former member of the House Committee on Science, where I served for many years, I am well acquainted with the important work done by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

NIST is the nation's premier entity for development of standards that govern the level of reliability, security, and operation of most products sold in the United States and around the world.

Standards development is critical to our nation's leadership in many manufacturing areas. Businesses large and small look to NIST for leadership in coordinating the development of voluntary standards in a wide range of areas that include office equipment, manufacturing materials, and encryption.

Founded in 1901, NIST is a non-regulatory federal agency within the U.S. Department of Commerce. NIST's mission is to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life.

NIST carries out its mission through the following programs through research conducted at:

NIST Laboratories that advance the nation's technology infrastructure and helps U.S. companies continually improve products and services;

The Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, a nationwide network of local centers offering technical and business assistance to smaller manufacturers to help them create and retain jobs; and

The Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, which promote performance excellence among U.S. manufacturers, service companies, educational institutions, health care providers, and nonprofit organizations.

Houston benefits from NIST's work in a wide range of areas.

Houston is known as the ''Energy Capital of the World'' with almost half of its economic activity driven by the energy industry. Houston is home to 40 of the nation's 145 publicly traded oil and gas exploration and production firms, including 11 of the top 25 as ranked by 2011 total assets.

NIST's fossil fuel Standard Reference Materials (SRMs) continue to be in high demand by the petroleum industry and the fossil fuel-based electric utility industries.

The fossil fuel SRM program is now 40 years old, and the current inventory of fossil fuel reference materials includes coals, cokes, residual fuel oils, distillates and gasolines.

To support regulatory and industry requirements for reference materials and standards, NIST produces and maintains a large inventory of fossil fuel SRMs that are certified for crude oils, gasolines, fuel oils, and diesel fuels. The program is continually adapting to meet the rapidly changing needs of the energy sector.

Houston's diverse workforce boasts a variety of skills and occupations. From medical professionals and engineers to production managers and accountants, Houston's labor force fills 2.7 million jobs and counting.

Houston has a world class medical center that serves the health care needs of residents and brings to our city people from around the world for health care.

NIST is responsible for leading the development of the core health IT testing infrastructure that will provide a scalable, multi-partner, automated, remote capability for current and future medical technology testing needs.

The objective of the NIST Health IT Testing Infrastructure Project is to harmonize the efforts of healthcare standards test development and delivery to meet the demands for conformance and interoperability within the healthcare domain.

NIST works in collaboration with health care providers, IT stakeholders such as vendors, implementers, standards organizations and certification bodies to establish a testing infrastructure that will:

Provide a variety of testing services;
Support a broad range of test environments;
Support numerous health data standards;
Provide a component-based user interface;
Support changing user requirements;
Leverage existing testing initiatives;
Provide a method for feedback so that health standards can be improved; and
Roll out tools and resources incrementally.

Houston also hosts universities, research institutions and agencies that rely upon NIST's core areas of work including:

Bioscience Health;
Building and Fire Research;
Chemistry;
Electronics & Communications;
Energy;
Environment and Climate;
Information Technology;
Manufacturing;
Mathematics;
Nanotechnology;
Neuro Research; and
Physics.

NIST's work touches the lives of every person in the United States from the smart electric power grid and electronic health records to atomic clocks, advanced nanomaterials, and computer chips, innumerable products and services rely in some way on the work of this small agency.

I ask that my colleagues join me in support this reauthorization of NIST and that we work together to end the impact on Sequestration on NIST programs.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Chairman of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, LARRY BUCSHON, in support of the reauthorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

Measurement science conducted at NIST contributes to industrial competitiveness by supporting the technical infrastructure for advancements in nanotechnology, global positioning systems, materials sciences, cybersecurity, health information technology, and a variety of other fields.

Research conducted at NIST laboratories has been lauded by independent review panels as being among the best in the world. NIST researchers have been awarded four Nobel prizes in Physics in the last 15 years.

H.R. 5035 codifies education and outreach efforts at NIST and requires a comprehensive review of the NIST laboratory programs by the National Academy of Sciences.

This bill authorizes just over $855 million dollars for NIST in Fiscal Year 2015, this funding level is consistent with the House passed Appropriations bill.

NIST works alongside industry and is recognized as a provider of high-quality information utilized by the private sector. H.R. 5035 reauthorizes the work of this important agency at responsible funding levels.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5035.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORY MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT OF 2014

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5120) to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5120

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORIES.—The term ''National Laboratory'' means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

(A) Ames Laboratory;

(B) Argonne National Laboratory;

(C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;

(D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;

(E) Idaho National Laboratory;

(F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;

(G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;

(H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

(I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;

(K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;

(L) Savannah River National Laboratory;

(M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;

(N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

TITLE I—INNOVATION MANAGEMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 101. UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND ENERGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(b) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7132(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Under Secretary for Science'' each place it appears and inserting ''Under Secretary for Science and Energy''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) establish appropriate linkages between offices under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary; and

''(I) perform such functions and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe, consistent with this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3164(b)(1) of the Department of Energy Science Education Enhancement Act (42 U.S.C. 7381a(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''Under Secretary for Science'' and inserting ''Under Secretary for Science and Energy''.

(2) Section 641(h)(2) of the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17231(h)(2)) is amended by striking ''Under Secretary for Science'' and inserting ''Under Secretary for Science and Energy''.

SEC. 102. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department's current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Technology Transfer Coordinator position; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department's ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

SEC. 103. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the establishment of the independent Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories under section 319 of title III of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, is an important step towards developing a coordinated strategy for the National Laboratories in the 21st century;

(2) Congress looks forward to—

(A) receiving the findings and conclusions of the Commission; and

(B) engaging with the Administration—

(i) in strengthening the mission of the National Laboratories; and

(ii) to reform and modernize the operations and management of the National Laboratories; and

(3) the Secretary should encourage the National Laboratories and federally funded research and development centers to inform small businesses of the opportunities and resources that exist pursuant to this Act.

TITLE II—CROSS-SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS AND GRANT COMPETITIVENESS

SEC. 201. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) TERMS.—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) RESTRICTION.—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act'') shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) EXTENSION.—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended for a term of 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) OVERALL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

SEC. 202. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—On entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 202(a) of the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2014, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)(A)''.

SEC. 203. INCLUSION OF EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early-stage and pre-commercial technology demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.''.

SEC. 204. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

''(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 205. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department to participate in the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program.

TITLE III—ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

SEC. 301. REPORT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the results of the projects developed under sections 201, 202, and 203, including information regarding—

(A) partnerships initiated as a result of those projects and the potential linkages presented by those partnerships with respect to national priorities and other taxpayer-funded research; and

(B) whether the activities carried out under those projects result in—

(i) fiscal savings;

(ii) expansion of National Laboratory capabilities;

(iii) increased efficiency of technology transfers; or

(iv) an increase in general efficiency of the National Laboratory system; and

(2) assess the scale, scope, efficacy, and impact of the Department's efforts to promote technology transfer and private sector engagement at the National Laboratories, and make recommendations on how the Department can improve these activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1600

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5120, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 5120, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act, ensures that the Department of Energy has the tools it needs to allow new start-ups, small businesses, universities, and the general public at large to do what they do best: react to market signals and innovate.

The Federal Government and the national labs fill a vital role doing the basic research needed to maintain America's role as an innovation nation. Far too often, however, the discoveries made in our labs get stuck in our labs.

This is due to a number of reasons, and this bill seeks to break down many of those purely bureaucratic barriers.

By extending the pilot for ACT agreements within DOE, the labs are given the ability to negotiate more flexible contracts with non-Federal entities that would like to take the lab's research and turn it into a viable product.

This legislation would also grant the directors of the national labs the signature authority for many agreements with non-Federal entities. Currently, the Secretary of Energy must make these decisions, so decisions a lab director can make over a phone call in the course of a day must weave their way through unnecessary bureaucracy before they land on the Secretary's desk. This bill would streamline that process.

H.R. 5120 also seeks to improve the Department's relationship with small businesses that can take part in the SBIR/STTR program, and it encourages the Secretary to enter into agreements with the I-Corps program at the National Science Foundation.

Our national labs have been at the cutting edge of technological development, and we must always ensure that development is in the national interest. A discovery lost in the lab is a discovery wasted.

That is why I would like to thank my good friend from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for partnering with me in this effort, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), who were founding members with me in creating the House Science and National Labs Caucus.

Chairmen SMITH and LUMMIS, as well as Ranking Members JOHNSON and SWALWELL, were also key in this legislation coming together and bringing it to the floor. This is a true bipartisan, bicameral effort, as Senators COONS and RUBIO have a similar companion bill on the other side of the Hill.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5120, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2014.

In the report, ''Rising above the Gathering Storm,'' Paul Otellini, the former CEO of Intel, challenged Congress and challenged the Nation to step up the innovation challenge to grow our economy.

Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist George Will wrote, ''Without a change in U.S. Government policy, the next big thing will not be invented here. Jobs will not be created here, and wealth will not accrue here.''

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to produce a bipartisan bill targeted at stepping up to that challenge.

Our national labs are currently doing innovative research that can hit roadblocks on the path to commercialization, on the path to helping small business run with those innovations, so this bill provides important tools to spur and accelerate the transfer of new technologies developed at our national laboratories and to the private sector.

It significantly broadens the range of companies that can participate in a new pilot program with our Federal labs and allows for more flexible partnership agreement terms between the public and private sectors.

The bill also allows labs to use their technology transfer funds for activities that identify and demonstrate potential commercial opportunities for their research and technologies.

These partnerships between our national labs and the business community will help eliminate gaps in funding by facilitating a path for innovative ideas from basic research to commercial application.

Let me tell you why this matters to me. The region I represent is home to the Pacific Northwest National Lab facility, and I have seen firsthand the innovative research being done there.

I have also worked closely with our premier research universities to find ways to enable exciting new partnership opportunities. So going beyond just the labs, this bill removes burdens that currently prevent many universities and other nonprofit research institutions from working with the Department of Energy.

This bill also streamlines management and coordination of DOE's full spectrum of energy activities, from basic research through commercial application, by establishing a single Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

The bill authorizes DOE to partner with the National Science Foundation, so that its researchers can participate in NSF's groundbreaking Innovation Corps program, which matches grant recipients with entrepreneurs to help get their ideas out of the lab and into the marketplace.

Lastly, the bill includes important reporting and accountability measures, so that we will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of each of these new tools and determine any additional steps that we should be taking down the road.

DOE's national laboratories have been the birthplace of some of our most revolutionary technologies. When this research is harnessed by entrepreneurs and business leaders, start-ups with only one or two employees can grow into companies that create hundreds of quality jobs.

We want to make sure that our national labs, our universities, and all federally-funded institutions and initiatives remain an important foundation of our knowledge-based economy.

That is why I was proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation, to give scientists and researchers in both the public and private sectors the tools and the freedom that they need to unlock a new wave of great discoveries.

I would like to close by noting that this is the kind of bipartisan, cooperative work Congress needs to do if we are going to bolster our global competitiveness. Countries around the world are working to recruit and develop the next generation of innovators. If we are going to have any chance of keeping up, we absolutely have to make research and development a top priority.

I am hopeful that we can renew the bipartisan spirit and commitment to making sure tomorrow's cutting-edge technology is developed here, not someplace else.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, our national labs, like Fermilab and Argonne, have been primary drivers of American innovation since the Manhattan Project, but many of their most important discoveries have been made in the past decade.

Research produced there has enormous economic potential, but many times, their discoveries remain stuck in the labs. It is essential that we update cold war-era policies, acknowledge the rapid pace of technological change, and improve the lab's capacity to partner with private enterprise and convert their cutting-edge research into marketplace innovation. This bill does that.

I am so grateful again for the cosponsors, especially Mr. KILMER, for his work on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Once again, I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN, Chairman SMITH, and Ranking Member JOHNSON.

Having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time either, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5120, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2014, enables the Department of Energy (DOE) to more efficiently form partnerships with non-federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Rep. RANDY HULTGREN, for his leadership on this issue. I also thank the Science Committee's Energy Subcommittee Chair, CYNTHIA LUMMIS, for her support for this bill.

The DOE's national laboratory complex, often called "the crown jewels" of our federal research and development infrastructure, comprises 17 labs across the United States.

These labs execute basic and applied research that keeps us on the cutting edge of global technological capabilities. This innovative early stage research is often not well understood by the private sector.

Ideas and products created in the national labs are often slow to reach the market due to a communication gap between the labs and the private sector. Additionally, federal government red tape can discourage the private sector from utilizing these unique state-of-the-art facilities.

This legislation modernizes the labs for today's market by granting operators increased flexibility. This bill:

extends a pilot program to enable more flexible contract terms between lab operators and non-federal entities;

grants lab directors signature authority for agreements with non-federal entities valued at less than $1 million; and

enables labs to demonstrate research for private sector adoption.

This legislation represents bipartisan, bicameral agreement to optimize the performance of the DOE national lab system. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5120, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4803) to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4803

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with Federal law and regulations, for law enforcement officers to qualify for premium pay as criminal investigators, the officers must, in general, spend on average at least 50 percent of their time investigating, apprehending, or detaining individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States.

(2) According to the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS IG), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) does not ensure that its cadre of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection are meeting this requirement, even though they are considered law enforcement officers under TSA policy and receive premium pay.

(3) Instead, TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection primarily monitor the results of criminal investigations conducted by other agencies, investigate administrative cases of TSA employee misconduct, and carry out inspections, covert tests, and internal reviews, which the DHS IG asserts could be performed by employees other than criminal investigators at a lower cost.

(4) The premium pay and other benefits afforded to TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection who are incorrectly classified as such will cost the taxpayer as much as $17,000,000 over 5 years if TSA fails to make any changes to the number of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection, according to the DHS IG.

(5) This may be a conservative estimate, as it accounts for the cost of Law Enforcement Availability Pay, but not the costs of law enforcement training, statutory early retirement benefits, police vehicles, and weapons.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term ''Administration'' means the Transportation Security Administration.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The term ''Inspector General'' means the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security

SEC. 4. INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.

(a) REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall analyze the data and methods that the Assistant Secretary uses to identify employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17) and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, and provide the relevant findings to the Assistant Secretary, including a finding on whether the data and methods are adequate and valid.

(b) PROHIBITION ON HIRING.—If the Inspector General finds that such data and methods are inadequate or invalid, the Administration may not hire any new employee to work in the Office of Inspection of the Administration until—

(1) the Assistant Secretary makes a certification described in section 5 to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Inspector General submits to such Committees a finding, not later than 30 days after the Assistant Secretary makes such certification, that the Assistant Secretary utilized adequate and valid data and methods to make such certification.

SEC. 5. TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION WORKFORCE CERTIFICATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Assistant Secretary shall, by not later than 90 days after the date the Inspector General provides its findings to the Assistant Secretary under section 4(a), document and certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that only those employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17), and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, are classified as criminal investigators and are receiving premium pay and other benefits associated with such classification.

(b) EMPLOYEE RECLASSIFICATION.—The Assistant Secretary shall reclassify criminal investigator positions in the Office of Inspection as noncriminal investigator positions or non-law enforcement positions if the individuals in those positions do not, or are not expected to, spend an average of at least 50 percent of their time performing criminal investigative duties.

(c) PROJECTED COST SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall estimate the total long-term cost savings to the Federal Government resulting from the implementation of subsection (b), and provide such estimate to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTENTS.—Such estimate shall identify savings associated with the positions reclassified under subsection (b) and include, among other factors the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate, savings from—

(A) law enforcement training;

(B) early retirement benefits;

(C) law enforcement availability pay; and

(D) weapons, vehicles, and communications devices.

SEC. 6. INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE USE OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or as soon as practicable, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

(1) any materials in the possession or control of the Department of Homeland Security associated with the Office of Inspection's review of the use of a Federal firearms license by Federal Air Marshal Service officials to obtain discounted or free firearms for personal use; and

(2) information on specific actions that will be taken to prevent Federal Air Marshal Service officials from using a Federal firearms license, or exploiting, in any way, the Service's relationships with private vendors to obtain discounted or free firearms for personal use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentleman for his work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4803, the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014. Again, I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for developing this commonsense bill, which increases accountability within TSA and saves precious taxpayer dollars by requiring the agency to correctly designate criminal investigators within the Office of Inspection.

According to the Department of Homeland Security inspector general, TSA does not ensure that its criminal

investigators in the Office of Inspection are meeting the Federal workload requirements for law enforcement officers, even though they are considered law enforcement officers and are receiving premium pay and other benefits.

If nothing is done to correct this problem, the misclassification will cost taxpayers roughly $17 million over the next 5 years. This type of waste is simply unacceptable.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I held a hearing on this topic and was both surprised and encouraged to hear the head of the Office of Inspection admit that his office would reduce the number of criminal investigator positions based on the office's workload.

Although an acknowledgement is a step in the right direction, TSA needs to go one step further. It is time for them to take real action on this issue and achieve tangible results, which is precisely what this legislation requires.

In addition to ensuring that the proper classification is placed on criminal investigators, the Committee on Homeland Security agreed to an amendment offered by the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, that would require TSA to submit to Congress any materials associated with the Office of Inspection's review of the Federal firearms license by Federal Air Marshals Service officials to obtain discounted or free firearms for their own personal use, as well as specific actions that will be taken to prevent air marshals from exploiting their positions to obtain free or discounted firearms from vendors for their personal use.

I have been concerned with TSA's failure to notify Congress of the ongoing Office of Inspection investigations into potential unethical activity related to the acceptance of free and discounted firearms for personal use among FAMS employees, including senior officials.

I am pleased that this bill would ensure the committee receives access to information that is necessary to carry out its important oversight role, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4803, the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014. The Committee on Homeland Security is tasked with conducting oversight over the various components within the Department of Homeland Security.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I have a particular interest in ensuring that the Transportation Security Administration is operating both effectively and efficiently.

Thanks to the Department of Homeland Security inspector general, we learned late last year that the Office of Inspection is not operating efficiently.

Specifically, we learned that this office was designating some personnel as criminal investigators who did not perform investigative duties to justify such a classification or the salary and benefits conferred a person with that title.

H.R. 4803 seeks to address this problem by requiring the TSA to certify that all persons designated as criminal investigators are working on criminal investigations at least 50 percent of their time.

There is no justification for providing personnel with the enhanced benefits and pay associated with criminal investigators when they are not doing the job of a criminal investigator.

This legislation is not intended to punish the entire Office of Inspection. It recognizes that there are legitimate criminal investigators within the office that have undoubtedly helped to thwart plots and other criminal enterprises that put our Nation at risk. This legislation simply encourages good government and the careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

We need to ensure that the resources are used effectively, so that we can keep citizens safe while operating at maximum efficiency. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership on the subcommittee. I would say the same to my colleague from Louisiana, for their respective pieces of work on this important bill.

As has already been noted by both of my colleagues, H.R. 4803 calls for, I guess, the institution of a fairly simple premise, and that is, we pay for what we get in government.

□ 1615

That is what they do in the private sector. That is what individuals do in the household. And if you stop and think about it, you wouldn't pay somebody who could run a backhoe or a bulldozer—heavy equipment, if you will—if all you needed was somebody who could run a shovel. You wouldn't pay a chemical engineer to come and clean your pool or mix the chemicals in the pool. You wouldn't hire Wolfgang Puck to come over and fix you a piece of grilled cheese. It may be the greatest piece of grilled cheese you could find, but it isn't what you would be paying for.

So this bill incorporates that commonsense notion of, in government, we ought to get what we pay for. And as has already been noted, criminal investigators in this case do not meet Federal standards with regard to the 50 percent threshold.

This bill does a couple of very, very simple things. It sets in place a standard by which to track whether or not they are doing so. And for the work that isn't to that standard, it eliminates this additional pay, the so-called LEAP pay. LEAP pay is law enforcement availability pay. As has already been noted, again, there is a 25 percent premium, but in many cases, this is the tip of the iceberg, because if you look at additional benefits in terms of early retirement or enhanced training, there is a real cost to the taxpayer that goes with continuing the road that we have been on.

This bill attempts to change that. It has teeth, and it freezes any hiring in the Office of Inspection going forward if these changes aren't made. As my colleague from North Carolina just noted, there are real savings: $17 million. It is small by Federal standards, but think about how many neighborhoods it takes to accumulate $17 million in taxes. It is a step in the right direction in saving taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, for all those reasons, I urge additional support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for introducing this piece of legislation and the chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman Hudson, and, of course, our ranking member, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for the bipartisan work on this bill.

What this bill stands for is just a commonsense approach to government and making sure that we pay for what we get, and it is that very simple premise. So I am honored to be standing here today with my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to do something that just makes common sense.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my chairman.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, again, thank you to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for this commonsense legislation. Also, I would like to thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. RICHMOND, for not only his work on this bill, but in the way we have worked together to make a difference for the American people.

The American people sent us to Congress to get things done, to make their lives better, and to make sure we are scrutinizing every tax dollar that is spent here. I think this piece of legislation, as my colleague from Louisiana said, is a commonsense piece of legislation that does just that.

So I am proud to stand here in support of it. I am proud of the work that

Mr. SANFORD put into this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for this piece of legislation.

Mr. SANFORD. All that could be said has been said, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4803, the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014, sponsored by the Gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD.

The DHS Inspector General has reported that TSA's Office of Inspection does not operate efficiently and could save significant tax dollars by reclassifying criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection to other less costly positions while still performing the same work. The DHS IG specifically found that criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection primarily monitor the results of criminal investigations conducted by other agencies, investigate administrative cases of TSA employee misconduct, and carry out inspections, covert tests, and internal reviews.

While each of these functions is important, and in many cases a criminal investigator may be well suited to perform them, they do not represent the equivalent of a criminal investigation and should therefore not be the primary functions of those employees who receive premium pay and other benefits associated with being a criminal investigator.

This bill addresses this issue by requiring a review of these positions by TSA and the DHS Inspector General to determine how many employees should be reclassified.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this common-sense bill, and would like to thank the Congressman from South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, both for his work on this issue and his strong participation in the Committee's oversight and legislative efforts this Congress. I would also like to commend the Gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, for his leadership as well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4803.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4803, the ''TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014''.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina, Representative SANFORD, for his leadership on this legislation.

Upon its creation, TSA was given broad authority to hire, fire, and set the terms of employment of its personnel.

This has resulted in employees, such as Transportation Security Officers, lacking the due process rights afforded other Federal employees.

It has also resulted, in some cases, of abuses of the system for the gain of a few.

According to the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, TSA's Office of Inspection has been gaming the system by employing a bloated number of personnel as ''criminal investigators'' for years.

Those who are designated as ''criminal investigators'' receive additional compensation and are afforded the right to retire early.

H.R. 4803 will put an end to these abuses by requiring the Inspector General to approve the method used by TSA to designate personnel as criminal investigators and by requiring TSA to certify to Congress that only those individuals performing the requisite criminal investigation work are designated as ''criminal investigators''.

According to the Inspector General, properly classifying individuals within TSA's Office of Inspection could save taxpayers as much as $17 million over five years.

During Committee consideration of this measure, I offered an amendment on behalf of Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ that addresses revelations about misuse of Federal Air Marshal Service official's relationships with private vendors to obtain discounted or free firearms by TSA personnel.

Specifically, in April, the committee became aware that the former director of the Federal Air Marshal Service bought several guns from an employee who is under investigation for using his position to obtain free and discounted firearms.

Unfortunately, TSA was less than forthcoming with Congress regarding this investigation, leaving many questions unanswered about how the investigation was conducted and the number of FAMs officials involved.

The exploitation of official relationships for personal gain is a serious matter.

Such misuse occurring within the Federal Air Marshal Service, the Law Enforcement component within TSA is unacceptable.

To address the lack of transparency regarding the investigation, the committee accepted language I offered to require TSA to provide information and materials associated with the Office of Inspection's review of the allegations to Congress.

With that Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4803.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and a former chair of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I rise in support of H.R. 4803, the ''TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2014.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

H.R. 4803 will save the taxpayers hundreds of thousands dollars annually by requiring the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, to conform its personnel classification practices to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions.

According to a report by the Homeland Security Department's Inspector General, IG, about half of the employees in the Office of Inspection, OII, are classified as criminal investigators even though their duties do not involve responsibilities that can be characterized as criminal investigation activities.

Instead, the responsibilities of these employees primarily consist of administrative duties such as investigating cases of TSA employee misconduct and conducting internal reviews.

Classifying these employees as ''law enforcement'' personnel, however, makes them eligible for premium pay and other significant economic benefits.

If TSA fails to reclassify criminal investigator positions as noncriminal investigator positions or non-law-enforcement positions, this will cost taxpayers as much as $17,000,000 over 5 years.

This money could be utilized to ensure that law enforcement agencies, which identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals, have the tools, resources, and training necessary to do their job efficiently, effectively, and economically.

Mr. Speaker, I have always strongly supported providing the resources needed by law enforcement and first responders and will continue to do in future.

But we have an obligation to the American people to be responsible stewards of the public fisc and it is not responsible to provide premium pay and benefits intended for law enforcement personnel to employees who do not perform the dangerous duties of law enforcement officers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4803, which directs the Office of Inspection to reclassify its current criminal investigator positions to conform to the requirements of applicable law and save the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4803, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERARDO HERNANDEZ AIRPORT SECURITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4802) to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4802

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The term ''Administration'' means the Transportation Security Administration.

SEC. 3. SECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE AT AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, conduct outreach to all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures, and provide technical assistance as necessary, to verify such airports have in place individualized working plans for responding to security incidents inside the perimeter of the airport, including active shooters,

acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

(b) TYPES OF PLANS.—Such plans may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons inside the perimeter of the airport, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for non-airport-specific law enforcement and fire response.

(3) A schedule for regular testing of communications equipment used to receive emergency calls.

(4) An evaluation of how emergency calls placed by persons inside the perimeter of the airport will reach airport police in an expeditious manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with travelers and all other persons inside the perimeter of the airport.

(6) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum timeframe for law enforcement response.

(7) A schedule of joint exercises and training to be conducted by the airport, the Administration, other stakeholders such as airport and airline tenants, and any relevant law enforcement, airport police, fire, and medical personnel.

(8) A schedule for producing after-action joint exercise reports to identify and determine how to improve security incident response capabilities.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings from its outreach to airports under subsection (a), including an analysis of the level of preparedness such airports have to respond to security incidents, including active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

SEC. 4. DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON BEST PRACTICES.

The Assistant Secretary shall—

(1) identify best practices that exist across airports for security incident planning, management, and training; and

(2) establish a mechanism through which to share such best practices with other airport operators nationwide.

SEC. 5. CERTIFICATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that all screening personnel have participated in practical training exercises for active shooter scenarios.

SEC. 6. REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an analysis of how the Administration can use cost savings achieved through efficiencies to increase over the next 5 fiscal years the funding available for checkpoint screening law enforcement support reimbursable agreements.

SEC. 7. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, and this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

SEC. 8. INTEROPERABILITY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, conduct a review of the interoperable communications capabilities of the law enforcement, fire, and medical personnel responsible for responding to a security incident, including active shooter events, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints, at all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the review, the Assistant Secretary shall report the findings of the review to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4802, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2014. As chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I introduced this bipartisan bill to improve the state of preparedness at our Nation's airports in response to the shooting that occurred at Los Angeles International Airport in November of last year.

The shooting that occurred at LAX, which took the life of Transportation Security Officer Gerardo Hernandez and wounded three other people, served as a tragic wake-up call to the relative ease with which someone can wreak havoc in one of our Nation's busiest airports.

In March of this year, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security conducted a site visit and field hearing at LAX to examine the response to the incident and better understand the actions that have been taken to improve incident response in the wake of this tragedy. Subsequently, my subcommittee held a followup hearing to receive testimony from additional representatives of the law enforcement and airport communities on security incident response.

Over the course of these activities, through this process, the subcommittee found that while the Federal, State, and local response to the LAX shooting was heroic and swiftly executed, there is room for improvement in how airport operators, TSA, and other stakeholders coordinate the response and communicate in the crucial moments after a major security incident like this.

Based on months of careful review and stakeholder input by the subcommittee, as well as detailed after-action reports by the Los Angeles World Airports and TSA, H.R. 4802 would require the Transportation Security Administration to provide assistance to all airports where TSA performs or oversees screening to verify that each airport has detailed, practiced plans for responding to security incidents. This includes plans for evacuating travelers, establishing unified command, testing radio equipment, and conducting joint exercises among responding agencies.

This legislation would also make TSA a clearinghouse for security incident response and communications best practices, which was a key recommendation from testimony the subcommittee received in May. In addition, the bill would require TSA to certify to Congress that all screening personnel have participated in an active shooter training, which is a requirement TSA appropriately instituted on its own following the LAX shooting.

The bill will also require TSA to assess whether interoperable communications capabilities exist among responding agencies at airports where TSA performs or oversees screening. We know interoperability is an ongoing challenge among many first responders, despite billions being spent to achieve better communications since 9/11, but, at this point, no one has done an overall assessment to determine what weaknesses exist in terms of communications at our Nation's airports.

Finally, the bill requires TSA to examine how it can increase its reimbursement of law enforcement officers who protect the screening checkpoints. These men and women are the front line of defense in protecting the traveling public. While TSA's funding for law enforcement reimbursement has decreased in recent years, the critical role these officers play at our airport checkpoints has never been more important.

This bill is a necessary step towards countering the threats facing our Nation's airports, without placing an undue burden on airport operators, law enforcement, or the taxpayers. In fact, according to TSA, the cost of providing assistance to airports will be incidental and would not require additional appropriations. This bill, nonetheless, makes it clear to TSA that no new funding is being authorized to carry out any of the provisions of this bill and that existing appropriations should be used to carry out this act.

I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MIKE MCCAUL, for his support of this bill and for moving

it through the full committee, as well as the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. RICHMOND, for cosponsoring this legislation and for working with us to produce this important legislation.

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4802, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 2013, an armed gunman entered Los Angeles International Airport with the intent to target and kill transportation security officers.

Tragically, on that day, Officer Hernandez, for whom the bill before us is named, became the first TSA employee to die in the line of duty. After shooting Officer Hernandez, the gunman proceeded past the checkpoint and entered the terminal where he shot and wounded two other transportation security officers and one passenger. The two TSA employees who were shot and wounded selflessly remained at the checkpoint after the shooting began, helping passengers escape to safety.

Despite communications challenges, the men and women of the Los Angeles World Airports' Police Department responded to the incident swiftly, taking the shooter down, and preventing the loss of more innocent lives.

Through our committee's oversight work, we have identified some commonsense steps that could be taken to mitigate any similar incident in the future.

H.R. 4802 embodies these commonsense steps. The bill does so by requiring airports to have plans in place for responding to active shooter scenarios and TSA to: provide information to airports on best practices for responding to a security incident at checkpoints, provide transportation security officers practical training for responding to active shooter scenarios, and conduct a nationwide assessment of the interoperable communications capabilities of the law enforcement, fire, and medical personnel responsible for responding to an active shooter event at an airport.

The requirements contained in H.R. 4802 were informed by post-incident reviews of the LAX shooting conducted by TSA and the airport itself, along with the oversight work of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

In March, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a site visit and field hearing at LAX to see firsthand how the tragedy unfolded and hear from TSA, airport officials, and the American Federation of Government Employees about how the response to a similar incident could be improved going forward.

In May, the subcommittee held a followup hearing on the shooting here in Washington and heard from a diverse array of airport operators and law enforcement to inform us of how a nationwide template for preparedness and response at airports could be most effectively crafted.

I am proud of the product before the House today. It is the result of intense review of the tragic LAX shooting and, if enacted, would result in airports across the Nation being more prepared to respond to a similar incident in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend Subcommittee Chairman HUDSON for the bipartisan and inclusive manner in which he has led the Subcommittee on Transportation Security's oversight and legislative efforts in response to the shooting at LAX.

I was pleased to join Ranking Member THOMPSON and Chairman MCCAUL as a cosponsor of H.R. 4802. I would also like to acknowledge Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, whose district LAX is in, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California, who were both at the subcommittee hearing in California to provide oversight and give their input as to how we can prevent these incidents from happening and give support, of course, to Mr. HUDSON.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this very important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. RICHMOND, for his kind comments and for the great working relationship we enjoy on this committee. It is a privilege to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, with the threats to our Nation's transportation system constantly evolving, we must work to ensure that airport security is prepared to respond effectively and efficiently to a variety of security threats. The shooting at LAX was a tragedy that will not soon be forgotten by those of us who are committed to enhancing security at our Nation's airports and protecting the traveling public. This bill will provide for more extensive collaboration and coordination between airports, law enforcement, first responders, and TSA, which will result in safer airports across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to honor the memory of Transportation Security Officer Hernandez and support this important, bipartisan legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4802, a bill I am pleased to cosponsor.

The shooting at LAX last November not only took the life of Officer Hernandez but also served as a stark reminder of the dangers that the men and women on the front lines of securing our aviation sector face.

Unarmed and exposed, Transportation Security Officers perform the often thankless task of screening 1.8 million passengers per day.

They do so with limited workplace protections and the great responsibility of preventing another terrorist attack on the scale of 9/11.

Given their vulnerability and the critical role they play in protecting our homeland, it is essential that airports and the law enforcement agencies that protect them have the resources, training, and plans in place to ensure a swift and effective response to a security incident.

In March, as the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I had the opportunity to participate in a site visit and field hearing at Los Angeles International Airport that focused on the tragic November 1, 2013 shooting.

We learned that while the response of the individual police officers was heroic, the overall response at LAX left much to be desired.

Panic buttons at the checkpoint were not in working order.

The emergency phone Transportation Security Officers have been trained to use did not display the location of the incident to the command center.

Police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel responding could not communicate via interoperable radios.

The bill before us today represents a bipartisan effort to remedy many of these issues.

Additionally, during committee consideration of the bill last month, Representative PAYNE offered an amendment to the bill requiring TSA to conduct a nationwide assessment of the interoperability capabilities of emergency responders at airports.

I am pleased that the amendment was adopted and is included in the bill before the House today.

Such an assessment will help inform future efforts to address communications gaps at airports.

Before yielding back, I am compelled to point out that it has been over eight months since Officer Hernandez was shot and killed, leaving his wife without a husband and his children without a father.

Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed their condolences to the Hernandez family for their loss.

Indeed, we did so in person during our visit to LAX in March.

What we have not done, however, is provided the Hernandez family with all the potential benefits due when an officer dies in the line of duty.

Under current law, the families of individuals serving a public agency in an official capacity as a law enforcement officer, firefighter, or chaplain receive compensation if their loved one is killed in the line of duty.

The same is true for families of employees of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and members of rescue squads or ambulance crews.

Unfortunately, the law has not been updated to include Transportation Security Officers within the definition of what constitutes a public safety officer.

As a result, the families of TSOs who are killed in the line of duty are not eligible for funds from the Public Safety Officer's Benefits Program.

While I am pleased the Appropriations Committee has included language in its Homeland Security bill addressing this issue for the Hernandez family, I would note that the legislation has not come to the House floor.

There is another, more direct effort underway. H.R. 4026, a bill introduced by Representative BROWNLEY of California, would address this issue directly by designating Officer Hernandez, and his fellow Transportation Security Officers as public safety officers.

That bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, has thirty-seven cosponsors.

Unfortunately, not a single Republican has signed on to support the measure.

I implore my colleagues to support that legislation so that the families of the men and women on the front lines of protecting our aviation sector are properly compensated should tragedy strike.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 4802.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4802, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2014. As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, which builds on some of the most important lessons from the tragic shooting at LAX last November, by helping airports nationwide learn from what happened and make improvements to their own security and emergency response plans.

Having traveled to LAX in March for the site visit and field hearing held by my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, and having had the opportunity to meet with the widow of Officer Hernandez during that trip, I strongly believe we owe it to the traveling public, emergency first responders, law enforcement, and our TSA screening personnel to ensure that the airport environment is as secure as possible and is adequately prepared to respond to security incidents within the airport perimeter.

I would like to commend the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON, for his diligent efforts to address this important issue, and his dedication to strengthening the state of airport security nationwide. I also wish to commend the bipartisan efforts of both the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, Mr. RICHMOND, whose support of this legislation is greatly appreciated. I also commend the hard work done by TSA Administrator Pistole to learn from the shooting, honor the victims, and engage with the TSA workforce and airport community to ensure we are constantly improving our ability to respond to these types of tragic events.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. I would also like to thank Homeland Security Committee Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL, Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON, Transportation Security Subcommittee Chairman RICHARD HUDSON, and Ranking Member CEDRIC RICHMOND for introducing this bill and bringing it to the floor.

I rise to support the passage of H.R. 4802, the Hernandez Airport Security Act.

This bipartisan bill was introduced in response to last year's horrific November 1st shooting incident at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) in my congressional district. The bill was named in honor of Gerardo Hernandez, the Transportation Security Officer (TSO) who was killed in the line of duty on that tragic day. As we debate this bill, we offer our deepest condolences to the family of Gerardo Hernandez, and we honor all of the TSOs, police officers, and other first responders who risked their lives to stabilize the situation and protect the public during that terrible incident.

Following the shooting, Congress conducted several congressional hearings, including a field hearing in my district on March 28, 2014. These hearings revealed serious security lapses at LAX, which interfered with incident response efforts. For example, there were emergency phones and panic buttons that did not work properly, problems in coordination between various police and fire departments, and incompatible radio systems. These security failures are unacceptable.

The Hernandez Airport Security Act requires the Department of Homeland Security to conduct outreach to airports to verify that they have working plans to respond to security incidents, including active shooter incidents, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints like the one where Officer Hernandez was killed.

It is imperative that major airports like LAX have a state-of-the-art emergency response system. The safety and security of our nation's airports and all of the workers and travelers who pass though them is of paramount importance.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and send it to the President's desk.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4802, The Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2014, which improves intergovernmental planning and communication during security incidents at domestic airport.

As a former chair and ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee Transportation Security Subcommittee, I understand how important this bill will be in enhancing safety and protection in the air transit industry, not just for our citizens but for our Transportation Security Officers working in the line of duty.

This legislation, which requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to devote more resources for planning and communication during and in case of threats or emergencies, is prompted by the tragic death of Gerardo I. Hernandez, a Transportation Security Officer who was killed in the line of duty at Los Angeles International Airport in November of 2013.

At just 39 years old, Gerardo Hernandez was the first TSA officer to lose his life in the line of duty in the 12 year history of the agency.

He died from several gunshot wounds inflicted by an assailant while on duty at the Los Angeles International Airport.

Gerardo Hernandez was among those thousands of TSA employees carrying out their mission to keep the airways safe for traveling citizens, and their work across the nation cannot be understated.

On average, TSA officers screen 1.7 million air passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation, which averaged over 637.5 million passengers in 2012.

H.R. 4802 will help ensure that all screening personnel have received training in how to handle potential shooting threats.

The bill also requires TSA to verify that all airports have plans in place to respond to any security threats, and provide technical assistance as necessary to improve those plans.

The bill also directs the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Office of Cybersecurity and Communication to report to Congress the capacity of law enforcement, fire, and medical response teams' communication and response to security threats at airports.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the implementation of H.R. 4802 would cost about $2.5 million in 2015. Of the $2.5 million, an estimated $1.5 million would serve to provide additional technical assistance to airports, and the remaining $1 million would be used to evaluate the interoperability of communication systems used by emergency response teams.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 13 years since our country suffered the tragedy of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

We will never forget how that day changed our lives, and the lives of every American generation to follow.

Security measures in airports across the country have been enhanced dramatically, and the resulting inconvenience is a small price to pay for the protective measures needed to keep the travelling public safe.

It is people like Gerardo Hernandez who do their best to make the necessary screening as least intrusive and burdensome as possible, consistent with the mission of ensuring the security of all members of the flying public.

TSA officers willingly risk their lives to make sure the job gets done, and for that we owe these men and women a debt of gratitude.

In honor of Gerardo Hernandez's contribution to his country, I strongly support this bill and urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4802, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONOR FLIGHT ACT

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4812) to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4812

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Honor Flight Act''.

SEC. 2. HONOR FLIGHT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 44927 the following new section:

''§ 44928. Honor Flight program

''The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall establish, in collaboration with the Honor Flight Network or other not-for-profit organization that honors veterans, a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling on an Honor Flight Network private charter, or such other not-for-profit organization that honors veterans, to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor the service of such veterans.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44927 the following new item:

''44928. Honor Flight program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act. This bill would improve the airport screening processes for veterans traveling to visit our war memorials by providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services.

I am pleased TSA is currently implementing the requirements outlined in this bill by working with the Honor Flight Network to expedite the screening process for veterans visiting war memorials here in Washington, D.C. Codifying this commonsense policy will ease airport access for our Nation's heroes, who have made incredible sacrifices and deserve our utmost respect.

Not only will this legislation help to simplify their passage through airports, it will also improve efficiency by freeing up TSA screeners to focus on real threats. This is a positive step for our veterans and ultimately our transportation and national security.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for his work on this issue, as well as Chairman MCCAUL for moving this bill through the committee.

The Committee on Homeland Security has long advocated for less burdensome airport screening for our men and women in uniform and our veterans. In fact, this bill builds upon previous bipartisan legislation promoted by the committee and signed into law requiring TSA to provide expedited screening to Active Duty military traveling on official orders, as well as severely injured or disabled veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

Each and every day, we are humbled and inspired by the incredible sacrifices of all our veterans. This should serve as a powerful reminder of our duty to do all we can to honor the sacrifices they have made for our freedoms and treat them with the dignity and respect they deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in strong support of H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON, for cosponsoring and supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The Honor Flight Act is a measure that seeks to pay a debt of gratitude to a group of Americans who were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to ensure that we are able to enjoy the freedoms that we have today. Although we may never be able to fully repay our veterans for their bravery, sites such as the National World War II Museum, which we are proud to have in the city of New Orleans, bring into focus their lasting contribution and their impact on American history.

The Honor Flight Network is a nonprofit organization that works with airlines and other nonprofits to transport veterans to Washington, D.C., to visit memorials dedicated to honoring their service and sacrifice. The organization was created in 2005 by Earl Morse, a former physician's assistant with the Department of Veterans Affairs and a private pilot who saw his patients' desire to visit the newly built World War II Memorial and recognized that many of them lacked the resources or support to make the trip on their own.

By the end of 2013, the Honor Flight Network had transported approximately 117,000 of our Nation's heroes to visit their memorials. Estimates from the Honor Flight Network show that number to be well over 120,000 people today. The Honor Flight Network currently prioritizes transporting World War II veterans and veterans who are terminally ill but intends to expand the program to transport veterans of subsequent wars in the future.

Presently, the Transportation Security Administration, under the leadership of Administrator Pistole, expedites the screening process for veterans visiting their memorials in Washington, D.C., via the Honor Flight Network private charter flights, saving them time and showing them the due respect and appreciation they deserve.

This legislation will authorize the collaboration between TSA and the Honor Flight Network in law, thereby ensuring that it becomes a permanent practice.

Before yielding back, I would note that I am especially proud of the bipartisan manner in which this legislation has come to the floor, from its inception and its handling in the subcommittee to today, and I am especially proud that this legislation received unanimous support in committee. I am sure it received unanimous support because it wasn't a political thing to do, it was the right thing to do, and truly bestowing honor on people in this country who truly deserve this honor. But for them, we would not be here today in the capacity that we are. We have to understand and we recognize that it is their sacrifice and their shoulders that we stand upon as a Nation. With that, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we walk around our Nation's Capital and visit the numerous war memorials, we are reminded of the incredible sacrifices that have been made by our veterans over many decades. H.R. 4812 is a simple and commonsense way to recognize and honor those sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for his work authoring this legislation. I am proud that we moved this forward in a bipartisan way. As the gentleman said earlier, this is not a political issue, this is not a partisan issue; this is an issue of right or wrong, and it is right for us to honor our veterans and it is right for us to expedite their travel when they visit Washington, D.C. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4812, the ''Honor Flight Act.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. RICHMOND, for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

We owe a great debt to the men and women of this country who have served to defend our liberty and freedom.

The Honor Flight Network is one organization that attempts to repay these veterans, by

bringing them to Washington, DC, to visit the war memorials commemorating their dedication and sacrifice.

I have seen how these trips have enriched the lives of veterans. In my district, fifty (50) servicemen and women registered with the Honor Flight-Mid South in Tunica, Mississippi.

Enactment of this legislation will, in some small way, express the tremendous appreciation and gratitude that we have for these veterans and their families.

We are all aware of the steps that the Transportation Security Administration takes to ensure the security of the flying public, as well as the amount of time that this process can consume.

We are also aware that the veterans that the Honor Flight Network currently serves are mostly World War II veterans.

These heroes, who in some instances require additional assistance, are often wheelchair-bound, and have other ailments that can make security screening very time-consuming.

To provide these veterans with the dignity and respect they deserve, since 2005, the Honor Flight Network has partnered with TSA to expedite the screening for veterans.

The legislation before us today will ensure that these veterans continue to receive the respect and consideration they deserve when traveling to the capital.

H.R. 4812 represents one of many pieces of legislation that Democratic members of the Committee on Homeland Security have proposed to support veterans.

Former Representative Hochul's ''Clothe a Homeless Hero Act'', signed into law last Congress, ensures that unclaimed clothes that TSA collects at airports are provided to homeless or needy veterans.

Earlier this Congress, Representative GABBARD's ''Helping Heroes Fly Act'' was signed into law by President Obama.

That legislation ensures that severely-injured service members and veterans are provided expedited screening by TSA.

Now we have the opportunity to extend such treatment to our veterans of World War II and, in years to come, to the other selfless men and women who served our country.

Mr. Speaker, we recently commemorated the seventieth anniversary of the D-Day invasion as well as 238 years of American independence.

Let us continue to support and honor the men and women who made these commemorations possible by enacting the ''Honor Flight Act.''

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this measure.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act. This bill would require TSA to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified screening for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service.

As the son of a World War II veteran, I'd like to commend the Congressman from Louisiana, Mr. RICHMOND for his work on this issue, as well as the important work of the Congressman from North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, Chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee.

Having recently witnessed the arrival of an honor flight at Reagan National Airport, I can honestly say that there is nothing more inspiring than seeing these heroic men and women who have made a tremendous sacrifice arriving in our Nation's capital to visit war memorials that are dedicated to their service.

This bill codifies current TSA policy and ensures that TSA continues to take a proactive approach to expediting screening for veterans traveling on Honor Flights. In doing so, it would ensure that TSA spend less time scrutinizing this lower-risk population and more time and energy screening higher-risk passengers and focusing on the real threats to our aviation sector.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am pleased to support such a bipartisan, commonsense effort.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act, which honors our World War II veterans, who have sacrificed much for this country, with a small but significant token of gratitude.

H.R. 4812 requires the Administrator of the Transportation Security Authority to ensure expedited and dignified screening for veterans travelling through airports on special chartered flights to visit war memorials built in their honor.

The Honor Flight program was created in 2005 by Earl Morse, a private pilot and former physician's assistant at the Department of Veterans Affairs. Mr. Morse realized the depth of his patients' desire to visit the newly-built World War II Memorial. However, he realized many of these patients lacked the financial resources to pay for the long trip on their own. Mr. Morse understood what seeing this memorial meant to his patients, so he found a way to facilitate them having that opportunity.

The average soldier in World War II was 26 years old, making many of them in their nineties today. Long airport lines and invasive TSA procedures are tiring for anyone. For our soldiers who fought in war 40, 50, and 60 years ago, especially those now in wheel chairs, it is arduous. Sadly, these long and frustrating security protocols often discourage veterans from making these wonderful and meaningful journeys. Mr. Speaker, our World War II veterans have done their duty. It is our duty now to reduce the hardship they might face in any way we can.

The TSA is doing a wonderful job of ensuring that our airports are secure and safe. Nothing in the Honor Flight Act would change that. The bill seeks to work entirely within their security requirements to ensure safety while minimizing the stress felt by our veterans when visiting a memorial through the Honor Flight program. It is a simple, low cost way to recognize our veterans' service.

I want to thank the Homeland Security Committee for bringing this bill before us today and offer my strong support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the former ranking member and chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act of 2014.

H.R. 4812 authorizes the collaboration between the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the Honor Flight Network, as well as other non-profit organizations that transport veterans to visit memorials, to ensure continued expedited and dignified passenger screening for veterans travelling to Washington, D.C. to visit memorials and other tributes to their bravery, heroism, and sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of veterans across the country fought to protect the freedoms we take for granted and to keep our nation safe. They are deserving of our gratitude for the valor and courage they displayed in risking their lives to keep us free and to liberate captive peoples in other lands.

They are veterans of World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Gulf Wars—Desert Storm, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom.

With each passing day, the number of World War II and Korea veterans declines by the hundreds. For many of these heroes, one of their last wishes is to visit the national war memorials in Washington, D.C.

Honoring and facilitating that request is the least we can do for those who did so much for us.

TSA works with the Honor Flight Network in expediting the screening process for veterans visiting the national war memorials, saving the veterans' time and showing them their due respect and appreciation.

The Honor Flight Network is a non-profit organization dedicated to transporting veterans on charter flights operated by commercial airlines to Washington, D.C. to visit memorials built in honor of their service.

Currently, the Honor Flight Network gives priority to WWII veterans and those from any war who have been diagnosed with a terminal illness.

The Honor Flight Network plans to expand the program in the future to include the veterans who served during the Korean and Vietnam Wars, followed by veterans of the wars in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, my home state of Texas has the second largest number of veterans of any state in the nation, with just over 1.6 million veterans. My home city of Houston is proud to be the residence of more than 300,000 veterans.

I strongly support the bill before us because I strongly support the efforts of TSA and the Honor Flight Network in making real the dreams, and in many cases the last wishes, of thousands of veterans who wish to visit the memorials dedicated by the nation in their honor.

I urge all members to join me in supporting H.R. 4812 so that our veterans continue to receive the security accommodations they need and deserve as they travel to Washington, D.C. to view the national memorials consecrated by their sacrifice in defense of our country.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4812, the Honor Flight Act.

The Honor Flight Network is a non-profit organization dedicated to transporting our military veterans to Washington, D.C. to visit the memorials of their respective wars. The brave men and women who have fought for our country deserve the chance to see the memorials erected in honor of their sacrifices and contributions, and the Honor Flight Network provides that chance.

I have had the opportunity to greet Honor Flights a few times, most recently last October. It truly is a privilege to shake hands with our nation's heroes as they arrive to see their memorials, and I was honored to participate in greeting them. These men and women put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms, and they deserve our deepest gratitude. I believe one small measure we can take to show that gratitude is to make the travel process for Honor Flight participants as smooth and easy as possible.

The commonsense legislation before us today is a step to achieving that goal. It sets in motion a process for expedited passenger screening services by TSA for veterans traveling on an Honor Flight Network charter. It simply makes sense to authorize and facilitate collaboration between TSA and the Honor Flight Network to ensure that our veterans are treated with the respect they have earned and deserve when they come to visit the memorials dedicated to their service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4812 as a token of appreciation for our veterans' service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4812, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EAST BENCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT WATER CONTRACT EXTENSION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4508) to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4508

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

SECTION 1. EAST BENCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONTRACT EXTENSION.

Section 2(1) of the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act (Public Law 112–139; 126 Stat. 390) is amended by striking ''4 years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Hearing that water services delivery could be in jeopardy for 60,000 acres of some of the most productive farmland in my home State of Montana, I was happy to introduce this legislation that ensures that irrigation in southwest Montana is protected.

H.R. 4508 protects irrigation and water supplies in the Beaverhead Valley by extending the district's contract while an updated contract is pending approval by the Montana Water Court. This contract extension is necessary since the Montana court system is in the middle of conducting a necessary State-required review of the new contract between the irrigation district and the United States. This bill does not prejudice the outcome of that examination but keeps in place the existing 1958 contract so area farmers and ranchers in the Beaverhead Valley of Montana have water supply certainty for nearly 60,000 acres.

The legislation has no cost to the Federal Government and is based on congressional precedent. In fact, Congress has extended this 1958 contract a number of times, since an extension provides an irrigation district with an absolute right under Federal law to negotiate a new contract with the Bureau of Reclamation. This bill simply adds 6 additional years to the last extension, thereby extending the 1958 contract until December 31, 2019, or until a new contract is executed.

This bill is the result of hard work that is being done in Montana. I especially want to thank Mr. Bill Hritsco and the East Bench Irrigation District for their leadership and for working with me on this legislation to provide Montana farmers and Montana ranchers with much-needed certainty about their water supply.

Mr. Hritsco, the Dillon, Montana-based attorney representing the Irrigation District, provided expert testimony on this bill before the House Natural Resources Committee earlier this year. The Irrigation District's work with me on this bill represents how Montanans can roll up their sleeves and get good things done. As a result, water will continue to flow in the Beaverhead Valley's fields for years to come if this legislation is enacted. I urge adoption of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4508, introduced by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), would extend the East Bench Irrigation District's water contract, as he has said, for 6 years, pending a judicial ruling. The extension will allow the water to continue to be delivered to nearly 60,000 acres in the Beaverhead Valley of Montana, will protect the right for contract renewal, and will be useful to the residents of the area while the court confirmation process is given time for completion.

I support this legislation. I ask my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4508.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EARLY REPAYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS TO BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4562) to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4562

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

SECTION 1. EARLY REPAYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (referred to in this section as the ''District'') may repay, at any time, the construction costs of project facilities allocated to the landowner's land within the District.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF FULL-COST PRICING LIMITATIONS.—On discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of all construction costs described in subsection (a) that are allocated to all land the landowner owns in the District in question, the parcels of land shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations under Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), including the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (13 U.S.C. 390aa et seq.).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—On request of a landowner that has repaid, in full, the construction costs described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the landowner a certificate described in section 213(b)(1) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) modifies any contractual rights under, or amends or reopens, the reclamation contract between the District and the United States; or

(2) modifies any rights, obligations, or relationships between the District and landowners in the District under Nebraska State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 4562, sponsored by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), allows farmers to repay accelerated or lump sums of capital debt owed to the Bureau of Reclamation.

□ 1645

In many cases throughout the West, current Federal law does not allow landowners to make such early repayments on Federal irrigation projects. These outdated Federal hurdles are similar to a bank prohibiting a homeowner from paying his or her mortgage early.

Congressman SMITH's bill removes the Federal Bureau of Reclamation repayment prohibition for individual landowners within the Northport Irrigation District. In return for such payments, these farmers will no longer be subject to the acreage limitations and the paperwork requirements in the Reclamation Reform Act.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill could generate up to $440,000 in Federal revenue. The bill is based on two recent precedents that passed in both Republican- and Democrat-controlled houses, and today, we should continue those efforts by adopting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 4562 would authorize landowners served by the Northport Irrigation District to prepay the remaining portion of construction costs allocated to them for the North Platte Project.

In exchange, the landowners who pay will no longer be subject to Federal acreage limitations and other requirements associated with the Reclamation Reform Act.

I believe no one from the minority intends to oppose this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), also a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Natural Resources Committee for moving this bill and also to the gentleman from Montana for his remarks.

Under Federal reclamation law, irrigation districts which receive water from a Bureau of Reclamation facility must repay their portion of the capital costs of the water project, typically under long-term contracts.

I introduced this bill to provide members of the Northport Irrigation District early repayment authority under their dated reclamation contract. The contract in question is more than 60 years old and continues to subject landowners to burdensome reporting requirements and acreage limitations without generating revenue to the Federal Government.

Allowing producers within the district to pay off their portion of the contract means the government will receive funds perhaps otherwise uncollected and the landowners will be relieved of costly constraints which threaten family-owned operations.

For example, at a Natural Resources Water and Power Subcommittee hearing earlier this year, one member of the irrigation district testified the acreage limitation will prohibit parents who own land in the district from passing down or selling farmland to sons and daughters who also own land in the same district.

As Mr. DAINES mentioned, similar legislation has passed under bipartisan majorities and, according to the CBO, could generate as much as $440,000 in Federal revenue.

This is a straightforward bill which would make a big difference to some family farmers in Nebraska.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is ready to close, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge approval of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4562.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE—FISH SPRINGS RANCH SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3716) to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3716

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe - Fish Springs Ranch Settlement Act''.

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

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ORIGINAL AGREEMENT.—The term ''Original Agreement'' means the ''Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Fish Springs Ranch Settlement Agreement'' dated May 30, 2007, entered into by the Tribe and Fish Springs (including all exhibits to that agreement).

(2) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe-Fish Springs Ranch 2013 Supplement to the 2007 Settlement Agreement dated November 20, 2013, entered into by the Tribe and Fish Springs, and all exhibits to that Agreement.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ''environmental impact statement'' means the final environmental impact statement for the North Valleys Rights-of-Way Projects prepared by the Bureau of Land Management (70 Fed. Reg. 68473).

(4) FINAL PAYMENT DATE.—The term ''final payment date'' means 30 days after the date on which the Tribe executes the waivers, as authorized in section 4, on or before which Fish Springs shall pay to the Tribe the $3,600,000 and accumulated interest pursuant to subparagraph 4.2 of the Agreement.

(5) FISH SPRINGS.—The term ''Fish Springs'' means the Fish Springs Ranch, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company (or a successor in interest).

(6) FISH SPRINGS WATER RIGHTS.—The term ''Fish Springs water rights'' means the 14,108 acre feet of water available to Fish Springs pursuant to certificates of water rights issued to Fish Springs or its predecessors in interest by the State Engineer for the State of Nevada, copies of which are attached as Exhibit ''G'' to the Original Agreement.

(7) ADDITIONAL FISH SPRINGS WATER RIGHTS.—The term ''additional Fish Springs water rights'' means the rights to pump and transfer up to 5,000 acre feet per year of Fish Springs water rights in excess of 8,000 acre feet per year, up to a total of 13,000 acre feet per year, pursuant to Ruling No. 3787 signed by the State Engineer for the State of Nevada on March 1, 1991, and Supplemental Ruling on Remand No. 3787A signed by the State Engineer for the State of Nevada on October 9, 1992.

(8) HONEY LAKE VALLEY BASIN.—The term ''Honey Lake Valley Basin'' means the Honey Lake Valley Hydrographic Basin described as Nevada Hydrographic Water Basin 97.

(9) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the project for pumping within Honey Lake Valley Basin and transfer outside of the basin by Fish Springs of not more than 13,000 acre feet per year of Fish Springs water rights, including—

(A) not more than 8,000 acre feet as described in the environmental impact statement (but not the Intermountain Water Supply, Ltd., Project described in the environmental impact statement) and the record of decision;

(B) up to the 5,000 acre feet of additional Fish Springs water rights; and

(C) the rights and approvals for Fish Springs to pump and transfer up to said 13,000 acre feet of groundwater per year.

(10) RECORD OF DECISION.—The term ''record of decision'' means the public record of the decision of the District Manager of the United States Bureau of Land Management's Carson City District in the State of Nevada issued on May 31, 2006, regarding the environmental impact statement and the Project.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior (or a designee of the Secretary).

(12) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians organized under section 16 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the ''Indian Reorganization Act''; 25 U.S.C. 476).

(13) TRUCKEE RIVER OPERATING AGREEMENT.—The term ''Truckee River Operating Agreement'' means—

(A) the September 6, 2008, Truckee River Operating Agreement negotiated for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 101–618); and

(B) any final, signed version of the Truckee River Operating Agreement that becomes effective under the terms of the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act.

SEC. 3. RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent that a provision of the Agreement conflicts with this Act, the Agreement is authorized and ratified.

(b) WAIVER AND RETENTION OF CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Agreement, any waiver or retention of a claim by the Tribe relating to the Agreement shall be carried out in accordance with section 4.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—This section, the Original Agreement, and the Agreement satisfy all applicable requirements of section 2116 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 177).

SEC. 4. WAIVER AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS.

(a) WAIVER AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS BY TRIBE AGAINST FISH SPRINGS.—In return for benefits to the Tribe as set forth in the Original Agreement, the Agreement, and this Act, the Tribe, on behalf of itself and the members of the Tribe, is authorized to execute a waiver and release against Fish Springs of the following:

(1) All rights under Federal, State, and other law to challenge the validity, characteristics, or exercise of the Project or use of Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights), including the right to assert a senior priority against or to place a call for water on the Project or Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights) regardless of the extent to which the Tribe has a water right or in the future establishes a water right that is senior to the Project or Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights).

(2) All claims for damages, losses, or injuries to the Tribe's water rights or claims of interference with, diversion of, or taking of the Tribe's water rights, including—

(A) claims for injury to lands or resources resulting from such damages, losses, injuries, or interference with, diversion of, or taking of tribal water rights under the Agreement or Original Agreement; and

(B) claims relating to the quality of water underlying the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation that are related to use of Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights) by the Project or the implementation or operation of the Project in accordance with the Agreement or Original Agreement.

(3) All claims that would impair, prevent, or interfere with one or more of the following:

(A) Implementation of the Project pursuant to the terms of the Agreement or Original Agreement.

(B) Deliveries of water by the Project pursuant to the terms of—

(i) the Agreement;

(ii) the Original Agreement; or

(iii) the February 28, 2006, Water Banking Trust Agreement between Washoe County and Fish Springs.

(C) Assignments of water rights credits pursuant to the terms of the February 28, 2006, Water Banking Trust Agreement between Washoe County and Fish Springs.

(4) All claims against Fish Springs relating in any manner to the negotiation or adoption of the Agreement or the Original Agreement.

(b) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND RETENTION OF CLAIMS BY TRIBE AGAINST FISH SPRINGS.—The Tribe, on its own behalf and on behalf of the members of the Tribe, shall retain against Fish Springs the following:

(1) All claims for enforcement of the Agreement, the Original Agreement or this Act through such remedies as are available in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

(2) Subject to the right of Fish Springs to carry out the Project, and subject to the waiver and release by the Tribe in subsection (a)—

(A) the right to assert and protect any right of the Tribe to surface or groundwater and any other trust resource, including the right to assert a senior priority against or to place a call for water on any water right other than against the Project or Fish Springs water rights;

(B) all rights to establish, claim or acquire a water right in accordance with applicable law and to use and protect any water right acquired after the date of the enactment of this Act that is not in conflict with the Agreement, the Original Agreement or this Act; and

(C) all other rights, remedies, privileges, immunities, powers, and claims not specifically waived and released pursuant to this Act and the Agreement.

(3) The right to enforce—

(A) the Tribe's rights against any party to the Truckee River Operating Agreement;

(B) the Tribe's rights against any party to the Truckee River Water Quality Settlement Agreement; and

(C) whatever rights exist to seek compliance with any permit issued to any wastewater treatment or reclamation facility treating wastewater generated by users of Project water.

(4) The right to seek to have enforced the terms of any permit or right-of-way across Federal lands issued to Fish Springs for the Project and Project water.

(c) WAIVER AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS BY THE TRIBE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.—In return for the benefits to the Tribe as set forth in the Agreement, the Original Agreement, and this Act, the Tribe, on behalf of itself and the members of the Tribe, is authorized to execute a waiver and release of all claims against the United States, including the agencies and employees of the United States, related to the Project and Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights) that accrued at any time before and on the date that Fish Springs makes the payment to the Tribe as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Agreement for damages, losses or injuries that are related to—

(1) the Project, Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights), and the implementation, operation, or approval of the Project, including claims related to—

(A) loss of water, water rights, land, or natural resources due to loss of water or water rights (including damages, losses, or injuries to hunting, fishing, and gathering rights due to loss of water, water rights or subordination of water rights) resulting from the Project or Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights);

(B) interference with, diversion, or taking of water resulting from the Project; or

(C) failure to protect, acquire, replace, or develop water, water rights, or water infrastructure as a result of the Project or Fish Springs water rights (including additional Fish Springs water rights);

(2) the record of decision, the environmental impact statement, the Agreement or the Original Agreement;

(3) claims the United States, acting as trustee for the Tribe or otherwise, asserted, or could have asserted in any past proceeding related to the Project;

(4) the negotiation, execution, or adoption of the Agreement, the Original Agreement, or this Act;

(5) the Tribe's use and expenditure of funds paid to the Tribe under the Agreement or the Original Agreement;

(6) the Tribe's acquisition and use of land under the Original Agreement; and

(7) the extinguishment of claims, if any, and satisfaction of the obligations of the United States on behalf of the Tribe as set forth in subsection (e).

(d) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND RETENTION OF CLAIMS BY TRIBE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.—Notwithstanding the waivers and releases authorized in this Act, the Tribe, on behalf of itself and the members of the Tribe, shall retain against the United States the following:

(1) All claims for enforcement of this Act through such legal and equitable remedies as are available in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

(2) The right to seek to have enforced the terms of any permit or right-of-way across Federal lands issued to Fish Springs for the Project and Project water.

(3) Subject to the right of Fish Springs to carry out the Project, all other rights, remedies, privileges, immunities, powers, and claims not specifically waived and released pursuant to this Act and the Agreement.

(e) EXTINGUISHMENT OF WAIVED AND RELEASED CLAIMS.—Upon execution of the waiver and releases by the Tribe pursuant to subsections (a) and (c) and upon final payment by Fish Springs pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, the United States acting on behalf of the Tribe shall have no right or obligation to bring or assert any claims waived and released by the Tribe as set forth in subsection (a). Upon the effective date of the waivers and releases of claims authorized, the waived and released claims as set forth in subsection (a) are extinguished.

(f) NO UNITED STATES LIABILITY FOR WAIVED CLAIMS.—The United States shall bear no liability for claims waived and released by the Tribe pursuant to this Act.

(g) UNITED STATES RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall affect any rights, remedies, privileges, immunities, or

powers of the United States, including the right to enforce the terms of the right-of-way across Federal lands for the Project granted by the Secretary to Fish Springs pursuant to the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), with the exception that the United States may not assert any claim on the Tribe's behalf that is extinguished pursuant to subsection (e).

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE OF WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS.—The waivers and releases authorized under subsections (a) and (c) shall take effect on the day Fish Springs makes the payment to the Tribe as provided in subparagraph 4.2 of the Agreement.

SEC. 5. SATISFACTION OF CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The benefits provided to the Tribe under the Agreement, the Original Agreement, and this Act shall be considered to be full satisfaction of all claims of the Tribe waived and released pursuant to section 4 and pursuant to the Original Agreement and any claims the United States might make on behalf of the Tribe that are extinguished pursuant to section 4.

(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO EXECUTE WAIVERS AND RELEASES.—If the Tribe fails to execute the waivers and releases as authorized by this Act within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, this Act and the Agreement shall be null and void.

SEC. 6. BENEFICIARIES TO AGREEMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The beneficiaries to the Agreement shall be limited to—

(1) the parties to the Agreement;

(2) any municipal water purveyor that provides Project water for wholesale or retail water service to the area serviced by the Project;

(3) any water purveyor that obtains the right to use Project water for purposes other than serving retail or wholesale customers; and

(4) any assignee of Water Rights Credits for Project water pursuant to the terms of the February 28, 2006, Water Banking Trust Agreement between Washoe County and Fish Springs.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (a), nothing in the Agreement or this Act provides to any individual or entity third-party beneficiary status relating to the Agreement.

SEC. 7. JURISDICTION.

Jurisdiction over any civil action relating to the enforcement of the Agreement, the Original Agreement, or this Act shall be vested in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

SEC. 8. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.

Nothing in this Act precludes the United States or the Tribe, when delegated regulatory authority, from enforcing Federal environmental laws, including—

(1) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) including claims for damages for harm to natural resources;

(2) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(3) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(4) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.); and

(5) any regulation implementing one or more of the Acts listed in paragraphs (1) through (4).

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) NO ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARD.—Nothing in this Act establishes a standard for the quantification of a Federal reserved water right or any other claim of an Indian tribe other than the Tribe in any other judicial or administrative proceeding.

(b) OTHER CLAIMS.—Nothing in the Agreement, the Original Agreement, or this Act quantifies or otherwise adversely affects any water right, claim, or entitlement to water, or any other right of any Indian tribe, band, or community other than the Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3716 is a bipartisan bill sponsored by Congressman AMODEI of Nevada. The legislation ratifies a water rights agreement between the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and the Fish Springs Ranch.

Although the bill does not authorize the expenditure of American taxpayer dollars, it is necessary due to the Federal trust responsibility for the tribe and because it decreases the Federal Government's potential liabilities related to those trust duties.

H.R. 3716 allows a water pipeline project to go forward while codifying an agreement that allows non-Federal payments to mitigate for water supply damages associated with the pipeline. This is a win for the American taxpayer, this is a win for the tribe, and this is a win for water users.

I commend Congressman AMODEI for his leadership and urge adoption of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 3716 would ratify a water settlement agreement between the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and a subsidiary of the Vidler Water Company. The agreement allows the Vidler Water Company to continue operating a water project that provides water to the northern Reno area and fairly compensates the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe for any actual or potential water losses.

As I understand the situation, the legislation is supported by all affected parties, and it will settle potential claims by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe against the United States at no cost to American taxpayers.

Consequently, I support this legislation. I am happy to see it come to the floor. I believe my colleagues on the minority of the Committee on Natural Resources concur.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), who I served on the Natural Resources Committee with recently.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my colleague from Big Sky Country.

This legislation would authorize the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe to grant waivers against both Fish Springs Ranch and the United States Government. The provisions would take effect after the tribe signs the waivers and Fish Springs pays the tribe. The amount in payment—for those of you keeping track—is about $3.6 million.

The tribe would also dismiss pending litigation against BLM for violations in NEPA and potential trust responsibilities related to the groundwater project. At that point, any potential Federal liability would be eliminated.

This is a settlement reached at arm's length between the two parties as a result of a lawsuit filed in 2005. Settlement was reached in 2007. The damage amount of $3.6 million would also have added to it interest from 2007.

The approach is simple and straightforward, with no Federal dollars involved.

I recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman from Montana is ready to close, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3716.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HINCHLIFFE STADIUM HERITAGE ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2430) to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2430

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act''.

SEC. 2. PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Section 7001 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 410lll) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)(3)—

(A) by striking ''The Park shall'' and inserting ''(A) The Park shall'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) In addition to the lands described in subparagraph (A), the Park shall include the approximately 6 acres of land containing Hinchliffe Stadium and generally depicted as the 'Boundary Modification Area' on the map entitled 'Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, Proposed Boundary Modification', numbered T03/120,155, and dated April 2014, which shall be administered as part of the Park in accordance with subsection (c)(1) and section 3 of the Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act.''.

(2) In subsection (b)(4), by striking ''The Map'' and inserting ''The Map and the map referred to in paragraph (3)(B)''.

(3) In subsection (c)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary''; and

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

''(C) HINCHLIFFE STADIUM.—The Secretary may not acquire fee title to Hinchliffe Stadium, but may acquire a preservation easement in Hinchliffe Stadium if the Secretary determines that doing so will facilitate resource protection of the stadium.''.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR HINCHLIFFE STADIUM.

In administering the approximately 6 acres of land containing Hinchliffe Stadium and generally depicted as the ''Boundary Modification Area'' on the map entitled ''Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, Proposed Boundary Modification'', numbered T03/120,155, and dated April 2014, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) may not include non-Federal property within the approximately 6 acres of land as part of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park without the written consent of the owner;

(2) may not acquire by condemnation any land or interests in land within the approximately 6 acres of land; and

(3) shall not construe this Act or the amendments made by this Act to create buffer zones outside the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park. That activities or uses can be seen, heard or detected from areas within the approximately 6 acres of land added to the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park by this Act shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct or management of activities or uses outside of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Hinchliffe Stadium is a historic 10,000-seat municipal stadium in Paterson, New Jersey, built between 1931 and 1932, surrounded by the city's national historical landmark district. It is one of only a handful of stadiums surviving nationally that once played host to Negro League baseball.

H.R. 2430 adds the historic Hinchliffe Stadium into the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, which was created in 2009.

This legislation amends the park's boundary to include the stadium, but an amendment adopted by the Natural Resources Committee prohibits Federal ownership. The stadium will remain as it is today, owned by local government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by commending my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for his work—his persistent, diligent work on H.R. 2430 and the preceding legislation that created this important park site.

The Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act that we are looking at now, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor, enjoys the support of every Member of the New Jersey congressional delegation—I should say the enthusiastic support of every Member of the New Jersey congressional delegation.

It will place within the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, which is one of the newest park service units in the country, this historic Hinchliffe Stadium.

I would say by mistake or oversight or because of difficulties in the first drafting of the original legislation, the park boundaries did not include this historic stadium. This will correct that.

H.R. 2430 would adjust the boundaries of the current Great Falls national historic site to include the 10,000-seat stadium, which is currently listed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as one of the most endangered historic places in the country.

As we have heard, this is one of the last remaining stadiums in the Nation where Negro League baseball games were played and is home to the New York Black Yankees and the New York Cubans.

Even though the names of these teams include New York, this area is very much New Jersey and has tremendous importance to the people of New Jersey and to the history of New Jersey, and it is of interest to the entire country.

In preserving this historic stadium, we will be preserving a visual reminder of an unfortunate, but not forgotten, era of racial segregation. Segregation in America extended beyond the buses of Alabama and the Deep South that was engrained throughout American society, even into our national pastime—baseball.

The Hinchliffe Stadium will serve as an educational opportunity for future generations to learn about this unfortunate past, so that we can continue to move forward collectively as a Nation.

This historic site brings memories and history of the industrial revolution, of the political and patriotic origins of our Nation, of art and culture, and American industry. Now, it will also include this historic sports site.

Again, I applaud my colleague, Mr. PASCRELL, for his efforts, and I urge support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from Paterson, New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both managers.

Hinchliffe Stadium overlooks the Great Falls of Paterson, New Jersey, one of the largest waterfalls on the east coast in the United States. It was built by the citizens of Paterson as a public works project during a very difficult financial situation in the United States, 1932. It was named for the mayor at that time, Judge John Hinchliffe.

The stadium site sits directly adjacent to the Great Falls National Historical Park. The New York Black Yankees played there and the New York Cubans. These games featured baseball Hall of Famers such as Paterson's own hometown hero, Larry Doby, the first player to integrate the American League.

Other greats such as Josh Gibson, Oscar Charleston, Judy Johnson also made appearances here. Besides baseball, the stadium hosted events in professional football, boxing, wrestling, soccer, even auto racing, throughout its long and storied history.

They also were the home of the Paterson Panthers, a professional football team, and the great concerts that went on there. Recently, it played host to all high school sports under the stewardship of the Paterson Public Schools.

Sadly, the stadium has sat in a state of disuse since 1997, when the school system could no longer afford to keep up with the maintenance. However, this legislation would not place the burden of restoration or maintenance on the National Park Service.

□ 1700

This bill would spur private donations as well as the State and local investments to make the necessary improvements at Hinchliffe Stadium. The stewardship of the National Park Service will simply provide certainty about Hinchliffe's future.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about putting purple ropes around an edifice. We want this stadium to be

functional again. I think, therefore, Hinchliffe Stadium provides a golden opportunity for the Park Service to meet its goal of reaching out to urban communities, minorities, and immigrant groups.

This legislation would vastly enhance the significance of the Great Falls National Park, which this body voted on a few years ago. Although the Great Falls Park's current historic assets focus on Paterson's role as the birthplace of American industry, Hinchliffe Stadium shows us the human side of blue collar workers who came to Paterson to work in mills through waves of immigration and the Great Migration. Their descendants are the Patersonians, New Jerseyans, and Americans of today, and new immigrants continue to seek the American Dream.

As it was originally introduced, the legislation establishing the Paterson Great Falls National Park included Hinchliffe Stadium within the park boundaries. However, the stadium's historic significance was found to be in need of further study. That study was completed last year, reaching a conclusion that the people of New Jersey have long known: Hinchliffe Stadium has played a vital role in our history. As a result, Hinchliffe Stadium was designated as a National Historic Landmark. The importance of this effort to the people of New Jersey is evidenced by the fact that the entire New Jersey delegation has joined together as original cosponsors in a bipartisan way.

We have the support of a broad group of stakeholders, from local community organizations to large national advocacy organizations. I will enter in the RECORD letters of support from the National Baseball Hall of Fame; the National Trust for Historic Preservation; the National Parks Conservation Association; the New Jersey Community Development Corporation; the Hamilton Partnership for Paterson; Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium; former Paterson mayor and current chair of the Great Falls Advisory Commission, Pat Kramer; and the current property owner, the Paterson Board of Education.

NATIONAL BASEBALL HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM,
Cooperstown, New York, November 19, 2013.

Hon. BILL PASCRELL, Jr.,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: On behalf of the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum, I am writing to express our support for H.R. 2430, Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013. This legislation would expand the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include historic Hinchliffe Stadium in Paterson, New Jersey.

As you know, Hinchliffe is historically significant as one of the last remaining stadiums in the nation to have hosted Negro League baseball. These games featured future Baseball Hall of Famers such as Paterson's own Larry Doby—the first player break the color barrier in the American League. Sadly, the Stadium has been closed since 1997 and is falling into disrepair.

With the progress being made in the area through the creation of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, now is our opportunity to bring further attention and resources to Hinchliffe. Future generations of visitors and Patersonians alike deserve the opportunity to enjoy Hinchliffe and learn about the amazing role that the Stadium has played in our history. This legislation is an important step towards making that vision a reality.

Thank you for your leadership in bringing national attention to Hinchliffe Stadium and its important role in our nation's cultural history. We look forward to assisting you in your efforts.

My Best,

KEN MEIFERT,
Vice President, Sponsorship and Development.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington DC, May 31, 2013.

Re Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park Boundary Expansion

Hon. BILL PASCRELL, Jr.,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: The National Trust for Historic Preservation enthusiastically supports your legislation to expand the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historic Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium. Your legislation is an important step toward a more comprehensive celebration of Paterson's past. Interpretive themes presented in industrial heritage, the labor movement, the Great Depression, recreation, and social progress are intertwined by the contributions to Hinchliffe Stadium's legacy in the Great Migration story, American sports, and Negro League Baseball.

We support the inclusion of 6 acres of land commonly known as Hinchliffe Stadium into the Park. We also support the continued ownership and management of the stadium by the local school district and look forward to its rehabilitation and use for school sports and other community activities. We also support the fact that the bill does not provide for the National Park Service to acquire the property.

The National Trust has been proud to partner with the City and the school district to preserve Hinchliffe Stadium. Since 2009 we have been working to raise national awareness of Hinchliffe Stadium. For example, the stadium was featured in the November/December 2009 issue of Preservation Magazine. In 2010, partnering with the 1772 Foundation, we enhanced the capacity of the Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium with board management and fundraising training, and granted $40,000 for the stadium's planning and stabilization. Hinchliffe Stadium was also named to the 2010 list of America's 11-Most Endangered Historic Places, and was included in our inaugural list of National Treasures. The site is one of 32 National Treasures identified by the National Trust as endangered places of national significance, where our on-the-ground success can have positive implications for preservation nationwide. We continue to invest our resources to help secure Hinchliffe Stadium's future and are proud of our recent and successful outreach to the City and school district facilitating support for your legislation.

Our work at the stadium is an active partnership with the Paterson City Schools, City of Paterson, and Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium. Together, we are beginning the process to stabilize and return Hinchliffe Stadium to use as a fully-rehabilitated community asset. For more details about this project, please visit: http://savingplaces.org/treasures/hinchliffe-stadium. We support additional measures to safeguard the stadium through the National Park Service system. We anticipate that inclusion in the Park will provide Hinchliffe Stadium:

Strategic support when the National Park is fully-functioning and operational.

An enhanced national profile and increased visibility through marketing and heritage tourism.

Scholarship and interpretation that showcase the story of Paterson's diverse cultural past, and its connection to broader narratives in American history.

An expanded network of partners that champion the National Historic Landmark's protection and preservation.

Increased possibilities for future public and private investments.

We look forward to continuing our collaborative work with the Paterson City Schools, City of Paterson, Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium, National Park Service, and your office so that together we may increase opportunities to preserve and interpret the role of Paterson's significant historic resources, including African American baseball players, business owners, and the development of Negro League Baseball.

With warmest regards,

THOMAS J. CASSIDY, Jr.,
Vice President, Government Relations and Policy.
BRENT LEGGS,
Field Officer, Project Manager.

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
New York, NY, March 3, 2014.

Re Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park Boundary Expansion

Hon. BILL PASCRELL, Jr.,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: The National Parks Conservation Association supports H.R. 2430, which would expand the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historic Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium. Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park is home to one of the country's most spectacular waterfalls—a 260-foot-wide, 77-foot drop that rushes through the Passaic River Gorge and is recognized as a National Natural Landmark. These astounding falls made Paterson the ideal site for one of America's earliest industrial parks—a thriving manufacturing district developed in part by founding father Alexander Hamilton and run for decades on the area's abundant hydropower.

NPCA supports the inclusion of 6 additional acres of land to the park's jurisdiction, which encompasses Hinchliffe Stadium. This historic 10,000 seat municipal stadium, built in 1931 above the Great Falls is an important historic structure who's history would fit nicely with the interpretive skills of our national park rangers. During the 1930's it was rare for a Negro League team to have a home ballpark, but at Hinchliffe, the New York Black Yankees and the New York Cubans were permanent residents. The cultural significance of this National Landmark should be preserved and interpreted.

NPCA supports the continued ownership and management of the stadium by the local

school district and understands a local effort will be undertaken to restore the stadium for school sports and community activities.

Sincerely,

OLIVER SPELLMAN,
Senior Manager, Northeast Regional Office, National Parks Conservation Association.

NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Patterson, NJ, May 3, 2013.

Re Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: On behalf of New Jersey Community Development Corporation (NJCDC), I am writing to express our support for the Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013. This legislation would expand the boundaries of the newly created Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include historic Hinchliffe Stadium within the park.

Hinchliffe is historically significant as one of the last remaining stadiums in the nation to have hosted Negro League baseball. These games featured future baseball hall of famers such as Paterson's own Larry Doby—the first player break the color barrier in the American League, sadly, the Stadium has been closed since 1997 and is falling into disrepair.

NJCDC is committed to the revitalization of the area we call the Great Falls Promise Neighborhood, within which Hinchliffe is located. With the progress being made through the creation of the new national park, this is the most appropriate time to include Hinchliffe Stadium in the overall efforts to remake this historic area. Future generations of visitors and Patersonians alike deserve the opportunity to enjoy Hinchliffe and learn about the amazing role that the Stadium has played in our history. This legislation is an important step towards making that vision a reality.

Thank you for your leadership in bringing national attention to the fascinating history of Hinchliffe Stadium and the City of Paterson. We look forward to assisting you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. GUARASCI,
Chief Executive Officer.

HAMILTON PARTNERSHIP FOR PATERSON,
Paterson, NJ, May 31, 2013.

Hon. BILL PASCRELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: I am proud to express the Hamilton Partnership for Paterson's support for a boundary amendment to the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium. The Department of the Interior recently designated Hinchliffe Stadium a National Historic Landmark—the culmination of a major study Congress authorized in the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park Act.

Hinchliffe is a former Negro Leagues baseball venue of enormous national importance that regularly drew racially-diverse crowds that included Paterson mill workers. Expanding the boundary of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium would enhance the National Park's interpretation of social movements and Paterson's immigrant past by connecting the National Park to the Great Migration and African American history.

Adding Hinchliffe Stadium would provide critical context to other aspects of the National Park by showing the broader experiences of workers and the evolution of a manufacturing city. Workers in Paterson mills played at Hinchliffe Stadium on racially-integrated teams such as the Doherty Silk Sox, the Wright Aeros, and the Uncle Sams. Without Hinchliffe, the Paterson National Park cannot capture the full story of diverse movements of people and cultures to Paterson.

The professionalism, integrity, and permanence of the National Park Service are essential for securing private financial support for Hinchcliffe's renovation. Expanding the Paterson National Park boundary to include Hinchliffe will also increase the likelihood of attracting non-Park Service federal and state funding for such purposes as environmental remediation, parking, and transportation improvements.

Ownership of Hinchliffe Stadium need not change. Hinchliffe could remain owned by the Paterson Board of Education and, after renovation, could be used for school sports and other activities much as it was for decades.

We very much appreciate your vigorous efforts and strong leadership in honoring this important part of the history of Paterson and our nation.

With all good wishes,

LEONARD A. ZAX.

FRIENDS OF HINCHLIFFE STADIUM,
Paterson NJ, June 4, 2013.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN BILL PASCRELL, Jr.
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: Though it has taken a decade to give official and unequivocal recognition to Paterson's Hinchliffe Stadium as a National Historic Landmark, our research had always shown Hinchliffe Stadium to be nationally significant. This honor reinforces the unwavering commitment of the Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium to help save such a remarkable monument to the courage, dignity and perseverance of African-Americans in the quest for civil rights.

We are confident that Hinchliffe Stadium's inclusion in the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, through the ''Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act,'' can play a role in realizing the longer-term objective of seeing the stadium preserved and restored to active use by and for the local and regional communities, and as a future educational resource for everyone who cares about freedom.

We had expressed our prior support of this inclusion as conditional on its acceptance by our project partners: the Paterson Public Schools (deed holders) and the City of Paterson (management partners through a Shared Services Agreement). Since it has now met with their approvals, we are proud to add our voices in support of this critical legislation.

If Hinchliffe Stadium is included in the Great Falls National Historical Park, it will be another measure in correcting the unfortunate National Register of Historic Places error, which incorrectly labeled Hinchliffe Stadium as only ''locally significant.''

Please keep us apprised of progress, and of any further service we can be to this effort.

Sincerely,

BRIAN LOPINTO AND FLAVIA ALAYA,
Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium.

The Hon. BILL PASCRELL, Jr.,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: I write today to express my enthusiastic support for the Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013, which would expand the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium.

As you know, Hinchliffe Stadium was completed in 1932 and named for John Hinchliffe, the Paterson mayor who fought to bring the stadium into being. Hinchliffe is one of just a handful of stadiums remaining in the United States to have played host to Negro League baseball, with games featuring future hall of famers such as local hero Larry Doby. Doby bravely cemented his name in history as the first player to break the American League color barrier.

Unfortunately, the Hinchliffe has sat abandoned since its closure in 1997 and has begun to deteriorate. We need to bring awareness to this vital landmark before it is too late to save Hinchliffe. With the establishment of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park in Paterson's historic district, we have an opportunity to elevate Hinchliffe's status. Patersonians and other visitors to the National Park deserve the chance to enjoy Hinchliffe and learn about the incredible role that it has played in our nation's history.

As a fellow former mayor of Paterson, I would like to thank you for your work in bringing long overdue attention to our hometown's fascinating history. Adding the Stadium to the National Park would reaffirm Hinchliffe's vital role in that history. I look forward to working with you to make the revitalization of Hinchliffe Stadium a reality.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE ''PAT'' KRAMER.

PATERSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Paterson, NJ, May 30, 2013.

Hon. WILLIAM J. PASCRELL, Jr.,
Congressman, U.S. Representative,
Patterson, NJ.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: The Board of Education received your letter dated April 23, 2013, requesting the Board's support of legislation to expand the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium.

At a special meeting held on May 15, 2013, the Board unanimously adopted the attached resolution expressing its support of your efforts to include Hinchliffe Stadium within the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park. As indicated in your letter, this support is with the understanding that the Board would not in any way relinquish control of the stadium property.

The Board looks forward to working with you in this effort.

Regards,

CHRISTOPHER C. IRVING,
President, Paterson Board of Education.

Attachment.

PATERSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT ACTION FORM

1. All Board Resolutions must clearly state how that program/initiative relates to or is specifically connected to the Priorities and Goals contained in the Strategic Plan.

2. This Action Form must be in the State District Superintendent's office according to cutoff date before the meeting of the Board of Education.

RECOMMENDATION/RESOLUTION

Whereas; Congressman Bill Pascrell, Jr., member of the House of Representatives representing the City of Paterson, has informed the Board of Education, Paterson Public Schools District of his legislative efforts to expand the boundaries of Paterson Great

Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium. This proposed expansion is based upon the Stadium's significant place in the history of the City as well as its place in the struggle for economic opportunity and racial quality by African Americans; and

Whereas; Since Hinchliffe Stadium is owned by Paterson Public Schools District, Congressman Pascrell has asked for the support of the Board of Education in his efforts to mobilize the resources of the National Park Services and other stakeholders in developing plans for the National Historical Park, including Hinchliffe Stadium and

Whereas; Congressman Pascrell has committed to the Paterson Public Schools District that the proposed legislation would not in any way (1) require Paterson Public Schools District to relinquish control of the Stadium; (2) require the National Park Services to acquire the Stadium; or (3) permit the National Park Service to acquire or manage the Stadium without the express support of the Paterson Public Schools District.

Therefore be it Resolved, that the Paterson Public Schools District Board of Education does hereby express its support for the efforts of Congressman Pascrell to include Hinchliffe Stadium within the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

APPROVALS REQUIRED

1. Submitted by Dr. Donnie W. Evans, State District Superintendent, May 15, 2013.
2. Approval by Divisional Administrator (State District Superintendent, Deputy, Assistant Superintendent or Business Administrator), Date.
3. Account No:
Certification of Funds—Business Administrator, (Signature) Date.
Funds Available—Funds Not Available—Funds Not Needed—Non-Budget Item.
4. Verification by Legal Department, if required: Date.
5. Approval—State District Superintendent: Donnie W. Evans, 5/28/13.
6. Board Adoption Date: May 15, 2013, Resolution Number 6.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has recognized the significance of Hinchliffe Stadium's contributions to our country and our history. This is a vital part of the history of our State and our Nation. Now is the time to ensure that the story has a place in our National Park System for generations to come. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, again, this has the unanimous support of the New Jersey congressional delegation. This is of national historic importance, and I urge support of this legislation to expand the boundary of this national historic site.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2430, the "Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013."

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation, which makes a long overdue adjustment of the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historic Park to include the historic Hinchliffe Stadium.

Hinchliffe Stadium, located in Paterson, New Jersey, was the home stadium of the "New York Black Yankees" and the "New York Cubans" of the old Negro Baseball League.

In the 1930s and 1940s, baseball, like most American institutions, was segregated by race prohibiting great players like Josh Gibson, Oscar Charleston and Judy Johnson from displaying their extraordinary talents in the major leagues.

These games featured future Baseball Hall of Famers such as Larry Doby—the first player to break the color barrier in the American League, as well as Josh Gibson, Oscar Charleston and Judy Johnson.

In 1942, future Hall of Famer Larry Doby played at Hinchliffe Stadium as a member of the visiting Newark Eagles. Larry Doby would go on to become the first African American to play in the American League, breaking the color line in 1948 as a member of the Cleveland Indians.

In addition to being the venue for Negro League baseball games, Hinchliffe Stadium also hosted boxing matches, auto races, professional football games, and other notable events.

In 1963, Paterson Public Schools assumed ownership of Hinchliffe Stadium and utilized it for high school sports.

Over time, however, the maintenance funds diminished and the stadium fell into disrepair, ultimately closing in 1997.

Hinchliffe Stadium was recently listed as one of the country's most endangered historic places by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and would benefit greatly, as would the nation, were it included in the National Park System.

H.R. 2430 will readjust the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, which overlooks the Paterson Great Falls, to include the adjacently located Hinchliffe Stadium.

By expanding the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, our country will retain one of the last remaining landmarks of an important chapter in the nation's history.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 2430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2430, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT JOHN ADAMS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3802) to extend the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3802

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR MEMORIAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 1 of Public Law 107–62 (40 U.S.C. 1003 note), as amended by Public Law 111–169, is amended—

(1) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2020'' in subsection (c); and

(2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS FOR ESTABLISHED MEMORIAL.—

''(1) If upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Adams Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

''(2) If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Adams Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator (as appropriate) following the process provided for in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(2) or (3) of title 40, United States Code.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

In 2001, President George Bush signed Public Law 107–62, which authorized the Adams Memorial Foundation to create a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia. When completed, the memorial will honor former President John Adams, along with his wife, Abigail Adams, former President John Quincy Adams, and their legacy of public service.

The Foundation has been working towards securing a location for the memorial, but a previous extension to their authority expired in 2013. H.R.

3802 authorizes an extension to this authority so that the Foundation may continue development and planning until December 2, 2020. No Federal funds are involved in the creation of this memorial and this extension has no impact on the Federal budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As many of us know, finding a location for a memorial in Washington, D.C., is not always easy. In 2001, Congress authorized the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in Washington, D.C., to honor the public service and legacy of the Adams family. Planning often takes longer sometimes than the initial authorization allows, and in this case, the Foundation was granted an extension, which expired in 2013. H.R. 3802 grants another extension until 2020.

I am happy to provide more time to make sure that President John Adams and his wife, Abigail Adams, and President John Quincy Adams all receive the commemoration in our Nation's Capital that their sacrifice and service deserve.

I would particularly like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for sponsoring this bill and for navigating it through the legislative process. I think without his hard work this memorial may have been mired in the planning process and might never be built. I now believe that, with this extension, we will see a worthy and fitting commemoration of the Adams family.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time and also for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 3802, to extend the legislative authority for the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes.

I would like to thank full committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO, as well as the gentleman from Utah, Subcommittee Chairman ROB BISHOP, and Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA for helping get this very important bill to the floor.

This bill simply extends the authorization of the Adams Memorial Foundation for 7 years. It is supported by the entire Massachusetts delegation, as well as Chairman BISHOP, as I said, and will allow the Adams Memorial Foundation, the National Park Service, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, and all stakeholders to continue to work toward finding a site and building a commemorative memorial honoring President John Adams and his family and the role they played in the shaping of our great Nation.

I have the great and good fortune to represent the Massachusetts Eighth Congressional District, a district rich in history that includes the city of Quincy, nicknamed the ''City of Presidents.'' Quincy is home to the Adams National Historic Park, birthplace of John Adams, and the home at which his family lived until 1927. I am also proud to hold the House seat associated with our Nation's sixth President and dedicated public servant, John Quincy Adams.

John Adams was a defender of due process, champion of independence, diplomat, Vice President, President, and Founding Father. He authored the Massachusetts Constitution, which is the oldest continually functioning written constitution in the world and the document after which the United States Constitution, frequently referenced on this very floor, was modeled.

As the second President of the United States, he was first to reside in the District of Columbia and to occupy the White House. Yet there is no memorial in our Nation's Capital dedicated to one of our most influential Founding Fathers, a man Thomas Jefferson called ''a colossus of independence.'' That is a tragic omission that must be corrected.

Our former colleague, my dear friend, Congressman Bill Delahunt, acted to correct this oversight when he introduced a bill authorizing the creation of the Adams Memorial Foundation.

The Adams Memorial Foundation was established to commemorate not only John Adams, but also the legacy of the Adams family, who for generations embraced his ideals. That includes his wife, Abigail; his son and our sixth President and Congressman, John Quincy Adams; his wife, Louisa Catherine; their son, Charles Francis; and his sons, Henry and Brooks Adams.

As the enabling legislation states:

> Both individually and collectively, the members of this illustrious family have enriched the Nation through their profound civic consciousness, abiding belief in the perfectibility of the Nation's democracy, and commitment to service and sacrifice for the common good.

Since its authorization, the Adams Memorial Foundation, which counts among its leadership members of the Adams family and respected historians and architects, has been committed to realizing its goal of creating a commemorative memorial. However, siting a commemorative memorial in the Nation's Capital is an arduous undertaking, as my colleagues have pointed out.

Despite broad support and the best efforts of the Adams Memorial Foundation, we remain without an agreed-upon location—but we are getting much closer—for this important memorial. I know that all stakeholders firmly believe the Adams legacy is worthy of memorializing in the Nation's Capital. This bill, if passed, will give all parties the time needed to reach agreement on a location that appropriately honors President Adams' legacy.

For many of us who grew up in Massachusetts, the John and Abigail Adams family and their contributions to the Commonwealth and our Nation serve as a beacon upon which to focus our own efforts. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams are referred to as the sword, the pen, and the voice of our Nation's independence. Yet the voice, which was carried for generations beyond independence, goes unrecognized in this seat of the government he helped to create and sustain.

In closing, I look forward to working with the Adams Memorial Foundation, the National Park Service, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, and all stakeholders to correct this oversight.

I thank Chairman BISHOP of Utah again for his courtesy and support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Montana is ready to close, I strongly recommend we pass the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, strongly support the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3802, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

HEZBOLLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4411) to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4411

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) prevent Hezbollah's global logistics and financial network from operating in order to curtail funding of its domestic and international activities; and

(2) utilize all available diplomatic, legislative, and executive avenues to combat the global criminal activities of Hezbollah as a means to block that organization's ability to fund its global terrorist activities.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HEZBOLLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. BRIEFING ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN SATELLITE PROVIDERS THAT CARRY AL-MANAR TV.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a briefing on the following:

(1) The activities of all satellite, broadcast, Internet, or other providers that knowingly provide material support to al-Manar TV, and any affiliates or successors thereof.

(2) With respect to all providers described in paragraph (1)—

(A) an identification of those providers that have been sanctioned pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001); and

(B) an identification of those providers that have not been sanctioned pursuant to Executive Order 13224 and, with respect to each such provider, the reason why sanctions have not been imposed.

SEC. 102. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS AND CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, shall prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, engages in an activity described in paragraph (2).

(2) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—A foreign financial institution engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the foreign financial institution—

(A) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions for Hezbollah;

(B) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions of a person designated for acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, Hezbollah;

(C) knowingly engages in money laundering to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B);

(D) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions or provides significant financial services to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C), including—

(i) facilitating a significant transaction or transactions; or

(ii) providing significant financial services that involve a transaction of covered goods; or

(E)(i) knowingly facilitates, or participates or assists in, an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D), including by acting on behalf of, at the direction of, or as an intermediary for, or otherwise assisting, another person with respect to the activity described in any such subparagraph;

(ii) knowingly attempts or conspires to facilitate or participate in an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(iii) is owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D).

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) of this subsection to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe and implement regulations to carry out this subsection.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the application of a prohibition or condition imposed with respect to a foreign financial institution pursuant to subsection (a) for a period of not more than 180 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 180 days, on and after the date that the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State—

(A) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the reasons for the determination.

(2) FORM.—The report required by subparagraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) identifies each foreign central bank that the Secretary determines engages in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2)(D); and

(B) provides a detailed description of each such activity.

(2) SPECIAL RULE TO ALLOW FOR TERMINATION OF SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not be required to apply sanctions to a foreign financial institution described in subsection (a) if the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the foreign financial institution—

(i) is no longer engaging in the activity described in subsection (a)(2); or

(ii) has taken and is continuing to take significant verifiable steps toward terminating the activity described in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) the Secretary has received reliable assurances from the government with primary jurisdiction over the foreign financial institution that the foreign financial institution will not engage in any activity described in subsection (a)(2) in the future.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section:

(A) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''account'', ''correspondent account'', and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(C) COVERED GOODS.—The term ''covered goods'' has the meaning given the term in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(D) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''financial institution'' means a financial institution specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (M), (N), (P), (R), (T), (Y), or (Z) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code.

(E) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION; DOMESTIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—

(i) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''foreign financial institution'' has the

meaning of such term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, and includes a foreign central bank.

(ii) DOMESTIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''domestic financial institution'' has the meaning of such term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(F) HEZBOLLAH.—The term ''Hezbollah'' means—

(i) any person—

(I) the property of or interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(II) who is identified on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury as an agent, instrumentality, or affiliate of Hezbollah; and

(ii) the entity designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(G) MONEY LAUNDERING.—The term ''money laundering'' means any of the activities described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1956(a) of title 18, United States Code, with respect to which penalties may be imposed pursuant to such section.

(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may further define the terms used in this section in the regulations prescribed under this section.

TITLE II—REPORTS ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKER AND A SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION

SEC. 201. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2008, after the two year Operation Titan run by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration and Colombian authorities dismantled an international narcotics ring that smuggled cocaine into the United States, Europe, and the Middle East, and was run by Chekry Harb, also known as ''Taliban''. According to lead prosecutor for the special prosecutor's office in Bogota, Gladys Sanchez, ''The profits from the sales of drugs went to finance Hezbollah.''.

(2) In 2011, the Department of the Treasury blacklisted the Lebanese Canadian Bank as a primary money laundering concern, alleging that it is part of a drug trafficking network that profited Hezbollah by moving approximately $200,000,000 per month.

(3) In April 2013, when the Department of the Treasury blacklisted two Lebanese exchange houses, Kassem Rmeiti & Co. and Halawi Exchange Co., for laundering drug profits for Hezbollah, it stated that Hezbollah was operating like ''an international drug cartel,'' adding that the ''Halawi Exchange, through its network of established international exchange houses, initiated wire transfers from its bank accounts to the United States without using the Lebanese banking system in order to avoid scrutiny associated with Treasury's designations of Hassan Ayash Exchange, Elissa Exchange, and its Lebanese Canadian Bank Section 311 Action. . . . Money was then wire transferred via Halawi's banking relationships indirectly to the United States through countries that included China, Singapore, and the UAE, which were perceived to receive less scrutiny by the U.S. Government.''.

(4) The Department of Justice reported that 29 of the 63 organizations on its FY 2010 Consolidated Priority Organization Targets list, which includes the most significant international drug trafficking organizations (DTOs) threatening the United States, were associated with terrorist groups, and noted with concern Hezbollah's international drug and criminal activities.

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

(1) Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker as set forth in the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.); and

(2) the President should so designate Hezbollah as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a detailed report on whether the Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker; and

(B) if the President determines that Hezbollah does not meet the criteria for designation under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker, a detailed justification as to which criteria have not been met.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Hezbollah is engaged array of illicit activities, from counterfeiting currencies, passport documents, to stolen automobile rings and other illicit activities.

(2) In 2002, authorities in Charlotte, North Carolina arrested members of a cell run by Mohammed and Chawki Hamoud and convicted them on various charges, including funding the activities of Hezbollah from proceeds of interstate cigarette smuggling and money laundering.

(3) In 2006 the Department of the Treasury designated operations of Assad Barakat, treasurer for Hezbollah, as providing material support for a foreign terrorist organization and noted that Barakat had engaged in mafia-style shakedowns and ''threatened TBA (triborder area) shopkeepers who are sympathetic to Hezbollah's cause with having family members in Lebanon placed on a 'Hezbollah blacklist' if they did not pay their quota to Hezbollah'' and also was ''involved in a counterfeiting ring that distributes fake U.S. dollars and generates cash to fund Hezbollah operations''.

(4) In 2009, Paraguayan authorities arrested Moussa Hamdan and three other individuals for selling fraudulent passports and trafficking in counterfeit money and sporting goods, illegally obtained consumer electronics and automobiles and then using the proceeds to buy arms for Hezbollah.

(5) In October 2011, a group of businessmen pled guilty to attempting to ship electronics to a shopping center in South America that the Department of the Treasury had designated as a Hezbollah front.

(6) A June 2014 ''threat assessment'' report by Canada's Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre indicated that Hezbollah members in Canada are involved in organized crime.

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

(1) Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation as a significant transnational criminal organization under Executive Order 13581 (76 Fed. Reg. 44757); and

(2) the President should so designate Hezbollah as a significant transnational criminal organization.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(A) a detailed report on whether the Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation as a significant transnational criminal organization under Executive Order 13581 (76 Fed. Reg. 44757); and

(B) if the President determines that Hezbollah does not meet the criteria for designation as a significant transnational criminal organization under Executive Order 13581, a detailed justification as to which criteria have not been met.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 203. REPORT ON HEZBOLLAH'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE TRADE OF CONFLICT DIAMONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to appropriate congressional committees a report detailing Hezbollah's involvement in the trade in rough diamonds outside of the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 204. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE AND HEZBOLLAH'S FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that details actions taken by the Department of State through the Department of State rewards program (22 U.S.C. 2708) to obtain information on fundraising, financing, and money laundering activities of Hezbollah and its agents and affiliates.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the actions described in subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 205. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DISRUPT GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS AND FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HEZBOLLAH.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) a list of countries that support Hezbollah, or in which Hezbollah maintains important portions of its global logistics networks;

(B) with respect to each country on the list required by subparagraph (A)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the global logistics networks of Hezbollah within the territory of the country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those networks—

(I) an assessment of the reasons that government is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those networks; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage that government to improve measures to disrupt those networks;

(C) a list of countries in which Hezbollah, or any of its agents or affiliates, conducts significant fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities;

(D) with respect to each country on the list required by subparagraph (C)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities of Hezbollah and its agents and affiliates within the territory of the country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities—

(I) an assessment of the reasons that government is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage the government of that country to improve measures to disrupt those activities; and

(E) a list of methods that Hezbollah, or any of its agents or affiliates, utilizes to raise or transfer funds, including trade-based money laundering, the use of foreign exchange houses, and free-trade zones.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(3) GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS OF HEZBOLLAH.—In this subsection, the term ''global logistics networks of Hezbollah'', ''global logistics networks'', or ''networks'' means financial, material, or technological support for, or financial or other services in support of, Hezbollah.

(b) BRIEFING ON HEZBOLLAH'S ASSETS AND ACTIVITIES RELATED TO FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING WORLDWIDE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the heads of other applicable Federal departments and agencies (or their designees) shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the disposition of Hezbollah's assets and activities related to fundraising, financing, and money laundering worldwide.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 206. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided, in this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

SEC. 302. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not less than 10 days prior to the promulgation of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 204) of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

SEC. 303. OFFSET.

Section 102(a) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 8412(a); Public Law 111–73; 123 Stat. 2068) is amended by striking ''$1,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,497,000,000''.

SEC. 304. TERMINATION.

This Act shall cease to be in effect beginning 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that Hezbollah—

(1) is no longer designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(2) is no longer listed in the Annex to Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(3) poses no significant threat to United States national security, interests, or allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in very strong support of this measure.

I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. MARK MEADOWS, who is the author of this legislation, along with Mr. SCHNEIDER of Illinois and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York, for their bipartisan leadership on this critically important subject.

Today, Israel is at war with Hamas. Thousands of rockets—over 2,000 so far—including advanced Iranian-supplied rockets, have been fired indiscriminately, aimed at civilians—from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and all across Israel—for the past 2 weeks. At the outset, Hamas was estimated to have 10,000 missiles. Hamas, which has been attacking Israeli civilians, is also using a sophisticated tunneling network, and it is a sophisticated terrorist organization—but, my friends, it pales in comparison with Hezbollah.

Hezbollah, the ''Party of God,'' has over 25,000 sophisticated missiles right now in southern Lebanon, nearly all of which were supplied by Iran. Hezbollah has carried out a number of terrorist attacks across the globe, from Bulgaria to Cyprus to India to Thailand, also here in the Western Hemisphere. Now, I saw firsthand in 2006 the work of Hezbollah. I was in Haifa as they were targeting civilian neighborhoods, and those Iranian-made and Syrian-made rockets were slamming into people's homes and were being targeted on the hospital, itself. Every one of these had 90,000 ball bearings. The only intent was to create mass casualties, and in that trauma hospital in Rambam, there were over 600 victims. That is the work of Hezbollah.

Hezbollah has actively targeted the United States now for 30 years, and I ask my colleagues to reflect on their history. Prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001, frankly, Hezbollah was responsible for the largest number of American deaths by terrorist organizations up until that point when al Qaeda carried out that attack. By the way, these include the 1983 bombing of the United States Embassy in Beirut and the bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks there again in the same year. Hezbollah was behind the kidnappings of Beirut throughout the 1980s as well as international airline hijackings and efforts to target U.S. military personnel in Saudi Arabia. Hezbollah provided the funding and provided the weapons to Iraqi militias—to do what?—to target American personnel and kill them in Iraq. Lethal, yes, but Hezbollah is also vulnerable. It is vulnerable to steps we can take.

Severe international sanctions against its patron, Iran, have reportedly led to a decrease in the funding to Hezbollah, and as a result, this organization has been forced to turn increasingly to its transnational organized criminal enterprises in order to expand its operational capabilities. In 2011, we saw the tip of the iceberg when a massive drug and money laundering operation for Hezbollah's benefit in weapons, logistics, and training was uncovered.

We must remember that any sanctions relief that we provide to Iran for a nuclear agreement will have an impact on Iran's ability to further support Hezbollah. In response to the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2014, this bill, written by MARK MEADOWS, builds on the existing sanctions regime by placing Hezbollah's sources of financing under additional scrutiny, particularly those resources outside of Lebanon. In addition to targeting the terrorist organization's diverse financial network, the legislation also requires the U.S. Government to report on Hezbollah's global logistics network and its transnational organized criminal enterprises, including all of its drug smuggling operations.

The goal is to improve coordination and cooperation with allies and other responsible countries in confronting the increasing threat posed by Hezbollah, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I begin, the Foreign Affairs Committee is acting in a bipartisan way by speaking with one voice to say ''no'' to terrorism. I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for the bipartisan way that he has conducted this committee. We believe that foreign policy is best when it is bipartisan, and there is no difference here between Members. We all condemn terrorist organizations like Hezbollah.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act. This legislation will greatly enhance our ability to confront Hezbollah as they continue to sow terror around the globe.

As the chairman pointed out, Hezbollah is a terrorist organization, just like its cousin, Hamas; and terrorism must be confronted whenever it raises its ugly head, be it in Israel or be it here in the United States of America. Everywhere around the globe, we must confront terrorism and speak with one voice and say that we will not accept it—ever.

Ten years ago, I wrote the Syria Accountability Act, which Congress passed, and it was signed into law by President Bush. At that time, Syria was already working closely with Iran to strengthen Hezbollah by facilitating the shipment of thousands of Iranian rockets and missiles to the group. A decade later, Hezbollah has become a more sophisticated terrorist organization, but their goal remains the same: supporting Iran's nefarious agenda throughout the region.

Once dependent on Assad in Syria, Hezbollah is now returning the favor. Hezbollah's intervention in the Syrian civil war on the side of Assad has provided a new lease on life to the Assad regime. In fact, it is the reason Assad believes he is winning this war and can continue to kill his own people, can continue to use starvation as an act of war, and can continue to do horrific things to hundreds of thousands of its citizens. Hezbollah has also had a corrosive effect on Lebanese politics, holding the Lebanese people hostage to its demand that the country accept its illegal armed force—a terrorist army which is perpetually at war with Lebanon's southern neighbor, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, claims that Hezbollah is just a political organization or some kind of a social services agency are simply naive, untrue, just plain lies. This bill exposes the group for what it is—a vicious terrorist organization with a global reach, including an operational capacity in the United States.

The United States is responding to this threat, and last week, the Treasury Department sanctioned companies for procuring engines, communications electronics, and navigation equipment for Hezbollah. It is time to impose even stronger sanctions on Hezbollah. It is time to focus on their evolving efforts to raise money all over the world whether through kidnapping and ransom, conflict diamonds, narcotrafficking, and other criminal enterprises. This bill would sanction foreign banks for knowingly facilitating transactions with Hezbollah and would designate Hezbollah as a narcotics trafficking organization.

We are currently in negotiation with Iran. Iran didn't come to the table because they are a good government or nice people. They came to the table because our sanctions passed by Congress are crippling their economy. We must do the same thing and cripple Hezbollah.

This bill shines a bright light on Al-Manar, Hezbollah's television station, which is itself a Specially Designated Terrorist group. Hezbollah uses Al-Manar for logistical, propaganda, and fundraising purposes. It is shocking that this station is still carried by satellite providers all over the world. It is just an outrage. By passing this legislation, Congress is seeking to give the administration every tool it needs to confront Hezbollah in this dangerous world.

I want to thank Representative MEADOWS for the extraordinary work he has put into this legislation. I want to thank Representative SCHNEIDER for also doing yeoman's work in making sure that this legislation is here. Again, it is another example of the bipartisan cooperation we have on the Foreign Affairs Committee so that this Congress will speak with one voice and say that we will never accept this scourge of terrorism, be it Hezbollah or be it Hamas. Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SCHNEIDER have made sure that this is a responsible and a targeted bill, focused on cutting off Hezbollah's financial lifeline without unintended consequences.

Mr. Speaker, as Hezbollah doubles down to defend the Assad regime and expands its political presence in Europe and elsewhere, now is the time for us to ramp up our efforts to disrupt its global logistics and financial network. It is a disgrace that the European Union, while designating Hezbollah's armed wing as a terrorist organization, tries to separate it from its social services wing and pretend that, somehow, Hezbollah's social services aren't a terrorist organization. They are a terrorist organization. That is an umbrella group, and it confronts everything. They must be boycotted, and we are doing that today. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. MARK MEADOWS. Although he is a new member to the committee, he is a very active member on Foreign Affairs and is the author of this important legislation.

Mr. MEADOWS. I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, Chairman ROYCE, for his leadership and his kind words but, really, for bringing forth this bill so that the American people can, once again, unify against what we all know is a blight on our country, a blight on our world. When terrorism prevails, we must stand firm, and I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on that.

I also want to echo the comments of the ranking member when he talked about this being a bipartisan effort. Indeed, we have the chairman and the ranking member taking the lead. My colleague Mr. SCHNEIDER from Illinois is working with us on this, and the committee staff—our staff—has worked very hard for many, many months to make sure that this is a targeted bill. Today, we have an opportunity to place a critical blow to Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act. It is to make sure that those who are innocent are protected. As the chairman so eloquently said earlier, over 2,000 rockets have gone into Israel in the last few days, but, today, some 20,000 to 30,000 rockets are aimed at Israel. The

trigger person—the trigger organization—is Hezbollah, so we must pass this legislation to make sure that what we can do is cripple their ability to finance and put people in harm's way.

Hezbollah has many different faces. In some areas, they are called a charitable organization. In others, they are talked about as a political organization. In Latin America, they are talked about as ones who would traffic narcotics. In North America, they are money launderers and counterfeit ring producers. We have many faces for Hezbollah but one soul, and that soul is dedicated to, really, eliminating a people off the face of this world.

Today, I rise in support of this, asking my colleagues to join me to make sure that we send a clear message, not only to the United States, but to the world as a whole.

Some people would say: Why should we be doing this?

□ 1730

This may only deal with Europe or Israel or Syria. It doesn't really affect me.

But I am going to close with this, Mr. Speaker. These words are not my words. They are the words of the U.S. attorney from the Western District of North Carolina, Anne Tompkins.

She was talking about Mohamad Hammoud, who was a student and a member of Hezbollah as a youth in his home country. And he came to the United States on a Hezbollah-driven mission, one that he loyally carried out, creating millions of dollars to send back for terrorism in a faraway place.

But it wasn't just a faraway place, because when he was waiting in jail, he ordered the death of a prosecutor who was prosecuting him, ordered the bombing of a courthouse in Charlotte, North Carolina.

So if it is not for Israel and it is not for Syria and it is not for Europe or Latin America, maybe it is for the United States of America. Let's come together and make sure that we pass this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), the coauthor of this bill.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act.

I would particularly like to thank the ranking member for the time this afternoon and for the tremendous bipartisan support shown in the Foreign Affairs Committee to address one of our most critical national security challenges.

The way this committee has run, both by the ranking member and the chairman, making a difference and taking the challenges of our world in a bipartisan way is most remarkable and worthy of our Nation.

I want to thank my friend, MARK MEADOWS, along with the chairman and ranking member, for their tireless efforts on this important piece of legislation.

I would also like to thank the outstanding effort of the majority and minority staff, along with Mr. MEADOWS' staff and my own team, who have put so much time and effort into perfecting this bill.

The United States has designated Hezbollah as a terrorist organization since 1995. As earlier noted, with the sole exception of al Qaeda, Hezbollah is responsible for more American deaths abroad than any other terrorist organization.

The legislation we are considering today would give the administration the means necessary to combat Hezbollah's global financial network. The bill not only broadens the Treasury Department's ability to sanction Hezbollah finances, but it also gives the administration another tool to go after Hezbollah for its narcotics and counterfeit goods trafficking.

Furthermore, the bill cripples Al-Manar, a television station that broadcasts pro-Hezbollah propaganda around the area. The Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act is a leap forward in combating the threat of global terrorist financing.

We have known for years that the international organization Hezbollah has planned, funded, and executed terrorist attacks in the Middle East, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere. It continues to use underground networks and elicit materials to fundraise its global instability efforts.

It has used U.S. and European banks along with their subsidiaries to hide and launder money out of the South American and European finance arenas, financing thousands of Hezbollah operatives around the globe.

One need only look at some of Hezbollah's attacks to understand the true threat they pose to U.S. national security.

In 1983, Hezbollah bombed the U.S. barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 241 Marines.

In 1992, Hezbollah bombed the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, killing 29.

Twenty years ago last year, in 1994, Hezbollah bombed the AMIA Jewish cultural center in Argentina, killing 85.

In 2006, Hezbollah operatives conducted cross-border raids into Israel, kidnapping IDF soldiers, which led to a 34-day military conflict between Israel and Lebanon.

In 2011, reports indicated that Hezbollah was behind a bombing in Istanbul that wounded eight Turkish citizens.

In 2012, authorities apprehended a Hezbollah operative planning terrorist activity in Cyprus against civilian commercial airlines.

In 2012, Hezbollah bombed a bus in Burgas, Bulgaria, killing six Israeli tourists and the Bulgarian bus driver.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a scarce few of the activities of Hezbollah that have targeted U.S. interests or our allies around the world.

In particular, over the last 2 weeks, we have seen the incredible destabilizing force that Iran continues to play in the Middle East. Stockpiles of Iranian-made rockets have allowed Hamas and Islamic Jihad to put all of Israel's major population centers under threat of indiscriminate attack on civilians. In the last 2 weeks alone, over 2,000 rockets have rained down on Israel.

In Lebanon, the threat is even greater. Hezbollah maintains a massive stockpile of Iranian arms with greater range and far greater lethality than those launched from Gaza. Tens of thousands of rockets are aimed at Israel and could be unleashed at any moment.

That is why, today, it is such a critical first step towards thwarting the unrelenting force. The sanctions included in this legislation will stem the ability of Hezbollah to purchase arms and employ operatives throughout the Middle East and the rest of the globe.

We can and must do more to stem the global financing of these activities. Today, we have that opportunity, and I hope that you will join us in combating this pressing threat to U.S. national security.

The Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act provides the administration with vital tools to go after financial institutions and satellite providers that deliver material support and propaganda tools to Hezbollah.

This important effort will result in fewer resources falling into the hands of terrorists, who have shown great resilience in attacking Western targets, in addition to the destabilizing efforts in the Middle East.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member again, along with my friend, MARK MEADOWS, for working with us to introduce this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. With more than 319 cosponsors in the House, I hope that this body will strongly support its passage, and that the Senate will move swiftly to enact legislation as well.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely going to reserve the right to close, should there be anymore speakers that Mr. ENGEL has on his side.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me just close. Let me sum up by saying that, in closing, this legislation comes at a very, very critical time. Anyone can turn on the TV or go online and know the region seems to be falling further into chaos.

As we seek greater stability, cutting Hezbollah off from its financial lifeline

is an important step to that end. We did this before with Iran, and the naysayers said what Congress did wouldn't be important because it wouldn't have that much effect. We proved them wrong.

Again, as I mentioned, there are negotiations now going on between the United States and Iran to end their nuclear program. They are at the negotiating table only because we slapped tough sanctions on them, brought their economy to its knees.

This can be done with Hezbollah. This is what we are trying to do today. So I urge passage of this important legislation.

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE again, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I will place into the RECORD the letters exchanged with the other committees with jurisdictional interests in this bill; Financial Services would be one, and Judiciary.

In closing, let me agree with Mr. ENGEL's observation that this is a critical time in the Middle East, and also, with our frustration that, during this time, Iran should continue to increase its support for its patron, Hezbollah, because for those of us with a longer memory, we remember how much they have increased their capability to do harm.

As a result of that funding that has come from Iran, Hezbollah-initiated killings and bombings have occurred, to the frustration of our European allies, to those in Asia and those in Latin America, today, on virtually every continent.

In 2012, Hezbollah carried out a bus bombing in Bulgaria—many of us remember that—and plotted an attack in Cyprus, leading to the European Union's designation of Hezbollah's military wing as a terrorist organization.

Furthermore, Hezbollah continues to fight on behalf of the Assad regime in Syria's brutal civil war. One of the things we have seen is missiles being brought over the border from Syria into southern Lebanon by Hezbollah.

We have seen the deaths in Syria at the hands of Hezbollah fighters. It has resulted in the deaths of thousands and thousands of people.

And most importantly, Hezbollah has been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans, and that is a third reason why we are focused on this terrorist organization.

We must do everything in our power to target Hezbollah's lifeline, to target their financing, and I urge all Members to support this legislation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing concerning H.R. 4411, the ''Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2014,'' which your Committee ordered reported on June 26, 2014.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on the provisions in our jurisdiction and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 4411, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert is jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 4411 into our Committee Report and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services that you have requested.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 4411 into our Committee Report and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Financial Services as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: On June 26, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2014, to be reported favorably to the House with an amendment. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4411, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I appreciate your July 11 letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4411, as amended, and your inclusion of a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING
Chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act.

The bill has more than 300 co-sponsors and is truly a bipartisan effort.

I commend my colleague from North Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS for leading this legislation.

Hezbollah is a militant group that has been designated by the U.S. and E.U. governments as a terrorist organization.

As part of our counter-terrorism operations, the U.S. continues to fight the flow of funding to organizations that have dedicated themselves to the destabilization of democracy.

For the record, it is important to recall all the atrocities that Hezbollah has perpetrated against the U.S. and its allies, including Israel.

Hezbollah actions include:

Suicide truck bombings targeting U.S. and French forces in Beirut (in 1983 and 1984)

Targeting U.S. forces again in Saudi Arabia (in 1996),

Suicide bombing attacks targeting Jewish and Israeli interests such as those in Argentina (1992 and 1994) and in Thailand (attempted in 1994), and

Many other plots targeting American, French, German, British citizens from Europe to Southeast Asia to the Middle East.

We must continue our efforts to stem the tide against organizations like Hezbollah and other terrorist organizations but cutting off funding and targeting their key money-making industries like narco-trafficking.

I continue to support efforts like H.R. 4411 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4411.

My amendment to the bill that passed in committee encourages the State Department to go after Hezbollah's money.

It does this by pushing the State Department to use its Rewards Program is an old-fashioned idea. It's like putting out a reward on a wanted poster. If we get good information that can be used for an arrest or conviction of a Hezbollah member, we're willing to pay a reward.

This is a strategy that works.

The Rewards Program paid $2 million to a source who helped reveal the location of Ramzi Yousef, the mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. Yousef was arrested in 1995.

All too often, the challenge with going after the finances of terrorist groups is knowing where they get their money and how they move it.

This bill will help bring more of that important information to light so we can seize Hezbollah's money and stop their evildoing ways.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of the Hezbollah Financing Prevention Act of 2014. Hezbollah has killed more Americans than any terrorist group other than Al-Qaeda, and it threatens Israel and America daily. Hezbollah has a far larger and more sophisticated rocket arsenal than Hamas, and it is now offering to support Hamas in its current, ongoing terrorist actions against Israel. This great threat of rockets is the reason the House increased iron dome funding for FY15 at the request of me and Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

But it's sanctions that have emerged as America's most powerful deterrent against bad actors in the world. And as we draw down militarily from the Middle East, we must aggressively pursue sanctions against sponsors of terrorism. That's what the bill before us today does. This legislation will help us cut off Hezbollah from the international financial system and cripple Hezbollah's media operations.

The bill also contains an amendment drafted by Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH and me that will enable the disruption of Hezbollah's global logistics networks and its fundraising and money-laundering activities. Our amendment also requires the Obama administration to shed light on those countries that either overtly or covertly enable any sort of Hezbollah activities within their borders. This provision is particularly important in the Hezbollah context, because there are far too many countries that outwardly condemn Hezbollah's military and terrorist activities while privately fostering environments where Hezbollah can operate politically and financially. Well no more, not if you want to do business with the United States.

I thank Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. DEUTCH for their leadership and partnership, the sponsors of the bill—Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ENGEL—for crafting such important legislation, and committee staff for all their hard work in putting it all together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4411, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TRAVEL PROMOTION, ENHANCEMENT, AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4450) to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4450

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Subsection (b)(2)(A) of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''promotion and marketing'' and inserting ''promotion or marketing''; and

(B) by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''At least 5 members of the board shall have experience working in United States multinational entities with marketing budgets. At least 2 members of the board shall be audit committee financial experts (as defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission in accordance with section 407 of Public Law 107–204 (15 U.S.C. 7265)). All members of the board shall be a current or former chief executive officer, chief financial officer, or chief marketing officer, or have held an equivalent management position.''; and

(2) in clause (x), by striking ''intercity passenger railroad business'' and inserting ''land or sea passenger transportation sector''.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Subsection (c)(3) of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131(c)(3)) is amended—

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

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (I); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) a description of, and rationales for, the Corporation's efforts to focus on specific countries and populations;

''(H)(i) a description of, and rationales for, the Corporation's combination of media channels employed in meeting the promotional objectives of its marketing campaign;

''(ii) the ratio in which such channels are used; and

''(iii) a justification for the use and ratio of such channels; and''.

SEC. 4. BIANNUAL REVIEW OF PROCEDURES TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF GOODS AND SERVICES.

Subsection (d)(3) of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''80 percent'' and inserting ''70 percent''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) MAINTENANCE OF AN IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY.—The Corporation shall maintain an in-kind contributions policy.

''(F) FORMALIZED PROCEDURES FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014, the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the Corporation, shall establish formal, publicly available procedures specifying time frames and conditions for—

''(i) making and agreeing to revisions of the Corporation's in-kind contributions policy; and

''(ii) addressing and resolving disagreements between the Corporation and its partners, including the Secretary of Commerce, regarding the in-kind contributions policy.

''(G) BIANNUAL REVIEW OF PROCEDURES TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF GOODS AND SERVICES.—The Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce (or their designees) shall meet on a biannual basis to review the procedures to determine the fair market value of goods and services received from non-Federal sources by the Corporation under subparagraph (B).''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5)(A)(iv), by striking ''all States and the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''all States and territories of the United States and the District of Columbia,''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''fiscal year 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, or 2015'' and inserting ''each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2020''.

(b) SUNSET OF TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEE.—Section 217(h)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2020''.

SEC. 6. ACCOUNTABILITY; PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS.

The Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (h), (e), (i), and (j), respectively;

(2) by moving subsection (e) (as so redesignated) so that it follows subsection (d);

(3) in paragraph (2) of subsection (c), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e), as redesignated, the following:

''(f) ACCOUNTABILITY.—

''(1) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND MEASURES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014, the Corporation shall—

''(A) establish performance metrics including, time frames, evaluation methodologies, and data sources for measuring—

''(i) the effectiveness of marketing efforts by the Corporation, including its progress in achieving the long-term goals of increased traveler visits to and spending in the United States;

''(ii) whether increases in visitation and spending have occurred in response to external influences, such as economic conditions or exchange rates, rather than in response to the efforts of the Corporation; and

''(iii) any cost or benefit to the economy of the United States; and

''(B) conduct periodic program evaluations in response to the data resulting from measurements under subparagraph (A).

''(2) GAO ACCOUNTABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Corporation receives a report from the Government Accountability Office with recommendations for the Corporation, the Corporation shall submit a report to Congress that describes the actions taken by the Corporation in response to the recommendations in such report.

''(g) PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS.—The Corporation shall—

''(1) establish a competitive procurement process; and

''(2) certify in its annual report to Congress under subsection (c)(3) that any contracts entered into were in compliance with the established competitive procurement process.''.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY.

The Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking subsection (e) (as redesignated by section 6(1) of this Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on this bill, and I would like to include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Homeland Security.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act, which was reported out of the subcommittee I chair, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, on July 9, 22–0. H.R. 4450 then sailed through the full Committee on Energy and Commerce on July 15 by voice vote.

I thank Congressman BILIRAKIS for his hard work, not only in crafting a very smart bill with the appropriate reforms, but also gaining strong bipartisan support along the way. And I also thank his cosponsor, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, for being the lead Democratic sponsor.

□ 1745

The Travel Promotion Act matches $100 million in fees from foreign travelers with $100 million in voluntary contributions from the industry to invest in advertising abroad. In 2013 alone, Brand USA generated 1.1 million visitors to the United States, who spent $3.4 billion and supported 53,181 U.S. jobs.

Now, we always think of Orlando, California, Miami, Disneyland, Hollywood, and Disney World as the tourist spots that are known worldwide, but thanks to the TPA and Brand USA, travel agents from abroad can educate their clients on popular attractions in America's heartland, not just New York City or Los Angeles. Nebraska alone has seen $4.4 billion spent and 44,275 jobs supported throughout the life of Brand USA.

With H.R. 4450, we increase accountability, as well as transparency requirements and performance metrics to ensure Brand USA is run efficiently. I am also pleased that the legislation makes contributions to Brand USA voluntary, rather than compulsory.

Conservative publications, such as RedState and Human Events have picked up on these changes and recognize these reforms as critical to the success of the Travel Promotion Act.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for their hard work in drafting H.R. 4450 and for gathering enough supporters that we can pass this legislation under suspension of the rules.

I was fortunate to be able to report the bill out of my subcommittee, so that our committee can continue to benefit from Brand USA, and I encourage a ''yea'' vote from all of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I write to you regarding H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on July 15, 2014. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Homeland Security will forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is being done with the understanding that the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the report accompanying H.R. 4450 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4450 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4450, the ''Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014.''

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration. I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction, and the Committee will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the report accompanying H.R. 4450 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4450 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, I am pleased that this bipartisan bill, H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014, was reported out of the full Energy and Commerce Committee last week.

The bill, which authorizes the Brand USA program through fiscal year 2020, is an important achievement for our committee. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), the chairman of our committee and subcommittee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the full committee ranking member, for helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

I strongly support Brand USA's mission of promoting international travel to the United States, and I have heard from travel and tourism professionals across my district about the need to reauthorize this program, but it is not just the Chicago area that benefits.

Brand USA supports an estimated 53,000 jobs and $3.4 billion in visitor spending each year from coast to coast, according to the U.S. Travel Association.

I would like to thank Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. WELCH, the sponsors of H.R. 4450, for their continued commitment to the promotion of international tourism. The sponsors worked with me to make some important improvements to this legislation during the committee markup process.

The amendment we made to the bill will make Brand USA even more accountable and economically viable, moving forward.

Due to our efforts, the bill incorporates several recommendations that the Government Accountability Office made in a 2013 report. The Department of Commerce is now required to establish specific publicly available timeframes and conditions for how Brand USA revises and resolves disagreements related to its in-kind contribution policy.

Having a set policy will not only promote greater transparency, but it will also, in the words of GAO, ''enable productive interactions and facilitate collaboration.''

GAO has also suggested that Brand USA be directed to develop a plan that specifies timeframes, methodologies, and data sources for measuring its performance and the campaign's impact.

By explicitly requiring those criteria, the bill now gives the organization more direction on the type of information it should collect and establishes metrics that can more effectively determine the success of the program.

I was glad that the bill's sponsors proposed lowering the cap on in-kind contributions in the underlying bill, and I am thankful that Mr. BILIRAKIS joined me to offer an amendment to lower the cap even further during the full committee markup last week.

Every contribution to Brand USA, whether public or private, cash or in-kind, is important to the organization's ongoing success, but I believe that the program is in the best possible position to maintain and build on its success through robust cash contributions by the private sector.

Brand USA's continued long-term success is essential to communities that—like my district—realize the economic and cultural benefits of tourism and travel. Brand USA has been successful in its first few years, and I firmly believe that this legislation improves the program even more.

Again, I applaud Brand USA for its ongoing efforts to encourage people from all over the world to enjoy everything our country has to offer, and I assure the chairman of our subcommittee that we will benefit not just coast to coast, but also the center of the country as well.

I thank the sponsors for their continued efforts to ensure the longevity of this valuable program and strongly encourage my colleagues to support this important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the full committee chair.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014—yes, it is a very important bill that is going to increase jobs and boost the economy by promoting the U.S. as a world-class travel destination.

The bill reauthorizes Brand USA and increases program accountability and transparency, thanks in large part to the amendments and the regular process that we went through in committee.

In 2013, Brand USA generated an additional 1.1 million visitors to the U.S. and, as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) said, $3.4 billion in additional spending at U.S. businesses.

This increase in spending triggered the creation of more than 53,000 American jobs and $2.2 billion in payroll, so Brand USA delivers all those benefits to the U.S. economy at no cost to the American taxpayers—no cost.

Earlier this month in my district, I held a roundtable to discuss the benefits of tourism and how this program contributes to southwest Michigan's economy.

We had local legislators. We had chambers of commerce. We had tourism organizations. We had State officials. It was noted that in my district, in southwest Michigan, we had nearly $1 billion in spending in 2012, supporting over 9,300 jobs and $200 million in payroll annually just for tourists. There was $1 billion spent in southwest Michigan by tourists.

It was also noted that the reauthorization of this bill was their number one priority. It expires next year, and one of the commitments that I made was to see if we could move it in an expeditious manner to give the Senate a little time, so that it doesn't get caught up later on and we can just get it off our plate, knowing in fact that it was bipartisan from the get-go.

I applaud particularly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who is going to speak a little bit later, and his colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), who are both very good members on our committee, for their working together and their leadership to spearhead this bipartisan bill.

I was glad to see it pass on a recorded vote that was unanimous in subcommittee and in full committee as well, and I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) as we work through this bill and to really get it to the floor as quickly as we can.

These are jobs. This is not a cost to the American taxpayer. It ought to be something that we can pass on a pretty good vote this afternoon.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada, DINA TITUS, from a place that certainly benefits from tourism and is a place where many of us go to have fun.

Ms. TITUS. I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding and for visiting my district whenever she can.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for his leadership on this issue.

During the 111th Congress, I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the first Travel Promotion Act, which actually established Brand USA. Prior to the passage of that act, the United States was one of the only countries in the world that did not promote its unique destination to foreign visitors.

Since its creation, Brand USA has played a critical role in bringing foreign visitors to destinations throughout the United States, including my district of Las Vegas.

Through innovative, targeted, and effective marketing campaigns, Brand USA has directly connected foreign visitors with world-famous destinations in Nevada's First Congressional District, including the fabulous strip; the new arts district; and the hip, edgy downtown section of Las Vegas.

Foreign visitors to the United States are critical for the success of the travel and tourism industry. Average foreign visitors stay 17 days in the United States and spend $4,500 during their visit. This certainly creates jobs in Las Vegas and around the country.

Brand USA has been very effective in bringing more of these visitors to the United States. For example, as you have heard, in 2013, Brand USA was directly responsible for a million new visits, generating $3.4 billion in new visitor spending and supporting 53,000 U.S. jobs, and this is all without spending a dime of taxpayer dollars.

Today, we have a chance to reauthorize the work that began with the Travel Promotion Act and remains so critical to our economy still today.

I look forward to continuing my work with Brand USA to support the travel and tourism industry, to bring more visitors to Las Vegas and to other destinations around the country, from the Grand Canyon to Niagara Falls, Chicago, and even Nebraska, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4450.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the author and chief negotiator of this bill, who worked in a very bipartisan way and allowed the bill to come out of our committee unanimously.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his good work on this bill, as well as his leadership on this very important subcommittee, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act, which would reauthorize Brand USA for a limited time, adds numerous accountability measures and strengthens the transparency of the public-private partnership that promotes increased tourism to the United States.

Passage of H.R. 4450 will be good for the economy. It is a jobs bill, Mr. Speaker. A recent analysis performed by the independent firm Oxford Economics estimated that, in fiscal year 2013, Brand USA generated 1.1 million additional international visitors who spent an estimated $3.4 billion, generating economic revenue and supporting job creation in communities across America.

Brand USA does not impose a cost upon the Federal Government. It has helped to reduce the deficit during the last 2 fiscal years and is expected to continue to do so. In fact, the respected and nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 4450 will reduce the deficit by $231 million over 10 years. It is a win-win, Mr. Speaker.

It is important to note that Federal taxpayer dollars are not used to fund Brand USA. Brand USA is supported by international visitors and voluntary private sector contributors.

After it receives contribution from the private sector, Brand USA can only collect up to $100 million in matching funds from fees paid by foreign travelers. Amounts collected in excess of that cap are returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

□ 1800

Finally, given the benefits to the economy across State lines, as well as the competitive nature of foreign competitors in travel promotion, Congress is well within its authority under the Commerce Clause to extend the Travel Promotion Act. Small State and local tourism offices and local small businesses across America are some of the strongest supporters of the Travel Promotion Act and benefit greatly from international tourism. Brand USA helps bridge these communities and opens up new markets to American competition.

I appreciate consideration of this legislation, which several commentators have noted includes important reforms. This bill improves an already existing partnership, Mr. Speaker.

I thank Chairman UPTON for his leadership, again, the subcommittee chair, Chairman TERRY, doing an outstanding job, all those who have contributed to this bill, our lead cosponsor, Mr. PETER WELCH, and the cochair of the Tourism Caucus, Mr. FARR—who I believe will speak in a few minutes—for their work on this legislation, and also the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I urge support of this prudent and narrow reauthorization of the Travel Promotion Act.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. It is now my pleasure to yield for such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who is from a beautiful area of the country.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much for yielding. Thank you for your leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for many reasons. The first reason is that America needs to market itself. You think that, oh, everybody loves America, but I found in my travels in talking with people that not everybody has the same opinion about America. Right now, if you turn on your television, the rest of the world is trying to get people who live in this country to go travel to their country—go to Spain; go to the Caribbean; go to New Zealand; go everywhere; go to Canada. It is all trying to get our people to be tourists in their country.

Well, finally, we did something about it. We have been doing this in agriculture for a long time. With the Agricultural Marketing Act, we decided, well, let's market America. Let's tell people what this great country is, how you can get here, and what you are going to see when you get here. It has had a tremendous effect. It really has. It, to me, is the biggest jump-starter for jobs that we can do because tourism is everywhere. It is all those things. It is little restaurants. It is museums. It is essentially Washington, D.C., from parks to rivers to everything. That is what America is made of.

There is also, I think, in this hot world right now, this complicated world—the news is full of bad stuff, and, unfortunately, America, because of all our movies and television, also has an opinion of people this is the most dangerous country in the world to visit. We have got to get over that, because everybody who comes here finds that it is not true at all. It is very friendly people and wonderful help. So it is very important. It is kind of foreign policy to say: Come on, come see this great country, this little pillar of the world, and meet the people.

Next year, we are going to have the 100th anniversary of our National Park System. We are the only country in the world that has a national park system like this one. They are the most beautiful places in America.

I would suggest that, frankly, this is a great, bipartisan product. Mr. BILIRAKIS and I have been cochairs of this Tourism Caucus. We have been trying to get every Member to join. It was interesting; we got more Democrats to join the caucus than Republicans. And hopefully now with this bill and this sort of discussion of how important this is to your local districts, and there is isn't a chamber of commerce in the United States that isn't watching this vote and hoping that we will pass this bill because those tourists, just like politics, all of it is local. All tourism is local. They go to some community, and they go to the main street and they help the small businesses.

I represent a pretty remote area of California called Big Sur, a beautiful coastline. The foreign tourists are carrying the economy of that area by their visits. The Europeans are visiting it in greater numbers than ever before. If you talk to any of the merchants, they will say, but for that European travel after the recession we have had, we wouldn't be recovering like it is.

So I want every Member of Congress to join our caucus because what do we do? Caucuses produce things. We produced this reauthorization, a bill, and Mr. BILIRAKIS as cochair carried it, and he has done a tremendous job. It is important that we focus for a moment on the importance of tourism as an industry just like steel, electronics, and airlines, but it is made up of all these other parts. That industry is in every single congressional district. If this is the tide that lifts the ships that bring the tourists here, it is also the tide that will help leave that tourist tax dollar, that tourist expenditure dollar in our local community and hire people to be a service-oriented industry.

So I applaud our colleagues in Congress for reauthorizing. We have done this before without controversy because it is a pay-for. It is already paid for. It is not a tax. It is a fee that is levied on tourists coming to this country to get a visa, and a portion of that fee then goes into paying for this promotion. So it is a win-win. It is a job promotion, and it is good for everybody. I hope we get a unanimous vote on both sides of the aisle, and I hope those that vote for it will also join the Tourism Caucus.

Mr. TERRY. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from southern Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4450, legislation to reauthorize the public-private program that is often known as Brand USA. This is a bill that was passed unanimously by the subcommittee and by voice vote through the full committee. I understand questions have been raised today, so let's address some very specific, important components of this legislation.

First, in 1981, Ronald Reagan signed the National Tourism Policy Act to promote the United States as a destination for international tourism, to expand our economy, and to grow jobs here in the United States. In 2009, this body passed the Travel Promotion Act.

Second, this is an activity that extends across State lines bringing this

bill, this legislation, within the article I Commerce Clause authority of this body, the constitutional authority of this body.

Third, no Federal taxpayer dollars are used to fund Brand USA. It is funded by industry contributions and by international visitors. The United States is the only major destination that does not fund its promotion programs through taxpayer dollars. It is through private contributions of industry matched by international traveler fees.

There is a cap on the program, the amount of funds it can expend from those fees collected from international visitors; and when the funds exceed that cap, that money is returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction. In FY13, that was $27 million in deficit reduction to benefit the taxpayers. This bill was recently scored, and over the next 10 years, this would reduce the deficit, contribute to the Treasury $231 million not from taxpayers but from international travelers.

This bill rightly is supported by associations and organizations across the country, from hotel and lodging, including those in Florida, from business travel to cruise lines to amusement parks, shopping malls, restaurants, convention and visitors' bureaus, the U.S. Olympic Committee, and in my home State, by the organization Visit Florida. And rightly so.

Let's revisit why. There is no cost to the Federal Government by this program. There is no cost to the U.S. taxpayer for this program. This program reduces the Federal deficit, and it fosters economic growth in communities across the country, in each and every one of our congressional districts that we are sent here to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the discussion that is being had on this bill, but I ask my colleagues, let's not stand in our own way when it comes to sensible, good legislation that we can pass to promote the economy across the country and in the communities that we represent.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, can I ask how many minutes remain on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I have no more speakers, but I want to just make a couple of comments. I think in addition to this being a really important bill and recognized in a bipartisan way, I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will realize how good it feels when we work together, and maybe this could be the beginning or a model for how we can deal with legislation. There were some changes to the bill. We sat down. We agreed on them. We worked it out, and we have a product at the end of the day. It is called compromise. It is not a dirty word. We have achieved, I think, an excellent product.

The other thing I wanted to mention, we have talked about Big Sur, Carmel, Las Vegas, and other places. I just wanted to say that I am kind of pushing an idea for an organization called To Chicago, which is our tourism bureau to bring people to Chicago, especially for the summer. I thought a really good idea would be to promote: Come to Chicago, swim in Chicago, no sharks. And so I thought I would use this opportunity to push my ''no sharks'' idea for Chicago. You could add ''no salt'' as well, but I thought particularly ''no sharks.'' We have beautiful beaches in Chicago. So I am trying to get To Chicago under the banner of brand Chicago to promote my good idea of no sharks.

But there are so many ideas I think that we have for many small communities. I was in the delta of Louisiana at the original blues bars and blues restaurants down there, and all of us have something wonderful and unique in our communities. That is what Brand USA is about, to bring tourists not only to the likely suspects of places but to so many of our communities so they get the real flavor of the people, the diversity, the color, the smell, the feel, and the sound of the United States of America. So this is a great piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I will take this time to talk about Brand USA. To the chairman of the subcommittee, thank you for your leadership on this important, bipartisan issue. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation and urge its favorable passage today.

Just looking at the Colorado Tourism Office, just reading the Colorado tourism industry facts, it starts with saying that tourism equals jobs and revenue for Colorado. It is a vital piece of our economy. Tourism is one of the largest industries in Colorado in terms of jobs, employing 144,000 people in the tourism sector. Overall, these employees earn $4.1 billion annually, contributing to State revenue through income taxes. And, in fact, it is a little known fact that, without the taxes that are paid by tourists who visit from out of country, out of State to Colorado, the average Colorado family would have to pay an additional $407 a year in taxes to make up for the money that would be lost if we didn't have those tourism dollars being spent in Colorado. It has been a tremendous success.

When it comes to Brand USA, a quick look at the work that Brand USA has done in Colorado, partnering with Colorado to market the State to international visitors—marketing activities include both traditional media from TV display out of homes, social media, and more—but also our work in Colorado when it comes to craft beer being featured as part of Brand USA's 2014 Great American Road Trip, talking about the work we are doing in Colorado, thousands of people being employed in a new and growing industry.

Colorado was featured in Brand USA's 2014 inspirational visitors' guide, over 16 international audiences exposed because of Brand USA's international visitors' guide, which will generate over 30 million impressions through Brand USA. The list goes on and on, the work that we do.

I think it is also important to highlight the work Colorado has done with Brand USA's Discover America Pavilion at international trade shows around the world, like the Japanese Association of Travel Agents, work that we can do to highlight the opportunities to come to the United States, to create opportunities, perhaps a tourist the first time but a business partner the next time. I think it is a number of jobs that we can create.

Again, I thank the chairman for his work on this legislation, the bipartisan support for the legislation, and urge its passage today with the support of the House of Representatives.

□ 1815

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I will close by just thanking the gentleman—all of the gentlemen—and ladies who have participated in making this important legislation come to fruition.

I do hope we are able to move it very quickly and, hopefully, unanimously here, move it over to the Senate and get it done right away. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill to extend the Brand USA program and ensure it is successful, accountable, and transparent going forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank JAN SCHAKOWSKY, the ranking member, for her great work on this bill. She and I understand and have worked together in a very bipartisan way to try and encourage more foreign investment in the United States.

That builds our economy and helps to create jobs when you bring money from outside the United States in. We had a bill that passed earlier, overwhelmingly in this House, that is sitting over in the Senate, to do a study to figure out what the barriers are to direct foreign investment in the United States.

This is the easy lift here. This is providing visas to people from all around the world that want to come spend some time in the United States because they want to go to the Windy City on the big Ferris wheel on the pier or to one of our great amusement parks or

to Colorado skiing. We attract people from all over the world. We have to encourage them.

There is a worldwide competition for the tourism dollar, and we need to make sure that the United States is competitive, and Brand USA is that program that promotes the United States, so that the tourists come here, whether it is from Brazil to go shopping in the Miami area—which is very popular—or whatever they want to do as their destination.

When they decide to make that trip, they get a visitor's visa, and they pay a fee for that visa. The interesting part is when some of that money is then invested in Brand USA through this act, over that period of the year, there is actually more dollars that go towards budget or deficit reduction than are used for the processing and for Brand USA, so it actually reduces our deficit. Who wouldn't want that?

It is also the point that it creates jobs, and I think of this bill more as a jobs bill. 53,000 jobs per year are supported because of Brand USA and foreign visitors to the United States—1.1 million visitors directly from Brand USA.

I would like to see us do 2 million next year, but we are only going to do that if there is a way to get the word out around the world that we want visitors to the United States, so this is a great bill.

GUS BILIRAKIS, the gentleman from Florida that worked this bill, resolved all of the major issues. He negotiated, and this is now a voluntary program on the business side, not compulsory.

I don't think there are any real issues here, any barriers or bumps here, so I think we should have a unanimous vote on this. Therefore, I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yea'' on this great pro-U.S.A. bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I am pleased to see the House of Representatives take up the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014 today. I want to thank my caucus co-chair, Rep. GUS BILIRAKIS, for introducing this legislation to reauthorize Brand USA—our nation's Destination Marketing Organization or DMO.

This legislation will allow our country to continue its success in the international travel and tourism market, bringing greater numbers of international visitors to our shores. These travelers provide a substantial boost to our economy and produce many U.S. jobs. Did you know that international visitors coming to the United States are measured as an export? They are, and travel and tourism is the top export industry. Number One! Seventy million international visitors, spending over $180 billion, have produced a trade surplus every year since 1989—and Brand USA is a crucial part of this. Brand USA's most recent annual report showed that FY13 saw an increase of 1.1 million visitors. That increase brings an additional $3.4 billion in spending to our economy and supports over 50,000 new jobs.

International visitors are drawn to America's well known destinations like New York, Los Angeles, Orlando, and Chicago. And yet, it is our ''amber waves of grain'' and ''purple mountain majesties'' that attract travelers to all corners of our country. Our scenery sells us to the world and the upcoming 100th Anniversary of the National Park Service will highlight some of our most notable scenery.

Brand USA's efforts bring substantial benefits to our economy with a return on investment of more than 30 to 1. If only my investments did this well. This unbeatable value is done at no U.S. taxpayer expense. Funding for this program is provided by the international visitors who come to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I like to point out that travel and tourism is in every state, every territory, and congressional district across this country, and I encourage all my colleagues to join Rep. BILIRAKIS and myself in supporting America's travel and tourism industry by voting aye for this bipartisan legislation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today the House will consider H.R. 4450 and I rise in strong support of this legislation. I would like to thank Congressman BILIRAKIS for his leadership in bringing this bill to the House floor, and also the Tourism Caucus and co-sponsors for their support.

One of the most important amendments in H.R. 4450 includes the U.S. territories among the states and the District of Columbia whose benefits the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Travel Promotion plan must ensure. This provision is particularly important to my district- the U.S. Virgin Islands—where tourism is the primary economic activity. The Virgin Islands normally host approximately 2 million visitors a year, many of whom visit on cruise ships.

Tourism is a critical component of economic development in the U.S. Virgin Islands; especially with the closure of the oil refinery, HOVENSA, on St. Croix. The closure eliminated close to 1,200 refinery positions and raised our unemployment rate to the double digits. The ripple effect also included school closures, home foreclosures and a large number of residents leaving the island. As the Virgin Islands struggles to turn around its economy, it is critical that we continue to grow and sustain our tourism industry. Including the territories in the Corporation's promotion plan will significantly support these efforts. The territories are a major destination point for national and international travelers alike and should be a focal point for the Corporation.

H.R. 4450 is sponsored by more than a third of the House of Representatives, and almost equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats. Independent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office and the U.S. Travel Association concluded that the bill would reduce the federal deficit by $231 million over a year and not cost taxpayers a dime, all while creating jobs and economic opportunities in communities across America.

I think it is a Win-Win situation for our nation's economy and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4450.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4450, the ''Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014.''

I am pleased that the Energy and Commerce Committee made important enhancements to H.R. 4450 during its recent markup, significantly improving the bill before us today.

Specifically, H.R. 4450 now includes a provision to enhance accountability of the program by requiring Brand USA to establish performance metrics to assess the effectiveness of its marketing efforts; whether increases in visitors are due to Brand USA's efforts or outside factors; and any cost or benefit to the U.S. economy.

It also includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Commerce to establish formal procedures for revising the policy governing in-kind contributions or resolving disputes about the value of in-kind contributions with Brand USA.

These provisions are responsive to findings in a July 2013 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled ''Brand USA Needs Plans for Measuring Performance and Updated Policy on Private Sector Contributions.''

Given my strong desire to stimulate new tourism to the United States, I requested GAO to examine the effectiveness of Brand USA so that Congress could be informed as to whether the corporation was positioned to achieve its mission.

In that report, GAO concluded that Brand USA has taken some steps to measure its performance but has not yet developed a plan to monitor and evaluate whether its efforts are increasing travel to, and travelers' spending in, the U.S.

GAO also found that there were possible problems with current valuation methodologies for in-kind contributions and cited disputes between the Commerce Department and Brand USA about whether certain types of in-kind contributions are allowed under the law.

For the Federal government's part, the resources that are provided to Brand USA are derived from a fee assessed to foreign travelers that Customs and Border Protection collects. Given the well-documented resource challenges within CBP, I have no doubt that CBP would welcome the opportunity to retain more of these funds for its own traveler facilitation programs and operations but, as a policy matter, Congress has said it must go to this corporation to advertise and promote travel to the U.S.

For its part, it falls to Brand USA to show us that we made the right call by delivering data showing how the ad campaigns and media efforts undertaken by this corporation have impacted travel and the overall economy.

The bill being considered today will help ensure Brand USA addresses deficiencies found by the GAO and utilizes its funding in the most effective and efficient manner possible, as we extend authorization for the program through 2020.

Because of these improvements to the bill, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4450, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4450, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4411, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1022, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 3230, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

TRAVEL PROMOTION, ENHANCEMENT, AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4450) to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 57, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—347

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—57

Amash
Black
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Carter
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Culberson
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hensarling
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Meadows
Neugebauer
Perry
Petri
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Stockman
Stutzman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—28

Bachus
Campbell
Carney
Davis, Danny
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Kingston
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Tsongas
Vela
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1900

Messrs. STOCKMAN, HUNTER, WOODALL, HENSARLING, LAMBORN, MEADOWS, PERRY, SESSIONS, and GARRETT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, BURGESS, PETERS of California, HALL, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEZBOLLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4411) to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and

other institutions, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—404

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—28

Bachus
Campbell
Carney
Davis, Danny
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Foster
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Kingston
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1907

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURING ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENTS AND AMERICAN JOBS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1022) to develop an energy critical elements program, to amend the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 143, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—260

Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—143

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boustany
Brideństine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Byrne
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McAllister
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—29

Bachus
Campbell
Carney
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Kingston
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)

□ 1914

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 207, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brideństine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—34

Bachmann
Bachus
Campbell
Carney
Clawson (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Tsongas
Vela
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1923

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4984, EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–546) on the resolution (H. Res. 677) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H. RES. 649, DIRECTING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO TRANSMIT EMAILS TO OR FROM LOIS LERNER BETWEEN JANUARY 2009 AND APRIL 2011

Mr. MCKEON from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–547) directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Peters of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 702 of the Senate amendment (relating to the approval of courses of education provided by public institutions of higher learning for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program conditional on in-State tuition rate for veterans); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

HIGHER EDUCATION BILLS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss efforts to strengthen America's higher education system, make it more affordable, and provide students the tools they need to make smart investments in their futures.

Later this week, the House will consider three bipartisan bills that recently passed the House Education and the Workforce Committee, which include H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act; H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act; and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

Together, Madam Speaker, these measures will support innovation, strengthen transparency, and enhance financial counseling, which will ultimately help students access a more affordable education.

These legislative proposals are part of a broader effort to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. The House remains determined to strengthen America's higher education system and provide students the tools that they need to succeed.

I encourage my colleagues in the House to support these commonsense bills and call on the Senate to join us in working to make a difference in the lives of students and families.

□ 1930

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATH

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I rise to support education in the STEM fields—science, technology, engineering, and math—especially as more than 60 percent of U.S. employers face difficulties finding qualified workers in the STEM fields, it is essential that we support education in the STEM fields to remain competitive in a 21st century global economy.

That is why I have introduced the Innovative STEM Networks Act, which will establish a grant program for school districts to create partnerships with universities, business, and local nonprofits to support learning in the STEM fields.

Schools like FIU, Miami Dade College, and the University of Miami have dedicated resources to ensuring their students have a strong foundation in STEM subjects, and my bill will replicate this success for students preparing to enter college or the workforce.

I urge my colleagues to work with me to create jobs and spur economic growth by supporting STEM education.

MAYO CLINIC NAMED BEST HOSPITAL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I just want to congratulate the Mayo Clinic on being named the best hospital in the country by U.S. News & World Report, beating out nearly 5,000 medical centers nationwide.

U.S. News & World Report takes into account several factors, such as survival rates, technology, patient safety, and physician surveys. This was the first time the Mayo Clinic has been awarded the top prize, beating out other outstanding facilities like Massachusetts General and Johns Hopkins Hospital.

The Mayo Clinic is the largest integrated nonprofit group practice in the world, attracting people from all 50 States and 150 different countries. In addition to providing patients with unparalleled care, the Mayo Clinic engages in cutting-edge research, community outreach, and the education of the next generation of medical professionals.

Madam Speaker, I just want to commend the Mayo Clinic's commitment to providing high-quality care for its patients, and I congratulate them on this well-deserved distinction and recognition.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, my community has experienced over the last couple of weeks senseless horrific violence done with guns, wrapped and intertwined with domestic violence.

First, I offer my sympathy to Cassidy Stay, who lost six members of her family at the hands of a gun and an individual who was coming to do harm to her aunt; and then to the family of Candace Williams, whose three children—7-year-old Neira, 1-year-old Paris, and 6-year-old Torian—watched their mother gunned down in her bedroom with baby Paris, 1-year old, sleeping alongside her mother; and of course, the Stay family—Katie and Stephen, Bryan, Emily, Rebecca, and

Zach—who lost their lives at the hand of a violent individual who was, as I said, coming to do harm to his own ex-wife.

It is time to raise the understanding of domestic violence. Today, at a press conference in Houston, we announced the Candace Way Out, so that women all over America would be able to know there are places to go.

I intend, Madam Speaker, to introduce legislation to enhance the penalty for anyone involved in domestic violence that uses a gun that results in the death of that loved one. Madam Speaker, violence, guns, and domestic violence must end.

Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak to a tragedy resulting from another senseless act of domestic violence in my congressional district.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the friends and relatives of Candace Williams, especially her three young children, 6-year-old Torian, 7-year-old Neira, and 1-year-old Paris, who were left without parents following the murder of their mother who was killed by their stepfather before taking his own life.

A few days earlier, Stephen Stay, his wife Katie, and their four children—Bryan, 13, Emily, 9, Rebecca, 6, and Zach, 4 were brutally shot and killed in their suburban Houston home by the ex-husband of Katie Stay's sister.

I offer my deepest sympathies and condolences to Cassidy Stay, the sole survivor of this horrific crime but who is also a hero for leading the authorities to the perpetrator of this crime.

It is imperative that we come together in strong support of a broad and comprehensive strategy to address the causes and effects of gun violence when domestic violence is involved.

Weighing heavily on our hearts and consciences is the fact that an estimated 46 million children in our country are exposed to violence each year through crime, abuse and trauma.

Domestic violence is the willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, or other abusive behavior perpetrated by a family member or intimate partner against another.

It is an epidemic affecting individuals in Houston and across the nation, regardless of age, economic status, race, religion, nationality or educational background.

Violence against women is often accompanied by emotionally abusive and controlling behavior, and thus is part of a systematic pattern of dominance and control.

Domestic violence results in physical injury, psychological trauma—and as we have seen in Houston—too often in death.

The emotional, physical, and psychological damage caused by domestic violence can last a lifetime. Consider the following facts:

1. One in four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime

2. Historically, females have been most often victimized by someone they knew.

3. There were 187,811 incidents of family violence in Texas in 2010.

4. There were 120 domestic homicides in 2010 as a result of domestic violence of which 43% were committed by a spouse and 24% were committed by a dating partner.

In the United States, 9,146 people were killed by firearms in 2011 a number 223 times greater than the United Kingdom, which experienced only 41 homicides by firearm.

Homicide rates in the United States are 6.9 times higher than the combined rates in 22 most populous high-income countries.

Madam Speaker, we must begin discussing common-sense steps we can take right now to combat gun violence.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee and the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, I have introduced H.R. 65, the Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act and other legislation to reduce the incidence of gun violence.

Changing a culture of violence will not happen overnight but that is no excuse for failing to try. We must try. We must not give up.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in redoubling our commitment protect our children and our communities from domestic violence.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of domestic violence everywhere.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, when talking on the floor, presenting legislation, it is always good to have a compass, so you can have some sense of where you are going and what it is all about.

This is one I often bring to the floor when we talk about the issues of the day. This is from FDR—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—and he said the ''test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.''

It is a compass, and it is a way of judging progress or a lack of progress, and we seem to have more of the latter than the former. We have much to do if we are going to add to those who have little.

In America, the American middle class, the working men and women, the families who raise their children try to buy a home, a car, maybe take a vacation—they have been struggling for the last 20 years. It has been tough. They have not seen income growth.

The statistics are stark and clear. The middle class of America has stagnated, and, in fact, it has shrunk, as more and more Americans have fallen into the lower income class.

There is something we can do about it, and we, Democrats, intend to do just that. We want to jump-start the middle class. We want to put in place policies that will grow the opportunities for the working families of America, for those men and women that get up in the morning, feed their children, get them off to school while they are getting off to a job.

There are things we can do. I want to talk about that tonight. Some of my colleagues will join us a little later.

Let me put up the agenda for jump-starting the middle class, the Make It In America agenda, rebuilding the American manufacturing sector, which was the heart and—in many ways—the soul of the working middle class of America, where they could get a decent wage, where they know that a husband or a wife, by themselves, could provide sufficient income for the family to have a home, a car, and enjoy the benefits of this great Nation.

So we will talk about the Make It In America agenda, and we will go at that in some length tonight because that is our basic subject matter.

The other one is very simple. It is a reflection on the demographics, and it is a reflection on the working people of America, and it is women. It is women. What we say is that when women succeed, America succeeds.

There is a set of policies that we need to put in place all across this country that will guarantee that the women of America that are out there working day in and day out have an equal opportunity. Right now, they don't.

They make about 70 cents on every dollar that a man makes. There is an inequality that exists in America's workplace, and our agenda is to end that inequality, to make sure that whether you are a man or a woman, you are going to be paid an equal amount for the same amount of work, the same experience, the same productivity. So when women succeed, America succeeds.

There are several other policies here that are family-friendly policies, and we will talk about that another day.

If the middle class is to succeed, if we are going to jump-start the opportunities for the middle class, a key element is education. So that is the third plank—the third leg upon which we rest our policies.

How can we jump-start the middle class? Education—there are very many things that we can do in education. One just passed the House of Representatives on a bipartisan vote after almost two decades of struggle.

We are revamping the job training programs in America, so that the preparation that people need to get a decent job are streamlined, effective, and efficient, and that is part of it, the job training programs, but it is more than that.

American students now have to—in almost every case—borrow an extraordinary amount of money in order to get a higher education, whether it is community college or the 4-year colleges and beyond.

That extraordinary debt burden is enhanced by extraordinarily high interest rates, so what we want to do is to bring down those interest rates, and there are three or four different pieces

of legislation that our Democratic team has put forth, all of them to accomplish the same goal, bringing down the interest rates.

We would like to see it go down to the same interest rates that banks pay for the money that they borrow from the Federal Government and the Federal Reserve—wouldn't that be nice—because it is almost zero, but we don't think we can get that far.

We know it can bring that interest rate down from 6, 7, 8 percent down to the 3 percent, maybe the 4 percent range—literally cutting in half the cost of that money. So there are a series of policies on education.

Let me turn to the one that we want to focus on tonight, which is the Make It In America agenda. There are many pieces to this. One of them was put forward by our team, and there are about seven different elements to this program. This is our logo, Make It In America, so that Americans can make it.

Trade policy, taxes, energy policy, labor, education—which we just talked about—research, and infrastructure, these are the elements of a solid program to have the middle class have an opportunity, to jump-start the working men and women so that they can, once again, make it in America—by rebuilding the manufacturing sector, by having decent trade policies, where we don't give it away and see the American corporations simply run off to China or Bangladesh or wherever to get the lowest possible wage, trade policies that are fair to America.

Our tax policy is critically important. If anybody was reading the newspapers, The Wall Street Journal or other business newspapers last week, the word now is ''inversion.''

Well, what is inversion? It is simply a runaway American corporation, running away to the lowest possible tax haven in the world and making themselves domiciled in that country, leaving America behind, where they got their start, where they built their enterprise and simply running away, leaving those who cannot run to pay the burden of operating this great country's security, our defense, and all of the other things we need to do. So tax policy fits into it.

Energy policy, labor—we will go through some of these tonight. We won't get to all of them.

I want to deal very quickly with this last one, which is the infrastructure. We passed a bill last week, and it was a stopgap. It was a kick the can down the road bill to keep our national highway system funded. It was really a pretty lousy bill.

It would extend for some 10 months an inadequate amount of funding for the transportation systems of this Nation, and it was funded by a cockamamie scheme of somehow smoothing pensions, which basically meant that American corporations didn't have to pay as much into their pension system, so that they could pay more in taxes. It is not going to happen.

If you wonder why Detroit, why San Jose, why other cities and companies across this Nation have troubles with their pension systems, it is because of this kind of foolish legislation.

What are you to do? Let the highway program stop? No. We passed the bill, and we will see where it winds up.

What we really need is what the President has proposed—a robust, comprehensive make it and build it in America program. It is called the GROW AMERICA Act, to grow America, to build the infrastructure, and there are several pieces to this piece of legislation—all of them deserve the immediate attention of the 435 of us in the House of Representatives and the 100 Senators—proposed by the President and, therefore, dead on arrival here.

If it had been proposed by—I don't know—any other leader in the world, it probably would have passed by now, but the Republicans will not allow President Obama's proposals to move forward.

Here it is, the highway system. Now, this is just in 2015. The highway system would get even more money than it has today, some $60 billion total, $7.6 billion to fix the current highway system, and this is in addition to the money that the States and locals are putting in—public transit, an increase in public transit, the buses, the light rail trains, and the like, inner city rail, Amtrak, boosting that—I am going to come back to Amtrak in a few moments.

International trade—back to what I talked about a few moments ago in the Make It In America agenda—international trade, the ports, revamping the ports, a freight policy—really, for the very first time, we would have an opportunity to have, in the United States, a freight policy.

□ 1945

How do you get the containers off the ship in Long Beach, put them on a railcar, travel across the United States to some terminal, and then, once again, put them on a truck to go to wherever they are going? A policy, a comprehensive policy about how we move freight is critically important to the United States. International commerce and fair trade is important because it does allow for the boosting and the growth of the American economy. Now, free trade is something different, and that basically means give it away to some other country, which we should not do.

This GROW AMERICA Act is one of the principal elements in jump-starting the middle class. Why? Because these are middle class jobs. These are construction jobs on the highways, on the transit system, in the railroads, and certainly in the ports and the freight system—middle class jobs. How do we grow the economy? Build the infrastructure, increase the jobs for the working men and women and the families of America, and we grow the economy.

By the way, we also grow the tax revenues because people are working. They are not tax takers, they are taxpayers.

So this is a proposal that the President has put forward. There has not been one hearing in the House of Representatives on this proposal that is now over 4 months old. Why? Why? Why is it that we have not given the President of the United States at least the consideration and the courtesy of having a hearing on his proposal? We should do so because it happens to be a very, very good proposal.

Let's take a couple of these elements for a moment. This bridge collapsed. Now, this isn't a bridge from Donetsk in Ukraine that was bombed during that war there. This is a bridge in Washington, a bridge north of Seattle on Interstate 5, the highway system between Canada, the United States, and Mexico, right down the coast, the west coast of California. This bridge collapsed just a couple of years ago. And this is not unusual. We have had bridges collapsing all across the United States.

This is part of the GROW AMERICA agenda. It is part of the agenda that we have in mind for the middle class, jump-starting the middle class, because when this bridge is built of American-produced steel in the Buy America laws that are presently on the books—which, by the way, the President says we ought to make even more robust so that your tax dollars are spent on American-made steel, American-made concrete, and the other elements that go into building these infrastructure projects, in other words, spreading the opportunity that comes from the transportation system and the growing and the building of the transportation system into all the other elements in the economy. It can be done.

The GROW AMERICA Act is specifically designed to deal with the deficiency in America's roads, and particularly in the bridges. Oh, the economic loss as a result of this highway system being shut down? Unfathomable. Didn't have to happen. And if we pass the GROW AMERICA Act, it is not likely to happen.

I want to pick up that little piece about what happens when you spend your tax money on American-made systems. Now, we talk a lot about green energy, as we should. We talk about energy conservation, as we should. We talk about wind turbines, and we talk about alternate energy systems such as solar, as we should. But where are those manufacturers?

Where are the wind turbines manufactured? Where are the solar systems manufactured? Oh, China. By the way, we have a trade suit against China for dumping solar panels in the United States and decimating the American manufacturing system.

This piece of legislation, 1524, I like it. I am the author of it. H.R. 1524, Make It In America, create clean energy manufacturing jobs—simple. Your tax dollars must be spent on American-made solar, wind, and green energy systems. Now, if some developer out there wants to build a solar energy plant and use your tax dollars as a subsidy to pay for that plant, then if this becomes law, he must buy American-made solar panels. Now, if he wants to use his own money, he can buy whatever he wants. But I believe your tax dollars ought to be spent on American-made equipment, which is part of the Make It In America agenda.

There are many other pieces to this puzzle, and in the Democratic Caucus, we have introduced well over 50 pieces of legislation to advance the program of Make It In America so that the American middle class has a chance to grow and a chance to prosper. We can do that. Any number of those bills—or, in fact, all of them—would advance the middle class, literally jump-starting the middle class and giving American families an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this incredible society and this incredible country we call America.

Joining me tonight is a woman from Ohio who has spent many years dealing with manufacturing and talking about the things we need to do to build and to grow the manufacturing sector of America.

I think you come from the heart of that. MARCY KAPTUR, welcome. Please share with us your thoughts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, first of all, I want to compliment Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI for his exceptional leadership in the Make It In America agenda and allowing Members like myself, Congressman TONKO from New York, and others to participate in focusing the spotlight on what counts. I wanted to follow on what the gentleman had said about what we import versus what we export.

People say, well, America has a budget deficit. Well, we have a jobs deficit that grows from importing more than we export. You mentioned the energy sector, one that I have particular responsibility for here. Last year, we imported $369 billion more of petroleum than we exported energy products. That translates into lost jobs in our country of over 1.8 million, nearly 2 million jobs just in the energy sector that we could bring back home if we focused on an all-of-the-above energy strategy that would help us recapture that wealth.

Those jobs here at home, automotive, a sector that our region of the country, Toledo, Sandusky, Lorain, Cleveland, Parma, and Brook Park, we know the auto industry well. Last year, we imported into our country $309 billion worth of automotive products from countries that didn't accept our parts for vehicles—take Korea for one—and that lost wealth, that ceded power inside this economy translates, just in the auto sector, to over 1.5 million lost jobs just in 1 year. That is just 1 year.

If we look at consumer goods, we see all these children streaming across our border from Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras; and you look at the economies of those countries and the sweatshops that are making apparel, for example—those are some of the consumer goods that come in here—the people are earning a dollar a day, maybe $10 a day. They live in utter poverty.

Okay. So those goods are sent here, and Americans spent $533 billion on imported consumer goods last year. That translates—rather than making it here, we imported it—just in the consumer goods area, in 1 year, we lost 2.6 million jobs.

So if you add up just the energy jobs, the auto jobs, and the consumer goods jobs, you are talking about nearly 6 million jobs in 1 year. And we have 20 million Americans who remain unemployed or underemployed in our economy right now. Think about what this hemorrhage is costing us.

Some of the very companies that have moved these jobs from California, from New York, and from Ohio, they still operate those companies in foreign locales. Congressman LEVIN of Michigan calls it an inversion. That is kind of a good word, actually. Others have called it outsourcing. Others call it shipping out, shipping out our jobs and shipping out our wealth. People say, well, what has happened to the middle class? Well, it has gone global. Unfortunately, the people in those places are not middle class. They are working under horrendous conditions. And those goods are sent here, whether they are agricultural goods or whether they are industrial goods.

I want to compliment you on keeping a focus on Make It In America.

I do have a bill I wanted to put on the record, H.R. 194, which is the Congressional Made in America Promise Act, that would amend the Buy America Act to require this branch of our government, the legislative branch, in all of its gift shops and supply shops to emphasize the procurement of goods made in America. Doesn't that make sense? If you go around and you look at what is in there, you will be very surprised to find many products that are made overseas. We are just saying put as much effort into finding goods made in America and sell them in our gift shops.

So I would hope that some of our colleagues that are listening would cosponsor H.R. 194. It is a very well-written bill. It is our bill. It makes sure that if something is overpriced and doesn't belong in a gift shop, there are requirements. It is very sensible, and it would have some affirmative effort by the shops here on Capitol Hill to buy American-made goods.

So I want to thank the gentleman very much for his leadership. This is what the American people long to hear, a discussion here in the Congress on jobs and economic growth. It seems to be an agenda that the Speaker and the leadership is not willing to put on the floor, so I thank the gentleman from California for your leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Ms. KAPTUR, for bringing to our attention ways in which we can actually do something. It may seem small, but we get thousands and thousands of people coming through the gift shop here at the Visitor Center, can they find something made in America. They ought to be able to.

I like your bill, and it will send a message, a message to us, because we will set the policy. If we set that policy right, we can grow the American middle class, jump-start the American middle class, and give the working men and women a real opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this society.

I noticed while you were chatting a colleague of mine who often shares this hour, Mr. TONKO from New York. Thank you for joining us once again. We were here last week, weren't we?

Mr. TONKO. We were, and it is always a pleasure to join with you, Representative GARAMENDI, and with Representative KAPTUR for the purposes of highlighting what can be done in this arena to cultivate a climate that grows private sector jobs and to be supportive of American-made products. So I stand here this evening in support of H.R. 1524, which would allow for us to prosper with the energy innovation and energy alternative technology which, as American produced, would be highlighted, would be the focus of attention with H.R. 1524.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Would you excuse me?

Before you came to Congress, were you not responsible for the State of New York innovation, energy, and related issues?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. I served as president and CEO before this work in Congress at NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, and some of the partnerships that we inspired, public-private matches, where NYSERDA would have a piece of the action working with our innovator community and our entrepreneurial community and come up with these innovative designs that would allow for us to meet energy demands or to foster energy efficiency concepts which are very important to

the outcome of energy policy and performance in this country. So, absolutely, I was involved in that.

I know that that is a growing edge. It is a meteoric rise within our manufacturing sector with all of this challenge as energy consumers to not only provide for alternatives and more efficient and effective outcomes and perhaps, in many cases, reduce costs, which are important, but also embracing an environmental agenda that deals with carbon emission and methane emission through the concepts of climate change and global warming.

So it is an across-the-board win, Representative GARAMENDI. I applaud you for H.R. 1524 and am supportive of H.R. 194, just recently spoken about by Representative KAPTUR, where we have the opportunity, again, to govern the decisions to either sell American-made products in gift shops or not.

One thing I would like to highlight here this evening, we have many traditions that have followed through the Halls of this Congress through the decades, one of which is the Export-Import Bank. So as we talk about product development and working within an international marketplace, there are those concepts in competing nations that help them with their export-import development. We have such a bank. The Export-Import Bank is at risk because it needs to be reauthorized, and, again, there is a sluggish outcome here where there is denial as to that concept.

□ 2000

I can tell you that Export-Import Bank supports about $1 billion worth of sales in my own district. That is no small change. And so we need to make certain that we move forward with this concept of the Export-Import Bank being reauthorized. You look at the Ex-Im Bank and where it provides great services, and that is with the small business and medium-sized business community. Those are the up-and-coming efforts within the resurgence of our economy that need assistance. This program does it. Whether you are selling state-of-the-art energy innovative products or whether it is alarm systems or whether it is electronics, there is a great bit of assistance provided by the Ex-Im Bank.

Just last month, the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, who don't always agree, came together supporting their togetherness in swiftly addressing reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank. So I think it is very important. You have an organization here that has supported $37 billion worth of sales through last year that sustains some 200,000-plus jobs with over 3,400 companies. The important thing to note is their track record is stellar. For 80 years, they have been performing without assistance from taxpayer dollars. Their default rate is below 2 percent. Who can argue with that sort of success story?

So as we develop this Made In America agenda, we need the complementary efforts of the Ex-Im Bank so we can wholeheartedly go forward with every tool in the kit for our American manufacturers and our businesses, small and medium and industrial style, to be able to allow them the engine that heightens their export-import opportunity, and that is the way the work should be done, not denied here, not procrastinating about whether or not it should be reauthorized, not making it a political football, but really going forward and showing enthusiastic support based on tradition, on history, on performance, on success.

Let's get it done. Let's do our Export-Import Bank reauthorization. It is the right thing to do. This majority in the House of Representatives, the Republican majority, ought not hold back that progress. It is a support network that is essential to the future, the soundness of our business community, from small to medium to large.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO, thank you.

I was just thinking through that Export-Import, and the buzz inside the Beltway here in Washington that it only helps the big companies—General Electric and Boeing. The fact of the matter is, yes, it certainly helps those companies export airplanes and jet engines and whatever else, but it is the small companies that really take advantage of it. It is the start-ups and the growing companies that need that support.

I asked my staff, actually an intern, to do some research on the kinds of financing mechanisms that China, Japan, and Korea use to export their ships that they make.

The great shipbuilding industry is no longer in the United States, it is in those countries. There are one or two European countries that are also involved, but each of those countries support those shipbuilding companies with programs that are exactly the same as the Export-Import Bank, which is a loan guarantee. And it works.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. They are more aggressive than our program. So why would we reduce the complementary force that we provide to Ex-Im Bank. Ninety percent, as you just pointed out, a great amount of the activity, is with our small and medium-sized community; 90 percent is with the small and medium-sized business community. So what gives? Why are we not going forward with great energy, with great passion to say we can't miss, we need to reauthorize.

Instead, we are hearing vibes about not reauthorizing. We are having all kinds of groups coming together in nontraditional fashion, imploring us to do the right thing here. And again, it is being held back by the majority in the House. It is unacceptable, and it is unintelligent to do so.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I actually think, if I might say so, it is a small group in the Republican Party that is really taking the lead in this issue. Somehow they believe that government ought not be involved in commercial enterprise, when in fact since the very beginning of our Nation government has been involved, and together with the private sector is responsible for the growth of this incredible economy. This is but one example. There are numerous other ones.

I was just thinking about some of the words that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) spoke regarding energy policy.

We are now generating and extracting a large amount of natural gas, and so much so that now there is a desire to export that natural gas in liquid form called liquefied natural gas, LNG. We have to be careful because that natural gas has given us the opportunity to pull down our energy costs, manufacturing costs, so we are now seeing companies returning to the United States. Dow Chemical is but one example. I used to represent their major plant out in Pittsburg, California. They are coming home because of energy policy, so we have to be careful about the export of LNG because it can drive up the price and harm the growth of our manufacturing sector.

However—and here is an opportunity—the LNG is a strategic national asset. It is bringing down our cost of energy. Shipbuilding is also a strategic national industry. Our United States Navy, the most powerful and most effective and awesome in the world, depends upon American shipyards. However, private shipbuilding in the United States has basically gone downhill, together with the mariners, the maritime crews that are on those American-built ships. We have an opportunity here. If we are going to export LNG, then we ought to export that LNG on American-built ships with American crews.

It is an issue of public policy. We can do this, and in so doing, we can revitalize an important sector of the American economy, the shipbuilding economy, which is found on all of the coasts of America, from Maine, Philadelphia, around in the gulf to San Diego, and all of the way up to Seattle. There are shipyards that are desperate for business, and the LNG export is an opportunity to capture and bring home the shipbuilding, and when it is coupled with the Export-Import Bank issue, we can really restart and rebuild a critical element in the economy of America.

Mr. TONKO. I hear you making mention of a long-standing skill set, that of shipbuilding. It is important as we look at that Make It In America agenda that the Democrats in the House of Representatives have put together, a

very sound platform of initiatives, of policy and resource advocacy, a multifaceted concept of how to underpin the strengths of our manufacturing sector.

As we move forward with those skill sets that are required to build these ships, we need to make certain there is an investment in skills development and training, retraining, so we are doing it smarter. It doesn't have to be the cheaper price delivered to the market; it has to be the most quality also. And so we can win several of these contracts through brain power, through the investment of our intellectual capacity.

We are a Nation of pioneer spirit. I think that holds true to this day. Our humble beginnings taught us that we impacted not only the growth of this country with a westward movement, but through an industrial revolution. It affected positively the quality of life throughout this world because of that intellectual capacity, because of that pioneer spirit, because of that creative genius. And so it is important for us to include in our package as we do training and retraining, education formats, and research. We see it in the energy sphere. We see it across the board. It is important.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt you, before you move to the research agenda, which is absolutely critical, today the President of the United States signed the revamping of the job training programs in America. This is a bipartisan effort. It passed the House on a bipartisan vote—I think almost universal votes for the Democrats; the Republicans, maybe two-thirds voted for it and a third against it—but it is a complete revamp of an important element of what you just described, which is the job training and the job preparation and the training that is needed for these advanced manufacturing technologies.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And it is the way we keep our cutting edge as sharp and precision-oriented as possible.

We know that it is three areas of investment. It is investment in capital infrastructure, physical infrastructure, and human infrastructure. Having that quality workforce, well prepared, skill sets that are at the cutting-edge quality so that we can continue to prosper as we compete, our companies compete, our businesses compete, at that international market. So it is important for us to constantly invest in that upgrading, in that training and retraining, and in that enhancement of education for our young people.

So there is the cornerstone of our plan, along with research which, as we have seen through the last couple of decades, it is critically important. If we look back as far back as the global space race, that space race required an investment of research. Landing a person on the Moon first of any nation, with that American flag being anchored onto the surface of the Moon, didn't just happen; it took an order of planning and commitment and passionate resolve so that with that passion we could make a difference. Well, it happened, and America was energized and it was lifted in the eyes of nations around the world as that leader.

We are at a critical juncture again, and can we afford to walk away from an investment in research? Can we afford to walk away from an investment in training and retraining? Can we afford to walk away from an investment in education, or the Export-Import Bank, or all sorts of incentives that provide for upgrades to manufacturing, advanced manufacturing, robotics, technology that allows us to build the best product out there, and we set the pace, we set the tone? It is about this wonderful agenda of Make It In America, established by so many people, including yourself, Representative GARAMENDI, the leadership in our House, Leader PELOSI and the Democrats in the House, advancing this cause of investment in tomorrow, investment in today. It is how we get there and how we always achieve by seeing the problem, meeting the challenge, and investing in America and her people.

We don't get there by cutting our way to prosperity, by denial, by games on the House floor, by resoundingly defeating a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. It is absolutely essential that we do those building blocks that take us to the next generation of competition, the next generation of workers, and it can happen only if we plan accordingly and if we take that effort to lead rather than just hold back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You are so correct.

Let me give you an example. Yesterday I called together my manufacturing advisory committee. We had about 50 manufacturers, some very, very large—Boeing was there—and some very small companies. The discussion centered around precisely what you talked about. We had representatives from Lawrence Livermore National Lab, Sandia National Lab, Lawrence Berkeley Lab, and the University of California Davis, researchers, the most advanced research going on in the world.

Their discussion was not about nuclear weapons, which you might expect from Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Labs, because that is their principal job, how to deal with the nuclear weapons issue, but they were talking about technologies that they have come into and have advanced through their research, like laser research.

One of the companies that was there was a spinoff from research that was done at Lawrence Livermore National Lab on laser technology, and it is called laser peening. Now you have heard of a ball-peen hammer that is used to strike metal, and in striking the metal, it actually strengthens it. Well, now they are using lasers to strike that metal, and the result of it is that you significantly strengthen the metal. And this is now used by General Electric and others in the manufacturing of some of the internal parts in the jet engines. It substantially strengthens them.

That is just one example of the way that research can flow into the manufacturing sector, enhancing the job opportunities for the middle class, and once again, it is made in America and is giving the middle class a jump start.

□ 2015

These things all come together, so this manufacturing group yesterday dealt on everything you talked about. They were talking about export. They talked about tax policy. They talked about research into the private sector.

Another example, the University of California, which I have the honor of representing, has a very large engineering school. It is one of the largest in the Nation, and they are producing—I think they have 8,000 students in their engineering program.

A couple of the graduates, a few years back, developed a new way of programming machine tools—computer-assisted machine tools. They were so advanced that a Japanese machine tool company, one of the largest in the world, began to look at this and said: we need that technology.

They incorporated it into their program, and then they decided they needed to be near the researchers. So they have now located in Davis, California, a major manufacturing program to make these very advanced machine tools, using the research that comes from the university, a marvelous example of what we need to do in our public policies.

Mr. TONKO. It is interesting, as you highlighted the discussion, the dialogue with your advisers. The business of representing congressional districts, of representing any district in the halls of government, the key factor is listening, opening up to discussion, ideas, constructive criticism of what needs to be done out there, what is being done and what can be done better, what is not being done that needs to be done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Can I give you another example? It was exciting—it was a really exciting day, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Go for it, Representative.

Mr. GARAMENDI. One of the small businesses—of several of them, actually, after listening to the heads of these extraordinary laboratories said: yeah, but I am just a small company, I don't have any money to go and work with you guys on products that we want to develop.

The fellow from the SBA, the Small Business Administration, raised his hand—you know, I kind of see him wanting to jump into the conversation—so I called on him and he said: we can help.

I am going: You are from the government, and you can help? He said: we can help, we can help, we have a voucher program.

I didn't know this existed in the Small Business Administration, but they have a voucher program that a small business that wants to connect to one of the national laboratories or one of the universities can get a voucher that is worth a certain amount of money, take it down to the laboratory, and begin to work with the laboratory on transferring technology to that business.

Wow, I mean, do businesses know that such a thing exists? Are we promoting that? Are we supporting the Small Business Administration, so that they can help these small businesses in really what I think is a unique and wonderful way?

I interrupted you. My apologizes, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. No, no. It is fine because you are just speaking to the point of listening and responding, learning from our constituents, learning from the front line of the business community and the worker community. Basically, when we travel this route, if we gather the information and then act accordingly, great things can happen. Prosperity blooms and blossoms.

I believe that when the business community is speaking—from small to medium to large industry—when they are telling us we need workforce development investment, we ought to listen. When they are telling us they need immigration reform, we ought to listen. When they are talking about reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, we ought to listen.

When they talk about incentives that modernize and transfer and transition traditional manufacturing into advanced manufacturing, we ought to listen. The list goes on and on.

Just recently, I toured a manufacturing center, a factory in my district. My grandparents called the district I represent home. Ironically, a set of them worked in that factory. I am a product of immigrants—grandparent immigrants, who were dairy farmers and factory workers.

Those factory workers worked on that same floor that we were visiting, those grandparents—my grandparents. One couldn't help but wonder the equipment changes that have come in those decades that have passed. While they wove carpets—they were weavers in that carpet industry—today, they are weaving fiber strands for defense contracts, for huge equipment out there.

The owner implies and states to me that: I can't compete, I have to offer my product at a 1985 price level.

Why? One would ask why? He responded rather quickly and theoretically: a, our foreign competitors are subsidized by their government—they oftentimes own the factory, the government owns the factory. In this case, China manipulates the currency.

He said: you take away any of those factors, any one, and I can compete; you take all of them away, and I am a winner, hands down.

When our communities speak to us—in this case, workers, businesses, management—when they speak, we ought to respond accordingly. I don't understand the lack of action on an Export-Import Bank reauthorization. I don't understand the dumbing down of research opportunity. I don't understand the lack of resources to provide for a Make It In America agenda fostered by the Democratic leadership of this House, understanding full well that we are at our best when we invest in our tomorrow.

That pioneer spirit comes fully alive when we do that. Let's move forward with progress by committing to that order of agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There are so many pieces to this puzzle. At the top of our Make It In America is trade policy. Thank you for bringing that issue back onto the floor. It is something we constantly need to deal with.

We have not talked this last year—actually, since Republicans took control of Congress, we have not talked about the manipulation of currency by China. I know when the Democrats controlled the House, we were putting forth legislation multiple times to address the currency manipulation issue, but there are many, many pieces to this trade policy that are relevant to us.

As you were talking about the manufacturing, I put up one of my favorite photos, a Make It In America photo. You have seen my photo here, I am sure, of a locomotive. The American Recovery Act, a stimulus bill which really did work—trash it politically, but it actually worked—there was money for Amtrak to buy locomotives.

In that particular section of the Recovery Act, Congress wrote—and you voted for it—I wasn't here at the time, I wish I was because I would love to take credit for this—wrote a little paragraph that said this money must be spent on locomotives that are 100 percent made in America—100 percent made in America—a couple hundred million dollars to build these locomotives.

Companies looked at it. A German company said: that is a lot of money, we can build locomotives. Siemens, a large international industrial manufacturing company—located in Sacramento, building light rail cars—said: we can build American-made locomotives.

They started a new manufacturing plant. They have over 600 workers there today. They are producing 100 percent American-made locomotives because of public policy. Your tax dollars are spent on American-made locomotives.

That supply chain is all across this Nation—not made in Germany, made in America—the wheels, the trains, the tracks, the electronics, all of that, American-made. It is a matter of public policy. The Export-Import Bank, tax policy, how you are going to spend American taxpayer dollars—these are the things we wanted to do to jumpstart the middle class—Make It In America.

Mr. TONKO, we have got about 7 or 8 minutes left, so let's roll on.

Mr. TONKO. Okay. Well, some of those trends that saw decline in some of the manufacturing sectors in our economy over the decades are now beginning to close on that gaping bit of disparity.

Labor rates, for instance—as countries had very, very cheap labor rates, they witnessed that their labor population began to demand more, which is a sign of civilization. When you are investing your skill set, your brain power, into the development of products and working on that assembly line, you will begin to understand that remuneration for what you do is important.

An order of social fairness, social justice, comes into play, economic justice, so the discrepancy between the labor rates has narrowed.

We have earlier talked about the energy supplies and energy costs. Many now are citing us as the millennium of Mideast here, with the supply of natural gas and energy issues that are being addressed significantly through innovation and alternative supplies and through natural gas supplies.

So the energy quotient in that formula for manufacturing has been very much flipping, cycling favor for the U.S. economy.

As these major factors begin to steady our way, there is a brighter bit of hope out there that is launched. If we accompany that with the appropriate policies and attached resources, if we can adopt, if you would, the Democratic agenda for Make It In America, great things can happen.

It takes a vision, and it takes leadership, and it takes planning so as to get to that point where we are investing in that pioneer spirit of America. I earlier talked about my grandparents and the fact that they claimed the 20th Congressional District in New York as their home.

They tethered their American Dream there. They went to work in those factories, on those farms, and made certain they could climb that ladder for economic opportunity. They shared that with their children and their grandchildren. They wanted to make certain that this American Dream was

there for their family and then share it with others. That is us at our best.

Why not invest in that American Dream, so that as families go forward, as they dream their dreams, as they tether those dreams, as they become all they can be, as they submit to an American agenda that has always been about opportunity, about taking your natural skills, talents, and abilities and investing them for your own growth, but certainly for the growth of community and the American culture—that has been us, that is our history. Let it speak to us.

As we hear others who speak to us about the needs to grow the economy, let us respond. Let us do that with a keen sense of awareness, of empathy, of attachment to an American agenda for jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, it is always a great pleasure to be on the floor with you. You are so clear. Your vision and your purpose is so very, very clear.

The Make It In America agenda has many pieces: trade policy, tax policy, energy, labor, education, research, and infrastructure. All of it is designed for one purpose, and that is to give American working families an opportunity.

It has become part of our jump-start for the middle class. This is our policy. These are the things that we want to do as Democrats. We want to see the working families of America make it. We want it made in America, and we want American families to be making it, so the Make It In America is one part of this agenda.

When women succeed, America succeeds. This is the fact that a majority of the workforce in America is now women. The reality is they make 70 cents on the dollar for every man that makes a dollar, so we need to address that. We need to make sure that they have the opportunities.

Right now, there is an increasing concern about on-demand labor, which is mostly women. You can imagine the destruction to family life when a woman that is working at a retail store gets a phone call and has to immediately report to work for 3, 4, or 5 hours.

This is craziness, but there is a whole series of family-friendly policies for women that are involved in this issue, including the minimum wage.

Finally, the issue of education, which we have talked about. These are the jump-start the middle class policies that we are pushing forward.

Make It In America is the agenda that you and I have talked about so many times here on the floor—little progress is being made—but I am telling you, if we had the majority in this House, these pieces of legislation that we have talked about today would be sitting over in the Senate and they would be on the President's desk very, very quickly—critical policies for the future of this Nation, critical policies for the working men and women and the families of America.

We intend to do it. We intend to see this agenda, the agenda for the working men and women advance.

Mr. TONKO, do you want to have another 30 seconds before we are told to wrap?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. Just underscoring your statement that when women succeed, America succeeds—when women succeed, that lifts all families, whether it is a single female head of family, whether it is a male-female household, two women in the household, whatever it is, across the board, that is a win situation.

□ 2030

So families prosper, families succeed, and then, of course, America succeeds. Again, a multifaceted agenda that speaks to core needs. It speaks to social and economic justice. It speaks to the fact that pay equity and equal pay for equal work is a cornerstone to our women succeed, America succeeds agenda, the minimum wage being lifted, and certainly quality child care, affordable child care. That is what sustains the agenda, so that when women succeed, families succeed, America succeeds. We move forward with a vibrancy that began with its underpinnings of support here on the Hill in Washington, with Congress working toward the needs of workers and the business community and making certain that we respond to the present-day needs that exist out there that only build upon the richness of history and allow America to truly succeed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO and Ms. KAPTUR, thank you so very much for joining us tonight.

America will make it when we Make It In America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ENERGY ACTION TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as part of the House Energy Action Team, it is important for us to address the hardworking American taxpayers that are concerned about their rising energy costs and who want to know what their United States Congress is going to do about the issue of energy independence, the cost of fuel, the cost of electricity, and the fact that they have got less money in their wallet after a week of driving back and forth between work and taking the kids to school and ball games and church and all the things that we, as average Americans, do. After they pay for the fuel to do all of that, to drive their vehicles to and fro, they reach in their wallet for extra cash, and there is none left. What is the United States Congress going to do about the rising cost of energy?

I came to Washington to focus on three things: jobs, energy, and our Founding Fathers.

Jobs. How about unleashing and unbridling the innovative and entrepreneurial spirit of Americans that will actually turn this economy around by putting Americans to work, lessening the number of Americans on the welfare rolls, and actually having Americans earn their way? Jobs.

Energy. Energy is a segue to job creation in this country. Look at the States that have energy-driven economies like Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and North Dakota. North Dakota has a 3 percent unemployment rate or less. In fact, McDonald's is paying a finder's fee. If you have got somebody who wants to go to work at a McDonald's in North Dakota, they will pay you a finder's fee.

Jobs and energy. Energy is a segue to job creation and putting Americans to work. We are not just talking about the men and women wearing the hard hats and the oil uniforms out on the drilling platforms or in the Bakken up in North Dakota, turning those drills and producing that, whether it is through horizontal drilling or hydraulic fracturing or shallow water or deep water offshore. Yes, those are good-paying jobs. Those are hardworking American taxpayers. But think about all the other jobs that support the offshore industry and the onshore industry.

These are Americans that are working doing pipefitting and welding. And guess what. Pipes fall on truck beds, and the beds have to be repaired. So there are auto body mechanics and engine mechanics. All these people work in that industry. It can be those in HVAC. Folks are going out on the rigs to fix the air conditioner or provide the food service or the transportation or the supply vessels carrying the drilling mud and the diesel fuel.

Everything that it takes to support energy production in this country, guess what. Those folks are going to the local restaurants and they are eating and they are giving tips to the waitresses. They are going to their churches and they are tithing. They are joining the United Way and they are sponsoring ball teams. They are supporting our local communities.

You see it all up and down the Texas and Louisiana highways. You see it in North Dakota and Oklahoma. And guess what. We want to see it in South Carolina.

In fact, there are some gentlemen here that want to see it off their coast or may want to see it expanded in their States, whether it is onshore or offshore. They understand that energy

production is a segue to putting Americans to work.

Jobs, energy, and our Founding Fathers. Limited government, free markets, individual liberties, unleashing that entrepreneurial spirit that Americans have within us to go and create and do and put Americans to work and, yes, pay taxes to the government so the government can do its constitutional role.

Jobs, energy, and our Founding Fathers is a great acronym. It spells ''Jeff,'' and I am all about Jeff.

We want to see the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf opened up. We want to see some seismic work done first. That is the first step. Let's see what is out there.

They are looking at 30-year-old seismic graphs, trying to figure out are there recoverable resources off the coast of South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, the States that want to see that area opened up.

Using 30-year-old technology and 30-year-old graphs, let's see some 21st century technology drug in the Atlantic, like 4–D and 3–D technology, to actually see down in the Earth and see what sort of resources might be recoverable.

Let's allow the seismic work, and let's allow universities like the University of South Carolina do it. Being a Clemson graduate, it pains me to say that the University of South Carolina and Dr. James Knapp are leading the way, teaching the young, new minds to use that seismic technology and look at those graphs and figure out where those resources are. He is doing tremendous work there at the University of South Carolina. Let's open up more areas.

It is hard for me to applaud the Obama administration on a whole lot, but I will applaud them on a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement signed by then-Secretary Clinton with Mexico that opened up a million and half acres in the Gulf of Mexico, shared resources right under that maritime boundary between the United States and Mexico.

Mexico just denationalized their energy company, Pemex. They are opening up to more private investments. We are going to see great things happen in the transboundary area. But even though she signed that agreement, the administration failed to send to this Congress the implementing language to actually make it happen and to include those areas in the next 5-year plan. That took an act of Congress. That took a bill that passed out of this body last year. That took efforts like PAUL RYAN had in the omnibus to get the transboundary hydrocarbon implementing language in the omnibus so that we could open up that million and a half acres and we could put more men and women here in America, hard-working American taxpayers, to work developing the energy resources that we have in this country.

God bless the United States of America. He continues to bless us with the resources here to be truly American energy independent. We are working with our neighbors to the north with something like the Keystone pipeline—which should happen—to bring that Canadian oil into this country to the refineries where we have idle capacity and to put that oil into the marketplace in gasoline and plastic and asphalt and diesel fuel and all the other butanes and all the other elements that come out of a barrel of hydrocarbons when you put it under pressure and it separates naturally in all sorts of wonderful God-given elements.

The Keystone pipeline should happen. That is a no-brainer for most Americans that I talk to, but apparently the administration just doesn't get it. They don't get that the Keystone pipeline will put Americans to work.

We are talking about jobs. We are talking about energy. We are talking about less government. The Keystone pipeline and North American energy independence includes working with our neighbors to the south in Mexico as they decentralize, denationalize their energy industry, and more private investment, more American companies going down there developing those resources so we can possibly have North American energy independence, if not just American energy independence.

I am joined by a number of Members of Congress here that are part of the House Energy Action Team. One gentleman from the neighboring State to my north understands what I talked about with the Outer Continental Shelf and that mid-Atlantic, south Atlantic OCS area that we believe has resources. If you look at the geology, North Africa and the Middle East and England were all together one time with the United States, and the resources and geology are very similar. We believe that in the south. I know in South Carolina we may have some recoverable resources, and we can be players in that.

I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) wants to talk, I am sure, about that North Carolina offshore area.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentleman, my neighbor from South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN. I appreciate your leadership on this issue. I couldn't agree with you more.

Many of our constituents back home in North Carolina and South Carolina are entering the second half of the summer. They are preparing to take trips to the beach, maybe trips to the mountains, maybe going to visit relatives. Many of our constituents are contemplating those trips and, frankly, are experiencing a little sticker shock as they factor in the cost of gasoline and what it is going to cost their family.

Many of our constituents are struggling. They either are not in the job they want to be in or they are looking for a job, and it is tough to make ends meet. If you add the high cost of energy to that, it is a real burden on people. It affects real people back home.

Frankly, it doesn't have to be that way because we have got tremendous opportunities to have American sources of energy. It is just a shame we are not going after them.

I agree also with my colleague there are not a lot of things that President Obama and I agree on, but I do applaud his decision to allow us to do seismic mapping off the shore of the Atlantic Coast. We have tremendous opportunities in North Carolina, as well as Virginia and South Carolina, to find these large reserves. We know there is natural gas there. We know there is petroleum there. We need to find out what is exactly there.

So this is an important first step to get this seismic permitting so that we can know what kind of energy resources we have exactly. But I want to get North Carolina in the energy business. We have got the opportunity to put people to work.

As my colleague mentioned, North Dakota pays a $2,000 signing bonus at McDonald's because they can't find enough people because everybody has a job, and I look at North Carolina and my neighbors who are struggling to find work. Let's put people in energy jobs. Not only will it bring down the cost of energy for us at the pump, but it will put people to work.

There is another phenomena happening out there. We have lost a tremendous amount of manufacturing jobs in North Carolina, particularly in my part of the State, but we are seeing some of those jobs start to come back. The reason they are starting to come back is because of energy costs.

Even despite the fact that the current President won't allow any new permitting on publics lands, through fracking and other technology, we find it on private lands. We are being able to bring down some of our energy costs through exploration.

Imagine what we would do if we could unleash American energy by allowing us to go after all of our resources, whether they are on public lands or offshore. We can have a manufacturing renaissance in this country by having affordable American energy. We can start creating jobs like you wouldn't believe. There is no reason why we are not doing that.

So I am happy to be here tonight with my colleagues to talk about the importance of this. I am just ready to unleash the American energy and ready to bring those jobs back.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

This is a picture of the State newspaper in South Carolina. It says: Oil

Exploration OK'd Off South Carolina and the Entire East Coast.

The Department of the Interior has actually said: You know what? We are going to allow some seismic to actually happen off the coast of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia so we can see what is out there.

This is good news, America. This is good news because we are actually going to see that there are recoverable resources of our coast.

And I ask the question again of the Americans that may be tuned in: How much more is your regular travel costing, with gasoline prices being well north of $3 a gallon in this country? Or to ask a different way: How much less money do you have in your wallet after you travel back and forth to work—your normal travel and not summertime vacation travel—your normal travels from home to work and back, taking the kids to school, taking them to the ball games, going to church, going to the grocery store, all the things that you do, how much less money do you have?

I know in North Carolina and South Carolina, our constituents have experienced that.

Another member of the House Energy Action Team from Texas—and Texas gets it, because, God bless Texas, with Spindletop, Eagle Ford, Barnett, and a lot of other resources, they understand energy and they understand the jobs that come about from energy production.

I yield to Mr. WEBER of Texas, because I know he has got a great story to tell.

□ 2045

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the things that make America great are the things that America makes.

Now, how do we do that?

We have a stable, reliable, affordable energy supply.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to think with me here for a second. We have to have a strong America. Whether it is a typhoon or whether it is a hurricane or whether it is famine or flood or pestilence or civil war—no matter what it is—when the world has a catastrophe and they dial 911, who is it who answers?

It is the Americans—isn't it?—with our military, with our might, with our goodness, I would argue. So I would argue that, for the world to be a safer place, we must have a strong America.

How do we do that?

Like I said, a stable, reliable, affordable energy supply.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just about jobs and the economy. This is about a strong America that leads this world and makes the world a safer place to live in. I would further argue, Mr. Speaker, that you are seeing the result of an administration's policy. Around this world, we are seeing the results of people who understand that the current policy is weak, ineffective, and to be trampled upon.

It is bewildering to me and, quite frankly, to many Americans that the President and his administration continue to stand in the way of the potential that this country has to offer with respect to domestic energy production for the reasons I just stated. In fact, the President has canceled lease sales and has effectively closed off 85 percent of our offshore resources from exploration. Yet the majority of Americans support tapping these resources so that we can make our country more energy independent—and again, so the world is a safer place to be.

This country needs a President who will empower our energy sector, not suffocate it. I always say, as I did in my opening remarks, that the things that make America great are the things that America makes. Mr. Speaker, when more things are made in America, more Americans will make it in America. When government gets out of the way, we can create thousands of good-paying jobs and a whole lot of affordable, reliable, dependable, secure energy. Then and only then, when more things are made in America, more Americans will make it in America.

The energy sector, as the gentleman said, is one of our Nation's leading job creators, and much more can be done to unleash our energy in these United States. Just look at my home State of Texas. Texas has been responsible for close to half of all new jobs created in the United States since the end of the recession. Texas has allowed the energy industry to flourish while, at the same time, protecting the environment.

Shale gas development, which is booming because of innovations like hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling—despite this administration—is leading to billions in new investments in my district alone, billions in my District 14 on the gulf coast of Texas, for example. Chevron Phillips Chemical Company is investing $6 billion to build two polyethylene plants in Sweeny, Texas, bringing 400 new permanent jobs and 10,000 new construction jobs to my district alone. You all know polyethylene is used to produce common plastic products we use every day, and it is derived from natural gas. In addition to many other projects, two companies in my district are waiting to invest billions—with a ''b''—of dollars in liquefied natural gas export facilities, which would bring an untold number of new construction jobs to my State and the Nation.

It is a puzzle to me that this administration, instead of encouraging more of this kind of private investment nationwide, has decided that what we need now are more regulations. Are you kidding me? Just this past March, the administration announced that it is in the process of developing regulations on methane emissions from various sources, including from hydraulic fracturing sites. This is despite the fact that methane emissions have fallen by 11 percent since 1990. Such government overreach, which, undoubtedly, will also encompass emissions from cattle—if you can believe that—will raise costs for consumers, destroy jobs, and hurt energy production. This administration is so extreme it is proposing to regulate cow emissions. Now, in Texas, we call that a lot of bull. This Obama administration is out of touch with everyday Americans and is out of control with energy regulations. The administration's announcement on methane emissions is just one small piece of a much larger regulatory strategy.

Take the EPA, for example. The EPA is requesting millions of dollars to conduct a study of hydraulic fracturing, which is a technology that has been safely utilized by the oil and gas industry in Texas since at least 1947. In at least three cases, the EPA has blamed hydraulic fracturing on water contamination. In all three of those cases, they were forced to retract their conclusions. Therefore, I suspect the purpose of their study is only to justify further regulatory actions.

Most importantly, we cannot forget that the administration is planning to repropose a new rule on ozone this December. When originally proposed in 2010, this regulation was widely cited as the most expensive regulation in history, which would cost hundreds of billions of dollars and put over 80 percent of our Nation out of compliance—80 percent of our country in nonattainment when it comes to ozone regulations. Mr. Speaker, I would offer that the EPA needs to use common sense when it comes to the common sense of their nonattainment.

Unlike our counterparts in the Senate, the House has passed legislation to expand domestic energy production. It has acted to hold the Obama administration accountable for its regulatory agenda. On June 26, with my support, the House passed H.R. 4899, Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America that Works Act. If enacted, this legislation will require the administration to move forward on the new offshore production that the gentleman was referring to in areas that are projected to contain the most oil and natural gas resources by requiring new lease sales and by streamlining permitting. I could go on and on and on.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, even though, when he was running, the President said he had an all-of-the-above energy strategy, the truth is it is none of the above. He is in the process of killing the coal industry. Make no mistake. Fossil fuels will be next.

Let me close by saying I call on the President, as the gentleman did, to permit the Keystone pipeline. Let it get built. Let America continue to be an energy leader in the world. Let America be solid and strong, and let us, once again, have a safe world.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Texas. As I said earlier, Texas gets it.

I remember a colleague of ours from Louisiana who said that drilling equals jobs. That sums it up—drilling equals jobs. I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana, Jeff Landry, our former colleague, for sharing that with us.

I drive a diesel truck. I was filling up just recently back in the spring, and there happened to be an off-road diesel pump right beside the on-road diesel pump that I was at. I was paying about $3.59 a gallon for diesel fuel for my pickup, and I noticed the off-road diesel fuel price was about 10 cents less, about $3.49. I took a picture of it, and I shared it on Facebook because I wanted folks to realize America's farmers are paying $3.49 a gallon for off-road diesel fuel. This is a fuel you can't run on the highway because the Federal Government and the States don't collect any highway taxes from off-road fuel. It is just pure diesel fuel. If this is what America's farmers put in their tractors, it is off-road for a reason. If they are paying $3.49 a gallon for off-road diesel fuel, that is an input cost. That is a cost of production.

They are putting $3.49 a gallon of diesel fuel in their tractors to plant our crops and, in the fall, to harvest our crops. I think about the cost of fertilizer right now, which should be low because natural gas is abundant in this country—and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to talk about this in just a minute and what they have found in Pennsylvania. Natural gas is a huge component in the production of fertilizer, but fertilizer is at an historical high still. So you have got the input cost for farmers of off-road diesel fuel at $3.49 a gallon—that input cost and the cost of fertilizer.

We know of the regulations the gentleman from Texas was talking about that the EPA continues to push down on Americans, and America's farmers are feeling the brunt of it on where they can spray their pesticides or their herbicides and how far from ditches they need to be. There is some common sense there, I understand, but there is regulation after regulation. We have even combated, since I have been in Congress, the regulation of farm dust. Now, can you believe that the EPA would want to regulate dust created through the normal agricultural process?

The input cost of farmers will be affected and will affect the price, rather, of the commodities that moms and dads buy when they go to the grocery store this fall after harvest time. You think about commodity prices being high, and we are already seeing historically high milk prices, historically high beef prices, historically high fuel prices to go back and forth to the grocery store just to buy those commodities. It means less money for the hard-working American taxpayers at the end of the day who are having to pay extra for ObamaCare, extra in taxes to pay for the large government and government spending that we see. We can help. This Congress can help by lowering the price of fuel—gasoline for America's truckers and for America's moms and dads who travel back and forth.

We have got an abundance of natural gas in this country. It gets a bad rap when you use words like ''hydraulic fracturing.'' I will tell you it is working in Marcellus in Pennsylvania and Ohio. It could work in New York if they would get off their can and open up those areas.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) understands. He understands the area of Marcellus, so I yield to the gentleman so he can talk about that area.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding and for organizing this important discussion about energy.

Mr. Speaker, I talk a lot in my district, District 12 back in western Pennsylvania. Western PA is where you had the start of the oil industry back in the 19th century and, of course, the development of coal, and we are seeing this explosion in the development of the gas industry out there that is creating lots of jobs.

I talk a lot about energy in western PA because I contend that we can relight America from western Pennsylvania. We need to relight America. We need to boom again. A lot of people have given up on the idea that America can boom again, but for us to get this economy growing, energy is a huge part of it.

Again, we are seeing thousands of jobs throughout Pennsylvania because of the gas industry, and we are seeing people who are able to stay on their farms. Imagine that. They are fracturing the shale in Pennsylvania to release the energy. They are not fracturing families, because the families can stay on those farms and get the revenues from that gas to help them keep their farms in business. Growing our energy economy means more family-sustaining jobs and lower energy prices for families in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation. Developing our Nation's plentiful natural resources and being good stewards of the environment need not be mutually exclusive.

I want to bring attention, Mr. Speaker, to a little known area of energy that uses something known as refuse coal. Refuse coal was coal that was mined decades ago, often for the steel industry, and it was determined not to be of sufficient quality for use in the industry, so it was left. It was left on hillsides throughout Pennsylvania, throughout Appalachia, but technological advancements have allowed certain power plants to turn piles of this low-quality coal that has been left throughout Pennsylvania's countryside into cheap domestic energy. This has allowed for cleaning up the environment and restoring landscapes and rivers.

Just take a look at the remarkable difference here in these before and after pictures of the Barnes-Watkins coal refuse pile in Cambria County, in my district.

□ 2100

Plants across Pennsylvania and States including Illinois, Montana, Utah, and West Virginia are doing tremendous work to clean up the environment and generate affordable electricity.

Unfortunately, the unelected Federal elites at the EPA with their one-size-fits-all rules are threatening to shut down the plants that use this waste coal and stop the progress on cleaning up places like what you see right here.

This will cost middle class jobs. It will raise energy prices for many Americans and put an end to the positive work that these plants do to clean up our environment.

To address this very problem, I introduced H.R. 3138, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment; it is the SENSE Act, S-E-N-S-E, because it makes sense.

This commonsense legislation recognizes the important energy and environmental benefits that power plants like the ones in Cambria County provide. The SENSE Act offers a reasonable balance that keeps these plants open, saves local middle class jobs, preserves important domestic electricity generating capacity, and helps to continue cleaning up the environment.

I would urge my colleagues to take a look at this legislation and help us get it through.

But, again, we need to boom. We need to boom again because when America is booming again, that is when the jobs come in. And when we get people back to work, every person we get back to work, that person is paying Social Security tax, that person is paying Medicare tax, that person is paying income tax that allows us to pay for the critical social service programs that we need like Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits.

A booming economy is going to do that, and a key to the booming economy is the booming energy sector.

I, again, thank my colleague from South Carolina for highlighting the important role that the energy economy is going to play in relighting America.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been a leader in his short time in Congress as a freshman on energy issues because he gets what is going on in his home State.

I keep returning to the State of Texas because Texas, they have been developing energy resources for a very, very long time. When you think about Texas and Oklahoma, that is where it began in this country, the immense resources they have.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), one of my heroes and good friends who wants to talk about what is going on in his home State.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for sponsoring this leadership hour and bringing the issue of energy to the attention of the House and the American public.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we consider where I live, Houston, Texas, the energy capital of the world because it is the energy capital of the world. And it is because of our location. Fifty percent of the Houston ship channel exports exports are energy-related, not just energy itself, but everything that is used in the development of energy throughout the world. Fifty percent of the economy of Houston is based upon the Houston ship channel.

We are experiencing a phenomenon in this country that nobody thought would happen 5 or 6 years ago, and that is the abundance and surplus of natural gas and what we call Texas sweet crude, or light crude, an abundance of it in this Nation. There is so much natural gas being produced in this country that in south Texas, in the Dakotas, they are flaring gas wells. They are capping wells in west Texas.

What does that mean?

That means that when they flare wells, there are over 1,500 wells that are being flared. That is enough energy to take care of a million homes. We are talking about a lot of energy. We are talking about a lot of natural gas.

So what do we do with that?

Well, we should sell it.

There is an ice cream company down in Texas. It is a little creamery in Brenham, Texas, a German community, called Blue Bell Ice Cream. It is the best ice cream in the world, Mr. Speaker, by the way. Their motto is simple about their ice cream: We eat all we can and we sell the rest.

Well, that should be the American motto for our natural gas: use all we can, then sell the rest throughout the world. And yes, there are a lot of buyers who want to buy American energy, natural gas.

When I was in India, I talked to the Prime Minister, and all the Prime Minister wanted to talk about was getting natural gas from the United States to India. Mr. Speaker, there are a billion more people in India than there are in the United States. They can take it all. They will buy it all if we will just make it happen.

When I was in the Ukraine, right before the Russians invaded the place, that is all that the Ukrainians wanted to talk about: getting natural gas from the United States, mainly from Texas, to offset being held hostage by the Russians where they get gas from. You know, the Russians turn off the gas in the Ukraine when they don't like the politics in Ukraine.

Give them an alternative. Give them a free market alternative. Sell them American natural gas. The same with other Eastern European countries. Same with Western Europe. Give them an alternative to Russia. It is not only an energy independence thing for those countries, but it takes them politically away from the stranglehold of Russia. That is one thing we can do to offset Russian aggression: sell American natural gas throughout the world.

Then why aren't we doing it?

Well, we are, but it is slow. It is very slow. It takes forever to get the Department of Energy now to grant those permits.

Here is the way it works. Since we are now permitting to sell natural gas or exporting that product, it not only takes FERC to have a permit, but then the company has to get the Department of Energy to permit them as well, and it takes too long. So we don't get to sell the gas, and we lose out on that opportunity to competitors throughout the world who will sell their natural gas, who don't have to deal with the Department of Energy.

We need to expedite that, expedite the sale of natural gas. That helps the United States with jobs, as the gentleman from South Carolina has said. It helps us with American jobs. But it also makes us energy-independent.

We can make, Mr. Speaker, the Middle East irrelevant, not just their energy and all the turmoil. We can make them politically irrelevant because we can take care of ourselves, not only exporting natural gas but, of course, exporting what we call Texas sweet crude, or light crude, throughout the world. That is what we should do.

We should export. We should be willing to use all we can and then sell the rest. We should adopt the motto of the best ice cream company in the world.

A couple of other matters, if I may. The Keystone pipeline: How ridiculous is it that we haven't started building it? You have got to get that crude oil to market some way. What do you want to do, put it on ships? We have already found out that is not such a good idea.

How about railcars? Well, I think we have had some problems with railcar transportation of crude oil.

You want to use thousands and thousands of trucks to move that crude oil around? That is kind of dangerous too.

The safest way to move crude oil is through a pipeline. There are thousands of miles of pipeline. The XL pipeline, why it hasn't been done is because of political reasons, not because there is common sense involved in it. We ought to get through the politics and build the Keystone pipeline.

It comes from Canada down to southeast Texas to where the refineries are. My former district, Mr. WEBER now represents that area where they are waiting.

How much crude oil are we talking about? We are talking about as much crude oil, Mr. Speaker, as we get from Saudi Arabia. Now we are talking about a lot of crude oil.

Once again, make America energy-independent but energy-secure, and it is a national security issue as well. It is just sense. It is common sense. It also brings in revenue to America, to the American people to be able to sell throughout the world natural gas and crude oil.

I want to thank the gentleman for the time.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Texas. He has been a leader as long as I have known him on energy issues, representing Houston. I have been to Houston. I have seen the activity around the oil and gas industry, and I can tell you there are some States that want a little piece of that. South Carolina is one of those.

You are exactly right on the LNG terminals. Ukraine, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, they are all reliant on Russian gas now and they are concerned about the posturing of Russia, and they are concerned about whether that spigot might be turned off, that pipeline might be interrupted that supplies the much-needed energy that they enjoy currently.

They are looking west. They are looking to the United States. How about exporting your natural gas? You have got a ton of it. How about giving us some of it? We will buy it. We will pay you for it.

India, as the gentleman said. It is a geopolitical advantage that the United States has.

I was mentioning earlier about the areas that are opened up for development, and I wanted to show America this. I know it is small, but you can see the orange. That is right around South America. All that area in orange is open for energy development.

But look at North America. There is a lot of blue water. There are a lot of areas outside of the Gulf of Mexico, outside of the area off of Alaska, that are not available to energy production. They should be and they could be.

We have got a letter, a Dear Colleague letter, that we are sending to Secretary Jewell, saying, Look, we need a new 5-year plan for leasing the

Outer Continental Shelf area. We want to see certain areas like the mid- and South Atlantic included in that area, want to continue opening up more and more of the gulf.

But we would love to see the areas that are reflected in blue and not open on the map I just showed. Countries like Canada and Mexico and China, they are ramping up their efforts to develop their offshore resources and will be directly competing with the United States.

It is past time, America, that we develop the resources that we have been blessed with here in this country.

This letter, I am a leader on it. I am asking my colleagues, I am asking Americans to contact your Congressman and say, how about get on that letter to Secretary Jewell that Congressman DUNCAN has got, and let's encourage her to open up more areas that might be available in the next 5-year plan.

Five years out, let's open up more areas for energy production. Let's have lease sales. Let's allow exploration.

I know the next gentleman from Virginia, he gets it as well because I have dealt with Virginia for a long time. Senator Frank Wagner, from over near Norfolk, I met early on in my delving into the whole energy spectrum and arena.

I went offshore on the Gulf of Mexico with the Senator, and he taught me about what Virginia was doing. They were leading with an energy plan for the State of Virginia. They were leading with looking toward the offshore areas.

I know the gentleman that represents that area in the United States Congress, Mr. RIGELL, fully understands that. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend for his leadership in this critical area, and for having us out here tonight to talk about the tremendous opportunity to really shape the direction of our country in such a positive way by responsibly opening up our coastal regions for energy exploration.

The potential is great in job creation. 25,000 local jobs in the Hampton Roads area—that is southeast Virginia, jobs that would be going to some of those who need so desperately to have job opportunities, for our veterans who are coming out of our military right there in Norfolk and in Virginia Beach and other areas of our district.

Let me frame this discussion, Mr. Speaker, with this quote. It was said in this very Chamber. ''This country needs an all-out, all-of-the-above strategy that develops every available source of American energy.''

Mr. Speaker, that was shared by President Obama in 2012. So, in words and in speeches, it surely looks like there is common ground. Now, there is a disconnect in what the President's been saying and what the truth is and what reality is. We will get to that in just a moment.

But let's look for a moment at the tremendous opportunity that coastal Virginia energy represents and really, across the country, if we open up our shore lines in a responsible, environmentally responsible, way to improve the lives of Americans, to set our country on a far better fiscal path that gives us the revenues we need to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, and our national security as well.

I am an entrepreneur in a season of public service, and I have had these incredible opportunities to look so many in the eye and say, you are hired. And I have also known the great joy, myself, of being on the other end of that and having somebody say to me that I have been hired, and I go home and say, I got the job. We want to hear that more and more in our country.

These are the kind of jobs we need in America. They are high-paying jobs. They are skilled jobs. They are tradesman jobs, jobs that we need in our country.

□ 2115

I have seen it firsthand, Mr. Speaker. I led a bipartisan delegation to go down to Port Fourchon in Louisiana. They are so proud of their economy. They are proud that their young people are having opportunities. It is just a bustling place. I think of it as booming and growing and optimism.

They are also proud of their schools and their roads and their bridges. Why? Because they have got the revenue that they need—this is how they are generating their revenue, through growth.

They are also, Mr. Speaker, so proud of their environment. They are so proud of the fisheries that they have there and the gulf waters that are such a part of their lives and have been for generations.

Some would present it to us as we are faced with this choice: either you are for the environment or you are for job creation and coastal energy.

Look, I reject the premise, Mr. Speaker. It is a false premise. We have a moral obligation to leave our children with clean air and clean water and clean soil. This is common ground, and we also have an obligation. Indeed, I think it is a moral one, to have a strong economy and to leave our children free from a heavy burden of debt, and energy really represents, I think, the principle way that we can grow our economy.

There are some, as I mentioned earlier, who present this false argument about either we protect the environment or we grow jobs through coastal energy. We need to really wrestle with these issues of safety, and I am ready for the debate, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the debate.

As I mentioned, I have been to Port Fourchon, and that was really the epicenter of the Macondo challenge that we faced there, so much of what we have learned from that has been integrated into the safety policies that we have.

We can open up the coast and also create jobs, like they are doing in Norway, like they are doing in Canada. It is not this either-or proposition.

So what we have to do is we have to make the words that were spoken by the President—to go beyond a talking point, and to make it a reality, and I thank my friend from South Carolina for his leadership on this issue. I am with you on that letter, and I appreciate your leadership.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for getting on the letters, the right letter to include that area.

Energy production in the United States means lower energy costs for Americans. It is as simple as that. Energy independence through production here at home in our own backyards keeps Americans safe from the turmoil around the world.

The U.S. Atlantic and the entire OCS is a missed opportunity, but it is not an opportunity we are going to continue missing. It is an opportunity we are going to continue to propose, we are going to continue to support, because when Americans are free to dream and innovate, they will always find a cheaper, safer, cleaner, and more efficient way to produce energy and use energy. We need to make it happen.

I will now ask my colleague from Oklahoma—who I believe will be the next Senator from Oklahoma and will take a tremendous amount of experience over to the United States Senate, where I know he will talk about what is going on in Oklahoma now and what has gone on in Oklahoma in the past because he has educated me.

They have been fracturing down in Oklahoma for about 50 years. I remember the comments he made to us on the floor one day, right here in a HEAT Leadership Hour. He said: come to Oklahoma, and drink our water.

So I will now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and the invitation still stands. Come to Oklahoma. We have been fracking since 1948, and I would encourage folks to come drink our water, see the beautiful land, breathe our beautiful air, and understand that you can do this.

Oklahoma is one of the places where we do all-of-the-above energy. We have solar. We have wind. We have coal. We have oil and gas. We understand all-of-the-above energy, and we understand all that can work together.

For viewers that are on C–SPAN and the lights in this room, we understand that energy drives our economy. We don't interact with anything in our economy, whether it is food, whether it

is transportation, whether it is home heating, whatever it may be and however we operate, it operates because of energy.

If at some point this administration's policies are fully implemented, we will watch the price of energy, the price of food, the price of everything we do in America go up, simply because of preferences, not because of reality.

We can do this in an environmentally friendly way and also build a strong economy. If you want to come to Oklahoma, unemployment right now in Oklahoma is 4.5 percent. We are one of the top energy producers in the country.

If you want to go to North Dakota, the unemployment rate is 2.7 percent. In fact, technically, they have a negative unemployment rate. They actually have more job listings than they have unemployment there. Why? Because they are finding a way to be able to tap American energy to produce an American economy that can grow and thrive, and in those places where energy is thriving, the economy is also thriving.

Just look at one simple statistic here: from 2007 to 2012, private sector employment increased by 1 percent or about 1 million jobs. In oil and gas, however, they added 162,000 of those jobs and had an increase of 40 percent in employment. Just in that one sector, there was a 40 percent increase in employment.

What affect does that have on us? Obviously, that is Americans that have jobs, those are families that are taken care of, but it is also our trade deficit.

From 2012 to 2013, just in Saudi Arabia, our trade deficit declined 13 percent. That is oil and gas produced here in the United States, offsetting what we are purchasing from the Middle East. The positive effects of that are overwhelming, and we understand it full well.

We understand that, in the 1990s, our economy had a huge boom from the Web. The Internet and the expansion of the Internet created incredible entrepreneurial opportunities and an incredible expansion of our economy.

That boom in the economy right now is solely around energy, and the energy development that is happening and the revolution that is happening and the opportunity for people to be able to get good-paying jobs is happening strongly in one sector in our economy, energy.

Let's not blow it. Let's expand it. In the days ahead, we should be able to export oil and gas. That should be a prime something that we do.

You can send grain all around the world, just like you can send flour, but right now, you can't send oil all around the world. You can only send gasoline or diesel. You have to literally refine the oil before you can send it out.

Well, let's fix that. If you send grain, you should be able to send flour as well. If you can send timber, you should be able to also send lumber. It makes basic sense that you can send oil as well as you can send gasoline out.

This would help our economy. It would also reduce the price of oil globally. That price would drop because of the competition in the United States, estimated to be about 8 cents per gallon for a gallon of gas, if we get on the world market and start pushing back to bring the price down.

The same thing happens in liquefied natural gas, in natural gas. We are talking about the production, just to allow the enhanced production and export of oil and natural gas, around 1 million additional jobs in our economy.

Now, in a Nation that is looking for jobs, we literally have the jobs under our feet, and it is time we stand up and provide the opportunity to be able to explore for additional oil and gas, continue to expand our use of coal, to be able to export that worldwide and allow the United States to be the economic leader and the energy leader that she should be.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for sharing that. He is exactly right.

It is simple. It is supply and demand. That is simple economics. Let's put American oil and natural gas out there on the world market, and I believe you will see the spigot turned on by others that don't want to see us become energy independent, and I think you will see the price down go.

You know, I will get criticized because I want to allow seismic to happen off the Atlantic coast in the OCS areas, and they will say: oh, you are going to hurt the marine mammals, the dolphins and whales and other things.

Well, the environmental impact statement came out. There is good mitigation in there that industry can live with to mitigate any damage. If the whales are migrating north, they could stop those activities, but even with that, there hasn't been a single proven instance.

Now, we have been doing seismic all over the Gulf of Mexico, off the coast of Africa, in the Mediterranean, in the Red Sea, in the Persian Gulf. All over the world, they have been doing seismic work and not a single proven instance where seismic testing has caused permanent deafness or any other injury to a marine mammal, not a single one, but yet that is the criticism that we will take for wanting to actually look down on the Earth and see if there are recoverable resources.

I will tell you where there are recoverable resources, and that is in the great State of Wyoming, where they get energy—about $1 billion of revenue back to the State of Wyoming through revenue sharing, through the development of their natural resources and those oil and gas and coal deposits they have, and the single Member representing the State of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), I am sure can talk about that.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for gathering us to talk about American energy.

I want to talk about it from a couple of perspectives. My State of Wyoming had the first national park in the Nation, Yellowstone National Park; the first national forest, the Shoshone National Forest; the first national monument, the Devils Tower. We have an abundance of beautiful scenery and natural resources. We have the smallest population in the Nation. Our State is pristine.

What you may not have known is that Texas' production of energy is here. Wyoming's is here, and the next State catching up on us is far behind those two States. We know how to produce energy responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight because I want to talk about the people that are affected by the price of energy. I want to talk about a woman I met at a gas pump.

She pulled up in a very old car. She had a little baby in her back seat that she was taking to the sitter's before she went to her job, earning minimum wage, at a convenience store. Her husband, a young man, was also working at a very lower middle-income job. They were trying to make ends meet.

She only put $5 worth of gas in her car. I asked her why. She said: well, I can only afford enough gas to get me to work after I drop my child off, and while I am at work, I will get enough money to put a little more gas and pick my child up.

That is how a lot of Americans are living. That is how a lot of our seniors are living. They are living on an amount of money that squeezes them every time the price of gasoline goes up, the price of electricity goes up, the price of heat goes up, the price of air conditioning goes up.

That is the price of energy to the American consumer. Those are the people we need to be looking out for. Those are the people who need abundant, affordable, reliable electricity, gasoline, diesel fuel, heating oil, and other resources like natural gas, so they can be warm and protected from the cold, so they can be cool and protected from the heat, so they can get to work and the grocery store and to their doctors.

This is the American story, and it is American jobs that pay American taxes that can help those people make ends meet, that can help fund our social safety net.

We need Americans to work. We need American energy to put Americans to work. If it wasn't for the energy economy, there would be no economic recovery at all in this country. I know

that it is a rather anemic recovery. It would be zero recovery without the energy industry.

The importance cannot be overstated of energy in our economy. The importance of energy in our daily lives cannot be overstated.

I want to thank the gentleman who recognizes that we can have a clean environment and we can have affordable, abundant energy, so our quality of life in America is proudly second to none.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming. She does a fabulous job.

That is one of the things I enjoy about serving in the United States Congress, is meeting the congressmen from all of the other States that can educate me and can educate America about what is going on in their States—what is going on in their States to help meet Americans' energy needs, to help us truly become energy independent, to do all of the things that we have talked about here this evening.

You know, people back home may say: What have y'all done in Congress? What have you done in the House to address these issues?

We have sent numerous bills over to the Senate, where they languish in HARRY REID's office. The majority leader fails to bring the bills that the House has passed—even if you differ with the elements in those bills, bring them up. Bring them into a committee hearing, and let's have a markup.

Let's change those bills and pass whatever meets your desires for American energy independence or a lack thereof in the Senate. How about change the bills and send them back? We will go to conference, and we will work something out.

Instead, we have got a logjam. All these bills are right behind the dam, and then we could unleash all that power behind the dam by unleashing the American energy independence potential that you have heard talked about here tonight.

We just recently passed an offshore energy jobs bill, Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act, to open up these areas.

I want to commend Chairman DOC HASTINGS for his work on the Natural Resources Committee to really open up those Federal areas where we talk about those resources. I would like to give a moment of praise to my Senator TIM SCOTT who has got the SEA Jobs Act that would address a lot of the all-of-the-above energy issues that I have got in the EXPAND Act, to expand Americans' opportunities to pursue their resources and become energy independent, and it provides resources back to the State and revenue sharing and jobs. It works, America.

Energy is a segue to job creation, and that is what we are here to talk about tonight, putting Americans to work, meeting our energy needs, using those geopolitical levers that we may have to influence politics around the world, to help our friends and allies in Ukraine and in Europe that need America's energy resources, that want America's energy resources.

□ 2130

So as we wind down our time here tonight, energy production in the United States means lower energy costs for Americans.

I started out with a very simple question: Americans, how much more is your regular travel costing you? How much more does it cost you to drive from your home to work and back, from your home to school and back, from your home to church and back, and how much less do you have in your wallet at the end of the day because of the amount of money it has taken you to meet the energy needs of just transportation and electricity costs because of EP regulations?

You heard the gentlewoman from Wyoming talk about it and others. We could do something about it. We could solve it here today by meeting our energy needs with energy production. That is why the House energy action team is leading on this issue.

I appreciate the other colleagues being here tonight, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from South Carolina. He understands what is at stake here. I would like to ask him a question if he has got time to answer one question, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask my friend from South Carolina what it would mean to the people of South Carolina if we could get back to $2 a gallon gasoline or less.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thought the gentleman from Texas wanted to talk about energy because I have had the conversation with the gentleman from Texas. I understand it is a passion of his.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. But I know the issue you are going to talk about tonight, and that is on that southern border. I know that is on that gentleman's mind because that southern border is porous, and we have no idea, America, who is coming in our country. You are only seeing the 1 to 2 percent of the folks that have actually violated our national sovereignty by crossing our border illegally, and that is the children. But the other 98 percent of the people are not children, and they are not all Hispanics. Some are African and some are Middle Eastern.

I just got a notice a little while ago from RANDY WEBER from Texas. He showed me on his phone. He was with the Border Patrol this weekend, and they caught someone from Asia who couldn't speak Spanish and couldn't speak American. What is he coming for? Is he coming because there is violence in Guatemala or Honduras? I don't think so. What is he coming to this country for?

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on focusing on this border. Let's keep America secure. Let's secure our border. God bless Texas and Governor Rick Perry for putting the National Guard down there and taking matters into his own hands, because the guy at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has failed America and failed us in securing our border.

So I want to thank the gentleman for his time, and I want to encourage him to keep pounding that rock because you crack a rock—a big rock—by hitting it in the same spot over and over and over. Eventually, it will crack. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), and I do appreciate the hour spent on talking about energy, because if you hit a big rock in the right way, you just might get oil or gas out of it, and it would bring the price down in no time.

I do wish to talk about our southern border, but I was inspired by my friend, Mr. DUNCAN, and it brought back a history lesson from east Texas where I live.

In 1930, a man named Dad Joiner—''Dad'' was not his given name. His parents didn't give it to him. But, anyway, that is what he went by, Dad Joiner. He just knew there had to be oil in east Texas. He tried and he tried and he tried. He ran out of money. He had no more money, and he had the men. He could drill one more well. He thought he knew geology. He thought he had figured out there had to be an east Texas oilfield, and since he knew he could only drill one more time, Dad Joiner set his sights on the one place there had to be oil because he knew if he didn't strike it there—he was broke—he probably would never have another chance to do anything and be broke rest of his life.

This big old rig was on wooden skids, and they were dragging it toward the spot where he knew there had to be oil. The people in my district there in east Texas, they are praying people. They were praying people back in the 1920s and the 1930s. The Depression had just begun, and here you had Dad Joiner just sure there had to be oil.

Well, one of the skids broke. He didn't have money to fix it. He knew he couldn't get to the perfect spot there

had to be oil for his last attempt, so he didn't have any choice. He had to drill where the rig broke, where the skid broke, broke down, so he drilled there and he struck oil. He found the East Texas Oil Field that, until North Dakota and west Texas got so productive, for a while during World War I, it was the largest known oilfield in the world, and then the second largest for a long time after that. But it turned out if he had gotten to that spot he thought there was sure oil, he would have missed it, would have missed the big East Texas Oil Field. It would have been American tanks and vehicles running out of gasoline in Europe during the Battle of the Bulge instead of German. But we had gasoline, and we had the oil we needed because east Texas was producing.

But if that skid hadn't broken where it did, none of that would have happened. And so as it turned out, all through the 1930s, when people were looking for jobs, many people were told, well, they found oil down in east Texas. There have got to be jobs there.

People flooded down to east Texas, and they got jobs. They didn't go to the government. They didn't look for government to dictate what to do in their lives. Many people went to east Texas, and they found jobs.

The sad thing is there are areas all over the country that could be doing the same thing, including New York upstate where they have got some of the same gas formations in Pennsylvania where things are going much better than their areas of New York, because New York doesn't allow that drilling and, therefore, they have condemned people to suffer a desperate economy instead of allowing it to thrive and flourish.

In the meantime, you look across our border at our neighbor Mexico. Mexico has tremendous natural resources. We import a good bit of their oil. Canada has oil. We import oil from there—not as much as we would if the XL pipeline had been constructed giving more people jobs, giving more in the world a chance to have North American oil, but the President stands in the way for political gain, it would appear, because what else is there? What else is he gaining from keeping people from having jobs and cheaper oil and gas?

But in Mexico, we also know they have got hardworking people. We know because I am told constantly, if you want somebody that is really willing to work hard, long hours, do whatever it takes to finish the job, then you do well to hire a Hispanic. Generally speaking, some people say, oh, you are a Hispanophobe or whatever they say. I look at the Hispanic culture, generally one that loves God, is devoted to family, and has a hard work ethic. That is what America used to be. That is what America used to be. It is what I would love to see America doing again, back loving family and not saying that fathers are unneeded, unnecessary, and unwanted, not saying that the village is a better family than the foundational family of father, mother, and children that nature designed—and some of us believe nature is God.

But there are, in Mexico, incredible natural resources. So why is Mexico not one of the top economies in the world? Or at least it could be top 10, if not top 5, because they have got hardworking people and they have natural resources. Well, the answer is pretty clear. It is because the law is not enforced fairly across the board. There is graft and corruption. Capital, as it is said—that is money that is being invested—capital is a coward. It goes to where it feels safest.

There is money being invested in Mexico, but because of the drug cartels, because of graft and corruption, and because of the way people are seeing mistreatment even of police, capital is not flowing like it should to Mexico. The jobs are not in Mexico as they should be.

Mexico ought to be one of those shining lights on a hill where people are struggling all over the world wanting to get in. Of course, if you try to get into Mexico illegally, unless, of course, you are coming to the United States, you certainly don't get treated very well. If you try to buy land in your own name as a foreigner in Mexico, you are not going to be treated very well. You have got to have someone from Mexico buying with you. There are a lot of things in Mexican law that, if we placed it in American law, many Mexicans would be just insanely furious because we dared to put in our laws what Mexico has in its laws.

So, Mr. Speaker, I pose the question: Who is the better governmental neighbor? A government that forces lawful gun dealers to sell 2,000 or so guns—weapons—to people that they know will have them in criminal hands in no time in Mexico? Who is the better neighbor? One that is a government neighbor who throws a little money here and there but never really comes in and helps deal with the drug cartels that are a threat to its own existence as well as Mexico's?

Mr. Speaker, I heard Bill O'Reilly just before I came over here tonight debating with an individual who was saying that we should let everyone in that wants to come, basically. As Bill O'Reilly properly pointed out, there are children all over the world—South America, Africa, Asia, islands all over the world—who are in poor conditions, even squalor, and would love to come to this country.

We had a rally just out here on the west side last week by hundreds of North Koreans. They didn't come over here and say: We demand that you allow us to come into your country illegally because we have it so bad in North Korea. No. What they were saying is that America can bring great pressure to bear on an evil government in a place like North Korea. They are begging that, since there is not room in the United States for every child living in difficult circumstances to flood into America, they are asking an appropriate thing: put pressure on North Korea's Government so that we can help them make a more free North Korea. Help them by putting pressure.

But if you look at the record of this administration around the world, what has happened? It broke my heart to see, in the last few days, Mosul there in Iraq, where so many Americans gave their lives fighting for the freedom of the Iraqi people, fighting for freedom in that area, now the last known Christian in Mosul after nearly 2,000 years, going back nearly to the time of Jesus Himself, has had to leave.

The country that we, Americans, freed at the price of great treasure and American lives and limbs because of the poor foreign policy handling, the bungling of this administration, the failure to reach a status of forces agreement which was basically teed up and handed to it by the last administration, was fumbled, and now, as a result of this administration's ineptness, Christians around the world are being persecuted in greater numbers than ever before.

□ 2145

It was once thought that it may be the U.S. legacy. Mr. Speaker, just down the hall, you have seen it many times, the massive mural, the painting of the famous prayer meeting that the Pilgrims had in Holland before they went to England, and then from England came to America. You see the word ''Speedwell'' on the ship where the prayer meeting is being held, an open Bible where you can see the page is open to the New Testament of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. You can read that on the page. It is exactly as that particular type of Bible read, the same print, and they were having this prayer meeting, asking for God's guidance and God's deliverance. They went to England. The Speedwell began taking on water, and so it didn't get to make the trip to America. It was a much smaller ship, the Mayflower, that ended up bringing Pilgrims to America.

But even back then they were praying that this country to which the Pilgrims were coming would be a country where Christians would have the freedom to worship without persecution, and that Christians in this new country to which the Pilgrims were coming would be able to spread freedom, the freedom that our Creator, as the Declaration of Independence says, the Divine Providence, as it says, that blessing that was given to us by God as an opportunity to spread freedom and with freedom the chance to freely acknowledge God or reject him, not at

the point of a sword, not at the end of a gun, but either freely accept or reject the promises of Jesus, because in true Christianity, it reflects the freedom that God has given each one of us. It can't be forced on anyone. It is a free choice. But with free choice comes great responsibility, and that is why in George Washington's resignation that he sent to the 13 governors, the last part has a prayer, and the prayer ends with the words from Washington that he hopes that we will follow the example of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, without a humble imitation of in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation. He signs it ''the humble servant.'' What an extraordinary man.

This country has been so richly blessed that a good neighbor would make sure that in Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, all through Central America, South America, we would help any nation to help themselves, that we would help them to have that freedom. That is what America used to be about, although there are some who would say America has always been about being divisive, derisive, dismissive. Look, America has been an exceptional country because of the freedom that people recognize came from the Divine Author of our blessed religion, that came from our Creator, that came from Divine Providence, which is why our Constitution itself was dated in the year of our Lord 1787.

This country is at a crossroads, and it is not a pretty one. Yes, I have spent a lot of time on our southern border in the last couple of months. I have seen these beautiful children that break your heart, and I wonder why this administration will not help us by helping our neighbor rather than just throwing our borders open. And then this administration has the nerve to say, well, you know, the numbers are down in recent weeks.

Well, gee, do you think, Mr. Speaker, it might be because Texans have realized they are going to have to pick up the slack that this administration refuses to do? Our Border Patrol is overwhelmed in some ways. And yet we read an article here from Ryan Lovelace that says—and it is dated July 21, National Review Online—that:

President Obama is encouraging Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers to slack off on the job, former border cops tell National Review Online. Some ICE officials think the Obama administration has intentionally neglected to give them orders to support efforts to resolve the crisis on America's southwestern border, says Ronald Colburn, former national deputy chief of the U.S. Border Patrol. As a result, the wave of unaccompanied children from Central America is unfolding while ICE officials cool their heels.

''They are sitting still at their desks—reading newspapers, playing video games on their government computers—because they are not being tasked with work, and they feel like it is coming all of the way down from the top,'' Colburn tells NRO. ''These are guys that do want to go out more, but basically they are not.

Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, down on the border, they needed help. They still need help. The Border Patrol a few weeks ago, driving on those dirt roads, as I was honored to take Glenn Beck down in the dark with some of his staff, people from Mercury One, as I told his staff: Unless you let me take him in the dark down these roads, you never really understand what is going on.

One night some of us for an hour and a half we didn't run into Border Patrol, and we finally found out why. The drug cartels were told, the drug lords control different parts of the borders, and you don't cross without making sure that they get paid, or they will seek you out in America. So you make sure that you do things in accordance with what you are told, and that means making sure that the drug cartels get their money. And it means, as a border patrolman told me this past weekend—as a Hispanic, he speaks good Spanish—he is constantly being told: Well, we left Central America to get away from gangs.

And as he said: I tell them, You may tell that to some people and have them buy it, but you and I know that is not true. You and I know that it was the gangs that brought you up here. The gangs got paid to bring you to the United States, so don't tell me that you fled Central America to get away from gangs when the gangs brought you here. He said 90 percent of the time the people acknowledge that is true, but say we were told to say when we got here that we were fleeing gang violence.

Well, not everybody in this government is ignorant of what is happening. The fact is there was not a spike in violence before the huge spike of people coming to America, to the United States. There was not a huge spike in violence in Central America, but they came because the President began promising, you get to stay if you come. The government should leave charity to the people. And in this country, the people are the most charitable of any nation in the history of the world. The government doesn't do charity very well. Look at what is happening in our Veterans Administration hospitals. That is not charity. That is medical assistance that was earned. It is not even charity. This is what was promised to our military. We will provide you good medical help if you need it, if you serve in this manner. And this government can't even keep our promises to those who have earned good medical care.

So how much worse do you think it gets if we are trying to keep promises that were not even actually made, just one administration thinking they can turn Texas blue and the country blue if they bring enough people in here, promise them that they are the party that likes to give away things, and as a result get them voting their direction until they realize that is the kind of philosophy that wrecks a country.

It is time Americans woke up. There is so much suffering in this world in Central America and South America, and a good neighbor would help them stop the violence where it is, help stop the violence in Nigeria, radical Islam, help stop the violence of radical Islam around the world. This President was perfectly willing to blow up al-Awlaki, an American citizen, in Yemen. How was he an American citizen? Well, his parents came over on a visa and had him while he was here. That made him an American citizen. They took him back home, taught him to hate America, and even though both the Bush and Obama administration tried to work with him, he was still radicalizing people, so they blew him up. Wouldn't it be just as well to blow up people who have sworn they are going to destroy America? Wouldn't it be just as well to blow up the nuclear technology being developed in Iran by people who have promised in effect it will be the new gas chambers; instead of at Auschwitz they will be in Iran, and they will be delivered to a theater near you.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Americans to wake up. We must secure our borders. I never said I want them closed. They should be secure so people come legally.

And all this stuff that we have to fix the Wilberforce bill or we can't secure our borders is baloney. This administration can secure our border without any change in the Wilberforce bill. They have to provide additional hearings, but they can do that. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to finish tonight by directing your attention to an estimate from a group I am not always pleased with, but this administration generally is very pleased with them, and that is the Congressional Budget Office. I don't put a lot of stock in their estimates. And especially their estimates of what things are going to cost over time, but when they tell you how much a bill allocates to be spent this year, that is something you can trust. And so with all the talk about how important it is, we have got to have the House and the Senate pass our bill, it is an emergency, we have got to get this bill passed, oh, Mr. Speaker, you have to do this to help fix our problem at our border.

Well, you know why that is all lies? It is right here in the CBO study, the estimate. It tells you exactly what this administration is saying it needs to spend between now and September 30, the end of the fiscal year. It says the budget allocation that is already done, it has already been appropriated, was $1.83 billion, but what it wants additionally to be spent this year by the end of this fiscal year is not the 3.7, is

not the $4.3 billion that it is asking for, this incredible emergency this administration is saying it has to have to get this big bill that will save our border, it is asking for $25 million, with an m, for this year. That is it. And it doesn't go to the border—it goes to Health and Human Services.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that all of this is a ruse. They don't need this bill and the $25 million for Health and Human Services. They don't need all of the money that they are asking for in 2015, 2016, 2017 to go to groups that no doubt will be the new ACORNs of the future. They say we don't need anything other than $25 million, and we are not giving a dime of it to Homeland Security. They have all they need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a ruse. This administration can secure the border without this ridiculous claim for money. And if the administration needs help, we will get it. But in the meantime, they need to secure the border.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical issues.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ROBERT KAREM, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 30 AND JUNE 7, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Karem	05/31	06/03	Philippines		711.00						711.00
	06/03	06/05	Vietnam		550.68						550.68
	06/05	06/07	Singapore		900.52						900.52
	05/30	06/07	Total Transport				14,539.70				14,539.70
Committee total											16,701.90

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT KAREM, July 7, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 2 AND JUNE 8, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Ralph Hall	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	6/5	6/7	France		2,197.00		(3)				2,197.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Rubén Hinojosa	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Michael Capuano	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Susan Davis	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Michael Turner	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Michael Conaway	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Hank Johnson	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Doug Lamborn	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Robert Latta	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Carol Shea-Porter	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. David Cicilline	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Bill Flores	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Randy Hultgren	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Steve Stivers	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Janice Hahn	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Hon. Brad Wenstrup	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Jennifer Stewart	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Wyndee Parker	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Robert Simmons	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Jaime Cheshire	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Drew Hammill	6/5	6/8	France		2,989.00		(3)				2,989.00
Claude Chafin	6/3	6/8	France		4,574.00	2,463.00	(3)				7,037.00
Kimberly Shaw	6/3	6/8	France		4,574.00	2,463.00	(3)				7,037.00
Bina Surgeon	6/3	6/8	France		4,574.00	2,463.00	(3)				7,037.00
Committee total					102,600.00	7,389.00					109,989.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

[3] Military air transportation.

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, July 7, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, July 2, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael McCaul	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Hon. Jeff Duncan	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Nick Palarino	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Laura Fullerton	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Charlotte Sellmyer	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Sean West	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		[3]				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		[3]				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia				[3]				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		[3]				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		[3]				348.00
Fuel			Jordan						462.72		426.72
Overtime			Jordan						201.00		201.00
Control Room			Jordan						214.41		214.41
FSN Local Travel			Jordan				326.25				326.25
Misc. Supplies			Jordan						14.60		14.60
Prepaid Cards			Jordan						84.75		84.75
STAFFDEL Parikh											
Amanda Parikh	5/12	5/13	Germany		417.00		4,447.70				4,864.70
	5/13	5/14	Denmark		414.00						414.00
	5/14	5/17	United Kingdom		1,656.00						1,656.00
Nicole Halavik	5/12	5/13	Germany		417.00		4,447.70				4,864.70
	5/13	5/14	Denmark		414.00						414.00
	5/14	5/17	United Kingdom		1,656.00						1,656.00
Kyle Klein	5/12	5/13	Germany		417.00		4,447.70				4,864.70
	5/13	5/14	Denmark		414.00						414.00
	5/14	5/17	United Kingdom		1,656.00						1,656.00
Brian Turbyfill	5/12	5/13	Germany		417.00		2,865.60				3,282.60
	5/13	5/14	Denmark		414.00						414.00
Cedric Haynes	5/12	5/13	Germany		417.00		3,711.70				4,128.70
	5/13	5/14	Denmark		414.00						414.00
	5/14	5/17	United Kingdom		1,656.00						1,656.00
Transportation	5/13	5/14	Denmark				1,214.38				1,214.38
CODEL DUNCAN											
Hon. Jeff Duncan	6/1	6/4	Malta		1,324.48		11,213.00				12,537.48
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		375.00						375.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,206.00						1,206.00
Ryan Consaul	6/1	6/4	Malta		1,324.48		11,213.00				12,537.48
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		375.00						375.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,206.00						1,206.00
Rebecca Ulrich	6/1	6/4	Malta		1,324.48		11,213.00				12,537.48
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		375.00						375.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,206.00						1,206.00
Tamla Scott	6/1	6/4	Malta		882.99		11,213.00				12,095.99
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		375.00						375.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,206.00						1,206.00
Overtime—local staff			Malta						2,394.92		2,394.92
Overtime—Control Officer/Special Agent									1,082.75		1,082.75
CODEL STOCKTON											
Hon. Jackson Lee	6/12	6/16	Nigeria		2,032.00		12,585.50				14,617.50
Committee total					47,985.43		78,898.53		4,419.15		131,303.11

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Chairman, July 8, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Pete Sessions	5/12	5/13	Turkey		1,530.00	([3])					1,530.00
	5/14	5/14	Jordan		403.00	([3])					403.00
	5/15	5/17	United Arab Emirates		1,608.00	([3])					1,608.00
	5/18	5/18	Italy		325.00	([3])					325.00
Committee total											3,866.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, July 8, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, July 8, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, July 7, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Vice Chairman, July 15, 2014.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6503. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA): Changes to the Section 8 Tenant-Based Voucher and Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Programs [Docket No.: FR-5242-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC83) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6504. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Regulations Transferred to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau [Docket No.: FR-5788-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD67) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6505. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Reflect Change of Office Name From Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control to Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes [Docket No.: FR-5785-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD70) received July 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6506. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assessment of Fees [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0009] (RIN: 1557-AD82) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6507. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6508. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Tramadol Into Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-351] received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6509. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Indiana PM2.5 NSR [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0567; FRL-9912-85-Region 5] received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6510. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Placer County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0269; FRL-9910-99-Region 9] received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6511. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0312; FRL-9911-91-Region 9] received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6512. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reliability Standard for Geomagnetic Disturbance Operations [Docket No.: RM14-1-000 Order No. 797] received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6513. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Third Rule Implementing Export Control Reform; Correction (RIN: 1400-AD46) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6514. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Zimbabwe Sanctions Regulations received July 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6515. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Central African Republic Sanctions Regulations received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6516. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — South Sudan Sanctions Regulations received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6517. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-369, ''Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6518. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Amendment 20A [Docket No.: 131206999-4466-02] (RIN: 0648-BD83) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6519. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties [Docket No.: 14-07] (RIN: 3072-AC55) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6520. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to the Inland Navigation Rules [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0102] (RIN: 1625-AB88) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6521. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Annual Swim around Key West, Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico; Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0073] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6522. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0410] (RIN: 1625-AC13) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6523. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reports by Air Carriers on Incidents Involving Animals During Air Transport [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2010-0211] (RIN: 2105-AE07) received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6524. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Air Travel: Accessibility of Web Sites and Automated Kiosks at U.S. Airports [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2011-0177] (RIN: 2105-AD96) received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6525. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0281; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-17878; AD 2014-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6526. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam srl Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0156; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-17860; AD 2014-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6527. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dry Cargo Residue Discharges in the Great Lakes [Docket No.: USCG-2004-19621] (RIN: 1625-AA89) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6528. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30967; Amdt. No. 514] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6529. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1088; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-17831; AD 2014-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6530. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taylor, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0013; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-33] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6531. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — July 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-20) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6532. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Participation of a Person Described in Section 6103(n) in a Summons Interview Under Section 7602(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code [TD 9669] (RIN: 1545-BM25) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6533. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disregarded Entities; Religious and Family Member FICA and FUTA Exceptions; Indoor Tanning Services Excise Tax [TD 9670] (RIN: 1545-BJ06) (RIN: 1545-BK38) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6534. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Credit for Employee Health Insurance Expenses of Small Employers [TD 9672] (RIN: 1545-BL55) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4450. A bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113–542, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 4411. A bill to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–543, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5036. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (Rept. 113–544). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 646. Resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Justice that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011 (Rept. 113–545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 677. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish

a demonstration program for competency-based education, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–546). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCKEON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 649. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011 (Rept. 113–547). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 105. Resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez (Rept. 113–548). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4411 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4450 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5159. A bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation, and to ensure that employers consider these requests; and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain growing low-wage occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5160. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 5161. A bill to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 5162. A bill to amend the Act entitled ''An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center'' to remove the use restriction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5163. A bill to provide for the expedited processing of unaccompanied alien children illegally entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HALL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 5164. A bill to clarify that the Secretary of Homeland Security may undertake law enforcement and border security activities within the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5165. A bill to establish a grant program in the Department of Education to promote the involvement of female students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5166. A bill to direct the National Counsel on Disability to conduct a review of certain standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5167. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 676. A resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS:

H. Res. 678. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 815) to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 679. A resolution condemning the Ukrainian separatists illegally occupying the Ukrainian city of Donetsk, and the surrounding territory, as terrorists for shooting down a civilian passenger airliner, Malaysian Airlines Flight MH17, and condemning the Government of the Russian Federation for supplying the arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

271. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution No. 14-003 concerning congressional action to facilitate legal financial services for the marijuana industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

272. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 1076 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

273. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Senate Resolution expressing strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and the families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

274. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 284 expressing support for the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

275. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 1001 urging that the Department of the Interior immediately take all necessary measures to operate the Yuma Desalting Plant; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

276. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 95 memorializing the Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

277. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary for the proper allocation of resources on the federal, state, and local level to fund real-time audit practices in the developing, planning, construction, and executing projects funded by the RESTORE Act's Gulf Coast Restoration; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 5159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 provides that Congress has the authority ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 5162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Property Clause of Article IV, Section 3—The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulation respecting the Territory or other Property belong to the United States.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 4, and 18 to the US Constitution

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 5165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''

and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 104: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 140: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 147: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 274: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 318: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 401: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 411: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 425: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 455: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 543: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 594: Mr. MICA, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 610: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 611: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 628: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 647: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 719: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 720: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 721: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 725: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 741: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 851: Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 855: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 988: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1015: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1020: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1022: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1030: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1074: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1094: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1226: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1261: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1274: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1289: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1318: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 1331: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1386: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1507: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1527: Mr. WALZ and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1563: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1620: Mr. BARR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COOK, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1696: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1697: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1698: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1733: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1795: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1806: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1812: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1827: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1844: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1852: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1893: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1923: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1953: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1984: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2116: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2132: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2220: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2278: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2283: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. OLSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2376: Mr. HALL, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 2415: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2440: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2450: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2453: Mr. REED, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2529: Mr. POCAN and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2602: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2647: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2673: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2852: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2856: Mr. JONES, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2902: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2978: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3040: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3043: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3344: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3367: Mr. KILMER and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3374: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3456: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3494: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3531: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3560: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3566: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3708: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 3712: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3723: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3742: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3775: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3833: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3852: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3992: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4098: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4119: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4143: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4148: Mr. HONDA and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4156: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 4158: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4188: Mr. ROSS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4190: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4205: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4221: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 4301: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4320: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4321: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4351: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4374: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4385: Mr. DENT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4411: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4430: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4446: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4450: Mr. MESSER, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4510: Mr. FORBES, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4543: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4551: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4574: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4576: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4589: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4612: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 4625: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4626: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 4630: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4664: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4679: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4682: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4709: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 4711: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4717: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4740: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 4741: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4748: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4749: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4778: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4793: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4815: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4818: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4828: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4829: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4843: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4857: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4874: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 4878: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4882: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 4895: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4902: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 4906: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4920: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 4930: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4933: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4942: Mr. WALZ and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4960: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4971: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4981: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4989: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 5026: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 5034: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 5051: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5053: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 5059: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5062: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5071: Mr. HANNA, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5076: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 5081: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 5083: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 5085: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 5087: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. REED, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5088: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 5089: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 5095: Mr. FARR, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 5111: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. BASS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 5114: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 5118: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5119: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 5120: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 5128: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 5130: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5132: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5135: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5136: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 5137: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CARTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5138: Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5142: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 5143: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. FINCHER.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. KILMER.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MICA.
H. Res. 109: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 208: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 281: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 326: Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 456: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 508: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Res. 522: Mr. MESSER and Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 536: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 587: Mr. KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY.
H. Res. 606: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 620: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 623: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 644: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. COBLE.
H. Res. 651: Mr. KILMER and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 665: Mr. COOK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 675: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. GOSAR.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative KLINE, or a designee, to H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative KLINE, or a designee, to H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

88. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No. 14-47 urging Congress to enact common sense immigration reform that establishes a clear, expeditious, and reasonable pathway to citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. Also, a petition of Mr. John Carrol Guise, Jr., Aurora, Texas, relative to a petition calling for Congress to call an amending convention to propose amendments to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING HELEN MADDOX ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special woman on a very special day—her 100th birthday. Helen Maddox was born on her family's small family farm in Romulus, Michigan on July 28, 1914.

She was the youngest of three and admits that while she was surrounded by love, life back then wasn't always easy. There was always a long list of chores that included taking care of the animals and helping with the crops.

Helen worked at a roadside stand selling fruits and vegetables and says her curly hair was a great marketing tool. People would stop because of her cute curls, and then buy something.

Her parents were community leaders and that is a trait that rubbed off on Helen.

Like many people who weren't lucky enough to be born in Texas, she moved there as an adult. She immediately became involved in the small, but growing community of Arlington, Texas. Back then it was a town of just 15,000, now it is close to 400,000. Helen Maddox played a role in making it a big city with a small town feel.

She started attending city council meetings so she could keep up with what was going on and support city leaders. Helen founded the Arlington Women's Club in 1957 and it is still going strong. She also worked with longtime Mayor Tom Vandergriff to organize the YMCA.

She and her late husband loved to travel, many times hitting the road in their Winnebago.

Helen slowly got more involved in Republican politics. In 1986 she got an invitation to have tea at the White House with Nancy Reagan.

When Arlington became part of my district 20 years ago, Helen was one of the first people to welcome me. She was 80 at the time, but still full of life and her love of Arlington and America was infectious.

As she hits 100 she is still active in the community. I am proud today to say Happy 100th Birthday to my friend—Helen Maddox!

HONORING THE HON. JAMES B. KANE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable James B. Kane Jr., distinguished veteran and former chief administrative judge for the New York State Supreme Court, Eighth Judicial District of Western New York, on the occasion of his 90th Birthday.

Born July 21, 1924 to Helen and James B. Kane Sr., Judge Kane enlisted in the Army Air Forces at 18 years of age. Quickly, this young man from Navaho Parkway in South Buffalo, New York found himself over Europe as a navigator on a B–17 ''Flying Fortress'' bomber. Shot down twice over a span of thirty missions, First Lieutenant Kane was one of two survivors of a nine man crew that had just bombed a German rail yard and survived another attack close to Berlin.

His calm, cool courage under fire earned him the Distinguished Flying Cross, an Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters and other notable recognitions by the time this he was 20 years old and back home in Buffalo. He then enrolled in Canisius College, working as a City of Buffalo firefighter and using the G.I. Bill to pay his tuition. Georgetown Law School was the next stop for this veteran.

Following graduation, the practice of law and the art of politics would set the path for this outstanding jurist as he rose from Buffalo City Court to Erie County Family Court to serving with great distinction on the New York State Supreme Court, during which time his leadership and steady hand as chief administrative judge for the Eighth Judicial District earned praise in all corners of the community. His more than capable stewardship earned him many honors including awards from Canisius College as well as the Erie County Bar Association.

While Judge Kane's outstanding and lifelong commitment to the law and public service is worthy of recognition, it is his devotion to family which earns him our highest praise and greatest appreciation. A devoted husband to Marie for more than 60 years, the Judge and Mrs. Kane are the proud parents of 10 children and 14 grandchildren. His only brother, Donald, passed away earlier this year but their unbreakable bond remains a strong and shining example to their families and all who saw them together of the true meaning of brotherly love.

On July 20, the family and friends of this extraordinary man will gather at the home of his son, Orchard Park Village Judge Daniel Kane and his wife, Dr. Kathleen Kane, to celebrate and congratulate Judge James B. Kane Jr. for 90 years of exemplary leadership and dedication to his country, community, family and faith.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, I am proud to offer my best wishes for continued health and happiness to Judge Kane, his wife, Marie and his loving, large and very proud family.

IN SUPPORT OF A RESOLUTION OF THE CYPRUS ISSUE

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in calling for a resolution of what seems to have become the never-ending division of the island of Cyprus. I speak not of a resolution that casts blame for what has gone before, but one that reunites both Cypriot communities and allows the island as a whole to chart a path forward within the international community.

In much of the historical rhetoric surrounding this issue, what sometimes gets lost is that all Cypriots—Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—have legitimate grievances. Any resolution of the Cyprus question must respect the rights of all Cypriots. All Cypriots must be allowed to participate freely in the island's national life. Finally, the international isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community must come to an end. The overwhelming vote ten years ago by Turkish Cypriots to end the status quo and for the Annan Plan underlines the ridiculousness of Turkish Cypriot isolation.

As we observe this year the 40th anniversary of the island, and the 10th anniversary of the vote on the Annan Plan, the fact remains that two generations of Greek and Turkish Cypriots have known nothing but the status quo. It cannot be maintained for future generations. I call on the Administration and my colleagues to support and encourage the ongoing dialogue between both communities, so that a comprehensive settlement that encourages reunion and reconciliation can be secured.

RECOGNIZING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT CORPORAL DUANE E. DEWEY

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Medal of Honor Recipient, Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey for his commendable service in the Korean War.

Corporal Dewey was born in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He stayed in Michigan until he signed with the Marine Corps Reserve on March 7, 1951, at the age of 19. Corporal Dewey served in the United States Marine Corps from 1951–1952. During his years of service, Corporal Dewey served in Korea, where he was a part of the 2nd Battalion of the 5th Marines.

On April 16, 1952, Corporal Dewey was serving as leader of a machine gun squad

with Company E, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, near Panmunjom, Korea. During a skirmish with enemy troops, Corporal Dewey suffered numerous injuries due to a grenade that exploded at his feet. While Corporal Dewey was being treated for his wounds, another grenade was thrown that landed at the squad's position. Corporal Dewey grabbed the grenade and covered it with his body in order to protect his fellow soldiers. For his efforts, Corporal Dewey was the first person to receive the Medal of Honor from President Dwight D. Eisenhower on March 12, 1953.

Corporal Dewey stands as a shining example of bravery and determination that all Americans strive toward. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey for his service to the United States of America.

STEVE STINSON

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Southwest Washington native, Steve Stinson. After battling an advanced form of Leiomyosarcoma for more than two years, Steve passed away at the age of 52 on July 17, 2014.

As a family man, small forest owner, and friend to countless people across our state, Steve encompassed the very essence of Southwest Washington. Alongside his father, Doug, Steve ran the Cowlitz Ridge Tree Farm in Toledo providing for multiple generations of the Stinson family. As President of the Family Farm Forestry Association, he was a tireless advocate for living off the land and preserving the beauty and history of natural resources. While his tenure was certainly not short of challenges Steve approached each of them with the positive attitude and vibrant personality so many of us admired.

Mr. Speaker, I have been lucky enough to work with Steve throughout my time in Congress, and my deepest sympathies and prayers are with Steve's wife, Lou Jean and all of his loved ones. While hundreds of folks in Southwest Washington are sad to see another angel depart for heaven, we can take some comfort in knowing the lasting effect Steve Stinson had on so many lives.

IN MEMORY OF CHRIS BILLA

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Chris Billa of Park City, KY. Only 26 years old, Chris lost his battle with cancer on July 14, 2014.

Chris was a son, father and brother. But many knew Chris as a local firefighter. Despite having his own personal battle with cancer, Chris continued to battle the fires in our own community.

WBKO, a TV station in Bowling Green, KY, named Chris a ''Hometown Hero'' in October 2013. In an interview with the station at the time, Larry Poteet, Deputy Chief said, ''He's not changed. If anything has changed about him its made him put everybody in front of him more, and I just don't know how he does it.'' It was Chris's commitment to serve his community and decisions to put others first that rightly caught the attention of so many.

While a community is in mourning, we are all lucky to have shared this earth with Chris. I am grateful for his passion for life and his desire to serve our community. We will miss him and are thankful for his service.

THE HUMAN RIGHT TO WATER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, water is a human right. I applaud the recent decision to suspend Detroit's water shutoffs for 15 days to enable residents to demonstrate financial hardship. This is a first step in preventing a regional public health crisis and protecting the basic rights of Detroit residents.

I submit the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press, which makes the case that recent water-shutoffs, which have been implemented with little or no warning to households, are wrong-headed and shortsighted.

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 21, 2014]

ENDING DETROIT'S WATER SHUT OFFS A GOOD START

On Monday morning, the Detroit Water and Sewerage Department announced that it's calling a 15-day halt to an aggressive shutoff campaign that has left an unknown number of Detroiters without water.

It's a start.

The department has about 137,000 delinquent residential accounts totaling about $75 million, and about 10,000 delinquent commercial accounts worth about $23 million.

Folks who can pay should pay what they owe. But department officials have to accept that some Detroiters just can't pay—and further, that the department itself has created an expectation in customers juggling bills that it's OK to prioritize other debts. If the water department's goal is to get, and keep, delinquent customers current on bills, ramping up shutoffs with no warning to ratepayers was a wrong-headed, shortsighted way to proceed.

After weeks of public protest, harsh words from the United Nations, the federal judge overseeing Detroit's bankruptcy and this newspaper's Editorial Board, the department seems to get it.

Department officials say they plan a citywide advertising blitz, complete with outreach to community groups and churches. That's excellent news, but outreach must be paired with concerted efforts to match impoverished residents with financial assistance to pay up and stay current.

The department should also consider income-based partial amnesty for ratepayers who are truly unable to catch up, or comparing data with social service agencies to identify customers who are in need of assistance.

The department must also identify vacant, abandoned homes and target those first. There's little excuse for cutting off water to families as a cost-saving tactic when empty buildings are flooding.

We've been told, confidently, by the folks in charge that no one who honestly cannot afford to pay is being deprived of service; that's overconfidence at best, and outright dishonesty at worst, as documented in Free Press reporter Patricia Montemurri's story about conditions in the city this weekend.

Some adherents of the department's shutoff campaign have dismissed fears that disconnection from clean water and modern sanitation could lead to a public health crisis, noting that the vast majority of delinquent account holders pay up promptly and have water restored. But let's consider the reality of this situation: If just 10% of the ratepayers currently delinquent are unable to pay to have service restored, we're talking about more than 10,000 residents. It's terrible public policy.

All of this against the backdrop of the city's bankruptcy, and the department's efforts to clean up bad debt in an attempt to make a regional water authority more attractive to suburban county executives. (Though let's also keep in mind that aides to Oakland County Executive L. Brooks Patterson wrote in a February report to the Oakland County Commission that ''stoppage of water and sewer service for tens of thousands of fiscally distressed members of the system is unacceptable policy and one the Oakland County executive will never support.'')

Detroit is a poor city. About 38% of residents live in poverty. Our unemployment rate is twice the national average. It's time to talk about what our goals are, and rethink how we deliver water.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. RICK LARSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, July 20th marked the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus.

Forty years ago thousands of Turkish troops invaded and occupied the northern part of Cyprus. Thousands of Greek Cypriots were forced to flee their homes and many remain missing to this day.

Those forced to flee live as refugees within their own country as their former homes remain occupied or sold without notification or consent. Turkey also continues to obstruct the process of determining the fate of the persons missing since the invasion. Reports indicate that their remains were dumped in a mass grave, deemed as a classified military area, and are closed off to families of the missing.

Additionally, freedom of worship continues to be severely restricted, access to religious sites blocked, religious sites systematically destroyed and a large number of religious and archaeological objects stolen.

The continued occupation of the northern part of Cyprus undermines the unified democratic aspirations of our important ally.

Mr. Speaker, today I call for an end to the occupation and division of Cyprus and urge geographic, political, and economic unity. A strong and stable democracy in Cyprus is not

only beneficial to its people but to its relationships with its allies around the world.

We must work to end the occupation of Cyprus for once and for all. I stand with Cyprus and urge an end to their 40 year occupation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE OF DENNIS KELLY AND THE DENNIS KELLY DIVISION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF THE HIBERNIANS

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dennis Kelly, who died 150 years ago yesterday, and the Dennis Kelly Division of the Ancient Order of the Hibernians.

In 1806 Dennis Kelly arrived from Ireland with his wife, Mary, and their daughter, Margaret, and settled in the Philadelphia area. Mr. Kelly entered the textile business and supplied cloth to the Army and Navy during the War of 1812, providing jobs to people in his local community. When Mr. Kelly died on July 21, 1864, he donated a part of his land for the establishment of St. Denis Church. Waves of immigrants from Ireland joined the parish and worked at Kelly's Cotton Mills.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians, Dennis Kelly Division is located in Havertown, Pennsylvania. Founded in 2001, this Irish Catholic fraternal organization remains dedicated to promoting and preserving Irish and Irish-American heritage. The Ancient Order of Hibernians promotes values such as friendship, unity and charity. Over the years the group has supported numerous philanthropic causes in Southeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, today's Havertown, locally known as Ireland's 33rd county, and the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania owe a great debt to Mr. Dennis Kelly, one of Havertown's most influential immigrants on this, the 150th anniversary of his death.

THE RETIREMENT OF MASTER SERGEANT RODNEY T. ERICKSON FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize Master Sergeant Rodney T. Erickson for 30 years of exemplary service in the Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

MSgt. Erickson joined the Air National Guard on July 20, 1984, and for the past 30 years has admirably served his community, the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States of America. Throughout his career, he has received countless medals and awards honoring him such as the Air Force achievement medal, the Meritorious Unit Award, the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, the National Defense Service Medal. He has also been the recipient of numerous Pennsylvania awards including the Pennsylvania Commendation Medal, the Pennsylvania Governors Unit Citation, the Pennsylvania 20 Year Service Medal, and the Pennsylvania General Thomas J. Stewart Medal.

MSgt. Erickson began his career as a member of the Propulsion Section, during which he was deployed overseas for multiple operations including Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and Operation Enduring Freedom. Upon his promotion to become a Master Sergeant and supervisor of the Propulsion Section, he masterfully guided the group through a transitional phase of changing aircraft while many members of the unit were being deployed. Despite the limited manpower, through his leadership and example, the transition was successful and a highly trained workforce was able to maintain unit efficiency. Joining MSgt. Erickson in celebrating his retirement is his wife Dorothy and his children.

Mr. Speaker, MSgt. Rodney T. Erickson has been described as representing the very best of our citizen soldiers. I congratulate him and his family on his retirement from the Pennsylvania Air National Guard and thank him for his service to the commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,599,556,606,441.85. We've added $6,972,679,557,528.77 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

NICHOLAS KRISTOF ON ''RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN PERIL''

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a July 9 column by Nicholas Kristof of The New York Times. I have appreciated Mr. Kristof's advocacy on human rights issues over the years, particularly regarding the genocide in Darfur and ongoing violence in Sudan over the last decade. In this recent column, ''Religious Freedom in Peril,'' he cuts through the empty gestures that often surround discussions of religious freedom abroad, and points out that the Muslim world is tragically disproportionate in apostasy and blasphemy laws, limits on religious activities and other constraints on religious freedom.

Of course, religious freedom is at risk throughout the world, and Muslims themselves face dire religious persecution from Burma to China to India. But recent news, including the advance of Islamic extremists in Iraq and the ongoing case of alleged apostate Meriam Ibrahim in Sudan, reminds us that citizens of many countries with Muslim majorities still deserve far greater justice and equality under the law.

I urge all my colleagues to read Mr. Kristof's column and keep it in mind as they consider ongoing events in the world.

[From The New York Times, July 9, 2014]

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN PERIL

(By Nicholas Kristof)

A Sudanese court in May sentences a Christian woman married to an American to be hanged, after first being lashed 100 times, after she refuses to renounce her Christian faith.

Muslim extremists in Iraq demand that Christians pay a tax or face crucifixion, according to the Iraqi government.

In Malaysia, courts ban some non-Muslims from using the word ''Allah.''

In country after country, Islamic fundamentalists are measuring their own religious devotion by the degree to which they suppress or assault those they see as heretics, creating a human rights catastrophe as people are punished or murdered for their religious beliefs.

This is a sensitive area I'm wading into here, I realize. Islam-haters in America and the West seize upon incidents like these to denounce Islam as a malignant religion of violence, while politically correct liberals are reluctant to say anything for fear of feeding bigotry. Yet there is a real issue here of religious tolerance, affecting millions of people, and we should be able to discuss it.

I've been thinking about this partly because of the recent murder of a friend, Rashid Rehman, a courageous human rights lawyer in Multan, Pakistan. Rashid, a Muslim, had agreed to defend a university lecturer who faced the death penalty after being falsely accused of insulting the Prophet Muhammad. This apparently made Rashid a target as well, for two men walked into his office and shot him dead.

No doubt the killers thought themselves pious Muslims. Yet such extremists do far more damage to the global reputation of Islam than all the world's Islamophobes put together.

The paradox is that Islam historically was relatively tolerant. In 628, Muhammad issued a document of protection to the monks of St. Catherine's Monastery.

''No compulsion is to be on them,'' he wrote. ''If a female Christian is married to a Muslim, it is not to take place without her approval. She is not to be prevented from visiting her church to pray.''

Anti-Semitism runs deep in some Muslim countries today, but, for most of history, Muslims were more tolerant of Jews than Christians were. As recently as the Dreyfus Affair in France more than a century ago, Muslims defended a Jew from the anti-Semitism of Christians.

Likewise, the most extreme modern case of religious persecution involved Europeans trying to exterminate Jews in the Holocaust. Since then, one of the worst religious massacres was the killing of Muslims by Christians at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It's also true that some of the bravest champions of religious freedom today are Muslim. Mohammad Ali Dadkhah, an Iranian lawyer, represented a Christian pastor pro bono, successfully defending him from

charges of apostasy. But Dadkhah was then arrested himself and is now serving a nine-year prison sentence.

Saudi Arabia may feud with Iran about almost everything else, but they are twins in religious repression. Saudis ban churches; it insults Islam to suggest it is so frail it cannot withstand an occasional church.

Particularly insidious in conservative Muslim countries is the idea that anyone born Muslim cannot become a Christian. That's what happened in the case I mentioned in Sudan: The court considered the woman, Meriam Ibrahim, a Muslim even though she had been raised a Christian by her mother. The court sentenced her to die for apostasy; that was overturned, and she is now sheltering with her family in the United States Embassy in Sudan, trying to get permission to leave the country.

A Pew Research Center study found Muslims victims of religious repression in about as many countries as Christians. But some of the worst abuse actually takes place in Muslim-dominated countries. In Pakistan, for example, a brutal campaign has been underway against the Shiite minority. Likewise, Iran represses the peaceful Bahai, and similarly Pakistan and other countries brutally mistreat the Ahmadis, who see themselves as Muslims but are regarded as apostates. Pakistani Ahmadis can be arrested simply for saying, ''peace be upon you.''

All this is a sad index of rising intolerance, for Pakistan's first foreign minister was an Ahmadi; now that would be impossible.

I hesitated to write this column because religious repression is an awkward topic when it thrives in Muslim countries. Muslims from Gaza to Syria, Western Sahara to Myanmar, are already enduring plenty without also being scolded for intolerance. It's also true that we in the West live in glass houses, and I don't want to empower our own chauvinists or fuel Islamophobia.

Yet religious freedom is one of the most basic of human rights, and one in peril in much of the world. Some heroic Muslims, like my friend Rashid in Pakistan, have sacrificed their lives to protect religious freedom. Let's follow their lead and speak up as well, for silence would be a perversion of politeness.

HONORING THE AROOSTOOK FARM OF PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Aroostook Farm of Presque Isle, Maine as it celebrates its 100th anniversary.

Since 1914, the Aroostook Farm has served as a center for agricultural research and development, not only for Presque Isle, but for the entire state of Maine. As part of the Maine Agricultural and Forest Experiment Station, the Aroostook Farm works in tandem with the University of Maine as a prominent research and development facility for the Maine potato industry, a staple crop in the state's agriculture. In more recent years, the Aroostook Farm has expanded their existing research to work toward developing sustainable agricultural practices.

On Wednesday, August 13th, the Aroostook Farm will recognize 100 years of research, community involvement, and advancement in agriculture. The Aroostook Farm embodies Maine values by representing the importance of agriculture and educational advancement, practices that have taken place on the farm for the last 100 years.

It is an honor and a privilege to represent the Aroostook Farm in Congress, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to help celebrate its 100th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Aroostook Farm and its involved community, and wishing them well on this joyous occasion.

HONORING CHIEF STEVEN CURRAN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Steven Curran for his 23 years of service with the United States Navy and congratulate him on his retirement.

Chief Curran currently serves with the Navy Medicine National Capital Area as the Senior Enlisted Leader for both the Navy Medical Support Detachment and the Human Resources Department of Walter Reed National Military Medical Center. During his time with the Navy, he received three Navy Commendation Medals, five Navy Achievement Medals, Surface Warfare designation, the Command Career Counselor badge, the Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal and various other unit and campaign medals.

His legacy of service also extends to the community, where, for decades, he has been involved in everything from acting as the President of the NHCQ Chief Petty Officer Association, to being a volunteer mentor in a high school student ministry.

After 20 years, Chief Curran is still happily married to the former Dawn LaPere, and they have two children. Emma, their first child, is eight years old and their son Sam will be two in September. After Chief Curran retires, the family will move to Savannah, GA where Chief Curran will be the Small Groups Pastor at Savannah Christian Church.

In honor of his years of commitment and sacrifice for his country, I am pleased to recognize Chief Steven Curran and offer my best wishes in his retirement from the U.S. Navy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes Nos. 428–432, I am not recorded because I was absent from the House of Representatives due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall No. 428, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

On rollcall No. 429, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

On rollcall No. 430, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 431, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 432, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

CONGRATULATING AND HONORING LIEUTENANT ALICE WARREN OF THE BAKER POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. BILL CASSIDY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lieutenant Alice Warren of the City of Baker Police Department, located in Louisiana's Sixth Congressional District. It is indeed a great honor and privilege to join Lt. Warren in commemorating and celebrating her sixteen years of dedicated service to the Baker community in the state of Louisiana.

Over the past sixteen years, Lt. Warren has worked in several capacities within the Baker Police Department. Lt. Warren began her career with the Department as a Communications Officer and was later promoted to Police Officer in the Uniform Patrol Division. Lt. Warren continued her ascent when she was promoted to Patrolman First Class and then to Sergeant. In September of 2011, Lt. Warren was elevated to the rank of Lieutenant. In this role, Lt. Warren holds the distinction as being the first and only female to hold this position with the Baker Police Department.

In addition to Lt. Warren's long record of accomplishment and achievement, she should also be commended for her courage, outstanding service and heroic sacrifice in protecting and defending the residents of the City of Baker on a daily basis. On behalf of the residents of Louisiana's Sixth Congressional District, I congratulate Lieutenant Alice Warren on her many outstanding years of service and her invaluable contribution to the Baker Police Department.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of July, in the year of our Lord two thousand fourteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-eighth.

URGING THE REUNIFICATION OF CYPRUS

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an issue that is near and dear to many constituents in my district.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the decades-long struggle to find a common ground between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. On July 20, 1974, Turkey deployed its military forces to the island of Cyprus, separating thousands of families from their homes and dividing the sovereign nation in half.

Today, there are still many challenges that the Greek and Turkish Cypriots need to resolve before reunification can take place. While the path won't be easy and it will take the political courage of both sides, I am confident that a peaceful resolution can be found.

On February 11, 2014, the two Cypriot leaders, Nicos Anastasiades and Dervish Eroglu, renewed negotiations for a Cyprus settlement. This Joint Statement reflects the spirit of compromise and lays down a solid foundation for result-oriented talks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in urging for the peaceful reunification of the island of Cyprus and I call upon the United States to do everything it can to support both sides in this process.

SUPPORTING UNANIMOUS DECISION OF U.S. SENTENCING COMMISSION MAKING RETROACTIVE THE REDUCTION IN SENTENCING GUIDELINES APPLICABLE TO MOST FEDERAL DRUG TRAFFICKING OFFENDERS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the unanimous vote of the U.S. Sentencing Commission to apply retroactively the reduction in the sentencing guideline levels applicable to most federal drug trafficking offenders.

This action is welcome news to the families and loved ones of the estimated 46,290 persons eligible to have their cases reviewed by a judge to determine if their sentence should be reduced by on average of 25 months, or as much as 18.8 percent.

The United States incarcerates nearly 25 percent of the world's inmates, even though it only has 5 percent of the world's population. Thirty years ago, there were less than 30,000 inmates in the federal system; today, there are nearly 216,000, an increase of 800 percent.

This over-crowding of our federal prison system—at an annual cost of about $6.5 billion—is the direct and proximate result of the proliferation of offenses carrying mandatory-minimums and the discriminatory 100–1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine sentences in federal law.

African Americans and Hispanics comprise more than 6 in 10 federal inmates incarcerated for drug offenses. And African American offenders receive sentences that are 10 percent longer than white offenders for the same crimes and are 21 percent more likely to receive mandatory-minimum sentences than white defendants according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

The decision by the U.S. Sentencing Commission is particularly gratifying to those of us who worked tirelessly over the last two decades to restore balance and justice to federal drug sentencing policy.

In 2005, I introduced the ''No More Tulias Act of 2005'' (H.R. 2620) in response to the infamous drug task force scandal in Tulia, Texas that occurred six years earlier, during which 15 percent of the town's African American population was arrested, prosecuted and sentenced to decades in prison based on the uncorroborated testimony of a federally funded undercover officer with a record of racial impropriety.

Later, in 2007, I introduced the ''Drug Sentencing Reform and Cocaine Kingpin Trafficking Act of 2007'' (H.R. 4545), bipartisan legislation eliminating the unjust and discriminatory 100 to 1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine sentences in federal law. Companion legislation in the Senate was introduced by then Senator JOSEPH BIDEN of Delaware (S. 1711).

Three years later, this effort bore fruit when the Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the ''Fair Sentencing Act of 2010'' (P.L. 111–220), which finally ended the 100:1 ratio that had resulted in unconscionable racial disparities in the average length of sentences for comparable offenses.

But a large gap remained in the justice provided by this landmark legislation: its provisions were not retroactive. That gap has been filled today by the unanimous vote of the Sentencing Commission.

Beginning in November of this year, all federal inmates sentenced under the old regime are to be afforded the opportunity to have their sentences reconsidered under the provisions of current law, and those eligible for release may be reunited with their families and loved ones as early as November 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the vote today by the Sentencing Commission is a giant step in the right direction as it makes federal drug sentencing policy and practice fairer for all, helps save the taxpayers millions of dollars annually, and reaffirms the premise that the men and women who have paid their debt to society are worthy of a second chance to redeem their lives and contribute to their communities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 428.

A TRIBUTE TO MILWAUKEE COMMUNITY JOURNAL'S DR. TERENCE N. THOMAS SCHOLARSHIP ANNUAL BRUNCH

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Milwaukee Community Journal's Dr. Terence N. Thomas Scholarship Annual Brunch. The Dr. Terence N. Thomas Scholarship Annual Brunch celebrates its 38th anniversary at the Italian Conference Center on Sunday, August 3, 2014. The annual event was established in 1996 to promote academic excellence and to pay tribute to the publisher's deceased and beloved son, Dr. Terence N. Thomas. This fund has granted over a half million dollars to students who retain a 3.0 cumulative grade average or better.

Much of the success of the Milwaukee Community Journal can be attributed to one of its founders and Publisher, Patricia O'Flynn Pattillo. The Milwaukee Community Journal evolved from a publication called the Soul City Shopper, following the 1965 riots in Milwaukee. Insurance companies had refused to pay businesses for damages incurred during the riots. Ms. Pattillo was encouraged by business leaders to assume the role of editor of the publication. She penned a barrage of editorials that eventually pressured the insurance companies to uphold their obligations by paying claims so that repairs could be made and that businesses could reopen. This effort was dubbed The Unity in the Community Campaign; it was very successful and mobilized the entire community.

In addition to the scholarships, the brunch will honor many of those individuals who took part in that Unity in Community mobilization. The brunch's theme, ''Inspiration Meets Aspiration'': Fabulous, Fit, Fun and Fantastic: Uniting Generations,'' will focus on the many and varied contributions to our community of those individuals 50 and older. The honorees contributions have been broad and vast and have been the foundation for Milwaukee's central city community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Milwaukee Community Journal hails from the 4th Congressional District. It has consistently informed and entertained readers for nearly 38 years. I am pleased to give praise to Patricia O'Flynn Pattillo and her staff for providing a voice to the community and offering educational opportunities to students. I wish them many more years of success.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEATLES' HISTORIC VISIT TO OREGON COUNTY, MISSOURI

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th Anniversary of The Beatles's historic weekend visit to Oregon County, Missouri. In 1964 The Beatles visited the Ozarks of Oregon County, Missouri in September for a weekend of rest and relaxation at the Pigman Ranch.

I also would like to recognize the Ozarks of Oregon County, Missouri as the official September 19, 1964 weekend destination of John Lennon, Paul McCartney, George Harrison, and Ringo Starr. The Alton Community Foundation is conducting the Ozarks Beatlemania Festival on the 12th and 13th of September this fall to celebrate this historic event in the Ozarks. The community of Alton looks forward to sharing the history and stories of the Fab Four's visit to nearby Pigman Ranch on September of 1964. Although Pigman Ranch is no

longer owned by the Pigman family, the stories, the mystique and the uniqueness of the ranch remain.

With the Ozark Beatlemania Festival approaching, in which I am eager to attend, it is my pleasure to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the visit made by The Beatles to Oregon County, Missouri, before the House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 425 on July 16, 2014, I was unavoidably detained on my way to the House floor owing to a constituent meeting and consequently missed the Massie of Kentucky amendment vote to H.R. 5016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

HONORING THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT ORGANIZATION, MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HIGGINS

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major General Patrick M. Higgins, Deputy Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, or JIEDDO, who will retire from the United States Army on September 1, 2014, after 34 years of distinguished service. In his final tour of duty, Major General Higgins led efforts to disrupt threat networks that support, supply and employ IEDs globally. Through his contributions, JIEDDO has made significant strides in reducing the effectiveness of the IEDs and eliminating the enemy networks that seek to use these devices to harm our troops.

Major General Higgins has commanded within the special operations community at the detachment, battalion and group levels, culminating in assignment as the Commander, Joint Forces Special Operations Component Command in Iraq. He has served in numerous special operations staff assignments and director-level positions within the Joint Staff.

Major General Higgins has earned numerous awards and decorations including the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with ''V'' device, Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, among others.

I am proud to share in the celebration of Major General Higgins' long and distinguished military career. I would also like to congratulate his wife, Susan, and his three daughters, Sarah, Emily and Jessica, whose love and support has aided and strengthened Major General Higgins throughout his career. I wish him all the best in his retirement.

HONORING THE FLORIDA STATE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Florida State Chapter of the U.S. Air Force Association (AFA) in celebration of its 50th anniversary.

On Saturday, July 26, the AFA will hold its annual state conference in West Palm Beach, Florida. It is a privilege to represent constituents who are so deeply committed to the education, advocacy, and support necessary to maintain America's dominance in aerospace that helps keep our Nation secure.

From issuing scholarships and supporting STEM programs in elementary schools, to restoring and preserving Air Force fighter aircrafts, Florida's AFA chapter has been a tremendous advocate in the South Florida community.

I am proud to recognize the Florida Chapter and the entire AFA community for their achievements in promoting aerospace power and enhancing aerospace and science education for South Florida's next generation of leaders.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM D. MAGWOOD IV

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my thanks to a dedicated public servant who is moving on to another important assignment. Bill Magwood, currently a Commissioner on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), will depart for Paris in September to serve as the Director General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Nuclear Energy Agency. I want to wish Bill and his wife Janet all the best as they embark on this great adventure. I know Bill will do a wonderful job in this new position.

As a Member of Congress representing Idaho's second congressional district, I got to know Bill as the Director of the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy. In that capacity, Bill played an instrumental role in forming the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) as the nation's lead lab for nuclear energy and that designation has served the nation, the nuclear energy industry and the State of Idaho very well. Bill Magwood's vision for INL and creative institutions such as the Center for Advanced Energy Studies has exceeded all of our expectations and we owe Bill a debt of gratitude for his foresight and perseverance.

After leaving the Department of Energy and working in the private sector for a few years, Bill was asked by President Obama to return to government service and serve on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Bill accepted this challenge, but I do not believe he or anyone else had any idea of what was in store for him. Under Bill's watch at the NRC, the Fukushima disaster hit Japan and the NRC was thrust into the spotlight to explain the situation to the American people. At the same time, the NRC was faced with serious internal challenges, which Bill met with courage and conviction, and for this he deserves our recognition and praise.

Bill Magwood has served his country with honor and distinction and I want to offer my praise as he moves on to his new international leadership role.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSEMBLIES OF GOD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th year of the General Council of the Assemblies of God.

The General Council of the Assemblies of God began in Hot Springs, Arkansas in 1914 with 300 people and has called Springfield, Missouri its home since 1918, and we are proud to call them our neighbors in the 7th Congressional District. This broad coalition of ministers decided to work together to fulfill common goals by providing fellowship, establishing schools, and sending missionaries abroad. Since 1914, the Assemblies of God has grown to more than 67 million adherents in over 366,000 churches worldwide.

In these 100 years, Assemblies of God members have preached the gospel, prayed for the sick, witnessed miracles, published profound insights on the spiritual life, and established churches, schools, orphanages, and rescue missions. The Assemblies of God's dedication and loyalty to their members and employees has become a vital part of the Springfield community. Their outreach and sponsorship of higher education is a true testament of their fellowship and values. The General Council has formed close relationships to local businesses and universities, creating a network that values community, education, and friendship. It is an honor to recognize the General Council for their leadership and service.

I am confident the work of the General Council of the Assemblies of God will continue to make a positive impact in the area over the next 100 years.

A TRIBUTE TO RAY ALPERT—ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our community lost a true friend and major benefactor on Wednesday, June 11, 2014 with the passing of Ray Alpert at the age of 87.

Ray and his wife, Barbara, were known throughout Long Beach for their generosity

and passion for organizations that helped support the Jewish community. Over the decades, Ray and his wife Barbara donated millions of dollars to the Jewish Federation of Greater Long Beach and West Orange County and its partner agencies, the Alpert Jewish Community Center, Long Beach Hillel, Jewish Family and Children's Service and the Hebrew Academy of Huntington Beach.

From its inception, the Alpert Foundation has provided the Long Beach and Western Orange County Jewish Federation with its largest annual gift. In 1997, their lead donation to the Federation was instrumental in creating the 85,000 square foot Alpert Jewish Community Center, whose comprehensive programs and facilities now serve almost every segment of our community. ''The Alpert Jewish Community Center is forever indebted to Ray and Barbara for their generosity and caring for the Center,'' said Jeffrey Rips, Executive Director.

Ray's longtime friend, Jewish Federation and Jewish Community Foundation Past President, and community leader in his own right, Eugene Lentzner, spoke lovingly of his 50 year association with Ray. ''Ray achieved great success, yet he was the most unpretentious and unassuming person I ever know. (And you should also know that comment applies to his wife also),'' said Gene. ''He was most comfortable outside the limelight; yet he served on many boards, he had a lot to say about how the agencies functioned, and he never had to have a title or office to be the most effective person in the room. And that is why everyone who has anything to say about him says that he was our pillar.''

''He was an extremely generous man and very humble, very down-to-earth,'' said Deborah Goldfarb, CEO of the Jewish Federation and Jewish Community Foundation. ''He really believed in community involvement and was active in many non-Jewish causes, as well as Jewish causes. It was part of who he was.''

''The Hebrew Academy community is saddened by the loss of Ray Alpert a giant mentsch in our community,'' said Rabbi Yitzchok Newman. ''Ray paved the path to provide a myriad of opportunities for active participation in our community. He was a man who cared deeply about and invested generously in the future of our community. Ray will be sorely missed—may his memory be a blessing for all.''

Ray was born on April 9, 1927, and grew up in Boyle Heights. He was a co-owner of Alpert & Alpert Iron & Metal Inc., a Los Angeles-based scrap metal business founded by his father and uncle in the 1930s. Eighty years later, the company remains a family-owned business. Ray and Barbara moved to Long Beach in 1963 and soon joined Temple Israel.

''Through the years Barbara and Ray's passion for youth seemed unending,'' continued Lentzner. ''The establishment and endowment of the Alpert New Leaders Forum at the Jewish Federation, his lobbying and support that literally saved Hillel at Cal State, the founder's donation and ongoing funding of CCEJ's Building Bridges camps, which brings young people together to respect each other, were all indications of this commitment to the next generations.''

And the list goes on and on: ADL, National Council of Jewish Women, Hadassah, the rebuilding of Temple Israel, Ronald McDonald House, and the new Fisher House at the Long Beach Veterans Administration hospital, providing a place for the family of veterans who are being treated. ''In all, they were major funders of over 50 organizations every year, lead givers for their campaigns, and have endowed their gifts so that their programs will continue on into the future,'' remarked Lentzner.

''Ray Alpert was a man who was committed to his causes and the community,'' said Kathryn Miles, JFCS Executive Director. ''For Ray, it was not only a matter of a donation. He found long-lasting and far-reaching ways to impact programs and agencies, as both a leader and as a donor. For JFCS, Barbara and Ray's generosity has had a tremendously positive impact on our ability to provide mental health and social services to people who have nowhere else to turn.''

Ray also had a passion for Jewish history and Holocaust education. At Cal State University, Long Beach (CSULB), he and Barbara established the Barbara and Ray Alpert Endowed Chair in Jewish Studies. ''We at CSULB owe them a real debt of gratitude. Ray was not merely an active member of the Jewish Studies advisory board. At a moment of crisis, he and Barbara stepped up, and through their generosity, saved the Jewish Studies Program,'' said Jeffrey Blutinger, Director of the program. ''Their endowment has not only allowed us to continue offering classes, degrees, and our regular lecture series, but also helped us expand our programming by bringing artists, performers, and lead scholars to campus.''

Ray and Barbara have also been strong and consistent supporters of Beach Hillel, which provides services to Jewish students at CSULB and several other universities and community colleges in the Long Beach and Orange County areas. ''Through the help of Ray Alpert, Beach Hillel has been able to provide free and kosher Friday-night dinners to students, opportunities to work for social justice, and various educational and social activities that encourage students' personal growth and exploration,'' said Rachel Kaplan, Hillel Executive Director.

''One issue dear to Ray's heart was building bridges among communities,'' said Blutinger. For the last two years, Ray and Barbara have funded a collaborative project on campus involving Jewish Studies and Chicano and Latino Studies, bringing speakers on campus to highlight the longstanding relationships between the Jews and Latinos(as) in Southern California. Just a few weeks ago, he and Barbara went to CSULB to hear Dr. George Sanchez from USC describe the unique nature of the Boyle Heights community of the 1930s and '40s, a place where immigrant Jews mixed with Mexican and Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, and Japanese-Americans, forming alliances of mutual support.

''Since Ray was born and raised in Boyle Heights, he was delighted to see students from Jewish Studies and Chicano and Latino Studies classes come together to learn about his common past,'' said Blutinger.

Gene Lentzner echoed Ray's interest in connecting diverse communities. ''I have to mention Ray's love for the people with whom he grew consulted and argued until they got it right, and then did it together. And the results were wonderful, often incredible,'' said Lentzner at the funeral which took place on Friday, June 13. Ray is survived by his wife Barbara, his children, Teri, Alan and Nancy; his sister, Janet Farber; and seven grandchildren who will all miss him tremendously.

''I once asked him what gave him the most satisfaction in life. You created a foundation to give away most of your fortune, so it wasn't about just making money, or having the best of everything. And he simply answered: Helping other is the best reason for the gift of life on this earth. That is what my parents taught me. That is what I tried to teach my children,'' remembers Lentzner.

His life was a blessing for all of us. He really knew how to live. It is why he was so universally respected and loved.

Ray's generosity and activism has touched the lives of countless people in the Long Beach area and his passing leaves a gaping hole in our hearts.

NELSON MANDELA DAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today marks what would have been the 96th birthday of Nelson Mandela, one of the great liberators in human history and an enduring international symbol of peace, integrity, humility, resilience, and courage. While we lost Madiba in December, his ethos of nonviolence and his unyielding quest for justice continue to guide and inspire people throughout the world.

After 27 years imprisoned on Robben Island and decades of devoted campaigning to overturn hateful racist policies, Nelson Mandela succeeded not only in unravelling apartheid but also in shepherding his nation through an extraordinary peaceful democratic transition. The people of South Africa—and people of all races, ethnicities, and nationalities around the world—are forever grateful.

More than two decades ago, just months after his release from prison, I had the honor of first meeting Mandela when he visited Detroit to organize for his ascendant political movement in South Africa and speak with the great American civil rights hero Rosa Parks. I was astounded not only by Mandela's insight but also by his kindness and humility. Just four years later, I was delighted to travel to South Africa to attend his inauguration as President of South Africa.

Today, his birthday, is recognized globally as ''Nelson Mandela Day,'' an occasion established by the Mandela Foundation in 2009 to commemorate his life and to underscore the notion that a single person can—through commitment and character—yield extraordinary positive change. Today, in my hometown of Detroit, Michigan, thanks to the work of the Friends of Detroit City Airport Community Development Corporation and Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, a portion of Atwater Street from Civic Center Drive to Bates Street will be renamed ''Nelson Mandela Drive.'' A commemorative ceremony will highlight the extraordinary achievements of Mandela and

ways that community members can continue to fulfill his revolutionary vision of justice and nonviolence.

IN RECOGNITION OF FOLKSVILLE USA

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Folksville USA, a pioneering organization that began in Arizona and is spreading through communities across our nation. Folksville USA works with Adopt-a-Highway to back BagReadyJobs, an innovative program that pairs local businesses with youth groups to clean up our highways.

Arizona's District One boasts some of the most beautiful landscape in the country, and the BagReadyJobs program is keeping it that way! Under the leadership of Gary Chamberlain, Folksville USA is teaching the kids of Arizona about the effects of littering, the fundamentals of money management and most importantly, introducing them to that positive feeling you get when you are serving your community.

Getting kids excited about cleaning up the environment and raising money for a good cause is no easy feat, but Gary Chamberlain and Folksville USA seem to do it over and over again. This program makes a difference in the lives of Arizona kids and preserves the pristine beauty of our state, and I hope communities all over our country will have the opportunity to achieve these same benefits. Thanks for keeping Arizona beautiful!

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF DUKE ELLINGTON SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Duke Ellington School of the Arts in the District of Columbia. The 40th Anniversary Celebration launched with a tribute concert at the Kennedy Center honoring co-founders Peggy Cooper Carfritz and the late Mike Malone. The Duke Ellington School, named in honor of the late great Duke Ellington, a Washington native, is one of the premier performing arts schools in the nation, and ranked the third Best School in the District of Columbia by U.S. News and World Report.

Established in 1974, the Duke Ellington School of the Arts was designed to reflect the ''creative soul'' of the District as well as the cultural diversity of the United States. Its mission is to both nurture and inspire passion for arts and learning in talented students who might not otherwise have an opportunity to develop their artistic skills. The Duke Ellington School of the Arts is the only high school in the District that combines a full college-preparatory curriculum with professional arts training. Students are provided with training in areas such as dance, theater, literary media, museum studies, and instrumental or vocal music. The Duke Ellington School of the Arts strives to maintain a unique curriculum in which students are well equipped in both the arts and academia.

The Duke Ellington School of the Arts has also produced distinguished alumni, among them mezzo-soprano opera singer Denyce Graves, screenwriter and comedian Dave Chappelle, CNN contributor Michaela Angela Davis, and a host of others who have contributed greatly to the nation's arts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Duke Ellington School of the Arts, and in wishing the school success in continuing its proud legacy in the District of Columbia.

ROCKINGHAM COUNTY LAND TRANSFER

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to transfer land from the United States to Rockingham County, Virginia. The County has long managed this land and associated buildings and has been responsible for all upkeep.

In 1989, the Department of the Interior deeded this land, which it no longer used, to Rockingham County for public good. The County approached then Rep. Jim Olin in the 101st Congress to allow the buildings on this land to be used for the particular use of a non-profit day care that serves the County. This resulted in PL 101–479. However, because of the narrow way this law was drafted, Rockingham County does not have true autonomy over the land and must check-in with the Department of the Interior when any repairs or upgrades of the facilities are needed. Given that the building is used for a child care facility, this added bureaucracy delays and impedes the ability of the day care to move efficiently to make any necessary upgrades.

For over 25 years Rockingham County, Virginia has managed this land as if it belonged to the County. Although this land was already transferred to the county, it was not done effectively. This legislation will finalize the efforts of a previous Congress and fully transfer this land to the county. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation.

IN HONOR OF VIOLA DEL GRECO'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Viola Del Greco upon her 100th birthday.

Yesterday she joined a growing segment of America: the Centenarians. According to the 2010 Census, over 53,000 Americans are 100 years old or older. Their combined contributions to our nation have coincided with the rise of what has been called ''The American Century.''

Mrs. Del Greco has lived by any measure what can be described as a successful life. Married to her late husband for 72 years, matriarch, business owner and faithful church goer, she has modeled for her family and community how to appropriately balance the demands of life. Faith, family, friends, and neighborhood all require time, energy and attention. Those that give each the proper care can look back and see the handiwork of a lifetime and rejoice in the result. Viola Del Greco must rejoice at what she sees.

As a mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, she understands the importance of family. The family unit serves as the most fundamental human institution and a basic foundation for our society. The family acts as an incubator in which all the virtues and principles we hold dear are passed on to our children.

Her faithful membership at St. John the Baptist Catholic Church speaks to her core values and strength of character. Her role as business partner with her husband at Del Cleaners bonded them as a team and as part of the community. Her children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren have watched her example and honor her life.

Mark Twain was right when he observed, ''Only he who has seen better days and lives to see better days again knows their full value.''

Mrs. Del Greco understands the value of each day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 23, 2014*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

THE HUNGRY RUSSIAN BEAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, in the sky above eastern Ukraine, a surface-to-air missile was launched, and it destroyed a Malaysian civilian airliner. The dastardly deed killed—rather, murdered—298 people.

It appears the missile and launcher were Russian. The individuals shooting down the plane were so-called ''Russian-backed separatists'' in Ukraine. Apparently, the crash, which is a crime scene on the ground, is controlled by pro-Russian sympathizers, and it has been compromised by unknown malcontents.

It seems to me the Russian emperor, Putin—the Napoleon of Siberia—has his pitiful, complicit fingerprints all over this *Lusitania*-type incident. This is the latest in a series of aggressive acts by the Russian bear. In 2008, the Russians invaded the sovereign nation of Georgia. The bear gobbled up one-third of the nation. The world leaders protested loudly, but they were glad it wasn't their homelands. Then the world moved on.

Madam Speaker, the Russian tanks are still in Georgia. I have seen them.

Then the bear hibernated and woke up hungry in 2013 and invaded Crimea—a part of the country of Ukraine—to satisfy its appetite for more aggression. Now the Russians unlawfully occupy Crimea. The world leaders, once again, voiced opposition but went back to their policy of appeasement.

But Crimea did not fill the belly of the bear. So, still hungry, the bear of the north moved into eastern Ukraine and looked for more prey. It subversively has supported insurrection against the Ukrainian Government to gain more territory. Reports indicate Russian special forces are playing the role of pro-Russian separatists. Battles are being fought. People are dying. Russian imperialism persists in its aggression.

Then, recently, the Malaysian airplane was shot down over Ukraine. Also, in the last 24 hours, two Ukrainian military jets were shot down by Russian-backed rebels. The world leaders are self-righteously outraged. However, nothing has stopped the Russian bear.

What will the heads of state do? Will the leaders continue to take the position that, since the bear hasn't eaten them, they will do little but pontificate and hope the bear's appetite is satisfied?

Maybe the bear will hibernate again, Madam Speaker, but when it wakes up, like it always does, it will wake up hungry. Then, when it roars, who will be devoured next, the rest of Ukraine?—or maybe Moldova or Latvia or Estonia or Poland?—or just another innocent group of men, women, and children on a civilian airline?

Only Putin knows what the awakening roar of the Russian bear will bring to the rest of humanity. Appeasement certainly doesn't seem to be working, and it is not the answer to stopping aggression.

Madam Speaker, is there not one bold Churchill to be found amidst the overpopulated, boastful Chamberlains among us?

And that's just the way it is.

FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ACT

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, alongside my Republican colleague from Illinois, Representative AARON SCHOCK, who is here to speak about the Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014, which we will be introducing later today. This is an issue that I have been working on, Madam Speaker, for several years, one that will help us close the achievement gap that too many of our children face.

Our bipartisan bill creates a competitive grant program to expand the full-service community schools model across the country. Full-service community schools are an innovative approach to help students and their parents access a full range of critical services all in one place. Let me emphasize these are services that are currently available but that are not as accessible because they are not centralized. We will encourage communities to put together the services that they already provide in an accessible way for children and their families.

For low-income parents who are working multiple jobs as they send their kids to school, finding time to provide them with adequate medical checkups and dental screenings is often very difficult. The full-service community schools model locates these services at their children's schools, along with nutritional counseling, financial literacy education, and adult classes—services that in most communities are already offered—to make it easier for both students and parents to access these services under one roof. It also helps ensure parents have the tools they need to support their children's learning—so critically important to the children's success. Studies show that when children are healthy they learn better and have a better chance at academic success.

Maryland has been employing this model for several years now in the form of Judy Centers, named for my late wife, Judy Hoyer, who was an early childhood administrator in Prince George's County. The Maryland State Department of Education has found that children accessing services at Judy Centers perform better than their peers who did not when tested for kindergarten readiness. I know the gentleman from Illinois has similar evidence from a full-service community school program in his State. In his district, in fact, his university from which he graduated partners with that full-service school, Bradley University in Peoria.

The results are clear that the full-service community schools model has the potential—and in fact, in our own State, we have realized that potential—to help millions of low-income

families across the country ensure that their children can do well in school and have a better shot at being college or career ready when they graduate. This is good for America. It is good for the children. It is good for their families. It is good for our competitiveness. This legislation, Madam Speaker, is an example of what is possible when we set differences aside and work together.

Now, AARON SCHOCK is a good friend of mine. He is a Republican and I am a Democrat, and some say, well, that doesn't really happen in Washington—but it does. Outside of the ambit of this bill, AARON and I have worked on a number of pieces of legislation, and I am proud of the fact that we are working on this legislation together on behalf of children, on behalf of families, on behalf of our country. This legislation is an example of what is possible when we set our differences aside, as I said. We work together across the aisle to make progress for those who are trying to make it in America for themselves and for their families.

I want to thank Representative SCHOCK for partnering with me on this effort, and I hope this Congress can come together, as the two of us have done, and work in a bipartisan fashion to pass this bill without delay.

FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ACT

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014, which I am pleased to be introducing with my friend, Mr. HOYER.

A strong education is the foundation our children need to succeed in life. Unfortunately, issues affecting students' home lives often interfere with their ability to achieve their true potential.

One innovation that seeks to overcome these burdens is full-service community schools. As Mr. HOYER mentioned, in my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, three of these schools have been created and are operated with the support of Bradley University. The Harrison full-service community school has many of these diverse programs.

Harrison promotes events such as Fitness with Firemen, which teaches students the importance of a healthy lifestyle, or Hawkeye News, which is another program that uses smart boards to let students write, produce, and read the news in both English and Spanish. LEGACY is yet another program that gives young people the skills they need to transition from grade school to high school and beyond.

The utility of these schools is further illustrated by the Trewyn full-service community school in Peoria. At Trewyn, the Riding Tigers Horse Club allows financially disadvantaged students to learn how to ride and take care of horses. The riding program has been so successful that it has attracted the attention of parents, many of whom have never had the privilege of riding a horse themselves. Trewyn is also committed to getting parents more actively involved in their children's educations with programs like the Parent Advisory Council. We all know that parental engagement is key to a child's success and learning, and successful alternative programs like this deserve a chance to positively impact our communities.

The program that best captures the collaboration between a full-service community school and the local community is Manual Academy's Academic Progress Conference, the APC. The APC program provides a platform for students to share their academic progress reports with the community and receive feedback from local community members. These gatherings have given community members greater insight to the challenges these students face in their community while also strengthening the ties between the students and the students' neighborhoods.

You see, full-service community school programs have received positive feedback from both school leaders and the parents. For example, parents have expressed to me that they have seen that full-service community schools have promoted students' creativity outside the classroom, and school leaders have credited the program for allowing students to experience relevant school activities that are matched to their personal interests.

I can tell you, as a former school board member and as the youngest school board president in Illinois' history at District 150, I know the challenges that these parents, teachers, and school administrators face every day. Motivating these children to learn, teaching them and meeting their basic needs are a daily reality for everybody involved. If we don't do it, it doesn't happen. The full-service community schools are an important tool in this effort, and although relatively new to the Peoria area, these schools are making a difference to educators, to parents, and, most importantly, to the students.

The Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014 will expand the opportunity for more schools to become full-service community schools and to see the benefit to the neighborhoods as well. As Congress continues to seek innovative solutions to address our national educational needs, the full-service community schools should play an important role.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his leadership on this important cause. On a personal note, I want to join him in a fitting tribute to his late wife, without whom full-service community schools may never have enjoyed the remarkable success they have in his home State or in mine.

I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER on this effort, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important program throughout our country.

□ 1015

CRISES IN UKRAINE AND NIGERIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on Monday, I joined other Houstonians to express our sympathy by greeting citizens from the Netherlands and Malaysia after the enormous tragedy that occurred just 4 days ago, or more than 4 days ago, the shooting-down of the Malaysian flight over Ukraine territory, manned by an illegitimate government that thought it was appropriate to shoot missiles where no knowledge, allegedly, was gained or understood as to what it was, and hundreds of souls lost their lives.

I hope that today, as the remains will be reaching the soil of the Netherlands, we will all take a moment to reflect on that enormous tragedy.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am, obviously, extraordinarily disturbed because it pierced the sanctity of the international airways, and it says that there is no respect, dignity, or protocol as relates to the commercial flights and international airway.

That, first of all, for all countries, must be abhorrent and outrageous. And then, we must take knowledge of the atrocious behavior of Russia. And it should not be silenced; their behavior is outrageous.

It is inappropriate because Mr. Putin is a head of State. Bodies of another sovereign nation lay in a field, many sovereign nations. Mr. Putin did absolutely nothing to avoid the desecration and the insult and the indignities given to those lost souls.

I am reminded of crashes over the years when countries or airlines were able to take the family members, within days, to the site for prayer or acknowledgment, giving them added comfort.

So I think it is important to understand, and I refer my colleagues to an article, yes, in The Wall Street Journal, on why Putin is taking major risks in Ukraine. He is still living in the world of the Soviet Union.

But it is imperative to know that we have something that we can offer, besides a request of peace, reconciliation, and international investigation unfettered. We have something that we can acknowledge.

Even the Transportation Secretary indicated that energy resources, natural gas, oil and gas, natural gas, LNG, are resources that we can utilize to substitute for the despotic hold that he has over Europe.

The Secretary of Transportation indicated it is a creator of jobs. But we need to start having Europe turn to the United States to ensure the opportunity for freedom and ceasing this atrocious hold on Europe.

Let me state, just for a moment, to acknowledge a tragedy and the terrorism of Boko Haram. I will go to the Nigerian Embassy today, Madam Speaker, to acknowledge that the girls in captivity have been held for almost 100 days.

I will look to introduce legislation that will use some of the seized Nigerian assets that have been seized through criminal activity to establish a real victims funded, even though I congratulate President Jonathan for creating one, but there has been no money given to these victims.

And I will say that we need to watch this place because Boko Haram has now seized a whole town in the Northern State, the very State we were in when we went to Nigeria and spoke to the Governor. Now, a whole city, like New York or Chicago or Houston, has been seized.

We have elements that we can do something about: Russia and its misbehavior, mistreatment of lost souls, and the terrorists and terrorist activities of Boko Haram.

I implore my colleagues to work together to find a solution so that souls may be buried in dignity and never have this happen to them again and, as well, so that Boko Haram, is in essence, brought to justice.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly extraordinary and exceptional American, a man by the name of John Kanzius, and to recognize a major milestone in John's dream to find a better way to treat cancer: that is the completion of the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation's mission.

When I first came to Washington, I was absolutely amazed by the number of academicians, researchers, thinkers, and intellectuals that work and reside in our Nation's Capitol. You know, you listen to these people and you say, my goodness, we are so blessed, as a country, to have this great wealth of knowledge and the sheer brain power, the collection of brain power around here is incredible.

Then you learn about something even more incredible and even more remarkable, and it happens right in your own home district and in a town that you represent. And you say, wait a minute. In Erie, Pennsylvania, a guy named John Kanzius recognized that there had to be a better way to treat cancer.

Now, John is truly an inspiration, not just to me and to his family, but to the entire country and, especially, to the cancer community.

Let me tell you a little bit about John. John was born in Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1944. John made a living as a radio and TV engineer, and was a onetime station owner.

When he retired, John and his wife, Marianne, they had already completed their successful professional life and had raised two adult children. They headed to Florida like a lot of Americans do to enjoy their retirement. But that is not what was in store for John.

In 2002, John was diagnosed with terminal leukemia and had undergone countless treatments of toxic chemotherapy. And this is the worst kind of luck that put John on a new path, and a miraculous path, because it gave John the idea that maybe you could use radio waves to kill cancer cells.

Now, while John didn't have a medical background, he did understand radio waves. And when he was diagnosed with terminal leukemia in 2002, his knowledge of the deficiencies in modern cancer treatment became firsthand.

But it wasn't John's sickness that motivated him. It was the sad and helpless eyes of all those children he would see in the cancer ward when he went in for his chemo and he would see these kids sitting there, their hands bandaged up, their frail bodies, knowing that they couldn't go outside and play the way other children did.

He looked at that and said, there has got to be a better way to treat this horrible disease. And that is what motivated him.

Now, I want you to think about something, because John Kanzius—and anybody who has been through this—my own sister died of pancreatic cancer—as you go through that, as the person, whether it happens to you or somebody in your family, you start to feel what they are going through.

John couldn't sleep at night. And rather than wake Marianne up, you know what he decided to do?

One morning, at 2 a.m. he got up and he went downstairs. So he grabbed some copper wire, some boxes, some antennas, and Marianne's pie pans, and he starts to build a machine.

This is just an average, everyday guy who just got it. He understood that technology. Now, he is weak and weary from his own cancer, but John continued to work. By the spring of 2004, John was feeling a little better and he started to get the word out about his discovery and he started to raise money for more expansive research.

Could radio waves be the key to a nontoxic, noninvasive way to treatment?

If one could find a way to direct metal to cancer cells, could radio waves be the answer to the prayers of countless people, young and old, suffering health failure and an uncertain future on account of this cancer?

Now, confronted with his own battle and the suffering of so many young people, John Kanzius' can-do attitude kicked in, and he set out to demonstrate that radio waves, indeed, could kill cancer cells without harming any other tissue. No collateral damage. And this endeavor became the mission of the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation in Erie, Pennsylvania.

Now, in the midst of undergoing dozens of rounds of toxic chemotherapy, he encountered so many sick young people facing a similar ordeal. The cancer and the chemo were stealing these children's health, and John was tormented by the reality that was reflected in their faces. He just knew that there had to be a better way, and he went about it.

Last month, on June 30, the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation announced that the organization would be closing its doors, after raising more than $15 million in donations, a day that John Kanzius had only dreamed about.

And why?

Because the Kanzius research team is now entering into the next phase by submitting up an application to the FDA to initiate human trials to test the possibility of John's vision of curing and treating cancer.

The Kanzius Foundation has funded all the research necessary for the team to demonstrate how the technology works and begin the first phases of these trials, which will target pancreatic and liver cancers, two of the particularly deadly forms of cancer. If successful, the treatment will be a game-changer for so many of these people with these two types of cancer.

Now, while John is not around to see the culmination of his life work because he passed away in 2009 at the age of 64, I don't only trust, I know that John is seeing what is going on today. And I am so happy to be here and be able to talk about the Kanzius Research Center.

Some of the people are in the gallery actually: my good friend, Mark Neidig, who is the executive director; board president, Maryann Yochim; and D.C. board member, Debra Thornton, to name a few. Again, an exceptional American.

WINDS OF CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, Oregon begins a campaign that may turn the corner, once and for all, on our illogical, ill-advised approach to marijuana.

We have reached a critical point, where, over the last 40 years, a misguided policy of prohibition has patently failed. It simply doesn't work. It criminalizes behavior that most Americans feel should be legal. It costs taxpayers billions of dollars a year in the futile enforcement of prohibition. It feeds billions more into the coffers of drug cartels, which destabilize Mexico while they terrorize Central American countries, sending tens of thousands of children fleeing to our borders.

Imagine a situation so desperate that a parent would send a child on a treacherous journey, thousands of miles away.

The current policy undermines the credibility of government drug prevention programs. How do we expect people to respect an authority that pretends marijuana is more dangerous than methamphetamine or cocaine, that cannot answer the simple question: Has anybody ever died of a marijuana overdose?

Why respect an agency that wastes time and money that should be spent on drugs that are much more deadly and addictive?

The winds of change are blowing through the Capitol. We have seen, in the recent weeks, we have had five consecutive victorious votes on the House floor to have a more rational policy.

But the real leadership is at the State level. Forcing the issue are 23 States and the District of Columbia, where, now, over a million patients have access to medical marijuana, often in programs authorized by the voters.

In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington both legalized adult use and have now started commercial markets, in Washington State just this month.

The campaign in Oregon is going to be key. It is a carefully-drawn statute which will be considered by the voters.

Now, make no mistake, the one-size-fits-all prohibition fanatics will be out in force, and we will hear about any hiccups in the neighboring State of Washington, largely blown out of proportion.

But we are going to hear everybody talk about their legitimate concern for keeping marijuana out of the hands of children. We all agree that young brains should not be subjected to marijuana. But, frankly, this is one of the biggest failures of our current program of prohibition.

We have a huge underground, shadow market. No one thinks that a 12-year old has a harder time getting a joint than a case of beer. Nobody checks ID. No one has a license to lose.

The success in Oregon will usher in, I think, a new era where the States have the right to regulate marijuana, just like alcohol. There will be more money for things we care about, like education, drug treatment, and drug enforcement, to keep and protect our children.

The failure of the current Federal prohibition is obvious. I am hopeful that voters in Oregon can help usher in this new era of regulation for adults and protections for children.

I think it is going to be a fascinating public policy debate.

□ 1030

WATERS OF THE U.S.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory attack on our economy and way of life in central and northwestern Pennsylvania has been growing for some time.

In recent months, the EPA moved forward with an egregious power grab to redefine the Agency's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act through a new proposed rule commonly known as the Waters of the United States.

In Pennsylvania, agriculture is our number one industry. As in other parts of the country, our farmers and ranchers know that clean air, clean water, and being good stewards of the environment in which they live and work is of fundamental importance to their livelihoods.

Despite local prerogatives and successful State and regional initiatives to protect our natural resources, the Federal Government, once again, has chosen to undercut these efforts with punitive Federal regulations.

In March, the EPA issued the Waters of the U.S. proposal, explaining that the rule expands neither Federal authorities, nor the amount of water or land under the Agency's jurisdiction.

Well, the EPA has argued the action is necessary to eliminate ambiguity over which bodies of water are jurisdictional under the law. Unfortunately, this is a far cry from the truth. In reality, the EPA's plan represents an unprecedented expansion of Federal power that will harm our economy and erode the rights of both States and private landowners.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs, such as setting wastewater standards.

The scope of the law is limited to navigable waters, and for the first time, it made it unlawful to discharge any pollutants into these bodies, unless a permit was obtained.

The law was never intended to impinge upon States' authority as the primary managers of water resources within their borders. The law was never intended to regulate small, noncontiguous bodies of water, such as streams, ditches, ponds, and creek beds, which would impose unnecessary burdens on economic activity. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the EPA has proposed.

Despite Supreme Court rulings interpreting the regulatory scope of the Clean Water Act more narrowly than what the Federal Government has asserted, the EPA's new rule moves in the opposite direction.

In fact, essentially all waters in the country under the EPA's proposed rule could potentially be subject to regulation and permitting approval by the Federal Government.

The Obama administration and the EPA have argued the rule is intended to eliminate ambiguity and offer greater protections for States, farmers, and landowners when, in fact, it will create new regulatory burdens, more ambiguity, and less certainty.

EPA Chief Gina McCarthy earlier this month characterized the growing opposition to the Waters of the U.S. rule—which has come from both Republicans and Democrats—as ''ludicrous'' and ''silly'' and recently summarized the backlash as a ''growing list of misunderstandings.''

Madam Speaker, it is no misunderstanding. EPA's new Waters of the U.S. rule is a historic power grab that poses a fundamental threat to our economy and way of life in Pennsylvania and for communities across the country.

Unfortunately, the only thing ludicrous is how the EPA continues to believe a punitive one-size-fits-all approach to environmental stewardship is the only way forward.

RECOGNIZING BOY SCOUT TROOP 772

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group from my district, Boy Scout Troop 772 of Fort Pierce, Florida.

Troop 772 was established last year at Dan McCarty Middle School as a community effort to keep young men in the area engaged in positive afterschool activities by providing support and guidance. Troop 772 is no ordinary Boy Scout troop. It is much more.

For too long, Fort Pierce has been plagued by gangs, by rampant violent crime that has taken the lives of neighbors and colleagues, friends and loved ones. For the young men of Troop 772, this violence isn't just something they see on the television or hear about in the abstract. It is the terrifying reality they face every day of their lives.

I want to share what these Scouts have said about what it is like in their community in their own words: ''I want you to get rid of gangs in my community. I want to be able to wear any colors I want without having to change. It would be good to go a week or so without hearing a gunshot. We will be better if people stop fighting.''

When I hear this, I am both saddened and outraged. No one—let alone our youth—should have to live in constant fear of violence, but at the same time, I am hopeful. What brings me hope for Fort Pierce is Troop 772. Troop 772 was born out of violence, but in them, I see a solution to that violence.

When Troop 772 was just an idea, there was a lot of skepticism. There was skepticism about whether the troop could move these young men away from the violence and into their community, but the troop, the community, and, in particular, the adult leadership of the troop has given much-needed support to these young men.

They have been a constant presence in the lives of these Scouts at a time when they need them the most, at a time when others in their community would only do them harm. It is clear that this troop will help make the community a safer and better place to live.

These young men who had struggled or had bad behavior are starting to thrive as a result of Troop 772 and the positive environment it provides.

Earlier this year, I was privileged to visit with the troop and see their hard work and dedication firsthand while they worked on a local environmental project.

It is this kind of hard work and commitment that will help these young men succeed and become the leaders of tomorrow. It is this kind of hard work and commitment that has brought Troop 772 to Washington today to receive their Citizenship in the Nation merit badges. It is truly an honor to recognize them with this major accomplishment and the dedication that has brought them here.

I also want to take a moment to recognize all of those individuals who helped them reach this monumental point today. I want to thank Scoutmaster Rusty Hines and Assistant Scoutmasters Dan Hafner and Bob Taylor for teaching Troop 772 leadership and Scouting skills, as well as for making the Scouting experience so enjoyable for these young men.

Thanks to all of the members of the community who helped make this trip of a lifetime possible and State Representative Larry Lee, Jr., and St. Lucie County Commissioner Kim Johnson for showing their continued support of these young men by joining them here today.

Of course, I also want to thank Scott Van Duzer, who made Troop 772 a reality. Through his Van Duzer Foundation, his dedication to helping these young men and bettering our community is unwavering. Our community will be forever grateful for all of their work, which has touched so many lives and inspired an entire community.

Lastly and most importantly, I want to thank the Scouts of the troop. Our community is so proud of what they have achieved, individually and together. This troop is a testament to what can be accomplished when youth are given the chance to succeed.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST ERIC HOLDER

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, last November, I filed Articles of Impeachment against our Attorney General, Eric Holder. This was a serious action. I am not happy that I had to do it.

The trust of the American people in their government is at an alltime low. They wonder: Where is the Constitution? Is it still law? Is it alive?

It is still law. It is still alive. I took a sacred oath to defend it. All of my colleagues took that same oath. Mr. Holder took that oath. Sadly, he has broken that oath many times.

He has a long record of enforcing laws he likes and ignoring laws he doesn't like. The oath he took doesn't give him that choice. He is the number one law enforcement official in America.

We are having an immigration crisis on our border with Mexico. Kids are coming across in record numbers. Next year, our Border Patrol thinks that 150,000 kids will cross illegally. That is roughly the same number of Allied Forces that invaded Normandy on D-day.

We have laws on the books to stop this crisis, and yet Mr. Holder won't enforce those laws. Instead, he made up new rules that refuse to deport people who have come here illegally. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

The Internal Revenue Service has been using our Tax Code to harass Americans because their political views oppose the administration's. The watchdog over the IRS begged Mr. Holder to investigate because crimes may have been committed within the IRS by senior officials. Mr. Holder chose not to investigate the IRS. He chose politics over our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Finally, Mr. Holder, under oath to tell the truth, told Congress that he had no involvement in an operation against a reporter working for a network Mr. Holder didn't like, yet Mr. Holder's signature was on the paper approving that operation. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Hoping to remind Mr. Holder about his oath and his duty to enforce all of our laws, Congress held Mr. Holder in contempt in June of 2012. He made history, with two bipartisan votes holding him in contempt of Congress. Sadly, 2 years later, Mr. Holder continues to break his oath.

The only weapon Congress has for Federal officials who break their oath and our law is impeachment. I have 28 cosponsors of my resolution to impeach Mr. Holder. I ask my colleagues to remember that we are a Nation of laws.

Show the American people that our Constitution is alive and well—cosponsor H. Res. 411, Articles of Impeachment against Eric Holder.

THE BLAME BARACK OBAMA CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, we have a humanitarian crisis at our border that challenges the capacity of the United States of America to address it from both a resource perspective and from a compassionate perspective.

Tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors are seeking entry into this country, children who are fleeing extreme violence in the northern triangle countries of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

Now, there are some in this institution who want to lay blame for this crisis at the feet of the Obama administration. This is not a surprising development because these individuals are members of the BBO caucus, the blame Barack Obama caucus.

Whenever anything happens in this country or in this world, they want to blame the President of the United States. Something goes wrong in Iraq, a war that was prosecuted, that was botched, that was mismanaged by the previous administration, the BBO caucus blames Barack Obama.

So we are seeing a similar phenomenon as it relates to this humanitarian crisis. First, they claim it was brought about by the President's decision related to deferred action connected to individuals falling into the DREAMer category.

□ 1045

But they failed to note that in order to be eligible for deferred action, you have to be in this country continuously since 2007. That claim has no basis in reality.

Then they say, well, the President refuses to enforce our Nation's immigration laws. How silly is that argument? Hundreds of thousands of individuals have been deported by the Obama administration each and every year in record numbers, particularly when compared to the previous Republican President. The unenforcement argument has no basis in reality.

Then, lastly, they say, well, this has to do with comprehensive immigration

reform. Comprehensive immigration reform is not the law of the land. The bill was passed by the Senate. It hasn't even been acted upon by the House, let alone sent to the President for his signature. And even if a pathway toward citizenship were created, if you look at the legislation, only individuals in this country since December of 2011 would be eligible.

Yet the blame Barack Obama caucus doesn't care about the facts. Well, here are the facts. The individuals, the children who are fleeing and who are coming to this country, are trying to escape extreme violence, gang activity, drug trafficking, sexual abuse, and intimidation. The Northern Triangle countries of Central America—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—are among the most violent in the world. Honduras is the murder capital of the world—number one. El Salvador is number four, and Guatemala is number five.

How do we know that this phenomenon is not simply Uncle Sam throwing his hands up saying come into our country? Well, here is another reason. All of the Central American neighbors to our south outside of these Northern Triangle countries have also experienced an exponential increase in unaccompanied minors. Mexico, Belize, Panama, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua have all experienced significant increases in children coming to those countries, more than a 400 percent increase collectively in asylum applications in 2012.

This is not a pull from the United States. These children are running for their lives. And so we have got to address it with an understanding of what is the root cause of the humanitarian crisis.

Several of us on the Judiciary Committee have introduced the Vulnerable Immigrant Voice Act because we believe that the unaccompanied children should have access to counsel. It would benefit the taxpayer in making immigration proceedings more efficient and ensuring expedited removal when merited and in making sure that unnecessary detention doesn't take place.

Now, many of these children will not have a valid legal basis to remain, but some will. Some will have asylum claims, U visa, or Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, and for that reason we should give them access to counsel and do what is right for these children.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a package of human trafficking legislation to be considered by the House today. I also rise to recognize and support all the good work done by my colleagues to combat the hideous crime of human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I was exposed firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. I witnessed and reported on the devastating consequences of human trafficking, but never in my wildest dreams did I ever think human trafficking was so rampant right here in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, right now, there are young women and children being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across this Nation. In fact, I was shocked to learn that my own hometown of St. Louis has been identified as one of the top 20 areas for sex trafficking in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this problem is hiding in plain sight. Every year, thousands of young Americans' lives are impacted by this despicable crime. However, I take hope from all the good work being done by law enforcement and those who work in victims' services. Most importantly, I take hope from all the survivors of this hideous crime. Their strength gives us strength; their resolve gives us inspiration; and their steadfast commitment to ending sex trafficking gives us all the courage to fight.

Madam Speaker, because of the efforts of many individuals and groups, I am happy to report that Congress has taken notice of this very serious problem. Years of work have raised awareness of this issue and have laid the foundation for the long overdue action that Congress is presently taking. I applaud these efforts, and I look forward to continuing this work for years to come.

However, Madam Speaker, there is much work yet to be done. As legislators, we have an obligation to come together and do something because we can, because we should, and because we must. I urge Senator REID to take up the bills that the House has already passed that take steps to address this horrible crime, including the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation, or SAVE, Act, which I had the pleasure of passing with overwhelming bipartisan support.

THE CRISIS IN FOREST FIRE FUNDING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, we have a crisis in firefighting funds here in the United States of America, and what has this Congress done about it? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Zero. Nada. It hasn't even held a hearing.

Right now there are 11 major fires burning in Oregon, five in Washington—one the largest in the history of the State—two in Utah, two in Idaho, one in California, and one in Arizona. There are forecasts for a substantial amount of new lightning storms moving through, and that means more fires. Our resources are about at their maximum, and the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service are about to run out of funds. Now, this was predictable.

The budget set by the Republicans and PAUL RYAN was totally inadequate. There was a proposal, which is the rarest of things in this town, a bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats—bicameral—Senate and House—proposal supported by the President of the United States, and that was to look at what has happened over the last 10 years of the dramatic increase in the severity and the occurrence of fires, particularly in the Western United States, on public lands and to give the Forest Service a budget adequate to fight those fires year in and year out. And also, for those extraordinary fires, the ones that are pretty much unprecedented in history because of mismanagement, climate change, and a number of other things, to fight those with emergency funds just like we deal with tornadoes, hurricanes, and earthquakes.

That money should not come out of the budget of the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, because what do they have to do? Starting later this month, they are going to devastate the remainder of their budget. That means, instead of going out and reducing fuels on fires through contracts, using private contractors and mitigating the future risk of fire, they are going to have to cancel those contracts for this year because they are going to have to spend the money to fight the fires.

Then, it is not only firefighting contracts they have to cancel, they have to devastate all across their budget, including recreation programs and their timber sale programs, things that bring in revenue to the Federal Government. Any State that has Federal lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service—most of the States in the Union, much more of an impact in certain States than others—will see a detrimental impact because the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior are going to have to rob their budgets to pay for the costs of these fires.

It also means that we didn't have as many people pre-deployed; we didn't have as much equipment pre-deployed; and we didn't have all the resources we needed ready. We also need a whole new firefighting fleet. We are using World War II aircraft. They are kind of at the end of their useful life. And we are now pressing into service planes that are not particularly efficient at fighting fires because we don't have a fleet of planes, a modern fleet of

planes, to assist our firefighters to help save their lives on the ground and help save the lives of people in the communities that are affected.

And what has this House of Representatives done? Nothing. Not even a hearing. Now, we can blather on forever about all sorts of things. We can have 50 investigations of this or that day in and day out. But can we take an action on something that is staring us in the face, which is the forest fire crisis in the Western United States right now?

Come on. Wake up and smell the smoke before it is too late. Take action. Pass this bicameral, bipartisan reform supported by the President of the United States. Give us the resources we need to fight these fires and to prevent future fires so we won't have more years like this.

PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, I rise to provide an update on Puerto Rico's political status, which is an issue of national significance.

Puerto Rico is an unincorporated territory of the United States. Territory status is undemocratic. Although Puerto Rico is home to more American citizens than 21 States, island residents cannot vote for President, are not represented in the Senate, and have one nonvoting Delegate in the House.

Territory status is also unequal. As a recent GAO report confirms, Puerto Rico is deprived of billions of dollars each year because it is treated worse than the States under a range of Federal programs. Every objective observer understands that territory status is the underlying cause of the economic, fiscal, and demographic crisis that has enveloped Puerto Rico. History teaches a simple lesson: no people have ever reached their potential while being deprived of political rights and denied equality under the law. Puerto Rico is no exception to this rule.

If the people of Puerto Rico wish to discard territory status, there are two—and only two—paths forward. The territory can become a State on equal footing with the other States, or the territory can become a sovereign nation, either fully independent from the U.S., like the Philippines, or with a compact of free association with the U.S. that either nation can terminate, like the Republic of Palau. If Puerto Rico becomes a sovereign nation, future generations of island residents would not be American citizens and would receive reduced Federal support.

In a 2012 referendum sponsored by the Government of Puerto Rico, a majority of my constituents expressed their opposition to territory status, which means that Puerto Rico is being governed without its consent. Statehood received more votes than territory status, which is unprecedented. And statehood obtained far more votes than either of the two nationhood options, which demonstrates that Puerto Rico has no desire to weaken or break the bonds forged with the United States over nearly 12 decades.

At my urging and in response to this landmark vote, the Obama administration proposed an appropriation of $2.5 million to fund the first federally sponsored referendum in Puerto Rico's history with the stated goal being to resolve the territory's status. Earlier this year, Congress approved this appropriation with bipartisan support.

Although the law does not specify how the ballot should be structured, it does require the Department of Justice to ensure that any option on the ballot is compatible with the Constitution, laws, and public policy of the United States. Therefore, the ballot cannot contain the status proposal known as ''enhanced commonwealth'' that one political party in Puerto Rico has consistently put forward over the years and that Federal officials—including the Obama administration, Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI—have just as consistently rejected as impossible.

Moreover, the ballot should not contain the current territory status as an option because it was rejected in the 2012 referendum. It is the primary source of Puerto Rico's problems, and it does not resolve the island's status since, as long as Puerto Rico remains a territory, it has the potential to become either a State or a sovereign nation.

Last week, the Governor of Puerto Rico announced his intention to use the $2.5 million to conduct a federally sponsored vote by the end of 2016. I have proposed that the Federal funding be used to hold a yes-or-no vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State, just as Alaska and Hawaii did. This approach would yield a definitive result that nobody could reasonably question, and it has broad congressional backing, garnering support from 135 Members of the House and the Senate.

If the Governor of Puerto Rico resists this approach, he will face a problem. The party he leads has never been able to agree upon a status proposal that does not conflict with U.S. law and policy.

□ 1100

But let me be clear. If a vote does occur, statehood advocates will show up in force. Any time, any place, an army of men and women will be there to seek equality and justice, and we will prevail.

PASS TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of a clean Terrorism Risk Insurance Act reauthorization. Many of us on the House Financial Services Committee have worked on a bipartisan basis. Let me repeat that and let me emphasize that. We have worked on a bipartisan basis for more than a year to put a bill before this House that can pass. We have worked cooperatively because the lessons of 9/11 revealed to us the raw exposure that this country faces and our economy faces as insurers exited terrorism risk insurance after 9/11.

But, unfortunately, some other Members are working on a partisan basis to derail the terrorism risk insurance program. Now, unfortunately, this fringe minority is more interested in promoting antigovernment ideology than governing on behalf of the American people and securing for Americans a safe harbor in the event of nuclear, biological, chemical, or other acts of terrorism. The dysfunction of the Tea Party-driven agenda—it thrives on crisis after crisis, whether it is flood insurance or the debt ceiling or keeping the government open or passing a transportation bill. They just thrive on keeping this place in chaos.

And here we have, once again, some must-pass legislation. Terrorism risk insurance has bipartisan consensus, bicameral support, and how does the Tea Party-driven leadership in this House respond to the attempts to reason with them regarding the urgency of passing a clean reauthorization of TRIA without the unworkable triggers and the bifurcation provisions? What we get is an arrogant rebuff, channeling Dirty Harry: You gotta ask yourself, do you feel lucky?

Colleagues, this is not instructive. And be clear, colleagues, the Tea Party is not just symbolically throwing tea overboard, but their antigovernment agenda is again throwing the American economy overboard. I mean, we have real world knowledge of what happens if TRIA is not reauthorized.

Following the September 11 attacks, the insurance industry met their claims and liabilities related to the attacks, but quickly, reinsurers and primary insurers withdrew from terrorism risk insurance. The resulting lack of coverage led to the loss of 300,000 jobs as economic activity slowed without coverage.

You hear them say that they want more private capital in the market, but their bill has exactly the opposite impact by diminishing market capacity. In fact, the RAND Corporation estimates that the terrorism risk insurance saves the government and taxpayers money that otherwise would be

spent on disaster assistance following an attack. In the case of an attack as destructive as 9/11, the study estimates TRIA saves the Federal Government $7.2 billion.

At this point, not even the majority of the Republican majority can have their voice heard in this House. I just don't understand why this House has to be constantly held hostage to a fringe minority of the majority that has no interest in governing.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that TRIA is the orderly response to a major terrorist attack. Why are we providing confusion, uncertainty, and partisanship to helping this country recover in the unthinkable event of another successful large-scale terrorist attack?

I hope that the voice of the American people prevails and a bipartisan TRIA bill can be brought swiftly to the floor.

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as cochair of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, I rise this morning to talk about how important expanding Medicaid is for my State and for the country.

First, I want to thank my good friend from North Carolina, Congressman G. K. BUTTERFIELD, for agreeing to cochair this caucus. He is the driving force behind Medicaid expansion, that portion of the Affordable Care Act. There are few people in Congress who understand this issue as well as G. K. does, and it means a lot that he would agree to work on this issue with me.

I am also proud that 33 Members of Congress have joined the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus. We want to have an ongoing conversation about why it is so critical that every State expand Medicaid. Medicaid expansion is a choice that States can make because of the Supreme Court's ruling. However, when the Court struck down the requirement and gave States the choice to expand Medicaid, it did not strike the facts that make Medicaid expansion the correct budgetary, economic, health, and, yes, moral choice. Twenty-seven States, a majority of the States of this great country, looked at the facts and made the choice to help their people become healthier and therefore better able to lead productive lives. Expanding Medicaid in those States provided health coverage to approximately 10.5 million people who otherwise wouldn't have had it, according to Families USA.

Despite the political winds that swirl around the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid expansion should be a bipartisan issue. The Republican Governor of Arizona, for instance, pushed her State legislature to expand Medicaid because Governor Brewer and her allies knew that expansion would allow the program to help 300,000 low-income Arizonans who otherwise would not have had health coverage.

In Ohio, that State's Republican Governor expanded Medicaid, grounding the move in his faith and his belief that Ohioans should benefit from their Federal tax dollars. Because of the Governor's action, Ohio will see $13 billion from the Federal Government over the next 7 years to cover those newly eligible Medicaid recipients, and approximately 366,000 Ohio residents are thus eligible for coverage beginning this year. According to some estimates, as many as 789,000 people will ultimately benefit from the Governor's decision.

In California, almost 3 million people have benefited by getting access to health care when that State expanded Medicaid. These are just a few of the success stories.

The Federal Government will cover 100 percent of the cost of expanding Medicaid during the first 3 years, and 90 percent of the cost for the duration of the program in every State. Like in Ohio, this investment will bring billions of Federal tax dollars back into the State, which will help States develop their health care infrastructures and, thus, improve those States' economies. It will also help low-income Americans access our health care system. We must remember that the people who will benefit from expanding Medicaid are no less deserving of health care than anyone else.

According to a recent Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services report, States that have expanded Medicaid have seen 17 percent more people enrolled in the Medicaid and CHIP programs. Those are children across the country who now have the option for a healthier life. Unfortunately, millions of low-income Americans are being denied health care by their State legislators and Governors. They are being punished for being poor and for living where they do.

The New York Times recently ran a story entitled, ''In Texarkana, Uninsured and on the Wrong Side of a State Line.'' It describes the harsh realities for those who live on the wrong side of the State line. The author wrote:

> Texarkana is perhaps the starkest example of how President Obama's health care law is altering the economic geography of the country. The poor living in the Arkansas half of the town won access to a government benefit worth thousands of dollars annually, yet nothing changed for those on the Texas side of the State line.

In my home State of Georgia, expanding Medicaid would mean access to health care for 684,000 people, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. My Governor reacted to this news by signing a bill eliminating his authority to expand Medicaid. I can't think of anything better than the State of Georgia going ahead and insuring our people with Medicaid.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, let me begin by commending my fellow Congressmen, HANK JOHNSON and Congressman BUTTERFIELD, for their initiative and their advocacy in fighting for and speaking up for Medicaid expansion in each of our States that have not taken it.

More than 5 million people in this country now have health coverage using Federal dollars available to every State to expand Medicaid eligibility to hardworking Americans and their families, but not in my home State of Pennsylvania. Instead, hundreds of thousands of people in Pennsylvania are left out. Madam Speaker, 305,000 people in Pennsylvania could have health coverage today but for the decision of our Governor. This is morally unconscionable and economically shortsighted.

Months have gone by, people are sicker, hospital bills go unpaid, and health providers struggle to stay at the forefront of innovation. Health care, whether it is to detect an illness or to treat a chronic condition or to save a life, is not optional. Consider the working mother who earns just enough to cover her basic expenses but not enough to get that mammogram so her breast cancer is detected early, and once it is, it is well advanced and life threatening.

Or the 9-year-old girl whose parents work full time at minimum wage and neither can afford to lose a day's pay to visit a pediatrician, so her need for glasses, something simple and correctable, or the early detection of diabetes, something more serious, is delayed or missed, with serious consequences not only for her health but her success in school.

Or the 52-year-old man who knows he should get that test that his doctor recommended, but simply does not have the $2,000 it costs. So he puts it off, thinking he will get it one of these days, and never gets that simple prescription, that medication that can well save his life. These are hardworking men, women, and children across this country and in Pennsylvania who could have health coverage today but do not.

With $8.2 billion available to Pennsylvanians, these are Federal dollars, dollars that Pennsylvanians have paid that are not coming back to Pennsylvania but would be available to us, are available to us. Over the next 3 years, we should use these funds to get health care to our people, to hire tens of thousands of health care workers to contain

costs, to improve the health status of the people of our State, and yes, to save lives.

There is no more time to waste. Pennsylvania should seize this opportunity. So should the other States that have Federal dollars available to them to do the same thing for the people of their State. We should use these Federal resources to expand lifesaving health coverage, to help our kids succeed, and to help us be healthy, to create jobs, and to ensure our economic growth. Let's do the right thing in Pennsylvania and across this country. These States should take Medicaid expansion and do right for the economy of our States, for the people of our States, and for the Nation.

□ 1115

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce to my colleagues the formation of a new House caucus to be known as the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus. I am delighted to cochair this caucus, along with my good friend, Congressman HANK JOHNSON, from the State of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, this caucus is 33 members strong. We want to demonstrate to recalcitrant Governors and State legislatures across the country the overwhelming public support to provide health care to low-income single adults, particularly those ages 18 to 65.

The majority of our caucus members are from States that have made the shortsighted and politically-motivated decision to exclude the very people the Medicaid program was established to help in the first place.

To date, 26 States and the District of Columbia have seized the opportunity to expand coverage to millions of Americans. These States made the wise and moral decision to not only ensure that their residents can get the care that they deserve, but they made a smart economic decision to pull billions of dollars in additional Federal funding into their economies.

These funds have the triple benefit of yielding better health outcomes for the low-income and poor, creating health care-related jobs, and driving down the aggregate cost of health care over time.

In contrast, 24 States have not yet expanded Medicaid. They have irresponsibly chosen to turn their backs on more than 5 million Americans that need this coverage. What are those 5 million Americans going to do when they get sick? What are 500,000 North Carolinians going to do when they need medical care?

Madam Speaker, I will tell you what they are going to do. They will either not seek the treatment that they need, causing their condition to get worse, which will lead to missed work and, therefore, unable to pay their bills. Ultimately, they will find themselves in a much worse situation than if they had coverage that they deserve.

The other option is that they will do what many uninsured people have always done out of necessity: go to an emergency room, be treated, and walk out with a bill that they have no ability to pay. Hospitals will then write the cost of treatment off as uncompensated care.

In order to recoup some of the lost money, hospitals will then increase the cost of their procedures, which results in higher premiums for the insured. Medicaid expansion isn't just good for our insurance premiums, but it is also good for the State's bottom line.

In North Carolina alone, expanding Medicaid will save the State more than $65 million over the next 8 years. Expansion would benefit our economy in North Carolina, adding nearly $1.5 billion to the State's revenue.

North Carolina drugmakers and medical device manufacturers will need to expand their workforce, adding a total of 23 jobs to the State. That is just in our State. The benefits of expansion nationally are far greater, yet the same scenario is playing out in nearly half of all of the States.

Twenty-four States' decision to not accept billions of dollars in Federal support defies logic and will prove catastrophic for the very people the Medicaid program is intended to help.

A critical point that many people overlook is the fact that, under the act, the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the cost of expansion through the year 2016 and 90 percent of the costs thereafter.

The public demands action in States that have not expanded, and members of this caucus are tired of inaction. We are disgusted that these States have such careless disregard for poor people. We will continue to press this issue until all 50 States have expanded their Medicaid program.

Again, I thank Congressman HANK JOHNSON, the 31 other members of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and the many advocacy organizations for their courage to fight for those who are being blocked from the most basic level of health care.

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION CAUCUS

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, today, I am proud to be one of the founding members of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and I want to thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD and Congressman JOHNSON for their leadership.

In my home State of Florida, there are more than 750,000 people who would benefit from Medicaid expansion. These are people who fall within the coverage gap, people who make too much to receive Medicaid, but too little to receive subsidies. This makes a difference in Florida and in many States who have rejected Medicaid coverage.

Just like in many States across the country, our Governor, Governor Scott, rejected $51 billion of Federal tax dollars—our tax dollars—money that could have provided insurance to those in need and could have created over 60,000 jobs.

This is money that will strengthen our economy and help Florida grow jobs by supporting hospitals and individuals who need help.

I urge Governor Scott and Florida's leaders in the State legislature to do what is right and take action and accept this funding.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Matthew Schramm, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Bay City, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Holy and merciful God, maker of Heaven and Earth, we come before You in thanksgiving for Your many blessings.

For the liberty to worship freely and live securely, for the freedom to pursue Your will for our lives, and for the honor of service to the peoples and nations of the Earth, we give You thanks.

We thank You that we live in a land of opportunity, and we pray that You would help us to be mindful of opportunities to help, to share, to protect, to welcome, and to proclaim what is just and what is good.

We ask Your blessing on this House, this government, and all those who serve the common good. By Your Holy Spirit, grant that they might have the courage to do just that; and may all that we do or say give honor and glory to You, Almighty Father, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND MATTHEW SCHRAMM

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Matthew Schramm, Pastor of Bay City's Westminster Presbyterian Church in my district, who delivered this morning's opening and very inspiring prayer.

I am pleased to welcome Pastor Schramm and his family to the U.S. Capitol, and to thank him for his continued service to our community. Westminster Presbyterian Church is one of the oldest churches in Bay City, helping to share love, faith, and hope with its congregants and others across Michigan.

In addition to serving his congregation, Reverend Schramm served as the youngest-ever chair of the Presbyterian Mission Agency Board, the ministry agency and the board of trustees for the Nation's largest body of Presbyterians.

Reverend Schramm not only serves at the church altar, but also in the community as well. He serves on Bay County's Federal Emergency Food and Shelter Board, the Do-Care Family Enrichment Center advisory board, and the McLaren Bay medical region's Medical Ethics Advisory Board.

Pastor Schramm, on behalf of the U.S. Congress, thank you for being here today. I hope that your uplifting words that you shared with us will give us the courage to work together in pursuit of the common good for all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE MANMADE CRISIS ON THE TEXAS BORDER

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border many times, but I never expected to witness what I saw last Friday, a real manmade crisis. The President's failure to secure our border and uphold the rule of law has led to this mess, and now he is failing to deal with it.

While President Obama is nowhere to be found, Texas Governor Rick Perry has made stopping the crisis his number one priority. I commend him on his latest decision to deploy the Texas National Guard to help secure the southern border. I am also grateful for the men and women working around the clock to control the crisis.

Securing the border will help send a clear message to countries that, if you enter illegally, you will not be allowed to stay. And that is the right thing to do. We are a Nation of laws, and there is a process for coming to America.

Texans and the American people deserve real border security now.

PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Parks and Recreation Month. This month plays an important role in engaging in educating Americans on the many advantages of parks and recreation facilities and how they play a vital role in the health, safety, and economies of our Nation's communities.

This nationally celebrated month aims to connect Americans with their natural outdoor environment through exercise, recreation, relaxation, and congregation. It is also an opportunity to recognize those tasked with the design, management, and conservation of our parks and recreational spaces, such as landscape architects, city planners, nonprofit organizations, and parks and recreation professionals.

Unfortunately, too many Americans, including children, live in communities with deteriorating parks and outdoor facilities, which hinders their ability to enjoy outside activities. According to the National Recreation and Parks Association, nearly three out of every 10 adults in our country do not spend time outside on a daily basis.

I believe that all cities, neighborhoods, and communities should have access to parks, which is why I introduced H.R. 2424, the Community Parks Revitalization Act. This legislation would help rehabilitate existing and develop new community parks.

EPA'S WATERS OF THE U.S. RULE

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the EPA's proposed Waters of the U.S. rule.

This rule will dramatically expand the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction by changing current law that limits EPA's authority to ''navigable waters.'' Under this new rule, EPA authority will apply to any body of water that has a bed, a bank, or a high water mark.

Hoosier farmers explain to me that this new rule means that large puddles left after a storm will fall under the EPA's jurisdiction. Farmers may have to get a permit to perform even the most basic tasks on their own land.

My constituents brought me these photos to show what changing the rule will mean. As you can see, this is not a stream, it is not a navigable body of water or a longstanding body of water. It should not be regulated by the EPA. It happened just after a large rainfall.

Mr. Speaker, this rule change will prevent farmers from doing their jobs, put people out of work, and increase food prices. It is bad for our Nation's landowners, it is bad for our Nation's farmers, and it is bad for Americans trying to put an affordable meal on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask EPA to withdraw this rule.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT HAMILTON

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, southeastern Connecticut last Friday suffered a terrible loss with the sudden passing of Bob Hamilton, a long time military affairs reporter for the New London Day.

Over the years, Bob covered the Groton sub base and earned a well-deserved reputation for accuracy, intelligence, and fairness. And that is the reason why the U.S. Navy selected him as the first reporter to be on a combat submarine in the opening days of Operation Enduring Freedom, when the opening salvo of tomahawk missiles brought down the Taliban regime.

In the last few years, Bob has been director of communications at Electric Boat shipyard, and was part of the team effort to boost submarine shipbuilding that resulted in the largest contract in the Navy to build *Virginia* class submarines, at two submarines a year.

Again, he passed away suddenly last Friday, leaving his wife, Kathryn, and three children, a terrible loss.

I would ask the Chamber to join me in expressing condolences to Kathryn, and salute the great example that Bob set in terms of good journalism, great advocacy for the national defense, and for being an outstanding human being.

THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION IS FAILING OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight a tragic story that emerged last week that captures how the failures of the Veterans Administration, those failures are hurting our veterans.

For 2 years, Vietnam veteran Michael Sulsona, from Graniteville, New York, a double amputee, had been waiting for a new wheelchair from the VA. His request was ignored.

On July 7, his wheelchair fell apart again while he was shopping at his local Lowe's home improvement center. What happened next captures the essence of American compassion and concern for our Nation's veterans.

Three of Lowe's employees immediately jumped into action and said to the veteran, ''We're going to make this chair like new.'' Forty-five minutes after the store closed, they delivered on their promise.

These three men embodied the American spirit by immediately helping this veteran because they knew it was the right thing to do, and because they knew that this veteran had made tremendous sacrifices in defense of their freedom.

These three men should be commended for their selfless action, and the VA should be embarrassed for its failure to meet the needs of this veteran.

FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, over the last few months, we have seen an unprecedented number of unaccompanied children coming across our border. While many of my colleagues want to rail at the lack of border enforcement, these kids are immediately being caught and turned over to the Border Patrol.

Just throwing more money at the border isn't going to fix the problem. Sending the National Guard to the border isn't going to do it either. In fact, it is pure political posturing.

What we need is comprehensive immigration reform now. Fixing our broken immigration system will clear the backlog so that we can process these children fairly and efficiently.

Instead of adding to the $18 billion we already spend on immigration enforcement a year, we need a comprehensive strategy based on reliable metrics to allocate resources where they are actually needed.

This crisis isn't going to be solved by scare tactics. These are children. We need a wide-ranging plan to ensure the fair and humane treatment of the children, and a long-term strategy to address the root causes of the crisis.

THE BORDER CRISIS DEMANDS MEANINGFUL POLICY CHANGES

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I just visited the Texas-Mexico border for the third time. I saw, firsthand, a real manmade crisis, a crisis created by an administration that urges amnesty.

I spent time with our Nation's border agents. They are doing an incredible job under the extreme circumstances. Despite their hard work, wave after wave of illegal immigrants is coming in from Central America.

I also witnessed the State of Texas Department of Public Safety's heroic efforts to combat drug trafficking.

Sending these illegal immigrants back to their home country promptly is one of the most humane things that we can do. Failure to do so will only encourage others to risk their own safety to pursue the false promise of amnesty.

My constituents in Texas demand a permanent border security solution. The law blocking a fast return of illegal immigrants to their home countries must be changed.

Until our President supports this major part of the solution, he will remain a major source of the problem.

THE MIDDLE CLASS JUMPSTART ACTION PLAN

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I stood with House Democrats to unveil the Middle Class Jumpstart Action Plan. This plan focuses on creating good jobs for the 21st century, empowering Americans to manage work and family, and making higher education affordable.

That same day, the majority showed where their priorities lie, by handing out unpaid-for, debt-raising tax breaks that will benefit the wealthiest Americans.

There is something wrong when folks can fight so vigorously on the House floor to protect corporate persons, but fail to defend real unemployed Americans by passing an unemployment insurance bill and raising the national minimum wage.

Yesterday, I met with labor groups to discuss how Congress can grow manufacturing and promote job creation. We discussed the need to invest in American workers by providing quality training, the need to invest in infrastructure, and how fair wages and a skilled workforce will help restore the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues to stop legislating for the 1 percent of Americans, and help jump-start and grow the middle class.

□ 1215

PRESIDENT OBAMA CAN SOLVE BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Border Security Caucus, composed of over 80 members and growing, met yesterday, and many of us have concerns about the administration's immigration proposals.

We feel the President is trying to make Congress take ownership of the border crisis. We should reject that by pointing out that the President right now—today—could stop the illegal surge by enforcing current immigration laws.

We should put the well-being of the children first and encourage them to stay in their home countries with their families.

The President, allowing over 500,000 people illegally in the United States to stay indefinitely, has enticed tens of thousands more to undertake a dangerous journey to cross the southern border. The President's policies are deadly.

The House should not send any immigration bill to the Senate, unless we know what is coming back. Otherwise, it is just a Trojan horse waiting to be used by those who favor amnesty.

NIAGARA FALLS AIR RESERVE STATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today, I will meet with the Niagara Military Affairs Council here in Washington, D.C., to discuss the future of the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

The Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station is critical not only to western New York, but to our Nation's security. The Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station employs over 3,500 people and has an annual economic impact of over $200 million.

Next month, the station will start construction on a new C–130 flight simulator, which I was proud to fight for with the western New York delegation.

Additionally, Customs and Border Protection has chosen the base as the preferred location for construction of a new Border Patrol station.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to fight to make sure that the mission at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station is preserved and that it is allowed to diversify through innovative partnerships.

Continued investment in the base and expansion of the mission ensures that the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station will remain a fixture in our community for many years to come.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHECKS AND BALANCES

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the House is considering a lawsuit to stop the President from unilaterally rewriting the ObamaCare statute. Some have criticized the lawsuit by saying that if House Republicans are opposed to the ObamaCare individual mandate, why are they suing President Obama for delaying that mandate?

The Constitution requires that if the President wants to change a law, he must come to Congress to ask for a change. He did not do that in this case, even though House Republicans agreed with the underlying change. The case is about following constitutional process.

Another objection is that President Obama has not issued as many executive orders as other Presidents, but the issue is not the number of executive orders, but the impact of the executive orders.

This lawsuit is about constitutional governance, not politics. We must maintain the checks and balances established by the Constitution.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the Democrats' plan to get the middle class working in America again. The Democrats' Make It In America plan will boost job growth by giving employers tax incentives for jobs created in the U.S. It also raises the minimum wage and updates our current infrastructure.

I want the constituents that I serve in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex to know that me and other Democrats are here, working hard for America to bring back these good-paying jobs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wanted everyone to know that I started my Marc Means Business initiative, where I work spending time at different jobs in the district that I serve.

This month, I worked at a concrete batch plant as a laborer at a downtown highway construction site in Dallas. Not only do I get to see what the constituents that I serve go through every day on the site, but this also highlights just how important rebuilding our infrastructure is to the U.S. economy.

Let's give middle class Americans a jump-start and continue to work on policies that expand our economy and get Americans back to work.

100TH BIRTHDAY OF ST. STEPHEN, MINNESOTA

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is such a thrill to be a Member of the United States House of Representatives. We are privileged to represent the great people in our districts, and I am obviously very biased that for 8 years, I have been privileged to represent what are the greatest people I think in the United States.

We truly embody in Minnesota's Sixth District the great, good-humored, full values of this country that are represented in that district, and this is a feel-good story, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to honor the people of St. Stephen, Minnesota, as they are celebrating their 100th birthday as a community. You see, it was in the late 1800s when Slovenian settlers came to this wonderful area in Minnesota and built the foundation of what later came to be called St. Stephen, Minnesota. It is what America fondly refers to as Lake Wobegon.

Today, led by Mayor Cindy VanderWeyst, St. Stephen boasts a very close-knit community of families and farmers and businesspeople. It is fitting that the town motto is ''A Place to Call Home'' and that it truly is.

St. Stephen is a shining example of small-town life in the United States. Congratulations, St. Stephen, on your 100th birthday.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, far too many of our young girls have fallen victim to modern day slavery. Last fall, I witnessed human trafficking firsthand during a visit to Costa Rica with my colleague from Texas, TED POE.

The stories we heard were heartwrenching. Girls—8, 9, 10, 13 years old—were being victimized and abused by grown men. This is not just a problem outside our borders. This is happening in our backyards.

In my community in Los Angeles, African American girls are overwhelmingly at a greater risk, making up 92 percent of youth sex trafficking victims. This is alarming and shameful.

On the average, victims are recruited between the ages of 12 and 14. These girls are victims, not criminals, and we must do everything in our power to protect them.

Recently, we have seen a paradigm shift in the protection of these victims. L.A. District Attorney Jackie Lacey has implemented the First Step diversion program, which will give victims the opportunity to rebuild their lives through counseling and education, an alternative to prosecution.

Programs like this and my colleague KAREN BASS' legislation that is on the floor today will help protect victims of human trafficking and not punish them.

HAPPY 91ST BIRTHDAY, BOB DOLE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Senator Bob Dole, born and raised in Russell, Kansas, and a graduate of the University of Kansas, has spent his life in the service of the American people and today remains the embodiment of public service. On Tuesday, Kansans from all across the Sunflower State wished him a happy 91st birthday.

Senator Dole enlisted in the Army once the U.S. entered World War II and was stationed in Italy. While leading an assault on a German machine gun nest, Senator Dole's unit was heavily fired upon.

Without hesitation, Senator Dole courageously returned to help rescue an injured radioman—he, himself, suffering life-threatening injuries. Many Army medics didn't think Senator Dole would survive.

With a strong spirit and steadfast resolve common to many Kansans, Senator Dole not only survived, but he returned home to the Sunflower State and spent many years in elected service on behalf of Kansans, including in the State house, as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and runs as Vice President and President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride to that I wish my good friend and fellow Jayhawk, Senator Bob Dole, a happy 91st birthday and many more to come.

Happy birthday, Senator Dole.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I was honored to bring together New Hampshire business leaders

to discuss the importance of the Export-Import Bank and to call for its immediate reauthorization.

I thank leaders from BAE, Boyle Energy, Conductive Components, and other Granite State employers for joining this important discussion on how supporting U.S. exports grows our economy and creates good jobs here at home.

The Export-Import Bank provides essential risk management services to American businesses selling their products in an unstable global economy. Dozens of Granite State firms have used these services, which have supported over $350 million in New Hampshire exports in recent years, and in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, the top destination for American exports is China.

Because of the Export-Import Bank, more consumers across the world are buying goods stamped ''Made in America,'' and more American families are able to make it here in America. Granite State exporters, like Mountain Corporation, Arch Energy, and Centorr Vacuum are counting on Congress to act, but time is running out.

In just over 2 months, authorization for the bank will expire, and I have heard from New Hampshire exporters who are already losing business because of uncertainty over the bank's future.

So let's renew this commonsense program that grows our economy, reduces the budget deficit, and helps create jobs.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise today as member of the new congressional State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and I call on my colleagues to join us in encouraging States to close the coverage gaps by expanding Medicaid.

Texas, my home State, has the option to accept Federal Medicaid funding to provide affordable health insurance to more than 1.4 million uninsured Texans. For many of these citizens, there is no affordable option, as long as Texas refuses the Federal funds.

Texas could extend insurance through Medicaid to residents with incomes up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, less than $28,000 for a family of three for whom there is no current alternative. Fifty-eight percent of the uninsured in our State would benefit, and if Texas does accept funding, the Federal Government will virtually pay for all of the costs in the expansion.

Closing the coverage gap is the right thing to do and is a sound investment for the State, by creating a healthier workforce, strengthening the State's economy, and improving our health care system.

I urge my colleagues to work with their home States and encourage Medicaid expansion.

RECOGNIZING THE OKONITE COMPANY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the employees, staff, and leadership at Okonite Company's facility in Cumberland, Rhode Island.

I am proud that Okonite's Rhode Island manufacturing facility, which supports 90 jobs, is located in my home district. Led by plant manager Eric Dodge, the 90 workers in Cumberland produce high-quality power line cables that are sold all across America and the entire world.

In May, I toured Okonite's Cumberland manufacturing plant as part of my Congress at Your Company series. I was delighted to meet with their talented employees and discuss ways to grow Rhode Island's manufacturing sector and support existing manufacturers.

I am thrilled that Okonite is expanding its operations in Rhode Island and that its plans for expansion are underway. Okonite has made a smart investment that is good for business and is good for Rhode Island.

I look forward to touring Okonite's new facility once it is completed, and I thank Eric and the rest of his team for working to strengthen Rhode Island's manufacturing sector. This is another great example of why it is important to make things in America and make things in Rhode Island.

#100 DAYS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over 100 days have gone by, and the kidnapped schoolgirls in Nigeria are still not home. The consequences of their absence and the lack of formal action to find the girls is unimaginable.

Eleven parents of the abducted girls have died—died from the heartbreak, died from fighting for their girls, died from international silence. A father slipped into a coma, repeating his daughter's name until he passed away. These stories are real.

In the meantime, Boko Haram has continued to kidnap more girls. Last week, they took over a whole town. This issue is real. We cannot ignore Boko Haram and the plight of these missing girls.

Mr. Speaker, with a tweet and a hashtag, you are showing the Nigerian people, Boko Haram, the missing girls, and the world that we have not forgotten. We have to keep tweeting. We have to keep talking. This is not an African problem. This is a world problem. These are our girls, and we will bring them home.

I urge you every day to join my Twitter storm and tweet: #joinrepwilson and #bringbackourgirls.

Tweet, tweet, tweet. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

□ 1230

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, right now students all over America are enjoying their much-earned summer vacation. We all know the enormous pressures today's youth face, and it hardly seems they get a chance to breathe anymore. Yet students all across the country are attending college in record numbers.

That, unfortunately, is where the good news stops. As our college students settle into their internships over the summer, many are running into old classmates who recently graduated, and all of them are asking the same question: How do you live with such debt?

We face a student debt crisis of truly mind-blowing proportions, but instead of working to give middle class families a fair chance at making college affordable, some of my colleagues are arguing over what to sue the President for.

Later today, we are going to vote for a tax credit—it is unpaid for—and that will barely make a dent in what is quickly becoming the economic challenge of our era. I ask my colleagues, all of us who are talking often, constantly about the need to care for future generations, is this really the best we can do?

THE BRING JOBS HOME ACT

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Speaker BOEHNER to allow a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. I cosponsored this bill to help businesses create jobs in my home district and across America. In the Coachella Valley, there are unacceptable high unemployment rates, in some areas over 17 percent.

The Bring Jobs Home Act will create critical tax incentives for businesses to bring jobs back to the United States and close tax loopholes for corporations who ship jobs overseas.

Over the last decade, America lost 6 million manufacturing jobs. That is millions of jobs families can gain if Congress does their job and votes to bring jobs home. Congress must put hardworking families above corporations that ship jobs overseas.

This week, the Senate will vote on legislation. The House must act. Mr. Speaker, Congress must put people before politics, solutions above ideology, and allow a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Let's put people back to work.

THE TRAVEL AND TOURISM FOR ALL ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, everyone deserves the opportunity to travel and explore the many incredible destinations located throughout our country, but individuals with disabilities, however, face much greater difficulties when they try to arrange travel.

Now, Las Vegas, my district, is a world leader in disability access. We have more handicap-accessible guest rooms than any other American city. Our casinos offer gambling tables and slot machines designed for wheelchair users, and all our show venues have designated handicapped seating.

Other places could benefit from our example, and that is why I have introduced the Travel and Tourism for All Act that would require the National Council on Disability to conduct a review of existing disability standards in the tourism and hospitality industries and provide recommendations to help Congress ensure that people with disabilities are able to enjoy traveling throughout the U.S.

This act would ensure that we continue to set the international standard for disability accommodation in the hospitality industry, and it will attract tourists from other parts of the world where accommodations are less welcoming.

THE SUPPORT THE FAMILIES OF FALLEN HEROES SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5085, the Support the Families of Fallen Heroes Semipostal Stamp Act.

The brave men and women serving in uniform put their lives on the line for our country every single day, and they deserve to know that America will support and care for any loved ones they leave behind. That is why I salute organizations like the USO and the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, known as TAPS. I salute them for providing assistance to the families of fallen heroes.

But we can do even more to help them. My bipartisan bill would create a families of fallen heroes stamp directing proceeds to the USO and to TAPS for supporting our military families in their time of need.

Let's honor the families of our fallen heroes and show them that our country will be there when they need us most.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4984, EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 677

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-52. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-53. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 677 provides for structured rules for consideration of H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

The Rules Committee was pleased to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to provide for floor consideration of a number of their amendments. The resolution makes in order 11 amendments to H.R. 3136 and seven amendments to H.R. 4984. In total, the committee made in order nine Democrat amendments, three Republican amendments, and six bipartisan amendments.

As a member of the Rules Committee, it is a privilege to see the number of amendments we have been able to make in order this Congress and the openness of the legislative process. My hope is that we will continue to work together in a bipartisan fashion to advance good legislation.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. We have held 14 hearings and invited dozens of witnesses to discuss a wide variety of issues facing students, families, and institutions of higher education.

Since the last reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the landscape has been constantly evolving with the student population rapidly changing and institutions developing more cost-effective modes for delivering academic content.

The upcoming reauthorization provides policymakers an opportunity to improve the law and strengthen America's postsecondary system to ensure Federal policies are flexible enough to allow future developments and innovations to occur.

Based on feedback received from the public and the committee's desire to reform the law in a way that will assist students in obtaining an affordable higher education that leads to employment opportunities, the committee will promote reforms that adhere to the following principles: empowering students and families to make informed decisions; simplifying and improving student aid; promoting innovation, access, and completion; and ensuring strong accountability and a limited Federal role.

Reform will help more Americans achieve their dreams of a postsecondary education and help secure a more prosperous future for the country.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of two bills that will inform the reauthorization process. H.R. 3136 creates a demonstration project for competency-based education. Competency-based education allows students to demonstrate what they already know and learn at their own pace by mastering specific skills and knowledge that translate to real-world application for their degrees.

H.R. 4984 ensures that students have the information needed to make good choices with their financial aid dollars and understand how to use that money well by increased financial counseling and services.

□ 1245

Education is a great opportunity in this country, and we have the most diverse system of postsecondary education in the world, with more than 6,000 public, private, nonprofit, and proprietary institutions of higher education. This diversity affords students from all backgrounds an opportunity to find an institution that meets their unique needs and helps them pursue personal goals of continuing their education.

The rule before us today starts that reform process, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the two underlying bills, H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013, and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. I do rise in opposition to the rule for reasons that I will go into regarding preventing us from addressing many of the major issues within public education and higher education.

While I am supportive of these two bills, I am disappointed that the House is not embarking on a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We can nip around the edges in certainly a constructive way to reduce costs, as these bills do, to be helpful, but none of them are game-changers or, dare I say, even a substantial part of making college more affordable like we could through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Since the last reauthorization in 2007, higher education has become more and more expensive. The cost of attending a university per student has risen by almost five times the rate of inflation since 1983. At the very time that an advanced degree is more important than ever for somebody to have a good job in today's increasingly complex global economy, it is getting further and further from the price range and affordability for American middle class families.

While a 4-year university isn't always the best choice, some form of postsecondary education is increasingly important—whether that is community college, whether it is a certification program—to be able to ensure that young people, and people of all ages, have access to a good-paying job in the 21st century workforce. Only by pursuing a full scale reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, soliciting ideas from Democrats and Republicans across the aisle, can we truly be able to help put college more in reach for students. As many of my colleagues from across the aisle say, we need to examine how or if many of the student loan programs only contribute to the increasingly high cost of college education. We need to take ideas from our side of the aisle, including some that I cosponsor regarding reducing textbook costs or looking at new and better ways that we can look at income-based repayment for student loans.

Through a comprehensive reauthorization, we can streamline payments by replacing our complicated student loan system with a simplified income-based program, which is part of a bipartisan bill that I sponsor with Congressman PETRI called the ExCEL Act. We could also improve articulation and transfer agreements so that students can move quickly and efficiently towards a credential from less expensive community colleges, if necessary, to colleges that offer 4-year degrees.

Furthermore, Representative HINOJOSA's open textbook legislation would help keep costs down so students can concentrate on their studies rather than having to work additional jobs just to be able to afford the textbooks. Finally, we can make sure that we improve accountability for colleges and universities that are not serving students well so that our limited Federal resources are used in a way to provide incentives to States and universities that support public education and they keep public education, higher education, affordable.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Higher Education Act, which this Congress does not appear to be moving forward on and this bill does not allow amendments to, our Nation's landmark kindergarten through 12th grade education law, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, sometimes referred to as No Child Left Behind, is long overdue to be replaced with a new reauthorization.

And this week, I was pleased to hear the President signed another work product of this body, the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act, another long overdue, bipartisan bill to improve our workforce development system that many of my colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee have worked on for many years. That bill started in a partisan way. The first iteration on the House floor received zero Democratic votes. The compromise, however, received the

support of every Democrat and nearly every Republican. It passed by a margin of 415–6.

Just a few months ago, we passed bipartisan bills to substantially improve the charter schools program and Federal investment in education research with a strong bipartisan vote. So, Mr. Speaker, this body has shown it can pass bipartisan Education and Workforce bills. These two bills coming before us today are additional examples of that. So why haven't we undertaken the hard work to make a full-fledged bipartisan effort to reauthorize No Child Left Behind?

Like with the Workforce Investment Act, we had a partisan version come to the floor. Not a single Democrat voted for it, just as not a single Democrat voted for the first iteration of the Workforce Investment Act. Anybody can pass partisan legislation that no one else supports, but that is not a constructive step towards lawmaking. Lawmaking entails making the tough decisions, working with the other side to create a work product. Again, with WIA, we had a 415–6 vote. With No Child Left Behind, whether it is that high or not, let's get a majority of Democrats and Republicans working together to reauthorize it. They began that hard work in the Senate Health Committee, where they have a bipartisan education reform bill that they have not brought to the full floor of the Senate, but at least they began that work of working in a bipartisan manner towards replacing No Child Left Behind with a new Federal education law.

This bill which passed the House, the Student Success Act, the Republican-only education bill, was opposed by Democrats for many reasons. First of all, it would have locked in education funding at sequester levels. Secondly, it would have locked many of our critical programs that support STEM, literacy, and the arts, support English language learners, and left students trapped in failing schools with little recourse for action. It was opposed not only by Democrats but also by the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and also every major education organization.

This process was unlike all other previous efforts to reauthorize the ESEA, when under the strong leadership of my colleagues, like now-Speaker BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER, Democrats and Republicans came together to strengthen and improve our education system. As Ranking Member MILLER enters retirement, with his last year in the House, we need to learn from his success in building consensus and forging compromise, in keeping students across our country first to ensure that we get the most bang for our buck with our limited Federal investment and students and young people receive the skills they need to compete in the 21st century workforce.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that our opportunity to build on the success of No Child Left Behind, which shined a light on the achievement gaps for minority and low-income students, is now, more than ever, critical. But just as it had successes, it also had failures that are recognized across the aisle. The superficial formula for adequate yearly progress is defended by nobody, and yet continues to be the law of the land.

I hope that this body can come together, just as we have for WIA, for charter schools, for ESRA, just as we are doing for the bills we are considering today, to update and improve the ESEA. That is what our students deserve and what we were elected to do. Rather than let these bills we are passing today stand out as an aberration, let us build upon them, let them form momentum for higher ed reauthorization and ESEA reauthorization so we can begin the substantive work that the voters of this country have hired us to do.

Despite the fact that we are not considering a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, despite the fact that we are not considering a full reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, I am nevertheless pleased that we are considering H.R. 3136, a bill that I coauthored with Representative SALMON. This bill allows innovative colleges and universities to shorten the time and cost of earning a degree through self-paced programs based on learning rather than seat time. This innovation, called competency-based education, allows students to work at their own pace and earn credit by mastering the knowledge, rather than sitting in a seat and, let's be honest, sometimes not even being awake. This growing trend of innovation around competency-based education is particularly important because it provides a way to increase innovation and reduce the costs of a college degree.

Today's students come to college with different backgrounds and learn at different rates and different times of day. The competency-based education program allows an institution to tailor a program of study to an individual student. By measuring and assessing competencies, or what a student can demonstrate that they know, students are guaranteed to matriculate with the knowledge of the skills they need to master. Businesses will know what to expect upon hiring these students, and students will be incentivized to learn as quickly and as inexpensively as they can.

While the Department of Education currently has some latitude to explore this model through the experimental sites' programs, the current regulations need to be updated and streamlined to better support these innovative programs, which is what this bill does.

I am proud to say that in my district, institutions like Colorado State University's Global Campus are demonstrating that online public universities with competency-based programs can lead the way in attracting, educating, and graduating young learners and adult learners to succeed in the 21st century workforce. But CSU-Global and programs like it currently need to adhere to existing higher education structure, which limits the schedules of students and limits when students can achieve financial aid because traditional higher education is based on the Carnegie unit, or credit hour, rather than what the students learn.

As Congress considers the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, this project, this innovation that this bill will unleash is more crucial than ever. In 1998, Congress recognized the importance of the growing trend towards distance education and the opportunity for students to learn online. Now once again, we have the opportunity to learn from, to study, and to innovate around competency-based education, to learn about the changes that we need to make to maintain quality, to reduce costs, and to increase the number of students that have access to these programs.

That is why I was proud to work with Representative SALMON, Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ms. FOXX on this legislation, which would permit institutions to waive certain regulations that stand in the way of them adopting a competency-based model. We will learn a lot. We will learn what works, and we will learn what doesn't work. They are both important as we seek to expand innovation across the higher education sector to reduce costs and increase quality.

This legislation will allow Congress and the general public to learn more about the opportunities that competency-based education offers for students to increase access and opportunity in higher education.

I am also pleased that the House is considering under this rule H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. Financial counseling is an important method for students to learn about the most effective and least expensive way for them to finance their higher education, both before, during, and after their college experience. Many students simply don't have the knowledge or the resources or the help to make sound decisions in their own interests about their opportunities to finance their postsecondary education.

To the degree that we don't provide a high quality standard of counseling, first-generation students in particular are the students who stand to benefit the most from improving access to higher education and they often lose

out. H.R. 4984 makes many improvements to our financial counseling obligations under current law. The bill ensures that all students and parents who participate in the Federal loan program receive proactive counseling each year that is personalized to meet their own financial needs. Students will receive information about the terms and conditions of Pell Grants and various other loan programs. The bipartisan bill also directs the Secretary of Education to create and disseminate online tools to provide annual loan counseling, helping to bring our financial aid counseling system into the 21st century and put useful, relevant information into the hands of students.

One place in particular that financial counseling can play an important role is when determining whether to take out Federal loans or private student loans. Private student loans often have variable interest rates, as high or higher than 14 percent. They are not eligible for the important deferment, income-based repayment, or loan forgiveness options that come with Federal student loans, but half of private student loan borrowers borrowed less than they could have in Federal Stafford loans. So without realizing it in many cases, people are turning to the higher priced, less beneficial private market place when they still have unused capacity on the Federal student loan side. It is clear that there is an information gap and students need information about the terms and conditions of these loans.

That is why I am thrilled that this underlying bill contains an important part of my Know Before You Owe Act, which I first introduced last session and reintroduced this session, along with Representative BISHOP and Representative SCHWARTZ, to ensure that financial counseling includes additional disclosures on private education loans, with information about college financing options and warnings about riskier private loans to help students make informed decisions about their choices so that they get the best deal that is available to them under current law.

□ 1300

I am also pleased the underlying bill will improve exit counseling for student loan repayment. Unfortunately, many students default on what could otherwise be manageable levels of debt because they don't understand the payment options.

The ExCEL Act, which I mentioned earlier and introduced with Representative PETRI, would make simple income-based repayment the default option, which will reduce paperwork and administrative overhead and prevent this unfortunate occurrence and make payments more affordable for students.

The bill will help students understand that they have many options to pay back their loans and help them make the choice that is best for them.

These bills are a step forward, but affording college education requires a lot more progress than a full step. We need to make enormous progress to reverse the trend of the last few decades that have led to five times the cost of college inflation adjusted since 1983.

I wish I could be here before you to say that these bills will fix that. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that they will help, but they alone will not turn around the alarming trend that is making college harder and harder for middle class families to afford.

So while I support these bills as a step forward, I oppose the rule and call upon this body to allow a full and open debate on the Higher Education Act on ESEA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), the prime sponsor on one of these bills.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and the subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for their support and work on this legislation. I am really appreciative of Representative POLIS and all of his fine work. This truly is a bipartisan bill.

I would also like to state how proud I am to be part of a body that has actually taken its job very, very seriously for the hard times that most Americans have fallen upon, and I am proud that over the course of the last year and a half since I rejoined the Congress, that we passed over 320 bills—40 of them that would create jobs in this economy immediately—that are languishing in the Majority Leader of the Senate's drawer and have no action taken.

A lot of the American public are frustrated, and they have gone to calling this the do-nothing Congress. Well, let me tell you, half the Congress—the House—is actually doing its work.

When it comes to the appropriation bills, which we are required by our rules and our laws to do every year, the House will have done its duty by the end of this year in passing all the appropriation bills. I think we have done 10 of them so far. I believe the Senate hasn't done any.

So I think that when it comes to dealing with the cost of higher education, this is a big step in the right direction. We are aware of the cost of higher education. It has grown by more than 500 percent since 1985 compared to an overall inflation rate of 121 percent.

Federal regulations greatly impede the efforts to reduce the cost of a college degree. As a result, we have got to implement policies to allow institutions to be innovative in developing new models of education, instead of continuing with the status quo because the status quo is not working.

That is why I introduced the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014 with my colleagues Representative POLIS and Representative BROOKS.

This important bipartisan legislation will set up a pilot project to allow institutions to more easily develop innovative ways to deliver education to their students. H.R. 3136 is the first step in allowing students to earn a degree and enter the job market sooner based on their knowledge and their skill set, rather than seat time in the classroom.

My bill will direct the Secretary of Education to implement a demonstration project and to waive regulatory requirements that impede innovations that might decrease costs to students.

The program would allow colleges to provide college credit to students who can prove competencies through prior work and life experience, rather than a specified amount of time in the classroom.

In our field hearing that we held in Arizona, two of our college presidents from Arizona State University and the University of Arizona said that this will immensely help them to be able to get students through their degree programs quicker, based on their competency.

They all agreed that the group of people that it will probably help more than anybody else in America are our returning veterans because they come with certain skill sets that they don't get credit for.

I would like to just talk 1 minute about how that process works because I had it work in my life. I served a mission for my church to Taiwan when I was a young man, and I came back fluent in Mandarin and Chinese.

It didn't make a lot of sense for me to go through Chinese 101 and learn how to say ''where is the bathroom'' with the other kids when I could already speak fluent Mandarin and Chinese.

I was able to test out of that by demonstrating my competency of already being fluent in the language, and I got just about an entire semester's worth of credit.

That is what we are talking about here. People who have been in the military, people who have been in other jobs that they have had, where they have been able to learn skills that don't necessarily translate into book work, but they are a lot more proficient at those skills than a lot of kids entering the classroom. This is going to cut through a lot of the garbage and allow people to be able to get those degrees earlier and, thereby, reducing their costs.

This legislation passed out of the Education and the Workforce Committee by a voice vote, and it allows

higher education institutions to explore more innovative ways to deliver education, measure quality, and disperse financial aid based on actual learning, again, rather than seat time.

It provides flexibility to the schools looking to provide students a more personalized, cost-effective education, and I think that is what we are all here for.

I thank the Speaker for entertaining my ideas, and I thank the gentlewoman for giving me the time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4582, Mr. TIERNEY's bill, to enable millions of students, graduates, and parents in middle class families to responsibly finance their existing student loans.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I did file an amendment to this bill that would be considered today. Quite simply, what it does is provide existing student loan borrowers the opportunity to responsibly refinance their high-interest debt to a lower-interest obligation, like homeowners and car owners are able to do all the time.

The amendment is based on legislation that I filed here in the House and my colleague, ELIZABETH WARREN, filed over in the Senate. We have over 130 cosponsors here in the House and dozens of respected educational groups and diverse organizations in support of this measure.

The amendment would help students and parents save some real money. In fact, the Congressional Research Service says that a middle class undergraduate student with an average loan debt would save over $4,000 over the life of the loan and a typical graduate student would save more than $2,500 and the parent who borrowed money to help pay for their child's education would save more than $3,500.

Mr. Speaker, these are real savings, real dollars, and no doubt, they are going to be directly invested back into the community. The Center for American Progress estimated that refinancing just the Federal student loans, not the parents' loans on that, would pump $21 billion back into the economy.

It helps taxpayers too. The Congressional Budget Office—nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—said that, over 10 years, it would save taxpayers $22 billion.

So the proposal is a good deal for taxpayers, it is a good deal for students and parents, and it is a good deal for the economy. The real question here is: Why isn't there an urgency to move this legislation? Because the benefits to the economy are huge and the savings for taxpayers are real—despite all this, the Republican leadership blocked this amendment from coming to the floor for consideration today.

By blocking that amendment, the Republican leadership has denied every Member in this Chamber the ability to vote on this important measure and show that they are standing with the people—with the students, with the parents, with the economy at large for people who want to take benefit of this legislation.

Worse, by blocking this amendment, the Republican leadership denies relief to tens of millions of college students and parents and middle class families across the country who would benefit from the provisions of the bill that we would offer.

Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable, but unfortunately, it is becoming more and more common in the House here, as it looks like Republicans refuse to stand with middle class families and those that aspire to the middle class, instead of putting politics before everything.

Instead of debating my amendment and the provisions of it that would help middle class families, Republicans are finding some way to sue the President of the United States.

If you were to take that measure and ask the public: Would you rather have some relief and allow people to be able to write down and refinance their loans to a more reasonable interest rate as parents, as undergraduate students, graduate students, and parents of students—would you rather do that, or would you rather pursue some suit against the President which doesn't make any sense and isn't going to have any effect and doesn't work to get them real relief in things that matter to them in their lifetime today?

We are not doing what we should be doing this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. We should be putting politics aside. We should be allowing this amendment. We should rely on every Member of this House to vote on it.

I believe that we would get a strong bipartisan vote of support if we did that. I ask my colleagues to not vote on the previous question, to allow us to insert this amendment, and move forward.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite well aware that his amendment was not germane to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Education and the Workforce Committee for bringing up H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Within the past year, I have held two Paying for College Workshops in my district. These district events have attracted hundreds of parents and students. I have noticed that parents take more careful notes during these workshops, but all of them were eager—all who attended were eager to learn about how to finance college tuition, from the free application for Federal student aid, to understanding the multiple grant and loan programs. Many students and parents struggle to understand this very complicated process.

I think that that is why this bill is important, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. With total student debt now over $1 trillion, it is critical to equip students and parents with proper interactive counseling, so that they have the knowledge to make responsible and informed decisions when borrowing.

Understanding the terms and conditions for the Pell grants, understanding what an individual's financial obligations are after graduating, these are key to helping students and parents understand and manage financial health well beyond college.

I, again, would like to thank Representative BRETT GUTHRIE and Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI for their joint work on this bill. I would like to express my support, not only for their bipartisan endeavor, but for the other higher education bills before the floor this week. These bills work to strengthen our education policy.

An education is one of the most important investments an individual can make. We must ensure that students and parents are able to make financially responsible choices. We must make sure they understand about Pell grants and other such programs available to them, along with the other higher education bills before this floor.

Let's improve the current system. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of H.R. 5134, legislation which would reauthorize two advisory committees within the U.S. Department of Education for 1 year.

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, known as NACIQI, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance play vitally important advisory roles to the Secretary of Education and Congress and would not otherwise be extended through the General Education Provisions Act when the Higher Ed Act expires this year.

NACIQI, for example, advises the Secretary of Education on matters related to postsecondary education accreditation and the certification process for higher ed institutions to participate in Federal student aid programs.

The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance provides advice and counsel on Federal student financial aid policy to both Congress and the Secretary of Education, including the recommendations for increasing college access and persistence to higher ed for low-income and moderate-income students.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I want to thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, and Ranking Member FOXX for their leadership on this issue.

Although I will continue to fight for a more comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I believe that this bill, as well as the other three higher education bills being voted on this week, make some key improvements to the Higher Education Act.

So with that, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5134.

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, the higher education landscape in America is changing to meet the demands of the ever more technologically engaged student population, as well as meeting the needs of adults who are coming back to college after some time in the workforce.

One of the most exciting innovations is competency-based education, which takes traditional degrees and college courses and maps them to specific skill sets or knowledge pieces, known as ''competencies.'' A student progresses through a course by mastering these skill sets and obtaining the knowledge to prove they understand the concept.

Many of these students are individuals returning to college after an interrupted first attempt where they dropped out of college. As Mr. SALMON said, many are veterans with skills that have not yet been equated to coursework. Now they hope to improve their skills and further their careers, but these adults have already been learning skills along the way through their jobs and life experiences. Competency-based education allows students to move quickly through concepts they understand and spend more time focusing on skills that they need.

Additionally, many of these programs apply the skills or concepts to real-world problems that students may have faced in their workplaces or in their families, which helps create a habit of continual learning and application.

While well-intentioned, Federal regulation has often gotten in the way of innovative programs because it cannot account for the rapid change taking place. That is why my colleague, Representative MATT SALMON, has authored H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act. This legislation will promote this innovation by directing the Secretary of Education to implement pilot projects for competency-based programs that will deliver greater flexibility to institutions that want to provide students with a more personalized education experience.

The bill will ensure accountability by requiring annual evaluations of each of these projects to determine program quality and ensure student achievement. My hope is that these projects will better inform our reauthorization of the Higher Education Act by giving us proven results of what works and what does not work in the current regulatory framework. Additionally, it will help inform our discussions around financial aid and what learning in the 21st century classroom looks like.

I worked in higher education for many years and thought these changes were imminent long ago, but higher education change in the past has occurred at a leisurely pace. It is exciting today finally to see some of the ideas and concepts that have been around for years being more widely tested and finding success.

In our country, there are 4.6 million jobs going unfilled because employers are not able to find individuals with the right skill sets to meet their needs. As these individuals come back to school to improve their skills, we should find ways to recognize and give credit for what they have already learned to help them move through the process more quickly. This bill will help students do just that by providing flexibility to institutions to create programs that meet those needs and holding them accountable for the results.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), my esteemed colleague and the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The underlying bill strengthens data transparency in higher education by establishing a new college dashboard Web site, which replaces the Network Navigator and ensures the inclusion of nontraditional students and data metrics.

The college dashboard Web site will provide better and more accessible information for students and families. Key information will consist of enrollment and completion data on full-time and part-time students, disaggregated by Pell recipients; by race, ethnicity, and disability; as well as information on net price, average student loan debt, and the college costs.

This bill promotes transparency on the use of adjunct faculty. For the first time, our Nation's colleges will be required to report the ratio of part-time to full-time instructors by degree level.

In addition, this legislation creates a more accessible calculator with clearer and more individualized information on student costs.

Finally, the bill requires that the college dashboard Web site be consumer tested with other agencies and students and institutions and experts to ensure it provides understandable and relevant information.

I am proud to say that Texas has been a leader in this area. The University of Texas system, for example, has developed an impressive college productivity dashboard designed to create transparency and to measure productivity in a more effective way. Above all, the UT dashboard system also provides students, families, and policymakers with robust data and information that they can use to make more informed decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Having better data and information has allowed the University of Texas to identify achievement gaps and to make improvements in areas that need reform. More accurate data on college participation and completion, for instance, can help to improve student outcomes, particularly for low-income students and students of color.

In closing, I applaud Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ms. FOXX for working in a bipartisan manner to advance this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 4983.

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

Mr. Speaker, the other bill to be considered under this rule is H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, which will promote financial literacy through enhanced counseling for all recipients of Federal financial aid.

Making the decision to pursue postsecondary education can be challenging, and many students and families find themselves overwhelmed by the choices and new terminology. It is in the best interest of students and taxpayers alike that information about Federal aid be presented in a way that is easily understood.

Additionally, for most students, Federal financial aid provides them with more money than they are used to handling, and they struggle with how to

manage properly their debt loads and living expenses. Students want to be treated as independent adults and therefore assume the responsibility that comes with their choices.

As they make the transition to college, or back to the classroom for adult learners, this bill seeks to help students make smart decisions about financing their education so they fully understand the circumstances they may face at the completion of their education.

This legislation ensures that borrowers, both students and parents, who participate in the Federal loan programs receive interactive counseling each year that is personalized to their individual situation, as well as review their loans each year and consent before receiving new Federal student loans.

The bill expands financial counseling to include students who receive a Pell grant, and it also directs the Secretary of Education to maintain and share a consumer-tested, online counseling tool institutions can use to provide annual loan and Pell grant counseling as well as exit counseling.

Mr. Speaker, it may surprise Members in this Chamber that I was the first person in my family to graduate from high school and go to college, where I worked full-time and attended school part-time. It took me 7 years to earn my bachelor's degree, and I continued to work my way through my master's and doctoral degrees.

From my own experience, I am convinced this is the greatest country in the world for many reasons, not the least of which is that a person like me who grew up extremely poor, in a house with no electricity and with no running water, with parents with very little formal education and no prestige at all, could work hard and be elected to the United States House of Representatives.

That is why I am passionate about ensuring that students have the opportunity to get an education but also understand the responsibility they are assuming in taking out a loan and the implications it may have on their family for years to come.

Throughout my career serving low-income, first-generation students, I know how rewarding an education can be, and this bill provides extra tools to help those students fully understand their commitments. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is best characterized by missing opportunities, whether it is balancing our budget, whether it is immigration reform, or, in the context of education, which is the primary issue I work on here on the committee in this institution, the opportunity to reauthorize and replace No Child Left Behind with a Federal education policy that works for our country and to replace the Higher Education Authorization Act with a bill that makes college more affordable for American families.

Today's considerations, while good bills—and I am particularly honored to have my bill with Mr. SALMON on the floor of the House, and I look forward to managing that and discussing its merits later and encourage a strong bipartisan vote of support—the tragedy is that we are nibbling around the edges and not dealing with the core of the issues that the American people demand that Congress deal with.

When we look at congressional approval ratings of 12 percent, we need go no further in explaining that than the hesitancy of this body to solve or address any of the major issues that I hear from my constituents on a daily basis.

If this Congress were serious, we could put H.R. 15, our bipartisan immigration reform bill, on the floor of this House. I am confident it would pass. If this body were serious, we could put the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, a bipartisan bill, on the floor of this House to prevent companies across our country from firing Americans simply because of whom they date or love in their private lives, and it would pass.

We could begin the not easy work but the worthwhile work of working together, Democrats and Republicans, on reauthorizing ESEA, No Child Left Behind, and replacing our broken Federal education policy with a constructive approach that works for kids across our country in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act.

What would be those principles behind reauthorizing the ESEA? I think there are a lot of good ideas from both sides of the aisle.

When No Child Left Behind was signed into law by George Bush, it was a step forward for transparency and accountability; but even in the immediate aftermath, it was clear that Congress didn't get everything right. Rather than improving it and adjusting it, it has been frozen like a time capsule from 2001. Secretary Duncan has done what he can with the broad authority of waivers.

I hope that my Republican colleagues agree that vesting any administration—not just this President—with that kind of ability should not be the intent of lawmakers. We should address the flaws in the act.

I think any President, Democrat or Republican, is doing what they can with the law such as it is, but the real answer doesn't lie with an administration. It lies with Congress. It lies in Congress altering and changing the AYP formula.

What does real accountability look like? Growth over time and how much students are learning. What should ESEA contain? It should promote innovation and excellence. It should expand and replicate what works in public education. The most promising thing we have is that we have examples of schools that work with at-risk kids from every demographic that outperform their peers and prepare kids for college and the workforce.

Finally, we need to change what doesn't work in public education.

So shining a light isn't enough. Having a broad stroke of AYP and policy levers and penalties that are unconnected to actually improving schools doesn't work. But we need to begin the difficult work of turning around persistently failing schools to ensure that every child across our country has access to a good education.

□ 1330

That is the work we are not doing. It is the work we are not doing in this bill. It is the work we haven't done in committee in any meaningful way, and it joins the litany of issues that I hear about from my constituents on a daily basis.

Has this Congress balanced the budget? No.

Has the Congress resolved our immigration crisis as we have seen the temperature increase with the tens of thousands of young people on our southern border? No, we haven't taken a single step. In fact, this Congress hasn't even passed or brought to the floor or debated a single immigration bill.

For a while, we were hearing that there would be a ''piecemeal approach'' to immigration reform. We are nearing the end of the 113th Congress, and we haven't seen a single piece. I don't know what kind of a meal that is, but it is not one that satisfies one's appetite, and it doesn't satisfy the appetite of the voters not to see Congress deal with immigration reform, secure our border and replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country.

People in the education world—teachers, students, families, school board members, principals across our country—all know what I hope my colleagues know, which is that ESEA is broken, that No Child Left Behind doesn't work. It has flaws that aren't ideological—they aren't Democrats say this or Republicans say this. It has formulas that don't make sense to anybody. It is the formula, namely, that

declares that nearly every public school in our country is a failure.

Now, that can be something that some people might want to say rhetorically, but I don't think you will even find too many Democrats or Republicans saying that every public school in this country is a failure. I shouldn't say ''every.'' It is 99 percent or 95 percent of them. I think there are a few small ones that got through, but AYP sets up this apparatus that is nearly impossible for schools to meet, which is requiring that every student cohort achieve proficiency now. It sounded good. Congress mandated that every student become proficient, but it shouldn't be a great surprise that it didn't happen, so it is time to replace that with something that makes sense. If people rhetorically want to say all public schools are failing on either side of the aisle, they are welcome to it, but I think we all know that the reality is more nuanced in that there are good public schools and there are poorly performing public schools.

The way that you treat and deal with a good public school and public policy is not to say it is a failing one. You can praise it. You can say they are doing a great job. You can pat them on the back. You can certainly challenge them to do more, but that is a very different policy response to a persistently failing high school where six out of 10 kids who go in the door in ninth grade don't even graduate. That school is doing their community a disservice and is only increasing the rampant inequality of opportunity that plagues our country.

Instead of relying on temporary fixes and marginal improvements, I encourage this Congress to take on the real issues—to take on immigration reform, to take on balancing the budget, and, in this context, to take on ESEA: replace our broken education law No Child Left Behind with a bipartisan bill that we can be proud of and that will endure for the next decade; replace the Higher Education Act with a bipartisan bill that actually makes substantive progress around reducing the cost of college.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and Chairman KLINE. I encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule, and I would encourage them to vote ''yes'' on both of these bipartisan bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We have worked in a bipartisan fashion on this legislation that is before us today and on some other legislation. Yesterday, the President signed H.R. 803, which we called the SKILLS Act when it left the House. I am very proud of that, and the President talked about how happy he was to sign that bill and how doing things in a bipartisan fashion felt so good.

But my colleague across the aisle keeps talking about ''the Congress.'' As he well knows, but sometimes does not present accurately to the American people, ''the Congress'' consists of two Chambers: the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House of Representatives, as evidenced by what we are doing here today, is very serious about doing our work.

On average, the House is holding 37 hearings every week, fulfilling our oversight responsibilities. We have passed 321 bills that are sitting in the Senate and are not being taken up by Senator REID, who is responsible for stopping meaningful legislation that will reduce energy costs and help create jobs in this country.

The record of House Republicans on fiscal issues is second to none. We have cut discretionary spending every year since taking control of the House. We have proposed reforms to many of our entitlement programs. If the gentleman is sincere in his desire for a balanced budget, I ask him to work with his ranking member on the Budget Committee to propose such a path. House Republicans have voted to support a pathway to balance, and Democrats have voted to raise taxes on hardworking Americans while never reaching balance.

Mr. Speaker, there is much work that needs to be done in this country, and we are facing lots of challenges. I believe that education is the most important tool Americans at any age can have. It was a privilege to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the Education Committee to advance legislation that seeks to meet the needs of today's student population as well as to provide accountability for hardworking taxpayer dollars invested. I think the record of the Education and the Workforce Committee is very clear: when our colleagues across the aisle will work with us, we move legislation.

No legislation is perfect, and that is why I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address their concerns and improve this legislation through the amendment process. Additionally, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to find common ground on advancing higher education reform that will improve the opportunities and results for students and will provide accountability for taxpayers.

However, these bills provide a good foundation to work from, and as a proud supporter of this legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule as it does not make in order a bipartisan amendment to H.R. 4984, that I introduced with my friend Congressman RUNYAN.

Under the legislation, institutions are required to provide certain information to borrowers recommending they exhaust their federal loan opportunities before taking out private loans, that federal loans typically offer better terms, and that if they do decide to take out a private loan, an explanation regarding some of the borrower's rights. Our simple, right-to-know amendment would add to the list of information required to be made available an explanation of the differences between private loans and federal loans when it comes to the death or disability of the borrower. Borrowers would be notified that the borrower's estate or any cosigner of a private loan may be obligated to repay the full amount of the loan in the event of the death or disability of the borrower.

This amendment is based on bipartisan legislation I introduced with Mr. RUNYAN, legislation which passed by a voice vote in the House a few years ago. The Bryski family—who live in Mr. RUNYAN's district in South Jersey—fought for six years to discharge a private student loan they cosigned for their son Christopher, a college student who suffered a traumatic brain injury during his third year at Rutgers University and passed away after spending two years in a coma. Upon Christopher's death, his family was told by the bank that they would have to take over the loan and begin making payments on the $50,000 owed.

No family ever expects to lose a child. However, should the unexpected happen during college, it is a terrible fact today that families not only struggle with the loss of their loved one, but are also burdened as they find out they now have the obligation to pay the student's outstanding private loans. In this circumstance, federal loans are forgiven, but private lenders often still require families to pay back loans on behalf of their children. Understandably, the unexpected costs are difficult to absorb, and families are not mentally prepared for these various circumstances.

While no one can prepare for or anticipate the death of a loved one, especially a child entering college, requiring this information to be made available will ensure families can make the most appropriate financial decisions about how they finance higher education. This bill does not add a dime to the deficit, and we are not seeking to change lending rules or requiring banks to discharge debt. We simply want loan cosigners to understand what they could be responsible for.

It is a disappointment that the Majority would rather keep parents in the dark, and would rather allow private banks and some of their most heartless practices remain in the shadows than consider this simple amendment that would simply ensure that students and their families are warned about this possibility.

I urge opposition to the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 677 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4582) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student

loans, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4582.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

STRENGTHENING TRANSPARENCY IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4983) to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4983

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act''.

SEC. 2. COLLEGE DASHBOARD WEBSITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''first-time,'';

(B) in paragraph (3) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''first-time,''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''first-time,'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''first-time''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''first-time'';

(3) by striking subsections (c) through (g), (j), and (l);

(4) by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (k) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(5) by striking subsection (d) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) CONSUMER INFORMATION.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF TITLE IV INSTITUTION INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall develop and make publicly available a website to be known as the 'College Dashboard website' in accordance with this section and prominently display on such website, in simple, understandable, and unbiased terms for the most recent academic year for which satisfactory data are available, the following information with respect to each institution of higher education that participates in a program under title IV:

''(A) A link to the website of the institution.

''(B) An identification of the type of institution as one of the following:

''(i) A four-year public institution of higher education.

''(ii) A four-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(iii) A four-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(iv) A two-year public institution of higher education.

''(v) A two-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(vi) A two-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(vii) A less than two-year public institution of higher education.

''(viii) A less than two-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(ix) A less than two-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(C) The number of students enrolled at the institution—

''(i) as undergraduate students; and

''(ii) as graduate students, if applicable.

''(D) The student-faculty ratio.

''(E) The percentage of degree-seeking or certificate-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at the institution who obtain a degree or certificate within—

''(i) 100 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled;

''(ii) 150 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled; and

''(iii) 200 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled.

''(F) The average net price per year for undergraduate students receiving Federal student financial aid under title IV based on an

income category selected by the user from a list containing the following income categories:

''(i) $0 to $30,000.

''(ii) $30,001 to $48,000.

''(iii) $48,001 to $75,000.

''(iv) $75,001 to $110,000.

''(v) $110, 001 to $150,000.

''(vi) Over $150,000.

''(G) A link to the net price calculator for such institution.

''(H) The percentage of undergraduate students who obtained a certificate or degree from the institution who borrowed Federal student loans and the average Federal student loan debt incurred by an undergraduate student who obtained a certificate or degree from the institution and borrowed Federal student loans in the course of obtaining such certificate or degree.

''(I) A link to national and regional data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on starting salaries in all major occupations.

''(J) A link to the webpage of the institution containing campus safety data with respect to such institution.

''(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall publish on Internet webpages that are linked to through the College Dashboard website for the most recent academic year for which satisfactory data is available the following information with respect to each institution of higher education that participates in a program under title IV:

''(A) ENROLLMENT.—

''(i) The percentages of male and female undergraduate students enrolled at the institution.

''(ii) The percentages of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution—

''(I) full-time; and

''(II) less than full-time.

''(iii) In the case of an institution other than an institution that provides all courses and programs through distance education, of the undergraduate students enrolled at the institution—

''(I) the percentage of such students who are from the State in which the institution is located;

''(II) the percentage of such students who are from other States; and

''(III) the percentage of such students who are international students.

''(iv) The percentages of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution, disaggregated by—

''(I) race and ethnic background;

''(II) classification as a student with a disability;

''(III) recipients of a Federal Pell Grant;

''(IV) recipients of assistance under a tuition assistance program conducted by the Department of Defense under section 1784a or 2007 of title 10, United States Code, or other authorities available to the Department of Defense or veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480); and

''(V) recipients of a Federal student loan.

''(B) COMPLETION.—The information required under paragraph (1)(E), disaggregated by—

''(i) recipients of a Federal Pell Grant;

''(ii) recipients of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan) who did not receive a Federal Pell Grant;

''(iii) persons who did not receive a Federal Pell Grant or a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan);

''(iv) race and ethnic background;

''(v) classification as a student with a disability; and

''(vi) recipients of assistance under a tuition assistance program conducted by the Department of Defense under section 1784a or 2007 of title 10, United States Code, or other authorities available to the Department of Defense or veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480).

''(C) COSTS.—

''(i) The cost of attendance for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution who live on campus.

''(ii) The cost of attendance for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution who live off campus.

''(iii) The cost of tuition and fees for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution.

''(iv) The cost of tuition and fees per credit hour or credit hour equivalency for undergraduate students enrolled in the institution less than full time.

''(v) In the case of a public institution of higher education (other than an institution described in clause (vi)) and notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), the costs described in clauses (i) and (ii) for—

''(I) full-time students enrolled in the institution who are residents of the State in which the institution is located; and

''(II) full-time students enrolled in the institution who are not residents of such State.

''(vi) In the case of a public institution of higher education that offers different tuition rates for students who are residents of a geographic subdivision smaller than a State and students not located in such geographic subdivision and notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), the costs described in clauses (i) and (ii) for—

''(I) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are residents of such geographic subdivision;

''(II) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are residents of the State in which the institution is located but not residents of such geographic subdivision; and

''(III) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are not residents of such State.

''(D) FINANCIAL AID.—

''(i) The average annual grant amount (including Federal, State, and institutional aid) awarded to an undergraduate student enrolled at the institution who receives financial aid.

''(ii) The percentage of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution receiving Federal, State, and institutional grants, student loans, and any other type of student financial assistance known by the institution, provided publicly or through the institution, such as Federal work-study funds.

''(iii) The cohort default rate (as defined in section 435(m)) for such institution.

''(E) FACULTY INFORMATION.—

''(i) The ratio of the number of course sections taught by part-time instructors to the number of course sections taught by full-time faculty, disaggregated by course sections intended primarily for undergraduate students and course sections intended primarily for graduate students.

''(ii) The mean and median years of employment for part-time instructors.

''(3) OTHER DATA MATTERS.—

''(A) COMPLETION DATA.—The Commissioner of Education Statistics shall ensure that the information required under paragraph (1)(E) includes information with respect to all students at an institution, including students other than first-time, full-time students and students who transfer to another institution, in a manner that the Commissioner considers appropriate.

''(B) ADJUSTMENT OF INCOME CATEGORIES.—The Secretary may annually adjust the range of each of the income categories described in paragraph (1)(F) to account for a change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics if the Secretary determines an adjustment is necessary.

''(4) INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISON.—The Secretary shall include on the College Dashboard website a method for users to easily compare the information required under paragraphs (1) and (2) between institutions.

''(5) UPDATES.—

''(A) DATA.—The Secretary shall update the College Dashboard website not less than annually.

''(B) TECHNOLOGY AND FORMAT.—The Secretary shall regularly assess the format and technology of the College Dashboard website and make any changes or updates that the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(6) CONSUMER TESTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing and maintaining the College Dashboard website, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, shall conduct consumer testing with appropriate persons, including current and prospective college students, family members of such students, institutions of higher education, and experts, to ensure that the College Dashboard website is usable and easily understandable and provides useful and relevant information to students and families.

''(B) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES.—The Secretary shall submit to the authorizing committees any recommendations that the Secretary considers appropriate for changing the information required to be provided on the College Dashboard website under paragraphs (1) and (2) based on the results of the consumer testing conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(7) PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE LINKS TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS AFTER SUBMISSION OF FAFSA.—The Secretary shall provide to each student that submits a Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 a link to the webpage of the College Dashboard website that contains the information required under paragraph (1) for each institution of higher education such student includes on such Application.

''(8) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with each appropriate head of a department or agency of the Federal Government, shall ensure to the greatest extent practicable that any information related to higher education that is published by such department or agency is consistent with the information published on the College Dashboard website.

''(9) REFERENCES TO COLLEGE NAVIGATOR WEBSITE.—Any reference in this Act to the College Navigator website shall be considered a reference to the College Dashboard website.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 131(h) (20 U.S.C. 1015(h)), by striking ''College Navigator'' and inserting ''College Dashboard''; and

(2) in section 132(a) (20 U.S.C. 1015a(a)), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) COLLEGE DASHBOARD WEBSITE.—The term 'College Dashboard website' means the College Dashboard website required under subsection (d).''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Education shall develop and publish the College

Dashboard website required under section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) COLLEGE NAVIGATOR WEBSITE MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary shall maintain the College Navigator website required under section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as in effect the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, in the manner required under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in effect on such day, until the College Dashboard website referred to in subsection (c) is complete and publicly available on the Internet.

SEC. 3. NET PRICE CALCULATORS.

Subsection (c) of section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as redesignated by section 2(a)(4) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraphs:

''(4) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR NET PRICE CALCULATORS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act, a net price calculator for an institution of higher education shall meet the following requirements:

''(A) The link for the calculator shall—

''(i) be clearly labeled as a net price calculator and prominently, clearly, and conspicuously posted in locations on the website of such institution where information on costs and aid is provided and any other location that the institution considers appropriate; and

''(ii) match in size and font to the other prominent links on the webpage where the link for the calculator is displayed.

''(B) The webpage displaying the results for the calculator shall specify at least the following information:

''(i) The net price (as calculated under subsection (a)(2)) for such institution, which shall be the most visually prominent figure on the results screen.

''(ii) Cost of attendance, including—

''(I) tuition and fees;

''(II) average annual cost of room and board for the institution for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution;

''(III) average annual cost of books and supplies for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution; and

''(IV) estimated cost of other expenses (including personal expenses and transportation) for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution.

''(iii) Estimated total need-based grant aid and merit-based grant aid from Federal, State, and institutional sources that may be available to a full-time undergraduate student.

''(iv) Percentage of the full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution that received any type of grant aid described in clause (iii).

''(v) The disclaimer described in paragraph (6).

''(vi) In the case of a calculator that—

''(I) includes questions to estimate the eligibility of a student or prospective student for veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480) or educational benefits for active duty service members, such benefits are displayed on the results screen in a manner that clearly distinguishes such benefits from the grant aid described in clause (iii); or

''(II) does not include questions to estimate eligibility for the benefits described in subclause (I), the results screen indicates that certain students (or prospective students) may qualify for such benefits and includes a link to information about such benefits.

''(C) The institution shall populate the calculator with data from an academic year that is not more than 2 academic years prior to the most recent academic year.

''(5) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DATA COLLECTED BY THE NET PRICE CALCULATOR.—A net price calculator for an institution of higher education shall—

''(A) clearly indicate which questions are required to be completed for an estimate of the net price from the calculator;

''(B) in the case of a calculator that requests contact information from users, clearly mark such requests as optional and provide for an estimate of the net price from the calculator without requiring users to enter such information; and

''(C) prohibit any personally identifiable information provided by users from being sold or made available to third parties.''.

SEC. 4. FUNDING.

(a) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Education to maintain the College Navigator website, $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized by this Act to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4983.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The Education and the Workforce Committee has held 14 hearings on higher education, and throughout these hearings, it has become increasingly clear that students and families face a deluge of data that often provides little to no useful information as they try to make the important decisions of where to pursue postsecondary educations.

Despite repeated attempts to enhance transparency in the higher education system, students and families still struggle to access important information that will assist in their searches for the right colleges or universities. To make matters worse, data that is available often ignores a large portion of students enrolled in the postsecondary education system or fails to capture crucial information students and families need to view the entire landscape of higher education.

That is why my colleague, Representative LUKE MESSER, and I authored the bill before us today. The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act attempts to streamline existing Federal transparency efforts to avoid duplicative information and confusion for students by creating a consumer-tested college dashboard that would display only key information students need when deciding which schools to attend as well as ensuring that all students are appropriately represented in the data presented.

Taxpayers provide a great deal of money to help students attend the institutions of their choice and to pursue their passions. Therefore, we should make every effort to see that students have the best information available to help them make good decisions for where to continue their educations. The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act seeks to make that information more accessible and easier to understand.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, which passed with bipartisan support out of the Education Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to express my support for H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The underlying bill strengthens the state of transparency in higher education by establishing a new college dashboard Web site, which replaces the Network Navigator and ensures the inclusion of nontraditional students in the data matrix.

The college dashboard Web site will provide better and more accessible information for students and families. Key information will consist of enrollment and completion data on full-time and part-time students as well as those segregated by Pell recipients—or race and ethnicity and disability—as well as information on net price, average student loan debt, and college costs.

The bill promotes transparency on the use of adjunct faculty. For the first time, our Nation's colleges will be required to report the ratio of part-time to full-time instructors by degree level. In addition, this legislation creates a more accessible calculator with clearer, more individualized information on student costs. Finally, the bill requires that the college dashboard Web site be consumer-tested with other agencies and students and institutions and experts to ensure it provides understandable and relevant information.

I am proud to say that Texas has been a leader in this area. The University of Texas' system, for example, has developed an impressive college productivity dashboard designed to increase transparency and to measure

productivity in a more effective way. Above all, the UT system's dashboard also provides students, families, and policymakers with robust data and information that they can use to make more informed decisions.

Having better data and information has allowed the University of Texas to identify achievement gaps and to make improvements in areas that need reform. More accurate data on college participation and completion, for instance, can help to improve student outcomes, particularly for low-income students and students of color.

In closing, I applaud Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ranking Member Foxx for working in a bipartisan manner to advance this legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 4983.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), my distinguished colleague and cosponsor for this legislation.

□ 1345

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which will provide prospective students with better information to make more informed choices about pursuing their higher education.

I want to commend Chairman KLINE and subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for bringing this measure forward. And I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his leadership on this topic as well.

In modern life, few decisions are bigger than whether to attend college and which college to attend. The right choice can be a head start towards a strong financial future. The wrong choice can leave a student without a degree and in tens of thousands of dollars of debt.

There is no magic formula for finding the best fit, but having access to clear and relevant data can make the decision easier and less overwhelming. Unfortunately, when making this important choice, students and their families are often faced with a convoluted maze of statistics which don't allow them to make fully informed, cost-conscious decisions.

This legislation will ensure that students have the information they need to make good decisions for their future. Helping students more easily find the schools that are right for them will encourage their academic success, avoid unnecessary student debt, and enhance their professional prospects after graduation.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished member of the Education Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. It is critical that prospective students have access to information on institutions that they may be interested in attending, and the bill before us would provide the platform for these students to gather this information.

This information is essential to ensuring that students will be able to make an informed decision on which institution to attend.

While providing students with additional information on institutions of higher learning is important, none of the bills before us actually will do anything to actually ensure that every student is given every chance possible of receiving an education past high school level.

Studies have consistently shown the value of higher education, and have also shown that two-thirds of the jobs in the future will require some sort of education past the high school level.

Unfortunately, many students today find higher education unaffordable and out of reach due to the increasing cost of attending college and high student loan interest rates. Currently, the Federal Government makes a significant profit on student loans, with the Congressional Budget Office estimating that the Federal Government will profit $135 billion over the next 10 years off of student loans.

We must continue to ensure that college remains affordable and accessible to all that seek it, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee towards that goal.

On the bill before us today, however, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

With the cost of a college education increasing, and outstanding student loan debt now at a staggering $1.2 trillion, it is more important than ever for students and their families to have the necessary information to make informed decisions about their educational pursuits.

This legislation empowers students and their families by improving the dissemination of key information about colleges and universities through a consumer-tested college dashboard.

This bill coordinates and streamlines information from multiple Federal agencies to assist students in comparing schools to determine which will best suit their unique needs.

The only college completion rates currently available to students and their families are for the traditional, first-time, full-time student. At East Tennessee State University in my hometown, only about 60 percent of the students fit this description, leaving a significant portion of students not represented by the data.

Completion rates for other groups of students, such as veterans and Pell Grant recipients, are included in the college dashboard to ensure that this information is representative of all students.

Surprisingly, despite spending approximately $32 billion each year to provide Pell Grants to over 9 million students, we have little information about the educational outcomes for these students. By taking a more thorough look at the results this program is producing, we can improve the likelihood of student success.

In addition to providing students and parents with better information, this bill will give us new tools to help strengthen the Pell Grants program, while ensuring it is a good investment for taxpayers.

To ensure that resource is utilized, students will be provided links to the college dashboard for each prospective school they look at, thus providing this important information to them at the pinnacle of their college search.

I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member on this bipartisan legislation, and I encourage its support.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

This bill creates a new Department of Education Web site that includes data allowing prospective students to better understand the cost of specific institutions, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me to improve this bill before it came to the floor.

The current Department of Education Web site is incomplete and misleading. The current Web site does not include the net price to a student according to that student's income level, which could cause, and does cause, lower and middle class students to reject schools that they, in fact, could afford.

They or their parents would see average net price, calculated for all students, and immediately assume it is unaffordable for them. The changes that I have included in this bill allow a parent or a prospective student to find, upfront, on the home page, the average net price of attending, based on the family's income level. And this information may lead students to consider institutions they would have otherwise excluded.

The difference between the average cost, calculated for all students, and the cost to a student, say, from a $40,000 income level, may be many thousands of dollars.

Now, I should add, in conclusion, that while this bill that we take up today makes some progress, this and the other bills we will be considering fall short of what is really needed: a comprehensive effort to help more students afford college.

We should be considering doubling the Pell Grants, reducing student loan interest rates, and doing all those other things that would be in a comprehensive higher education bill. I am sorry to say we are ignoring those solutions.

Nevertheless, I welcome the modest improvements that we will see in the legislation being considered here, and I hope that soon we will get to the comprehensive higher education legislation that the students of America deserve.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker I am honored to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member HINOJOSA for the time, and I thank the chairman and Ranking Member MILLER, and Chairwoman FOXX for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. This legislation will help prospective students and their families by providing more accessible information about the costs of attending our Nation's colleges and universities.

The bill before us today includes provisions that I authored that will improve a tool already available to help students and their families assess the cost of attending college, the net price calculator.

Currently, students and families have to guess where the calculators are located on the schools' Web pages, what each school calls the calculator, and whether the information it provides is accurate.

Additionally, veterans and servicemembers must try to determine whether the estimates provided by such calculators accurately reflect the academic benefits they have earned through their service.

As the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, one of my roles is to help government work more effectively and efficiently.

My bill, the Net Price Calculator Improvement Act, H.R. 3694, addresses the challenges identified with current net price calculators by ensuring that they will provide consistent and comparable price information for colleges and universities based on up-to-date data.

My legislation would also ensure that institutions place the calculators in consistent locations on their Web sites, and it would protect students who use the calculators from data mining.

I applaud my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee for including these critical provisions in H.R. 4983, and urge the passage of this legislation.

As I close, let me note that the bill before us is an important first step in the process of reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, and it contains important reforms. However, our work will not be done by simply passing this bill.

The bills before the House this week ignore the bread and butter of the Federal higher education policy, Federal student aid. We must reauthorize the Higher Education Act in its entirety as quickly as possible.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I close, I want to say that I look forward to working with my friends on the other side of the aisle as soon as possible so that we can complete, in its entirety, the reauthorization of higher education which is greatly needed here in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together on what I think is an important piece of legislation that will help families and students in the future.

I want to give particular thanks to the staffs on both sides of the aisle. The Education and the Workforce Committee has been very active this year and last year on presenting excellent legislation to this House, and I want to thank the staff for their good work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4983, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4983, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE EXTENSION

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5134) to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5134

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY.

Section 114(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011c(f)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 491(k) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098(k)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5134.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5134 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

While the majority of the Higher Education Act is extended until the end of FY 2015 by the General Education Provisions Act, the extension does not apply to two committees authorized under the law.

The first committee is the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, which advises the Secretary of Education on accreditation issues and which accrediting bodies to improve.

The second committee is the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, which advises both Congress and the Secretary of Education on student financial aid policy. In order to ensure these important advisory committees can continue to serve policymakers, Representative HINOJOSA and I authored H.R. 5134 to extend both of these committees for 1 year.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this simple extension and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 5134, legislation which would reauthorize two advisory committees within the U.S. Department of Education for at least 1 year.

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, known as NACIQI, and the Advisory

Committee on Student Financial Assistance play vitally important advisory roles to the Secretary of Education and Congress and would not otherwise be extended through the General Education Provisions Act when the Higher Education Act expires this year.

NACIQI, for example, advises the Secretary of Education on matters related to postsecondary education accreditation and the certification process for higher education institutions to participate in Federal student aid programs.

The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance provides advice and counsel on Federal student financial aid policy to both Congress and the Secretary of Education, including recommendations for increasing college access and persistence to higher education for low-income and moderate-income students.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Chairwoman FOXX for their leadership on this issue.

Although I will continue to fight for a more comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I believe that this bill today, as well as the other three higher education bills being voted on this week, make some key improvements to the Higher Education Act.

With that, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of H.R. 5134.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5134 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5134.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 677;

Adopting House Resolution 677, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4984, EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 677) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Honda	Perry
Campbell	Hoyer	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Huffman	Stewart
Eshoo	Kingston	Wasserman Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	
Hanabusa	Nunnelee	
Heck (WA)	Pelosi	

□ 1433

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. GARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KING of New York changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 437 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 437. If present, I would have voted ''no.''

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

HONORING DR. JESSICA BIENSTOCK

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recognize a special guest who is in our Nation's Capital today. Dr. Jessica Bienstock is the residency program director for the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

In her career, she has delivered over 1,000 babies, and one of them is well known to all of us, and she is Abigail Rose Beutler, who of course is the daughter of our friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Washington. We are all familiar with Abigail's story and the odds that she overcame. If she is a happy, healthy miracle, then Dr. Bienstock is the miracle worker who helped give the gift of hope and life to this family.

I think the whole House owes a debt of gratitude to her and to all of our doctors, nurses, and medical professionals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barber	Grimm	Pitts
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hall	Pompeo
Barton	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Harris	Reed
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Black	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roby
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jolly	Royce
Capito	Jones	Runyan
Carter	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Joyce	Salmon
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cohen	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Conaway	Lankford	Simpson
Cook	Latta	Sinema
Cotton	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Long	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lummis	Southerland
Daines	Marchant	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Stockman
Denham	Massie	Stutzman
Dent	McAllister	Terry
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thornberry
Duckworth	McClintock	Tiberi
Duffy	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Upton
Ellmers	McMorris Rodgers	Valadao
Farenthold	Meadows	Wagner
Fincher	Meehan	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Walden
Fleischmann	Mica	Walorski
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mullin	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Foxx	Murphy (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Noem	Wittman
Gerlach	Nugent	Wolf
Gibbs	Nunes	Womack
Gibson	Olson	Woodall
Gohmert	Owens	Yoder
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Yoho
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gowdy		Young (IN)

NOES—185

Barrow (GA)	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Butterfield	Clay
Beatty	Capps	Cleaver
Becerra	Capuano	Clyburn
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Conyers
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Costa
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Braley (IA)	Chu	Cuellar
Brown (FL)	Cicilline	Cummings
Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Polis
DeFazio	Langevin	Price (NC)
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Rahall
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Rangel
DelBene	Levin	Richmond
Deutch	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lipinski	Ruiz
Doggett	Loebsack	Ruppersberger
Doyle	Lofgren	Rush
Edwards	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda T.
Engel	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes
Esty	Lynch	Schakowsky
Farr	Maffei	Schiff
Fattah	Maloney, Carolyn	Schneider
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Frankel (FL)	Matheson	Schwartz
Fudge	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Gallego	McCollum	Serrano
Garamendi	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Garcia	McGovern	Shea-Porter
Grayson	McIntyre	Sherman
Green, Al	McNerney	Sires
Green, Gene	Meeks	Slaughter
Grijalva	Meng	Smith (WA)
Gutiérrez	Michaud	Speier
Hahn	Miller, George	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Takano
Higgins	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Tierney
Holt	Neal	Titus
Horsford	Negrete McLeod	Tonko
Hoyer	Nolan	Tsongas
Israel	O'Rourke	Van Hollen
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Vargas
Jeffries	Pascrell	Veasey
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Vela
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Velázquez
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Keating	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Waters
Kennedy	Pingree (ME)	Waxman
Kildee	Pocan	Welch
Kilmer		Wilson (FL)
Kind		Yarmuth
Kirkpatrick		

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
DesJarlais	Honda	Pelosi
Eshoo	Huffman	Rogers (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Kingston	Stewart
Gingrey (GA)	Latham	Wasserman Schultz
Hanabusa	Miller, Gary	

□ 1445

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3136.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3136.

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

□ 1447

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, with Mr. AMODEI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I rise today in strong support of the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013.

Mr. Chairman, this week, Congress is moving forward with a bipartisan effort to strengthen our Nation's higher education system.

Across the country, millions of college students are getting ready to start the school year. They will soon say good-bye to family and friends and pursue their dream of a postsecondary education. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, many Americans are struggling to turn that dream into reality.

The higher education system we know today is too costly, too bureaucratic, and outdated. Some are having a hard time fitting the traditional college experience into a busy lifestyle that already includes work, family, or both. Others are graduating with a pile of debt and no job prospects.

A college degree can open the door to a bright and prosperous future, yet too often, obstacles stand in the way. Ultimately, States and institutions must provide the answers students and families need, but Congress has a role to play as well.

First and foremost, we need to continue promoting policies that will get this economy moving again, so every college graduate who wants a job can find a job. We can also adopt commonsense reforms that will improve our higher education system.

Today, the House will begin to do just that. We have an opportunity right now—right now, Mr. Chairman—to advance reforms that will support innovation and empower students to make informed decisions about their college careers. H.R. 3136 is the first step in that effort.

The bipartisan Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act will allow institutions to expand an innovative approach to higher education, known as competency-based education.

This model of education defines a set of skills for a field of work and then measures student progress in acquiring those skills. Once a student demonstrates a level of skill or competency, he or she can move to the next step in the academic program.

Instead of awarding a student credit hours for time spent in class, competency-based education allows a student to learn at a pace tailored to his or her specific needs.

If you are a single mom, you may need more time to complete your degree while juggling the demands of work and kids, or if you are a dad out of a job with a family to support, 4 years sitting in a classroom is time you do not have.

Competency-based education holds tremendous promise. It allows students to earn a degree in less time and even at a lower cost than in a traditional education setting, yet it is difficult for institutions to expand this innovative model under a system that values time over learning.

H.R. 3136 will help us move in a different direction. The legislation directs the Secretary of Education to authorize a number of demonstration projects to test and strengthen competency-based education.

Among other provisions, the legislation requires the Secretary to focus on programs that are designed to reduce costs in the time it takes to earn a degree. The bill requires a thorough evaluation of each demonstration project, so policymakers learn which programs demonstrate success and what specific roadblocks are standing in the way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill that will help make a difference in the lives of students and families. I want to thank the bipartisan authors of the legislation: Mr. MATT SALMON, Mr. JARED POLIS, and Mrs. SUSAN BROOKS.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to join my colleague in support of the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013, a bill that I had the honor to coauthor with Representative SALMON. I greatly appreciate his work, as well as the work of many others on this bill.

This bill will help unleash innovation that promises to improve the quality of a college education and, just as importantly, if not more, reduce the cost. It will allow innovative colleges and universities to shorten the time it takes to earn a degree, reduce college costs through self-paced programs based on learning rather than time spent in the seat—and let's be honest, some of that time is often sleeping.

This innovation, which is called competency-based education, has a lot of promise. There is a lot to learn along the way, pitfalls to avoid. The benefits that we will learn over time promise to help allow students to work at their own pace and progress by mastering the knowledge of a course, which is essentially what the purpose of the course should be.

By demonstrating mastery of the course, regardless of how long it takes, we can, a, ensure employers that there is quality with regard to the outcomes of that course; and, b, reduce costs by allowing a student, if they are capable, to proceed faster.

This growing trend of innovation is very important because it provides a way to increase innovation and decrease costs. Since the last reauthorization in 2007, higher education has become more and more expensive.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of attending a university has risen by almost five times per student since 1983. At the same time that that cost has risen and a higher education has become harder and harder for American families to afford, the returns of a higher education have also increased.

College graduates who are working full time earn almost $17,000 more a year annually than their peers who only have a high school diploma.

While a 4-year university degree isn't always the best option for everyone, some form of postsecondary education, whether it is a community college or whether it is a certification program, has become increasingly imperative to landing a good-paying job in the 21st century workforce.

Competency-based education can increase access to higher education for both nontraditional students, as well as college-age students—oftentimes who have a job—a family, and other commitments.

The National Center for Education Statistics reports that of the 17½ million people enrolled in college, only 15 percent were attending a 4-year college and living on campus.

So when we think about higher education and who is attending college, only 15 percent of those are having the experience I had or perhaps many of our colleagues had, where you go and you live in a dorm and you attend college for 4 years. That is only 15 percent.

The other 85 percent are doing something else. It might mean taking classes at night, it might mean online education, or it might mean taking courses over a longer period of time. That has been the innovative center around cost reduction and improvements in quality.

H.R. 3136 will help align our higher education system with workforce needs. By providing a framework for measuring and assessing competencies, students are more likely to matriculate with the knowledge they actually need to master to be able to hold a good job.

Likewise, businesses will know what to expect upon hiring these students. That is why I am proud to say this legislation has garnered the support of the Chamber of Commerce, which has applauded competency-based education as an opportunity for employers to work with colleges to help identify skills and competencies for specific courses and programs.

This legislation, just as importantly, if not more, will help combat the rising cost of college. In higher education today, there are very few incentives for institutions to decrease costs.

To fully address this, we would need to do a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act—that is not what we have before us today—but we do have a constructive bill that will allow colleges and universities to adopt new technology, remove some of those barriers to innovation that exist today, and allow universities to look beyond delivering traditional classroom instruction, as they did in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries, and look at what a classroom of the 21st century might look like beyond the walls of the physical classroom.

Competency-based education is one of the first innovations in higher education that is specifically designed to help decrease costs and make college more affordable, while also improving quality in terms of what the student has learned.

At its core, what we are talking about here today, competency-based education, flips the traditional campus model on its head, so that learning is the constant, and time and location are the variable and are self-paced.

The result is actually a more uniform and measurable education, ensuring that students actually learn what they are set out to learn versus sitting in a seat for a period of time.

Because competencies are demonstrable skills, schools can potentially form articulation agreements with one another even easier under this bill and under the innovation pilot programs allowed under this bill, saving students and taxpayers money and giving students and families more options, geographically and within a city.

I am thrilled that the Department of Education has done what they could to allow some programs to explore this model through their Experimental Sites Initiative, but there are several advantages to legislation.

First and foremost, we are able to expand the Experimental Sites Initiative from four programs to 20 under this bill, and secondly, we are giving congressional bipartisan approval to this concept, which is far more enduring than the whim of a particular Secretary or a particular administration.

I am proud to say that institutions in my home district, like Colorado State University's Global Campus, are demonstrating that online public universities with competency-based programs can lead the way in attracting, educating, and graduating adult learners and other contemporary students and, at the same time, benefit the physical campus of the public university.

Colorado State University-Global Campus was created by the Colorado State University System Board of Governors in 2007 as the very first 100 percent online State university in the United States.

A longtime leader in academic innovation, CSU-Global already offers alternative credit options, including competency-based exams, which meet or exceed the rigorous academic standards required of a State university. These options help students to manage out-of-pocket expenses and reduce the overall cost of their education, while also rewarding them for their demonstration of knowledge.

However, CSU-Global and programs like it still need to adhere to the overly rigid higher education structure, which inhibits innovation by limiting schedules on which students can enroll and when students can receive financial aid.

□ 1500

In order to continue to be successful and innovate, programs like CSU-Global need the flexibility that this bill enhances to meet their students' needs.

As Congress considers the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, this project is more crucial than ever. That is why I was proud to work with Representative SALMON on this legislation, which would permit institutions chosen by the Secretary to waive certain regulations that stand in the way of adopting competency-based models that reward both students and universities based on what students learn rather than how much time they sat in a seat, regardless of whether they are awake or asleep.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and Chairman KLINE for working with my colleagues and I to craft this bipartisan bill that promises to increase innovation, increase equality, and decrease costs in higher education, and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting ''yes'' on H.R. 3136 to support competency-based education and allow for laboratories of innovation across our great country as we all seek to reduce the costs and improve the quality of an increasingly important advanced education degree to help middle class families achieve their dreams in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), a key member of the committee and one of the principal authors of this important legislation.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Chairwoman FOXX for their support and work on this legislation. I also want to thank Congressman POLIS and Congresswoman BROOKS for working with me on this legislation.

College costs have risen dramatically over the last several years. To be exact, they have risen 500 percent since 1985. The average national tuition for this past school year was just over $30,000, which represents 62 percent of the median annual income for my home State of Arizona. Even so, a college degree is still viewed as essential for success to many students and employers.

Throwing taxpayer dollars at the problem in the form of expanding loan forgiveness does not get at the heart of the problem or the solution of making college more affordable and is not a viable, long-term solution. Federal regulations continue to greatly impede efforts to reduce the cost of a degree. We need to implement policies that allow institutions to be innovative and try developing new models of education instead of continuing with the status quo.

H.R. 3136 will set up a pilot project to allow institutions to more easily develop innovative models of delivering education to students. I have been told before that all teachers don't teach the same and all students don't learn the same. We need to recognize this. This legislation is a step in allowing students to earn a college degree and enter the job market sooner—far sooner, in many cases—based on their knowledge and skill set rather than the amount of time that they spend in the classroom.

All students can benefit from such a program. However, this may be particularly beneficial to our Nation's veterans and nontraditional students. Our veterans return from duty with particular skills, and we should reward them for that by allowing them the ability to earn credits based on those skills and the learning that they have already received.

Similarly, nontraditional students often go back to school to finish their degree to get a better job, and they should be allowed to use the knowledge that they gain from their job to be able to advance their education and their degree.

Additionally, my legislation will incentivize students to work hard to accelerate their degree attainment, potentially cutting their overall education costs and allowing them to begin their careers sooner.

This bipartisan legislation, which passed out of committee by voice vote, allows schools to explore more innovative ways to deliver education, measure quality, and disburse financial aid based on actual learning rather than seat time.

My bill will direct the Secretary of Education to implement a demonstration project and to waive certain regulatory requirements that impede such innovations that would decrease costs. The program would allow colleges to provide academic credit to students who can prove competencies through their prior work and life experiences and hard work, rather than a specified amount of time in the classroom.

This is a good first step to try to find ways to make a college education more affordable and more attainable for our Nation's students. I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for all of his work on this legislation and joining Mr. SALMON in an effort to bring this to the floor. I thank both of them for reaching agreement on this. I also thank the chair of the committee, Mrs. BROOKS, and Mr. TIERNEY on our side, for this opportunity to vote on this legislation.

We have made a promise to America's students. We have said that we will make the cost of a college education affordable and accessible. With that comes another promise—the promise that when a student graduates with a college degree in hand, they will have the skills to succeed in the workplace and in the economy.

But the traditional college degree has not changed since the 1800s, as my colleagues have pointed out, despite dramatic changes for businesses and the workforce. We all know that a good middle class job requires some college education and training. And today, as most workers move from job to job more frequently, they need to tap new skills to keep up with the demands of emerging industries.

Despite the changing workforce needs, college credit is earned based upon the hours spent sitting in the classroom, not on the knowledge or the skills earned. Today, the Congress has an opportunity to vote for a new competency-based education model so we can flip the old model on its head.

This model is an opportunity for American students to access a high-quality education in a new way. And through technology and the Internet, this model becomes more user friendly and affordable for families.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. TIERNEY, for his dedication on this issue. Mr. TIERNEY and I spent many hours with the leaders of this movement to understand how the Federal Government can support these innovative programs—and, in some cases, where we can just get out of the way and let schools innovate.

In particular, I would like to thank the Lumina Foundation, New America, Southern New Hampshire University, Capella University, Cal State University, Open Learning Initiative, and San Jose State for their expertise on these programs.

This demonstration program makes sense because we need to test these innovations before we can make significant commitments of new Federal investments.

Specifically, this bill gives colleges a chance to create competency-based programs to help students succeed by measuring what they know and not solely the number of hours that they spent in the classroom.

Under this legislation, students will still learn the basic academic work, but this model allows them to become proficient at their own pace, potentially shortening the time it takes to earn a degree.

For the returning veteran, this could mean her Army medic skills are more easily transferred to an RN degree or some other medical degree. For a self-taught computer programmer, this could mean a computer science degree in a shorter timeframe and at less cost.

Combined with new technology, competency-based education is one of the most promising new innovations to help make college more affordable and more accessible. This is a very good step forward, and I urge the support of this legislation.

I also urge Members to support H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, a bill that would improve counseling on financial aid and student loans so that students can make more informed choices on how to finance their education.

While I support these bills, they are not enough for students already facing a mountain of college debt. I am disappointed that we are not voting today to help student loan borrowers save thousands of dollars and better manage their debt burden through lower interest rates.

My colleague, Congressman TIERNEY, offered an amendment at the Rules Committee to allow students to refinance student loans and to lock in lower interest rates, just like millions of Americans have been able to do with their mortgages or their car loans.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership refused to make the Tierney amendment in order, thus blocking a straight up-or-down vote on whether or not to help millions of students and their families reduce their debt.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman KLINE and my Republican colleagues for their cooperation and inclusiveness on all of the higher education bills that we are considering this week. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I will be the last speaker on our side, and will close. I think the other side has completed their speakers as well, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 23½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very excited that, at a time when there are great divisions in this body on so many substantive issues that the American people want us to address, be it immigration reform or addressing our budget deficit, or be it within the realm of education, replacing No Child Left Behind or ESEA with an education law that makes sense for our country, or the Higher Education Act, at least we are able to come together around innovation and removing barriers that currently exist to innovations in higher education that promise to improve the quality and help certify the quality of what students learn, and at the same time reduce costs and allow students more options and choices with regard to how they can pursue an advanced degree or particular content knowledge that can help them achieve the job of their dreams.

While I am pleased that Secretary Duncan and the administration have allowed some programs to explore this model through the Experimental Sites Initiative, this bill is even more important today because we will not only expand to 20 sites the number of sites that will be allowed to experiment with regard to competency-based education, but just as importantly, we will provide a more enduring, bipartisan imprint on this important innovative policy.

We live in a very exciting time, Mr. Chairman, and technology promises to help us reinvent both kindergarten through 12th-grade education, as well as higher education, in ways that benefit American families. But we must adopt our legal framework to ensure that that happens.

Rather than continue to exclusively reward time that sits in seats with a professor up front lecturing, we need to make sure we are inclusive enough and allow innovation that allows students to proceed at their own pace, in their homes, so long as they can demonstrate they can master the knowledge that is the goal of the course.

Employers benefit, which is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this bill, by knowing that students have achieved content area knowledge of the course. Universities like Colorado State University in Fort Collins benefit because through the auxiliary institution they are able to offer even

more varieties of courses to both their on-campus students as well as the surrounding community.

Most importantly, students and families benefit by having more choices and being able to afford a college education at a time when it is increasingly important in the global economy.

Competency-based education can increase quality and decrease costs, when done right. In allowing innovation and experimentation, we will learn what doesn't work and we will learn what does work. There are good ways to do it, and there are ways that fall short. But to be able to get to that answer that to employers and universities and families and our country offers so much promise, we need to allow this innovation to occur and change the restrictive laws that currently lock the bulk of funding into the seat time requirements of the Carnegie units.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Chairman KLINE, Representative SALMON, and others for working to craft this bipartisan bill that will increase both access and innovation in higher education.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 3136 to support competency-based education and provide contemporary students with the ability to attain a degree that is based on their knowledge and skills instead of how long they are sitting in a seat.

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

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

Again, I want to thank the authors of this bill, with particular emphasis on Mr. SALMON, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. BROOKS. A lot of people worked on this, though. My colleague, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. MILLER, and I have talked about the advantages of moving forward with innovation and new ideas, because that is what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

Colleges and universities are changing—or trying to change—the model, the model which, as Mr. POLIS pointed out, is based on how much time you sit in a seat, not what you have learned and not what competency you have.

□ 1515

It has been pointed out by a couple of speakers today that we are now dealing with a different student body than we have in the past. These are contemporary students. I guess that is our way of saying they are not the traditional students of the high school seniors who graduate and go off to 4 or 5 or 6 years of college. These are people, many times, who have come back, looking for a second career, a second chance, a new opportunity, and—yes, Mr. Chairman—looking for lower costs. This bill addresses all of that in order to give more students, more people, more families a chance—an opportunity—and a way to do it at a lower cost.

I know my friend and colleague Mr. POLIS has a couple of times mentioned his concerns about sleep for students. That may have something to do with a new baby in the family, but he makes a good point that these are families and that they have children and that they have jobs, and they need to be able to demonstrate that they have the skills and the knowledge to go forward and get that degree or certificate.

I am very, very pleased with this bill. I will emphasize that it is not the complete reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We need to continue to move to get that done, but it is an important first step, and I am pleased that this bill was the first step. It has strong bipartisan support and strong recognition in the administration, in Congress, and in colleges and universities that this is the direction we need to go.

As the ranking member pointed out, the demonstration projects part of this is important because, while we are thrilled with enthusiasm about the potential here, we need these projects to demonstrate what works well and what, perhaps, doesn't work as well as we had hoped.

So I am excited about this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I would like to see a very big bipartisan vote for this because I know that is where the thought is, and I am enthusiastic about it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3136, the ''Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act.''

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER of the House Rules Committee for their management of the debate on the rule for H.R. 3136.

I thank Congressmen POLIS and SALMON for their bipartisan work to draft this bill that the House is considering.

Chairman KLINE and Congressman POLIS, thank you for managing the debate the debate on H.R. 3136.

I appreciate and thank the bipartisan effort led by Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member FOXX, and the sponsors of H.R. 3136.

My appreciation to the Education Committee staff who worked with my staff on the Jackson Lee Amendment and for the Education Committee's support of the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 3136.

As founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I am committed to seeing that every child and young person has the opportunity to grow up in a stable and safe home.

The first step for a safe and healthy childhood is the stability of the lives of adults in the lives of children.

I will speak more on the Jackson Lee Amendment when it is considered by the full House later today. The Jackson Lee Amendment would direct the Secretary of Education to conduct outreach to a number of underrepresented institutions regarding the federal education pilot grant program prior to the deadline for applications to be submitted for consideration for grant funds under the pilot program.

This bill does not do everything that I would hope that a higher education bill would do, but it is a step in the right direction. It would create more opportunities for Americans to have access to more high quality education; flexible higher education opportunities that can meet their education needs—which can open up a world of opportunities for older college students or those who struggle to receive degrees while raising children and working full time jobs.

H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act will support federally funded pilot programs at secondary schools for Competency-Based Education programs that work to create certainty when a student progresses through a program that they are ready for the next step in their education.

We know that not everyone learns in the same way or at the same pace, but it is important that learning occurs. Adults have added pressures when they want to pursue education to compete for better paying jobs.

These programs may offer options that are not based on the traditional semester approach to classroom work, but on the steps that must be completed to move from one level of a training or education program to another.

Competence in any subject should be the foundation of education of students. If a student is returning to the classroom after years of work experience, this approach would best prepare them for being job ready upon graduation.

Competence-Based Education plans will aid students to master the lessons learned and enhance the student's educational experience, which will result in the maximum benefit to the student.

The challenge for the United States in the coming years is the STEM challenge—we have far more jobs in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics available than people who are trained or educated to fill them.

The future of the economy is in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math careers.

The growth in STEM jobs is 3 times faster than job growth in non-STEM jobs.

Minority college students who major in STEM higher education make 25% more than minority graduates with non-STEM educations.

Minority students who take STEM jobs make 50% more than minority non-STEM graduates.

Women pursuing STEM higher education drop out of programs with higher grades than males who remain and graduate.

More than two-thirds of all STEM positions are filled by someone with a STEM degree.

Because of the current shortage of STEM workers for STEM positions and the projected need for STEM trained employees, the Federal government is in a race to attract and retain STEM employees.

According to Booze Hamilton's The Biggest Bang Theory, nearly a 25% of federal government employees are people who work STEM positions.

Stem workers earn 26% more than non-STEM graduates.

By 2018 we will need: 710,000 Computing workers, 160,000 Engineers, 70,000 Physical Scientists, 40,000 Life Science workers, and 20,000 Mathematics workers.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues vote in support of H.R. 3136.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I submit an amendment to H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act. My Amendment would require the Secretary of Education to report to Congress, once every ten years, the needs of limited English proficient students using the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

Mr. Chair, I represent a substantial number of new Americans who have worked very hard to provide for their families and make a better life for their children. These children have worked hard, made good grades, and have earned their way into college. Like most Americans, they need help affording college. FAFSA, the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, is the key form that students and their parents need to fill out to determine the federal financial aid they qualify for.

Applying for financial aid can be a difficult and confusing process for any student. When students and their families don't understand the financial obligations associated with student loans, they often waste their own money and government dollars.

This is a particular problem for newer American students and their families, who can face significant language barriers when using FAFSA. These families often end up relying on for-profit companies that charge hundreds of dollars to help translate this free application.

My amendment is an important step towards addressing the issues facing limited English proficient students. By requiring the Department of Education to report to Congress, we ensure greater transparency from the Administration on how they serve the needs of these students.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–52. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 3136

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) PROJECTS.—Part G of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 486A the following:

''SEC. 486B. COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

''(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall select, in accordance with subsection (c), eligible entities to voluntarily carry out competency-based education demonstration projects and receive waivers described in subsection (d) to carry out such projects.

''(b) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring to carry out a demonstration project under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

''(2) AMENDMENTS.—An eligible entity may submit to the Secretary amendments to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1), at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, which the Secretary shall approve or deny within 15 days of receipt.

''(3) CONTENTS.—Each application shall include—

''(A) a description of the competency-based education to be offered by the eligible entity under the demonstration project;

''(B) a description of the proposed academic delivery, business, and financial models for the demonstration project, including explanations of how competency-based education offered under the demonstration project would—

''(i) result in the achievement of competencies;

''(ii) differ from standard credit hour approaches, in whole or in part; and

''(iii) result in lower costs or shortened time to degree, certificate, or credential completion;

''(C) a description of how the competency-based education offered under the demonstration project will progress a student toward completion of a degree, certificate, or credential;

''(D) a description of how the eligible entity will articulate the transcript from the competency-based education demonstration project to another program within an institution of higher education that is part of the eligible entity or to another institution of higher education;

''(E) a description of the statutory and regulatory requirements described in subsection (d) for which the eligible entity is seeking a waiver, and why such waiver is necessary to carry out the demonstration project;

''(F) a description of how the eligible entity will develop and evaluate the competencies and assessments of student knowledge (which may include prior-learning assessments) administered as part of the demonstration project, including how such competencies and assessments are aligned with workforce needs;

''(G) a description of the proposal for determining a student's Federal student aid eligibility under this title for participating in the demonstration project, the award and distribution of such aid, and safeguards to ensure that students are making satisfactory progress that warrants disbursement of such aid;

''(H) a description of the students to whom competency-based education will be offered, including an assurance that the demonstration project will enroll a minimum of 50 and a maximum of 3,000 students;

''(I) an assurance that students participating in the demonstration project will not be eligible for more Federal assistance under this title than such students would have been eligible for under a traditional program; and

''(J) an assurance the eligible entity will identify and disseminate best practices with respect to the demonstration project to other eligible entities carrying out a demonstration project under this section.

''(c) SELECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall select not more than 20 eligible entities to carry out a competency-based education demonstration project under this section.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting eligible entities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) prioritize projects which show promise in reducing the time or cost required to complete a degree, certificate, or credential;

''(B) consider the number and quality of applications received;

''(C) consider an eligible entity's—

''(i) ability to successfully execute the demonstration project as described in the eligible entity's application under subsection (b);

''(ii) commitment and ability to effectively finance the demonstration project;

''(iii) ability to provide administrative capability and the expertise to evaluate student progress based on measures other than credit hours or clock hours; and

''(iv) commitment to work with the Secretary to evaluate the demonstration project and the impact of the demonstration project;

''(D) ensure the selection of a diverse group of eligible entities with respect to size, mission, and geographic distribution of the eligible entities;

''(E) not limit the types of programs of study or courses of study approved for participation in a demonstration project; and

''(F) not select an eligible entity that has had, for 1 of the preceding 2 fiscal years—

''(i) a cohort default rate (defined in section 435(m)) that is 30 percent or greater; and

''(ii) a borrowing rate of loans under this title of more than 50 percent of the students enrolled at institutions of higher education of the eligible entity.

''(d) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive for any eligible entity selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section any requirements of the following provisions of law (including any regulations promulgated under such provisions) or regulations and for which the eligible entity has provided a reason for waiving under subsection (b)(3)(E):

''(1) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 102(a)(3).

''(2) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 481, as such subsections relate to requirements for a minimum number of weeks of instruction.

''(3) Section 484(l)(1).

''(4) Section 668.32(a)(1)(iii) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(5) Any of the requirements under provisions in title I, part F of this title, or this part, that inhibit the operation of competency-based education, including requirements with respect to—

''(A) documenting attendance;

''(B) weekly academic activity;

''(C) minimum weeks of instructional time;

''(D) requirements for credit hour or clock hour equivalencies;

''(E) requirements for substantive interaction with faculty; and

''(F) definitions of the terms 'academic year', 'full-time student', 'term' (including 'standard term', 'non-term', and 'non-standard term'), 'satisfactory academic progress', 'educational activity', 'project of study', and 'payment period'.

''(e) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall make available to the authorizing committees and the public a list of eligible entities selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section, which shall include for each such eligible entity—

''(1) the specific statutory and regulatory requirements being waived under subsection (d); and

''(2) a description of the competency-based education programs of study or courses of study to be offered under the project.

''(f) INFORMATION AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that carries out a demonstration project under this

section shall provide to the Director of the Institution of Education Sciences with respect to the students participating in the competency-based education project carried out by the eligible entity the following information:

''(i) The average number of credit hours the students earned prior to enrollment in the demonstration project, if applicable.

''(ii) The number and percentage of students participating in the demonstration project that are also enrolled in programs of study or courses of study offered in credit hours or clock hours, disaggregated by student status as a first-year, second-year, third-year, fourth-year, or other student.

''(iii) The average period of time between the enrollment of a student in the demonstration project and the first assessment of student knowledge of such student.

''(iv) The average time to 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, and 100 percent of the completion of a degree, certificate, or credential by a student who participated in the demonstration project.

''(v) The percentage of assessments of student knowledge that students passed on the first attempt, during the period of the participation in the demonstration project by the students.

''(vi) The percentage of assessments of student knowledge that students passed on the second attempt and the average period of time between the first and second attempts by students, during the period of the participation in the demonstration project by the students.

''(vii) The average number of competencies a student acquired while participating in the demonstration project and the period of time during which the student acquired such competencies.

''(viii) Such other information as the Director may reasonably require.

''(B) DISAGGREGATION.—Each eligible entity shall provide the information required under subparagraph (A) disaggregated by age, race, gender, disability status, and status as a recipient of a Federal Pell Grant, provided that the disaggregation of the information does not identify any individual student participating in the demonstration project.

''(2) EVALUATION.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, in consultation with the Secretary, shall annually evaluate each demonstration project under this section. Each evaluation shall include—

''(A) the extent to which the eligible entity has met the goals set forth in its application to the Secretary;

''(B) the number and types of students participating in the competency-based education offered under the project, including the progress of participating students toward completion of a degree, certificate, or credential, and the extent to which participation and retention in such project increased;

''(C) whether the project led to reduced cost or time to completion of a degree, certificate, or credential, and the amount of cost or time reduced for such completion;

''(D) obstacles related to student financial assistance for competency-based education;

''(E) the extent to which statutory or regulatory requirements not waived under subsection (d) present difficulties for students or institutions of higher education;

''(F) degree, certificate, or credential completion rates;

''(G) retention rates;

''(H) total cost and net cost to the student of the competency-based education offered under the project;

''(I) a description of the assessments of student knowledge and the corresponding competencies; and

''(J) outcomes of the assessments of student knowledge.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall annually provide to the authorizing committees a report on—

''(A) the evaluations of the demonstration projects required under paragraph (2);

''(B) the number and types of students receiving assistance under this title for competency-based education under such projects;

''(C) the retention and completion rates of students participating in such projects;

''(D) any proposed statutory or regulatory changes designed to support and enhance the expansion of competency-based education, which may be independent of or combined with traditional credit hour or clock hour projects;

''(E) the most effective means of delivering competency-based education through demonstration projects; and

''(F) the appropriate level and distribution methodology of Federal assistance under this title for students enrolled in competency-based education.

''(g) OVERSIGHT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall, on a continuing basis—

''(1) assure compliance of eligible entities with the requirements of this title (other than the provisions of law and regulations that are waived under subsection (d));

''(2) provide technical assistance;

''(3) monitor fluctuations in the student population enrolled in the eligible entities carrying out the demonstration projects under this section; and

''(4) consult with appropriate accrediting agencies or associations and appropriate State regulatory authorities for additional ways of improving the delivery of competency-based education.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section:

''(1) COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION.—The term 'competency-based education' means an educational process or program that measures knowledge, skills, and experience through assessments of such knowledge, skills, or experience in place of or in addition to the use of credit hours or clock hours.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) an institution of higher education;

''(B) a system of institutions of higher education; or

''(C) a consortium of institutions of higher education.

''(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 102, except that such term does not include institutions described in section 102(a)(1)(C).''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to alter the authority of the Secretary of Education to establish experimental sites under any other provision of law.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Department of Education, $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–546. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 6, insert ''that has been selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section'' after ''eligible entity''.

Page 2, line 8, insert ''approved'' before ''application''.

Page 8, line 15, strike ''Institution'' and insert ''Institute''.

Page 13, line 12, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 13, line 16, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 13, after line 16, insert the following:

''(5) collect and disseminate to eligible entities carrying out a demonstration project under this section, best practices with respect to demonstration projects under this section.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I offer this amendment in close cooperation with my colleague, the ranking member, Mr. MILLER.

This manager's amendment clarifies that eligible entities that have been selected to carry out demonstration projects may submit amendments to their approved applications. It requires the Secretary of Education to collect and disseminate demonstration project best practices to eligible entities carrying out such projects, and it makes technical corrections.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment, and we offer it together to improve this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this manager's amendment would bolster the Department of Education's ability to help identify and share best practices from experimentation at demonstration project sites.

Really, through this careful review and analysis, lawmakers can be sure that competency-based education is working and can identify any future

policy issues that would need to come back to us or others at the State level.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so we can move one step closer to making colleges more affordable and accessible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider the Walberg amendment next, out of order, and then to return to the original order as a courtesy to a Member.

The CHAIR. A change in the order of the amendments would have to be accomplished in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman's request cannot be entertained.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas, I have an amendment at the desk, the Jackson Lee amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

''(2) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall, prior to any deadline to submit applications under paragraph (1), conduct outreach to historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, nontribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide those institutions with information on the opportunity to apply to carry out a demonstration project under this section.

Page 2, line 6, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 2, line 12, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this amendment that Ms. JACKSON LEE thoughtfully put together.

This amendment would ensure that the Department of Education is reaching out to colleges and systems that educate minority, low-income, or students with special needs.

Some of those who stand to benefit the most under this innovation are first-generation college goers for whom cost is a major barrier to success. Minority-serving institutions are a critical thread in the fabric of America, and they should be included when experimenting with promising new education models.

Competency-based education programs are self-paced, helping ensure that students can work while they are in school, helping students who need a little more time to catch up or to learn concepts succeed and achieve at the highest levels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I don't intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. I see that the author has arrived.

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

Mr. POLIS. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas will control the balance of the time of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, may I determine what time is left, please.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. First of all, let me thank the managers of this legislation, who have really brought together an important concept, and I just want to call the name of the bill: the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am a big supporter of pilots because pilots provide information, and information generates a concrete program.

Mr. POLIS, thank you so very much for bringing up my amendment, and thank you both, the chairman and the ranking member, for supporting this amendment.

Let me be very keen on what it is both to Chairman KLINE and to Mr. POLIS. This is to take what you have and to add to it or, I might say, to make it better. The reason is that information is a gift. If you have information, you can do a lot of things.

Mr. Chairman, I work with a lot of Historically Black Colleges, so the Jackson Lee amendment would direct the Secretary of Education, prior to any deadlines for colleges or universities to submit applications for the consideration in the pilot program, to conduct outreach to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, nontribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide information to them on the opportunity to apply to carry out a pilot demonstration project under this bill.

It is a whole gamut of individuals and colleges that this bill is directed to engage. Yes, there is general information, but I will tell you, when information is targeted, there are great successes that occur.

In my State alone, Texas ranks 43 out of 50 in State rankings with a 61.3 percent high school graduation rate. This statistic alone shows the need for dramatic improvements in our own system. However, there are great institutions that serve Native Americans, Hispanic-serving and African American, such as Texas Southern University and A&M. This outreach to them would provide these educators with working class residents the opportunity to get the right kind of information in order to develop competency-based education.

Texas Southern University has a technology program that trains young people for the new industries of today. They have a School of Public Affairs named after Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, our colleagues here in the United States Congress. They have a transportation department, which is very much geared toward the new opportunities for transportation. Then, of course, they are into science, as I indicated, as well as technology and math.

We have sent out these brilliant graduates, and this pilot program in helping their faculty and helping the university would be a great start. My amendment is to give them the knowledge to be part of the solution.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is information to be part of the solving of the problems. I want more students to graduate from high school, and I want them to have opportunities broad based.

Let me close on this note.

Many people ask about the value of Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic-serving, Native American institutions. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? There are enough students who are not in college today who will fill all of the universities. All of these universities have a rightful place, and the history of Historically Black Colleges in their traveling through the years of postslavery is a great opportunity to continue to serve. Now, with Native American-serving institutions and Hispanic-serving institutions, I am delighted that this amendment is put before this body.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which will create more opportunity and more outreach.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer the Jackson Lee Amendment that adds critical language to this bill.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and Congressman POLIS for their work in managing the debate on the rule for H.R. 3136.

I thank my colleague Congressman POLIS for his authorship of the bill and his leadership in working in a bipartisan way with the Education Committee to provide on this legislation that would address the education needs of non-tradition College and university students.

I appreciate and thank the bipartisan work the Education Committee staff who worked with my staff on the Jackson Lee Amendment, and for the Education Committee's support of the Jackson Lee Amendment.

The Jackson Lee amendment is simple, and would further the goals of the bill.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would direct the Secretary of Education prior to any deadlines for colleges or universities to submit applications for consideration in the pilot program to conduct outreach to historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, non-tribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide information to them on the opportunity to apply to carry out a pilot demonstration project under this bill.

Texas ranks 43rd out of the 50 in state rankings with a 61.3 percent high school graduation rate. This statistic alone shows the need for dramatic improvements to Texas' education system.

There will be adults who will benefit from the programs supported by this bill by creating education options that consider that some adults who may want to pursue a degree may need to first receive a GED.

The Texas Southern University located in my Congressional District will benefit from the outreach in making timely information available to the institution regarding the competency-based education demonstration projects Pilot program created by the bill.

TSU is uniquely situated in the heart of a community that it has served the education needs of for decades.

Institutions like TSU provide great educations to working class residents of Houston that is affordable, which means they often do not have Washington, DC based offices and may not receive notice of this opportunity unless efforts are made to conduct outreach to them.

Because of TSU's size it is within their scope and experience to develop a competency-based education pilot program that breaks the learning process down into stages that will attract students who may be unemployed, underemployed or considering a career change from the surrounding residential community where the TSU is located.

The institutions that may benefit from the inclusion of the Jackson Lee Amendment could reach students who are late in life—but still dream of earning a degree, but think that it is far out of reach.

Education programs that support training in a trade would be strengthened through this bill by ensuring that students are job ready upon completion of a certification or education program.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson Lee Amendment the H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act.

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

The gentlewoman's amendment will help advance this goal by ensuring that a number of diverse institutions are aware of the opportunity to carry out an innovative, competency-based demonstration project.

I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike ''An eligible'' and insert the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible''.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

''(B) EXPANDING ENROLLMENT.—Notwithstanding the assurance required with respect to maximum enrollment under paragraph (3)(H)—

''(i) an eligible entity whose demonstration project has been evaluated under subsection (f)(2) not less than twice may submit to the Secretary an amendment to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1) to increase enrollment in the project to more than 3,000 students, but not more than 5,000 students, and which shall specify—

''(I) the proposed maximum enrollment or annual enrollment growth for the project;

''(II) how the eligible entity will successfully carry out the project with such maximum enrollment or enrollment growth; and

''(III) any other amendments to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1) that are related to such maximum enrollment or enrollment growth; and

''(ii) the Secretary shall determine whether to approve or deny an amendment submitted under clause (i) for a demonstration project based on the project's evaluations under subsection (f)(2).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, with the dramatic rise in the cost of obtaining a college degree which we have witnessed over the last decade, it has become even more important to focus on ways to remove Federal roadblocks which prevent efforts to make higher education less costly.

H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, represents one of the innovative steps promoted by the House Education and the Workforce Committee to ensure we actually measure what students are learning, not just the time they have spent sitting in a class.

My amendment builds on this approach and will allow participating entities in the demonstration projects to expand an approved project to a maximum of 5,000 students.

To ensure accountability and program quality, any entity wishing to expand a project must provide the Secretary a new proposed maximum number of students, a description of how the project will successfully carry out the expanded enrollment, and a description of any other amendments to the initial application related to the new enrollment number.

The small-scale expansion allowed by my amendment will help institutions develop techniques for increasing their competency-based education projects so more students can realize the benefits of a self-paced, lower-cost degree.

This approach will also help inform policymakers and the public of what projects are doing the best job at advancing this innovative education delivery model.

I want to thank Representative SALMON and Chairman KLINE for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Walberg amendment would allow institutions that have shown success with their demonstration projects to increase the number of students that can participate in their programs, helping to scale and allow more students to benefit.

By increasing the number of students in successful programs, we can better get a sense of how successful programs can be brought to scale.

Institutions should be rewarded with the ability to run a more robust demonstration project if their programs are reducing costs, improving quality, shortening time to degree. We should make sure that they are allowed to expand and remove any barriers to that.

Therefore, I am proud to join my colleague in support of the Walberg amendment. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so that institutions will be able to run more robust and scalable demonstration projects.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. MCNERNEY, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike ''and''.

Page 4, line 22, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 4, after line 22, insert the following

''(K) A description of the population of students served by the eligible entity that are veterans or members of the Armed Forces and how such eligible entity will, when appropriate, incorporate the specific needs of such population when carrying out the demonstration project.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the McNerney amendment. This amendment will require participating institutions to show how they are addressing the needs of veterans and members of the Armed Forces in their demonstration project.

Americans with military experience, both present or in their past, stand to benefit tremendously from competency-based education because they leave the military with a wide range of practicable, demonstrable, and marketable skills.

I have talked to so many veterans in my district who felt that they received excellent education within the military around a particular task, but get no credit for that with regard to the demonstrable skills that they have achieved. This amendment will help that occur.

Ensuring that institutions report more on how veterans and members of the Armed Forces are performing in demonstration projects will help highlight those who have served our country to the Department of Education so we can better identify best practices and expand best practices to those who have served.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am excited about this amendment. There has been much discussion about things that we can do to help our American heroes, to help those veterans who have served and/or are serving. Many of these veterans and servicemembers are seeking higher educational opportunities, and many of them, while they have limited time due to work and family, they have skills. They have education. They have competency. So this competency-based education is almost tailor-made for them.

I want to urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill to help not only these American heroes, but students across the country.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER, as well as the bill's author, Representative SALMON, for their joint efforts and leadership on this bipartisan piece of legislation, H.R. 3136.

Millions of American families share a common goal of sending their children to college. However, the cost of a college education continues to escalate, making it prohibitive for too many middle class families.

Promoting innovative ideas that provide institutions the flexibility will be essential in an evolving education system and learning environment. H.R. 3136 is a step in the right direction.

The bill seeks to change the ways that institutions have historically used credit hours to measure student progress and the awarding of financial aid, among other things.

The bill incorporates new innovative practices in higher education by allowing students to advance academically by demonstrating competence in a subject rather than by spending a set amount of time in a classroom.

While H.R. 3136 specifies a range of criteria that applications must fulfill to run a competency-based project, it is important that military and veteran populations are also taken into consideration.

That is why I am offering an amendment that requires an applicant, under this program, to provide information on the number of veterans and military students it has, and to include how it incorporates those particular student needs into its demonstration project.

Servicemembers and veterans often require flexibility in the pursuit of their education goals. We owe it to these brave young men and women, upon their returning from service, to help them pursue higher education as seamlessly as possible.

I believe that my amendment will help keep track of these progresses that a veteran and the military student populations are making in any new competency-based program, and to hold these programs accountable for the progress of veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional speakers on this side. I reserve the right to close.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KLINE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused about who has the right to close.

The CHAIR. Where there is no qualifying opponent, the gentleman from Colorado has the right to close on his amendment.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the chair of the committee, and others in encouraging my colleagues to support the McNerney and Polis amendment, so that veterans and members of the Armed Forces today can be better served by these demonstration projects and stand to benefit from the education they receive within the military itself.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 1, strike ''20'' and insert ''30''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, technical amendment that seeks to increase the maximum number of eligible entities authorized to participate in the competency-based demonstration project established by H.R. 3136 from 20 to 30.

As a former member of the Alabama State Board of Education and chancellor of Alabama's 2-year college system, I commend my colleague and fellow member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. SALMON of Arizona, for introducing this innovative legislation.

In today's world, we cannot continue to regard higher education as a one-size-fits-all process. As our economy continues to recover, higher education

institutions continue to see a large influx of students who are seeking to further their education after years in the workforce.

At the same time, our K–12 school systems are becoming more innovative, incorporating cutting-edge technologies and allowing for dual-enrollment and workforce training opportunities prior to graduation.

For these reasons, many students are arriving at higher education institutions with a variety of different skills in place but must still complete a prerequisite amount of courses before earning a degree, regardless of their competency in certain areas of study.

Unfortunately, the cost of higher education continues to rise, as does student loan debt. The competency-based demonstration project authorized by H.R. 3136 will allow students to gear their financial aid towards actual learning opportunities, versus simply checking off courses that may not be applicable to their needs, and logging seat time.

My basic amendment would simply allow for a more full-bodied and diverse sample of participating institutions to ensure that this demonstration project creates a truly representative sample of higher education opportunities.

This increase should improve the ability to analyze how such an approach could affect flexibility for institutions, while providing a more personalized, cost-effective education for a variety of different students.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. BYRNE's amendment would increase the number of institutions or consortiums allowed to participate in the demonstration project. Including more high-quality institutions in the demonstration project will yield more information and more innovation on the benefits and risks of competency-based education.

Including more institutions will accelerate the amount of experimentation and, therefore, the amount of learning that we as policymakers have, and also help increase the likelihood of identifying successful best practices to reduce college costs more quickly.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so that more institutions can experiment with innovative, new, cost-effective education models.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. At this time, with America, we have so many opportunities before us, but we have to make sure that the people in our society, and the people that are coming through some difficult circumstances, have opportunities that didn't exist before.

These sorts of innovations provide opportunities for them and for institutions of higher education to figure out where we need to go in the future so that we deliver the product of higher education in the way it needs to be delivered and received by those that can benefit the most.

□ 1545

So I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. AMODEI, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 105, REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider House Concurrent Resolution 105 in the House, if called up by the Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee;

that the amendment printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1 be considered as adopted;

that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be considered as read;

and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3136.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly take the chair.

□ 1547

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–546 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 9 insert the following:

''(B) EMPLOYMENT DATA.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that carries out a demonstration project under this section may provide to the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences with respect to the students participating in the competency-based education project carried out by the eligible entity the number and percentage of students completing a competency-based education program or course of study offered by such eligible entity who find employment in a field related to the program or course of study of such students.

''(ii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall, at the request of an eligible entity, provide technical assistance to such eligible entity to assist such eligible entity in collecting and reporting accurate information relating to the employment of students participating in a competency-based education project carried out by such eligible entity.

Page 10, line 10, strike ''(B)'' and insert ''(C)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, thank the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SALMON, as well as

Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for their work in bringing this very important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow entities receiving funds under this bill to report the number and percentage of students who are able to find employment in a field relating to their program or course of study and would allow the director of IES to provide technical assistance to such entities upon request.

Basically, my intent is to give situational awareness to both educators and students and also an understanding of how well our dollars being spent in terms of educating both our young people and people who are looking for a second career, looking for other job opportunities, so that they know that their time and effort will be well spent.

I am proud to be joined in offering this amendment by my good friend and colleague, Congressman G.T. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, as cochairs of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus.

Representative THOMPSON and I are committed to providing all students with the information necessary to make informed career decisions.

Many of the students who will be served by this bill are nontraditional students, working parents, students with full-time jobs, and many others who are seeking a different education than what a traditional 4-year curriculum affords, so these are the very people who would benefit the most from clear and accessible career market information.

It has become obvious that high school diplomas are really no longer sufficient training for the modern job market, and while not every job will require a college degree, some sort of postsecondary education will be necessary, and students, Mr. Chairman, deserve accurate information to help them find the career pathway that best fits their goals and abilities.

My amendment will help these students by encouraging schools to report on the number of students who are able to use their education to find a relevant career, data that students will be able to use in the coming years to inform their own decisions and choose an academic path that will lead to a well-paying job.

This amendment has been scored by the CBO as budget-neutral and will not result in any additional spending.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while claiming the time in opposition, I rise as a supporter and cosponsor of this bipartisan amendment with my colleague and fellow cochairman of the House Career and Technical Education Caucus, Congressman LANGEVIN.

Our amendment would allow eligible entities to submit to the Institute of Education Sciences information regarding the number and percentage of students who are able to find employment, jobs in a field relating to their program or course of study.

This will provide for the collection of longitudinal data and will allow policymakers to have a further understanding of course study and career alignment, but more importantly, students will be able to utilize these findings to see what courses of study have a higher prevalence of job placement.

Mr. Chairman, I often say, ''It is not where you start out in life, but it is where you end up,'' and education is the key to that journey.

This amendment will further assist students participating in competency-based programs, many of whom will be nontraditional students and will provide them with another opportunity to attain success in life.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, no-cost amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments and the exceptional work that he does and that we do collaboratively with respect to career and technical education, and I appreciate his cosponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, in closing, this amendment would help to give situational awareness to students, to educators, and to all those who want to understand, is the time and effort, the investment that people are making worth that investment, and is it a clear path forward, particularly for those who are looking for a new career or who are looking to, as we do right now, trying to close the skills gap that we have not only in my home State of Rhode Island, but across the country, as people are trying to get the right skills for the right jobs that are good paying going forward.

This will give them the data to understand the best career paths to follow, where it would be best to invest their time and their energy, as well as their resources.

So with that, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I just want to thank my colleague for his work and leadership on this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 17, strike ''(h)'' and insert ''(i)''.

Page 13, after line 16, insert the following:

''(h) DISCLOSURE OF AUTHORIZATION TO SELL STUDENT DATA.—An eligible entity carrying out a demonstration project under this section shall ensure that each institution of higher education of the eligible entity provides to each student, or the parents of each minor student, enrolled in the institution of higher education—

''(1) a disclosure letter, which describes the personally identifiable information of the student that may be sold by a person with whom the institution of higher education has an agreement to provide software applications for students; and

''(2) an option to opt-out of such personally identifiable information from being sold.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all the work that Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER have put into this bill.

My amendment today has to do with the issue of privacy. Listen, technology has been a great thing for America. It has allowed better communication and connectivity amongst our friends and our family members.

With email, cell phones, text, and pictures, we are able to share very intimate parts of our lives with those who are closest to us, but it is not always used with the purest of hearts. Many Americans, including many young Americans, have been concerned about the data collection that comes from the NSA about Americans' emails, texts, and phone records.

We have just learned recently about the information that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is collecting on the American citizenry. They are collecting information on nearly 600 to 800 million credit cards in America.

They are also teaming up with FHFA to form a database that collects information on Americans about their race, their religion, their sex, their payment history, their credit scores, the number of children that they have, their date of birth, their Social Security number.

They have access to all of this information, and I think most Americans would say that is too much information for the government to have.

It just doesn't happen in government though. It also happens in the private

sector, without Americans' permission or consent.

My amendment is narrowly focused on this demonstration project, but it requires those schools, universities, and colleges who participate that when they enter into an agreement with an outside company and that outside company can actually sell the personally identifiable information of students to third parties—whether it is for advertisement or just basic data collection for research—they actually have to give notice to the students that their information is going to be sold, and they have give an opportunity for the students to opt out, that their information not be sold to third-party vendors.

This is about empowering students, giving them the power and control over their personally identifiable information, and if they choose to have it sold, so be it. They give permission, just like when they make a post on Facebook or they send a tweet on Twitter, but if they don't give consent, let's not allow schools to take their information and sell it without their permission.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in support of our students across the country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the Duffy amendment, but do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require institutions participating in the demonstration project to provide a disclosure to students when companies can access and potentially sell students' personally identifiable information.

Students should always know when and how their personal information may be used or sold. This amendment would also allow students to opt out of any arrangement where their information could be sold, allowing them to maintain their privacy.

I have been very active on this issue of privacy in the K–12 space, where I challenged a group of industry leaders to come up with a statement of principles or a promise to parents that delineates clear language about what they are doing and not doing when it comes to housing student data.

I would certainly be pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin on this issue in the higher education space as well, to ensure that we are protecting the privacy of all students.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his amendment to ensure the continued protection and safety of students' personally identifiable information, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Listen, I would just make the point to my good friend from Colorado, this is common sense.

If you are able to take a poll of university students—college students and say: Listen, there is an amendment on the floor today that would give you power over your personally identifiable information so schools can't sell it and it can't be used for advertisement or data collection, would you support that amendment, to empower you with your personally identifiable information?

□ 1600

I think the answer would be a resounding ''yes.'' And I have worked with the committee to narrowly tailor this amendment specifically for this demonstration project.

Frankly, I am one who believes this should apply to colleges and universities across the board empowering students. I think if you talk to 20-year-olds and 24-year-olds around the country and what they think about the NSA infringing upon their privacy, they are the ones that were outraged by it.

So I think this makes sense. I guess I am disappointed in the opposition. I believe in our youth in America. I believe they should have the right to their data and how their data is used. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 1, insert before the semicolon at the end the following: ''including an institution of higher education that offers a dual-enrollment program under which a secondary school student is able simultaneously to earn credit toward a secondary school diploma and a postsecondary degree, certificate, or credential''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by recognizing and thanking my friend and chairman, JOHN KLINE from Minnesota, for his leadership not just on this bill, but on the whole jurisdiction of Education and the Workforce. I want to also thank the folks on the staff, Mr. Chairman, of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Mr. MILLER, and especially my friend PETER WELCH for working with me on this amendment.

The underlying bill, Mr. Chairman, as you know, seeks to support innovation in higher education by reenvisioning how regulators and institutions have measured student progress and student aid. This bill, Mr. Chairman, sets up demonstration projects to study the effect of competency-based education.

Our amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply permits participation of dual enrollment programs to be included in the demonstration projects created. As the chairman knows, many students—in fact, I am reluctant to cite statistics, but I think it is well north of 1 million students across our great country—have benefited in dual enrollment classes.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I live with a student that has benefited back home in Spartanburg, both at Dorman High School and, I know, Spartanburg High School. Probably other high schools have partnered with institutions of higher learning to prepare, Mr. Chairman, our children, number one, to be able to gauge the speed of the pitches in college—the pitchers pitch a little faster in college sometimes than they do in high school—but more significantly, and particularly for my daughter's friends, it enables them to go ahead and start getting college credit and reducing both their caseload and, more importantly, the cost when these children decide to matriculate.

The dual enrollment programs are widespread, and they deserve to be considered as part of the demonstration projects.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am in favor of it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. First of all, I do want to thank Mr. KLINE and Mr. MILLER for bringing this bill to the floor, and I want to thank the staffs for working with Mr. GOWDY and me on this amendment and an amendment to follow.

One of the things that brought Mr. GOWDY and me together is the concern about the cost of education, and I know that has been a major concern for the Education and the Workforce Committee. But one of the dilemmas that we have is that, if we put more money in as taxpayers—and I am a strong supporter of more grant and more aid for our colleges—but if every dollar we put in is a dollar increase in tuition, then the students are treading water and the taxpayers are treading water.

So what are some of the things that we can do to try and help give the flexibility to our institutions of higher learning the ability to actually accelerate graduation and, therefore, help potentially lower the cost?

Mr. GOWDY outlined what this competency-based learning amendment would do. It would reward students who have some ambition and get started early. It would allow college administrators to properly give credit for that serious effort on the part of students, and it might help reverse what has been a trend where a lot of students are taking more than 4 years to graduate and allow them the opportunity with their effort and discipline to graduate in less than 4 years. If you graduate in 3½ years, that is a significant savings to that family and that student who is borrowing money as a way of getting ahead in this society.

So I really appreciate the focus that the committee has had on this question and appreciate very much the work that Mr. GOWDY in trying to present to this body this amendment which will help, I think, facilitate the goal of making college more affordable. It is absolutely so essential to the young people of this country.

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

Mr. GOWDY. In summation, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank, again, the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, for his willingness to entertain other peoples' ideas for his hard work and the full book of business that they do on Education and the Workforce, and particularly the women and men who work so hard on the staff, and my friend from Vermont who is always open to areas of consensus and agreement and working across the aisle.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I would just say the same to Mr. GOWDY. I appreciate working with him on this and also on our Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of Ms. MENG.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, beginning line 16, redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (d).

Page 14, after line 15, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of Education shall report to Congress, every 10 years, on the needs of limited English proficient students using the Free Application for Federal Student Aid.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I am proud to rise in support of the Meng amendment.

This amendment would ensure that the Secretary of Education assesses the usability of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, which we always often call FAFSA, in the business for students with limited English proficiency. Access to student aid should always be free, but the technical form is often hard to understand and complete when a student's, or particularly their parents', first language isn't English. Frankly, I have looked at the form, and it is hard enough to understand in English, Mr. Chairman, as a native speaker.

Assessing the usability of the FAFSA every decade will allow the Department of Education to adapt the changing demographics at colleges across the country. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so students can have better and easier access to Federal student loan aid programs for free.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

SECTION 3. HIGHER EDUCATION REGULATORY REFORM TASK FORCE.

(a) TASK FORCE ESTABLISHED.—Not later than 2 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall establish the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force shall include—

(1) the Secretary of Education or the Secretary's designee;

(2) a representative of the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance established under section 491 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098); and

(3) representatives from the higher education community, including—

(A) institutions of higher education, with equal representation of public and private nonprofit institutions, and two-year and four-year institutions, and with not less than 25 percent of such representative institutions carrying out distance education programs; and

(B) nonprofit organizations representing institutions of higher education.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress and make available on a publicly available website a report (in this section referred to as the ''Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report'') prepared by the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force on Department of Education regulatory requirements for institutions of higher education described in paragraph (2).

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report shall contain the following with respect to Department of Education regulatory requirements for institutions of higher education:

(A) A list of rules that are determined to be outmoded, duplicative, ineffective, or excessively burdensome.

(B) For each rule listed in accordance with subparagraph (A) and that is in effect at the time of the review under subparagraph (A), an analysis of whether the costs outweigh the benefits for such rule.

(C) Recommendations to consolidate, modify, simplify, or repeal such rules to make such rules more effective or less burdensome.

(D) A description of the justification for and impact of the recommendations described in subparagraph (C), as appropriate and available, including supporting data for such justifications and the financial impact of such recommendations on institutions of higher education of varying sizes and types.

(E) Recommendations on the establishment of a permanent entity to review new Department of Education regulatory requirements affecting institutions of higher education.

(3) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—At least 30 days before submission of the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Education shall publish the report in the Federal Register for public notice and comment. The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force may modify the report in response to any comments received before submission of the report to Congress.

(d) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002), except that such term does not include institutions described in subsection (a)(1)(C) of such section 102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank Mr. KLINE and all the hardworking folks on Education and the Workforce, the Members and especially the women and men of the staff.

The Upstate of South Carolina, Mr. Chairman, is home to several higher education institutions, public and private, large and small, and the issue of education affordability is front and

center. And, frankly, Mr. Chairman, families are struggling trying to be able to plan for their kids' future.

I know that, both because I have the benefit of representing these families and I hear from them and I also know it anecdotally, Mr. Chairman. I have a 17-year-old daughter, and while she is blessed in many ways compared to her contemporaries, lots and lots of her friends come to the house from time to time. We preach to people that the road to prosperity is paved with hard work and education, but when this road is riddled with potholes called ''unsustainable debt,'' I don't know how we can expect them to get to the end.

You figure out what the cost of education is. In many of these instances, these children are the first ones in their family to try to go to school. And so they are looking at me. They have done well in high school. They have done everything we have asked them to do, and they are staring, in some instances, at massive amounts of debt just so they can do what we promised them that if you work hard and you get an education, the pathway to prosperity will be paved for you.

So against that backdrop, my friend from Vermont and I decided let's look at regulations and what impact they may have on the cost of higher education. Mr. Chairman, as you well know, you may conclude that a regulation is worth it. It may cost money, but it may still be worth it. That is fine. That is a separate analysis. But there really is no reason to not study the regulations themselves to see what impact they are having.

So I give a lot of credit to the gentleman from Vermont who approached me with his idea. I think it is a solid idea. I can't imagine any reason not to form a task force or a working group to study regulations and what impact, whether wittingly or unwittingly, those regulations are having on the cost of higher education.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am for the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, this question of college debt that my colleague, Mr. GOWDY, spoke about, that is brutal. It is not a red State-blue State deal, and it is not a Republican-Democratic deal. It is young people getting out of college with a mountain of debt, and they are starting out with the equivalent of a mortgage.

There has been an enormous amount of attention in this body to how to deal with that and a lot of debate about how to deal with it. I know Mr. MILLER has been a champion on this cause along with Mr. TIERNEY on our side and, I know, Mr. GOWDY and Mr. KLINE on the other side.

I have pushed back, to some extent, on our college administrators, because it is not just a matter of what taxpayers can afford to fund by way of grant and aid or what families can afford to put up from their hard-earned savings, it is a question of what will college administrators do to try to keep those tuition increases down. So we need the active participation of our college administrators.

When I talked to Mr. GOWDY, he talked to his folks, I guess the president of Clemson, and I spoke with the president of the University of Vermont and some of our other college leaders in Vermont, and they were somewhat resistant to the notion of our getting involved in what they saw as their job and made some complaints that regulations were causing them to have to spend money.

Now, sometimes that can be an excuse, but I think what Mr. GOWDY said is the right way to go. Let's take a look at them.

I happen to think there are times when you need law and you need regulation. Title IX has been a law that has done an immense amount of good for young women who want the full opportunity to be as athletic as young men, and that was a law that did real good. Sometimes regulations do good—but not always.

Instead of just having a debate about more regulation or no regulation, what Mr. GOWDY and I are saying is, hey, let's get the people who are affected by this from all sides, have them take a look at these things and come up with an analysis of this is working, this isn't working. Because as a person who is in favor of law and regulation in appropriate cases, I am against bad regulations that just get in the way of a good education and affordability.

So this doesn't stack the deck either way, but it does allow parties who are involved in having to deal with regulations to have a way of looking at them, assessing them, and making recommendations about them.

□ 1615

What I see as beneficial on this is that we are going to have this as a tool to get our college administrators more actively involved with us in what is, I think, an enormous challenge of our times, and that is make college affordable and sustainable for the hard-working families in your district, Mr. Chairman, and in my district and Mr. GOWDY's.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, in summation, reasonable minds can and I am quite certain will differ as to the propriety of certain regulations. I get that. I understand that. That is part of the beauty of our country. What I would think that all reasonable minds can concur on is that we ought to at least look at them and see what the numbers are. That will instruct and inform the debate as to whether or not the benefit is worthy of the cost.

So again, I want to thank Mr. KLINE and the folks on E&W, and I especially want to thank, again, my friend from Vermont for always being willing to listen to other people's ideas. And usually the ones I have he improves and makes them better.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my cosponsor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ___. STUDY ON USE OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS AS PRIMARY APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL STUDENT AID.

Section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C.1090) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) STUDY ON USE OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS AS PRIMARY APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL STUDENT AID.—

''(4) STUDY.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shall conduct a study on the feasibility and advantages and disadvantages of using individual income tax returns as the primary form of application for student aid under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

''(5) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner, shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Secretary of Education, in coordination with the IRS, to conduct a study on the feasibility of using individual income tax returns as the primary form of application for Federal student financial aid applications.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why American families are required to submit two exhaustive overviews of their financial situation

to the Federal Government each year if they have a family member who is seeking a student loan. Individual tax returns provide a complete picture of the taxpayer's financial situation. Why should they also be forced to fill out a secondary onerous financial aid form to the Department of Education as well?

In the past few years, the Department of Education has built an IRS data retrieval tool into the financial aid application form in order to reduce the amount of time spent completing the form. It is my hope that we can take this feature a step further.

I support efforts to streamline the financial aid process. I think that using one form already required of all income-earning Americans is the best way to do it.

My amendment today would simply ensure that Congress has all the information it needs in order to accomplish such a transition. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to streamline the student aid process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which requires the Secretary of Education to study the advantages and disadvantages of using IRS income data to complete a student's application for Federal aid is an idea that is growing in popularity.

Simplifying the Federal student aid application has been proposed by a number of our colleagues. As part of an effort to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, Representatives LARRY BUCSHON, MIKE KELLY, JOHN TIERNEY, TIM BISHOP, JARED POLIS, and ED ROYCE introduced H.R. 4982, Simplifying the Application For Student Aid Act, which addresses this issue as well. That bipartisan legislation would streamline and improve the student aid application process by allowing students to import into their application IRS income data from 2 years prior to the date of application. The gentleman's amendment today will help inform us how better to simplify this process. I thank him for offering the amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—413

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Campbell
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Nunnelee
Payne
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1649

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California, NEAL, FOSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. FATTAH, COTTON, and ISRAEL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 439 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, and, pursuant to House Resolution 677, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, in its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3136, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

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

SEC. ___. PROVIDING STUDENTS WITH REBATES TO LOWER THEIR EDUCATION COSTS.

(a) REBATES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Education may use funds made available under this section to provide a rebate to a borrower of a loan made under part B or part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) equal to the amount of savings the borrower would receive if the loan balance was refinanced at a rate equal to the rate that would be applicable to the loan if it were issued under such part D during the 12-month period beginning on July 1, 2013, and ending June 30, 2014.

(b) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS REQUIRED FOR REBATE.—The Secretary may only provide a rebate under subsection (a) to the extent that funds are appropriated in advance in an appropriations act for that purpose and shall only provide eligible borrowers a rebate on a first-come, first-served basis.

(c) APPLICATION.—Each borrower who seeks a rebate under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary not later than June 30, 2015.

(d) BASIS.—The Secretary shall calculate rebates provided to borrowers under this section to approximate the savings to the borrower of a refinanced-loan on a cash basis.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. KLINE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, student loan debt is at a crisis level in this country. Outstanding student loans now total more than $1.2 trillion, surpassing total credit card debt, and every year, students are taking on more. An estimated 71 percent of college seniors had debt in 2012, with an average outstanding balance of $29,400 for those who borrowed to get a bachelor's degree.

My constituents—and I am sure the constituents of my colleagues—are calling, emailing, posting on Facebook, and even approaching me on the street to share their stories about how they have been buried in student loan debt.

This debt is causing them to put on hold other life decisions, such as whether or not they can move out of their parents' home, whether or not they can buy a car, purchase their own home, get married, or even consider starting a family.

A young woman from Boxford, Massachusetts, wrote to me and said, ''I pay more than the minimum balance every month. I sacrifice daily for my loans. I live at home, have a 50-minute commute to work every day because I cannot afford to live on my own or even with roommates . . . I cannot have the dreams that I have dreamed of all my life. I'm 23, and I'm already telling myself that I can't own a house, that I will probably never have children because I can't afford to bring them into the world and take care of them when I can't even afford to live myself . . . That's what I live with every day. The anger, depression, and disbelief that I am forever stuck.''

Parents are calling and writing to me about the anxiety and concern they have about the debt their sons and daughters have accumulated. Some parents have even delayed their own retirement or made early withdrawals from their 401(k) to help with their children's student loan debt.

A mother from Middleton, Massachusetts, wrote to me and said, ''I have two children with multiple student loans. It is difficult enough to graduate, find a job in the field they desire, and to pay loans, rent, bills, et cetera. Please do all you can to make sure rates are not increased. My children may never afford to buy a house and live the American Dream because of college student loan debt.''

Mr. Speaker, those are just two examples from my district. I am sure there are untold others throughout this country. Millions are suffering this particular situation all across the Nation. We need to start listening to them. We need to start taking action on their behalf.

This motion is a modified version of the legislation that I filed in the House with Congressman GEORGE MILLER. It has over 130 cosponsors and the support of dozens of respected organizations. Senator ELIZABETH WARREN filed its counterpart in the Senate.

This motion is the functional equivalent of allowing for the responsible refinancing of student loans. We allow homeowners and car owners to refinance their loans to a lower interest rate.

Student loan borrowers should be able to do the same with their high interest loans—converting them into lower interest loans. Particularly right now, when interest rates are so low, they should be able to take advantage of that fact.

When you get right down to it, Mr. Speaker, the real question is: Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of the young woman from Boxford and the others of her generation who feel ''forever stuck''? Are we on the side of the mother from Middleton and the millions of Americans just like her who are concerned about their children's future?

Let's support this motion and show them we are on their side. Let's support this motion and show the tens of millions of students, graduates, parents, and middle class families, who would be able to refinance their loans at a lower interest rate and get their life started, that we are on their side.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand up and be counted. I ask Members to support this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' passion on this issue.

We have shown in this House, again and again, that we are willing and able

and have taken steps to help students pay for their loans. More importantly, we did that in a bipartisan way.

My colleagues may remember that last year, we all agreed it wasn't fair—it wasn't right—to double the rates students were already struggling to afford. We had a bipartisan solution to turn that interest rate determination over to the market, which much more accurately reflects the cost of that money, rather than politicians sitting around and making a decision.

□ 1700

We are taking action right now in the underlying bill to make it less costly for students to go to school to get their educations, to get their degrees, to get their certificates by advancing the competency-based education bill. We are open to discussing ways to help student borrowers manage the amount of debt they are taking on to finance their college degrees, but today, Mr. Speaker, is not the time, and this is not the place to have that discussion. This motion is, as is, frankly, always the case, a partisan move to score political points with a procedural vote.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill and vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 221, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—194

Barber	Cárdenas	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Brady (PA)	Clay	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Dingell
Broun (GA)	Clyburn	Doggett
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doyle
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Duckworth
Bustos	Conyers	Edwards
Butterfield	Cooper	Ellison
Capps	Costa	Engel
Capuano	Courtney	Enyart
Esty	Lowenthal	Rangel
Farr	Lowey	Richmond
Fattah	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Ruiz
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Ruppersberger
Fudge	Maffei	Rush
Gabbard	Maloney, Carolyn	Ryan (OH)
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda T.
Garamendi	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
Garcia	Matsui	Sarbanes
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Green, Al	McCollum	Schiff
Green, Gene	McDermott	Schneider
Grijalva	McGovern	Schrader
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Schwartz
Hahn	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Scott, David
Higgins	Meng	Serrano
Himes	Michaud	Sewell (AL)
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Holt	Moore	Sherman
Horsford	Moran	Sinema
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Israel	Nadler	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Neal	Speier
Johnson (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Takano
Jones	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Keating	Pallone	Tierney
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Titus
Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Kildee	Payne	Tsongas
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Kind	Peters (CA)	Vargas
Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Veasey
Kuster	Peterson	Vela
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Polis	Walz
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Waters
Levin	Quigley	Waxman
Lewis	Rahall	Welch
Lipinski		Wilson (FL)
Loebsack		Yarmuth
Lofgren		

NOES—221

Aderholt	DeSantis	Hultgren
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Amodei	Duffy	Hurt
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bachus	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins
Barletta	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Benishek	Fincher	Jolly
Bentivolio	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Joyce
Black	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Blackburn	Flores	King (IA)
Boustany	Forbes	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Bridenstine	Foxx	Kline
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Gardner	Lamborn
Bucshon	Garrett	Lance
Burgess	Gerlach	Lankford
Byrne	Gibbs	Latham
Calvert	Gibson	Latta
Camp	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Cantor	Goodlatte	Long
Capito	Gosar	Lucas
Carter	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Cassidy	Granger	Lummis
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Marino
Clawson (FL)	Griffin (AR)	Massie
Coble	Griffith (VA)	McAllister
Coffman	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Cole	Guthrie	McCaul
Collins (GA)	Hall	McClintock
Collins (NY)	Hanna	McHenry
Conaway	Harper	McKeon
Cook	Harris	McKinley
Cotton	Hartzler	McMorris Rodgers
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	Meadows
Crawford	Heck (NV)	Meehan
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Messer
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Daines	Holding	Miller (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Miller (MI)
Denham	Huelskamp	Miller, Gary
Dent	Huizenga (MI)	Mullin
		Mulvaney
		Murphy (PA)
		Neugebauer
		Noem
		Nugent
		Nunes
		Olson
		Palazzo
		Paulsen
		Pearce
		Perry
		Petri
		Pittenger
		Pitts
		Poe (TX)
		Pompeo
		Posey
		Price (GA)
		Reed
		Reichert
		Renacci
		Ribble
		Rice (SC)
		Rigell
		Roby
		Roe (TN)
		Rogers (AL)
		Rogers (KY)
		Rohrabacher
		Rokita
		Rooney
		Ros-Lehtinen
		Roskam
		Ross
		Rothfus
		Royce
		Runyan
		Ryan (WI)
		Salmon
		Sanford
		Scalise
		Schock
		Schweikert
		Scott, Austin
		Sensenbrenner
		Sessions
		Shimkus
		Shuster
		Simpson
		Smith (MO)
		Smith (NE)
		Smith (NJ)
		Southerland
		Stivers
		Stockman
		Stutzman
		Terry
		Thompson (PA)
		Thornberry
		Tiberi
		Tipton
		Turner
		Upton
		Valadao
		Wagner
		Walberg
		Walden
		Walorski
		Weber (TX)
		Webster (FL)
		Wenstrup
		Westmoreland
		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Barton	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (UT)	Heck (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Campbell	Honda	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Huffman	Stewart
Eshoo	Kingston	Wasserman Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1707

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KLINE. Can we get a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A timely request was not made. Is the gentleman prepared to ask for unanimous consent?

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a recorded vote.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, this will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—414

Aderholt	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Amash	Benishek	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bentivolio	Braley (IA)
Bachmann	Bera (CA)	Bridenstine
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Barber	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Barletta	Bishop (NY)	Broun (GA)
Barr	Black	Brown (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Blackburn	Brownley (CA)
Barton	Blumenauer	Buchanan
Bass	Bonamici	Bucshon
Beatty	Boustany	Burgess

Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Conyers
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1717

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 5171, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. CALVERT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–551) on the bill (H.R. 5171) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3393, STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4935, CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–552) on the resolution (H. Res. 680) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with title V of the Senate amendment (relating to health care related to sexual trauma); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

ENHANCING SERVICES FOR RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS VICTIMS OF YOUTH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5076) to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5076

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' before the semicolon at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' after ''assault'', and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting '', including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))'' before the semicolon at the end, and

(2) in section 351(a) by striking ''or sexual exploitation'' and inserting ''sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5076.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway And Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act, legislation I introduced to help better serve our most vulnerable youth who are the victims of extreme trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking is an issue that hits close to home for me. I represent parts of the city of Las Vegas and the surrounding suburbs. When people think of Las Vegas, they think of the lights, the magnificent hotels, shopping, fine dining, and nightlife. But the city's reputation as a national and international tourist destination, combined with the transient nature of the population, has made Las Vegas a prime target for human traffickers.

In fact, between 1994 and 2014, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department recovered 2,229 victims of sex trafficking. Just last year, Metro recovered 107 children victims of human trafficking.

All of us, Federal and State officials, law enforcement, the courts, all of us have a moral obligation to eradicate trafficking and support its victims. And it will take close coordination between all stakeholders to achieve the dual goals of ending the human trafficking epidemic and assisting the victims.

To help facilitate that coordination, I hosted representatives from Nevada's State government, law enforcement, the judiciary, and victims' rights groups for a roundtable discussion on ways to combat trafficking, and also offer more support to victims or potential victims.

At that roundtable I met Annie. She came to Las Vegas to make a better life for herself, and was, instead, ensnared in the sex industry. Thankfully, Annie got out.

This is how she described her life as a victim of human trafficking: ''I felt like a dirty, cheated, disrespected, violated, and worthless individual to society. I didn't know who Annie was anymore. I often wanted to end my own life.''

Now she is an advocate devoted to helping other victims of trafficking. One of the things that she and others at the roundtable talked about was the need for improved resources for victims' advocacy and support, especially for youth victims and at-risk youth.

To that end, I introduced H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act. My bill amends the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to enable the Secretary of Health and Human Services to apply existing grant resources to train staff on the effects of human trafficking on runaway and homeless youth victims, and for developing statewide strategies to reach such youth.

It also allows the Secretary to utilize the Street Outreach Program to provide street-based services for runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

Our Nation's runaway and homeless youth deserve access to services that will help them escape a life of crime, abuse, and neglect. By passing this simple fix to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, we can help ensure that those suffering from the trauma of these deplorable acts will have access to the care and support they need.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE of the Education and the Workforce Committee, as well as my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for working with me on this important piece of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2014. I am honored to have joined my colleagues, Mr. HECK and Mr. KLINE, and appreciate their leadership on this important issue.

Our bill makes an important change in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act so that victims of trafficking can be better served. We know that trafficking and youth homelessness often affect similar populations. Young people that have run away or are homeless are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation and trafficking, and programs targeted towards runaway and homeless youth should be simultaneously equipped to support victims of trafficking when there is such an overlap.

Research consistently confirms the correlation between running away and becoming exploited through prostitution. For example, according to a 2006 FBI Uniform Crime Report, girls who run away from their homes, group homes, foster homes, or treatment centers are at high risk of being targeted by a trafficker and becoming exploited.

Street Outreach Programs were created to provide services to ''runaway, homeless, and street youth who have been subjected to or are at risk of being subjected to sexual abuse.'' Every year, 25,000 of these young people find shelter as a result of these programs.

The legislation being considered today ensures that Street Outreach Programs can rely on funding already available through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

This allows the Department of Health and Human Services to provide street-based services such as individual assessments, treatment, counseling, or access to emergency shelter for runaway and homeless youth who are also victims of trafficking. Because of the overlap that often occurs with homelessness and trafficking, this just makes good sense.

Additionally, it is important that we provide the necessary resources to States, organizations, and other entities to train staff working with these victims. This additional training, authorized by this bill under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act research grants, will allow service providers to successfully address and respond to the behavioral and emotional effects of abuse and assault.

Our bill ensures that staff training will also include ways to recognize and respond to the unique needs and circumstances of trafficking victims. This is a simple change but an important one necessary to improve services available.

It is my hope that we can continue to work in this spirit of bipartisanship and work together to improve and strengthen programs that support our Nation's children, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his dedicated and hard work in combating sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, each year an estimated 300,000 innocent children fall victim to sex trafficking right here in the United States. The victims can be homeless or runaway youth. Others are simply taken from their parents in the blink of an eye. The victims' families are our neighbors, our friends, and our loved ones.

As a father of two and a grandfather of four, for me it is impossible to fathom the pain and suffering they must feel knowing their son or daughter is trapped in a modern-day slave trade filled with darkness and hopelessness. While we will never fully comprehend the grief these families are forced to bear, we can, as a Nation, fight this heinous crime with every tool available.

□ 1730

There are heroic efforts underway right now to locate victims of youth sex trafficking and return them to their families. Last week, the Education and Workforce Committee had an opportunity to hear from John Ryan, who is the head of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The center plays a vital role in a national effort to protect vulnerable youth, leading a partnership among law enforcement, government agencies, and private ventures like Honeywell, Google, and Lifetouch.

In my home State of Minnesota, the center has helped resolve cases involving 1,699 endangered runaways and 373 family abductions. The center's 24-hour CyberTipline has provided law enforcement more than 2 million leads of child sexual exploitation.

The center and its staff provide an invaluable service to families. They stand on the front lines of this critical battle each and every day. Despite these and other achievements, we know more can be done to protect our most vulnerable youth.

Right now, many kids are falling through the cracks of child welfare systems. Often, they are not properly identified as sex trafficking victims when they enter the system and are then lost in the shuffle once they are in State custody, and too often, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of sex trafficking do not receive the special help they need.

That is why I strongly support this legislation, which will enhance existing services for runaway and homeless youth. I am also proud to support legislation we will consider in just a few moments that will improve how State child welfare systems identify and respond to victims of youth sex trafficking.

Finally, we will also consider legislation that ensures victims are properly identified when reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children CyberTipline.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do more to address this national crisis. The bills the House is considering today move our country in the right direction. I am humbled to help lead this bipartisan effort and urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5076.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5081) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5081

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (xxii); and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(xxiv) provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));

''(xxv) provisions and procedures for training representatives of the State child protective services systems about identifying and assessing children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures for such training with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)); and

''(xxvi) provisions and procedures for identifying services (including the services provided by State law enforcement officials, the State juvenile justice system, and social service agencies, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters) and procedures for appropriate referral to address the needs of children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures for the identification of such services and procedures with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (v);

(ii) by inserting ''and'' at the end of clause (vi); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) the provisions and procedures described in clauses (xxiv) and (xxvi) of subparagraph (B);''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIM.—The term 'sex trafficking victim' means a victim of—

''(i) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10))); or

''(ii) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)).''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(17) The number of children identified under clause (xxiv) of subsection (b)(2)(B), and of such children—

''(A) the number identified as sex trafficking victims (as defined in subsection (b)(4)(C)); and

''(B) in the case of a State that has provisions and procedures to identify children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)), the number so identified.''.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension of the Senate, a report that—

(1) describes the specific type and prevalence of severe form of trafficking in persons to which children who are identified for services or intervention under the placement, care, or supervision of State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization child welfare agencies have been subjected as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) summarizes the practices and protocols utilized by States to identify and serve—

(A) under section 106(b)(2)(B) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)), children who are victims of trafficking; and

(B) children who are at risk of becoming victims of trafficking; and

(3) specifies any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may prevent identification and assessment of children who are victims of trafficking, including an evaluation of the extent to which States are able to address the needs of such trafficked children without

altering the definition of child abuse and neglect under section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term ''severe form of trafficking in persons'' has the meaning given the term in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)).

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''victim of trafficking'' has the meaning given the term in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5081.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking has reached epidemic proportions in the United States. Young people are being forced into manual labor or commercial sexual activity in what has become a $32 billion a year industry.

While we are fighting trafficking with every tool available, there is more that can be done. The fact remains that domestic child trafficking is a serious problem in the United States. Around 300,000 American youth are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking per year.

Through my involvement with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, I have seen the exploitation and horrific abuses trafficking victims have to endure. As an emergency room physician, I have seen the physical, emotional, and psychological trauma inflicted on victims, and as a father, it sickens me to think that one of my children could become a victim.

As a Member of Congress, I have worked on legislation to help address this problem and held a local roundtable in Nevada with victims, advocacy, and law enforcement groups.

H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014, will help protect child victims by improving practices within State child welfare systems to identify, assess, and document sex trafficking victims.

This legislation amends the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to direct States to implement and maintain procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of sex trafficking.

Additionally, this bill requires that States train child protective services workers on how to identify these children and the services necessary to meet their needs, and it would improve reporting on the number of children identified as sex trafficking victims.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report on the type of prevalence of youth trafficking victims in the welfare system, provide a summit of State practices for serving youth trafficking victims, and report on any barriers in Federal law that prevents the identification and assessment of youth victims of trafficking.

Instead of properly identifying and assisting trafficked and exploited children, these children are often sent to the juvenile justice system, where they are labeled and treated as criminals. These innocent victims are victimized again by the very system that was designed to protect them.

This bill works towards a positive solution that ensures child welfare agencies have the appropriate systems in place to properly identify, assess, and document child victims of sex trafficking, instead of treating them as criminals.

It is imperative that we continue to pass legislation that helps victims of both labor and sex trafficking to ensure that victims receive the services they need to escape a life of abuse.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman KLINE of the Education and the Workforce Committee, as well as the other original cosponsors of this legislation—Representatives KAREN BASS, MICHELE BACHMANN, TOM MARINO, JIM MCDERMOTT, and LOUISE SLAUGHTER—for their hard work on this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014 and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014, and I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for their support and collaboration on creating momentum for this policy that will be a critical step towards preventing child sex trafficking. I appreciate both their insight and assistance in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MARINO. He has been a tireless advocate for children in the foster care system. Mr. MARINO, along with the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth cochairs, Representatives MCDERMOTT and BACHMANN, all served as original cosponsors of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, and their continuing commitment to transforming the child welfare system has brought national attention to the intersection between child sex trafficking and the child welfare system.

The U.S. Department of Justice reports that more than 300,000 children in the country are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking each year. These are 300,000 too many, and tragically, this number shows that a comprehensive and aggressive response is needed in order to combat child trafficking throughout the country.

In my city, the Los Angeles County Probation Department reports that 61 percent of identified trafficking victims are foster youth. The Los Angeles STAR court is a specialized collaborative courthouse designed to serve commercially exploited youth and reports that 80 percent of these girls have been previously involved in the child welfare system.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the country as part of our nationwide listening tour. Unfortunately, the stories I have heard from advocates and youth is that children in the child welfare system continue to be preyed upon by traffickers who use their vulnerability as an opportunity to exploit them.

The stories that emerge are those like Caroline's, a young girl who grew up in a household where she was physically, sexually, and emotionally abused. When Caroline was just 13 years old, a 35-year-old man attended a sporting event at her school and deceived her into believing that he loved her and would give her the attention she craved.

Instead, this man began to sell Caroline to numerous men for sex. Throughout this time, she had many encounters with the child welfare system, but no one picked up that she was a victim of trafficking. The social workers did not have the training or the proper tools to assess that she needed specialized services.

Our bill would ensure that children like Caroline do not slip through the cracks, as State and county child welfare departments have protection plans that will outline provisions and procedures to identify and assess all reports of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.

State systems do not currently have the proper protections, services, or protocols to adequately serve those in the system who have been victims of trafficking. States also lack such support for victims who enter the child welfare system.

In fact, during a site visit recently on the Foster Youth Caucus listening tour to Missouri, a law enforcement officer told us that he had no other option but

to arrest the girls, to ensure that they receive the proper services.

In Los Angeles, the child sex trafficking unit of the county probation department specifically addresses the needs of child victims, and it is the only such division in the country. I commend their critical work and commitment to ensure the trafficking victims receive the resources they need.

We must not continue to arrest these children in order to provide them with these services. Our bill will be a first step toward ensuring that there are policies and procedures in place to connect child sex trafficking victims to public or private specialized services.

Last year, in a meeting with children in the child sex trafficking unit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department, the girls all echoed the same sentiment. While they were grateful to have the resources they needed to begin to deal with their trauma, they felt stigmatized by having to be arrested in order to receive these services.

Our bill would ensure that each State has a training plan for child protective service workers to appropriately respond to reports of trafficking, so that trafficked children would be provided the same resources as youth in the child welfare system and be classified as victims of crime, not as criminals.

We have story after story across the country of children being raped and sold as if they were little more than objects, but we do not have the concrete data to help them find the appropriate services. H.R. 5081 requires that, within 1 year, the Department of Health and Human Services report to Congress on the prevalence and types of trafficking they have encountered.

Many advocates believe that labor trafficking is also a critical issue with children in the child welfare system. The reality is we need hard data to evaluate what is happening to the children, so that proper resources can be allocated in the future. Our bill also allows States to establish the same policy and procedures for children if they are victims of labor trafficking.

The report will also assess State practices used to identify and serve trafficking victims and Federal laws and policies that may prevent States from supporting these victims, including the absence of trafficking in the Federal definition of child abuse and neglect under CAPTA, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

These critical steps to reforming our child welfare system will help ensure that victims are provided with the same resources and access as other children. I strongly urge my colleagues to support our bill and continue to build momentum to combat domestic child sex trafficking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding. I also want to thank my friend from California (Ms. BASS) for introducing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, you are going to find tonight that there are eight bills dealing with sex trafficking in the United States. You will also find that these are bipartisan bills, and a lot of different Members are involved in this legislation, which goes to say that on this issue of modern-day slavery—the human sex trafficking that is taking place—Members of Congress are working together in many different ways to come to the same conclusion to present legislation to the House floor.

I would just encourage the Speaker in his role to get the Senate to bring up this legislation as soon as it all passes, either tonight or tomorrow.

We have already had some good pieces of legislation pass, a piece of legislation called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, sponsored by CAROLYN MALONEY from New York, a Democrat, and myself, a Republican from Texas. That is about as bipartisan as you can get, Mr. Speaker. We don't even speak the same language, but it passed the House 2 weeks ago, 409–0.

The House of Representatives is moving as fast as we can and as carefully as we can to deal with this scourge of modern-day slavery. You don't get much talk about it in the national media. It is just not one of those controversial issues, but it is being done, and that is a good thing.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, there are two types of minor sex trafficking that are taking place. There are children from foreign countries that are being sold and delivered to the United States for sex trafficking, and then there are Americans, kids that live in the United States, that are being sold and delivered throughout the United States for domestic sex trafficking. It is increasing for a lot of reasons, but awareness is one of those reasons—or lack of awareness is a reason that we want to hopefully stop—and the awareness needs to go to parents and children about what can take place.

Also, when sex trafficking with minor children takes place, as my friend Ms. BASS from California has said, when that child is rescued by law enforcement, they don't have anyplace to take them. There is no housing for those individuals, so they put them in the juvenile justice system for their safety. But, yes, they are labeled. They are given that stigma of a criminal. Even though it is juvenile criminal, they are still a criminal.

They are not a criminal, Mr. Speaker. They are victims of crime, victims of slavery.

For example, in the United States, there are 5,000 animal shelters, and they are great. I have got three dalmatians—I call them the weapons of mass destruction—and two of them came from dalmatian rescue. But, Mr. Speaker, there are only 300 beds for minor sex-trafficked children in the United States. That is it. There aren't any more.

So we need to have the ability to take those children when rescued by law enforcement or by child protective services or whoever to a shelter where they have a place that they can stay other than the jailhouse. That is one of the most important things that we can do.

As the gentleman from Nevada has said, this scourge is a multimillion dollar business. It is second only to the illicit drug trade. The reason is because children can be sold more than once each day—some up to 20 times. Drugs are sold one time. Plus, the risk of apprehension and the consequences for drugs is a whole lot more than that of sex trafficking, and therefore that is why it is the second, will soon be the highest, income for illicit activity, criminal activity, because there is no risk involved.

So those are some things that are being addressed by these eight pieces of legislation tonight. They are all good, and they are all bipartisan. They are supported by most Members. There are a lot of cosponsors on all of that legislation. Hopefully, we can get all eight of those pieces of legislation passed and sent down the hallway to the Senate and get their attention and vote on these.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014.

Today, more than 293,000 American youth are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking each year. Far too often, State child welfare systems fail to properly identify and assist trafficked and exploited children. The protective services and protocols established for abused and neglected children within the child welfare system are rarely extended to trafficked children and youth. In many States, such children are often not even categorized as victims.

I would point out that we have on our borders today 57,000 youngsters who have come in whatever way they have come to our attention. One of the real dangers in sort of sending people back into whatever is that you may well be sending them back into sexual trafficking. This is one of the issues that should be looked at in every case where you find a youngster roaming the

streets. States have got to look at this issue and figure out a way to deal with it.

We know that youngsters when they age out of foster care have no skills, they have no job, and they have very little to keep themselves alive, and, therefore, they easily become victims of sexual trafficking. This is an issue that this country, if we really care about children, we are going to look carefully at every kid and what are the risks to which they are being exposed.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the cochair of the Foster Care Adoption Caucus.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5081.

It is an absolute outrage that between 100,000 and 300,000 American youth are currently at risk for becoming victims of commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking right here in the United States.

Although we know there are many factors that make youth particularly vulnerable to traffickers and exploiters, such as age range, history of abuse, living in an impoverished community, and many others, the most astounding indicator a child will be trafficked is whether or not he or she is in foster care—in the foster care system at all.

In 2013, 60 percent of the child sex trafficking victims recovered as part of an FBI nationwide raid from over 70 cities were children from foster care or group homes. Make no mistake about it. Our foster care system provides an essential service to our communities and our children. In fact, my wife and I have housed children from this system. However, we are simply not doing enough to protect these children from being preyed upon.

This is why I have worked with my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, to introduce H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. This bill would make much-needed reforms to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to ensure States increase their child protection service plans and that we increase the data being reported to Congress.

To enact good law in Congress, we simply need as many facts at our fingertips as possible. Sadly, criminals in the child trafficking industry have become adept at lurking in the shadows and evading law enforcement, leaving us with very poor records and data on the activity.

This is why Congresswoman BASS and I are calling on States to work with us to strengthen our records and data logs so that we can more effectively craft laws to stop these criminals moving forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan bill, because when it comes to those who are the most innocent among us, they deserve as much protection as possible.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for her tireless commitment to the children of our Nation's child welfare system and for extending time to speak on this timely and important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House's legislative efforts to combat human trafficking, a very cruel form of modern-day slavery. I urge all my colleagues to support the legislation before us, including H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, a bill that seeks to improve the child welfare response to trafficking by requiring States to have procedures for identifying, assessing, and documenting child victims of trafficking. H.R. 5081 would also help identify, assess, and document child victims of sex trafficking throughout the United States.

Unfortunately, human trafficking is a big, booming business, and I cannot—and I will not—stand idly by and watch as our country becomes the center for smuggling human beings and human sexual exploitation.

We have a major crisis on the border of our Nation and in big cities like New York and others across the Nation that have been exacerbated and enabled by highly organized crime syndicates. If we understand the methods these groups use and begin by eliminating their sources of revenue, we can save people from human rights abuses and exploitation. Young girls are sold as sexual property, and boys and men are forced to work for cheap labor after they are convinced to sign unfair labor contracts. Their government documents are taken from them, and they are left with no one and nothing.

The people who want to do harm to our most vulnerable are likely to get more money from trafficking a child for sex than from the illicit drug trade. Awareness concerning human trafficking has increased significantly in recent years, but awareness is not enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. The United States is now considered a destination country according to the United States Department of State. Yes, Mr. Speaker, you heard it correctly. Human trafficking isn't something that is just occurring in other countries or other continents. It is happening right here in America.

In the United States, human trafficking rakes in $9.8 billion for the use and abuse of victims, many of whom are children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that each year 100,000 children are falling victim to the industry within our own borders.

I am proud to join my colleagues and the ever-growing number of Americans who are standing up to the objectionable practice of human trafficking. Congress is taking the additional steps to protect our children with this legislation. Again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5081 and all of the legislation concerning human trafficking before the House. The time is now to protect children from being victims of human trafficking.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to support H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014.

It has been estimated that more than 293,000 children in the United States are at risk of sexual exploitation, many of whom are imported into this country along the routes used by the drug traders across the Rio Grande and moved through Texas. This form of modern-day slavery is absolutely unacceptable. No one, especially children, should have to endure this kind of cruelty. We cannot ignore that child trafficking is a serious problem taking place right here in our own backyard in the United States of America.

Unfortunately, many State child welfare systems do not identify and assist these exploited children appropriately. This bill strengthens the response to child trafficking by conditioning grants to States on their creating plans to protect children from these abuses and atrocities.

We had a hearing of the Homeland Security Committee in Houston and learned that often the trafficked children are not considered victims. They are considered the perpetrators. We have got to educate the police departments. We have got to educate the officers on the street. We have got to educate all of America that these children are victims. They need help. They don't need to end up in the juvenile justice system being treated like criminals.

This legislation would help identify children who were forced into sex trafficking and require States receiving grants to train their child protective services workers to appropriately respond to these activities.

Ideally, the child sex trafficking industry would not even exist. Unfortunately, the monetary motivations and God knows what else keep it going. It is happening right here, and we have got to stop it. This bill and the other bills on the floor of the House tonight take very important steps to combat this scourge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it and thank Representatives

BASS and KLINE for moving us forward in this important endeavor.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for introducing this bill and for all she does on behalf of foster youth.

Foster youth are some of the most at-risk children in our society. They are often victims of abuse or neglect, and too many face trials and tribulations beyond their years. So much that we take for granted—a stable home, living with our siblings, or returning to the same school year after year—are constant obstacles for these children.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us today will specifically address the link between girls in foster care and sex trafficking, and it will require States to develop a child protection plan to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of trafficking.

□ 1800

Additionally, States must provide training plans for child protective services workers to appropriately respond to reports to child trafficking and have procedures in place that will connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

So I want to echo the comments of so many of my colleagues who have spoken here today. I commend Congresswoman BASS and Congressman KLINE, and all those who have had a hand in this legislation and who are looking out for the welfare of our children. I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this day and the opportunity to be on the floor to have the Nation recognize the value of our children and the importance of protecting them. In particular, I thank Ms. BASS and Mr. MARINO for their leadership of the Foster Care Caucus, work that has been so important across America, and I thank the Education Committee with Mr. MILLER and Mr. KLINE for aspects of this legislation.

But I remember, Mr. Speaker, walking the streets of Houston with Covenant House and finding in cubbyholes homeless children, homeless teens. Many of them had aged out, and many of them during that time when the language wasn't clear had been prostituted, they were being sex-trafficked. No one was helping. So I am excited about legislation that recognizes that this act of ignoring them is child abuse, and that we need to ensure that they are not criminals and that the child welfare system understands their needs.

I was the first to bring to Houston a Homeland Security hearing on human and sex trafficking. It was an emotional hearing. The stories that were being told through law enforcement and those who had been victimized as children and how their lives were ruined would raise the hairs on your head. So I support all of these human trafficking initiatives, particularly as they take children away from the criminal justice system, and I look forward to Homeland Security moving more toward understanding this through the international process, and our Nation recognizing that, as has been said before, that the unaccompanied children are themselves victims of sex trafficking and need due process protection.

But we start at home. Therefore, I look forward to introducing legislation dealing with the homeland security human trafficking component in that Department, but the legislation offered by Ms. BASS and Mr. MARINO, again, is a program that is long overdue. And I am grateful that we will now have a system where these children will be recognized not as criminals but will be recognized through the State child welfare system to identify and help these children that have been taken by this terrible industry, Mr. Speaker, and save their lives. The bills on the floor today will save the lives of our children. I ask support for all of the bills on human trafficking today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5081, the "Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014," which strengthens the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Pub. L. 93–247) by requiring that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment programs include elements focused on human trafficking.

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I understand how important it is to defend those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year's massive effort "Operation Cross Country" led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

Between 1998 and 2003 more than 500 people from 18 countries were ensnared in 57 forced labor operations in almost a dozen cities throughout the State of Texas.

Currently, our state child welfare systems do not properly identify and help the children that have been taken by this horrible industry. Even more disturbing is that the protections provided by our child welfare systems often do not extend to young victims of trafficking.

Hard as it is to believe, in some states trafficked youths are not even regarded or classified as victims. Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals. They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 5081 because it is focused on helping at-risk and vulnerable children and treat them as victims rather than treating them as criminals.

Specifically, the bill requires that state plans for Federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment:

1. provide procedures to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking;

2. provide training for child protection service workers to appropriately respond to reports of child sex trafficking; and

3. develop and implement policies and procedures to connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

Additionally, the bill requires States to report annually the numbers of children identified as victims of sex trafficking within the already existing National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System.

H.R. 5081 also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress outlining the prevalence and type of child trafficking nationwide as well as the current barriers to serving child victims comprehensively.

I strongly support H.R. 5081 and urge my colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The fight against child sex trafficking is a bipartisan issue, and I appreciate that both parties have come together today to support the development of legislation that would make a significant impact on one of the most vulnerable populations in our Nation.

The Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act is an important step in ensuring that child welfare agencies have the proper systems in place to identify, assess, and document child victims of trafficking.

Stories like those of Caroline and the other young girls in the child sex trafficking unit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department are critical to understanding exactly the effect our bill would have in laying the foundation of transforming the way our Nation responds to child sex trafficking.

However, it is also important to recognize that this bill and the other bills on the floor today are steps on that journey, and there is still an enormous amount of work that needs to be done.

Again, I would like to thank members of the Education and Workforce Committee and the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth for their continued commitment to advancing policies that help change the lives of children.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my staff, Adriane Alicea, and especially my former deputy chief of staff, Jenny Wood, who did the lion's share of work to make this legislation happen, and without her hard work and dedication, this legislation would not be on the floor today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some compelling and moving stories this evening that underscore our moral obligation as a society to do all we can to combat this epidemic of child and human trafficking. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5081 and all of the related legislation that we will consider this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act.

We all know that our nation's children are our most precious resource, and we wish that every child had the opportunity to grow up in a family that loved and protected them, but unfortunately that is not the case.

As a result, about 400,000 children are in the foster care system as we speak. In the last few years, there have been great improvements in how we care for foster children, particularly the focus on supporting youth as they age out of the system.

But there is a stain on the American foster care system that we have not adequately addressed: child sex trafficking. Child sex trafficking is truly one of the most deplorable and disgusting crimes any adult can commit, and it's our job to do all that we can to end it—especially when so many victims are children for whom we have taken responsibility in the foster care system.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children tells us that 60% of runaways who are victims of sex trafficking were at one time in the custody of social services or in foster care. In my home state of New York, 85% of trafficking victims have prior child welfare involvement. While state-specific numbers vary throughout the country, they all tell us that something more needs to be done.

To add insult to injury, far too often, state child welfare systems fail to properly identify and assist trafficked and exploited children. Instead of being cared for and supported, these children are often sent to the juvenile justice system and criminalized for, at no fault of their own, being raped and trafficked! These children are victims, and we have a moral obligation to protect them.

I'm a proud original co-sponsor of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, which would help identify exploited children, train child protective services workers to appropriately respond to them, and connect child victims to specialized services so that they can begin the process of recovery. I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes a directive for HHS to report on any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may be preventing States from properly identifying, assessing, and serving children who are victims of trafficking. I believe one such barrier is that currently, under the Child Abuse Protection and Treatment Act, young victims of trafficking are not automatically defined as victims of abuse and neglect. Making a definitional change would ensure that these children, who are clearly victims, are supported and protected, not sent to the juvenile justice system for prosecution. I look forward to receiving this report next year and working with my colleagues to make that change for the sake of these young people who deserve our protection.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the Strengthening the Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act. As a co-chair of the Foster Youth Caucus and a former foster parent, I am grateful for this legislation, as it recognizes a terrible and undeniable truth about our child welfare system.

Statistics show that foster children are highly vulnerable to being sexually trafficked. This bill will lay out needed provisions to identify and track victims within the already existing National Child Abuse and Neglect Data Systems and ensure that each state is not only prepared to spot the signs of victimization, but also adequately help those who have been rescued.

This bill is an important step in coordinating state and federal efforts and resources, to give victims the necessary individualized care, and to stop this terrible assault on children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5081.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5111

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

SECTION 1. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking ''child prostitution'' and inserting ''child sex trafficking, including child prostitution''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5111.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in support of H.R. 5111.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives continues its commitment to providing the necessary tools and policies to help reduce child sex trafficking and better serve these victims in the United States. I want to thank Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY for her leadership on this issue and for introducing H.R. 5111, which will improve the ability of law enforcement officials and others to respond to and assist these victims.

For too long these victims have been viewed as willing participants and have been treated as actors in the criminal scheme. However, we now know that oftentimes individuals are trapped as victims by human trafficking organizations, and sadly, many of these victims are children.

As previous House efforts have done, the bills today attempt to change for the better how we view these victims. Congresswoman BEATTY's legislation will ensure that we view victims of sex trafficking not as participants but as victims, and ensure that child sex trafficking crimes are reported.

Under current law, the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, operates a CyberTipline to provide online users and electronic service providers a means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in many areas, including child prostitution. However, children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited should be treated as victims, not criminals. In fact, approximately one out of seven runaway youth are likely victims of sex trafficking, and roughly

one out of three youths are lured into prostitution within 48 hours of running away from home.

For this reason, H.R. 5111 would replace the term ''child prostitution'' with ''child sex trafficking'' in the CyberTipline reporting categories to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims whose situation should be taken seriously when reported. It would also ensure the public recognizes that child prostitution is included in how NCMEC uses the term ''child sex trafficking,'' and thus should still be reported to the tip line.

Again, I want to thank Congresswoman BEATTY, along with the Education and Workforce Committee and House leadership, for recognizing the need to steadfastly address this dreadful practice. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5111, a bill I introduced which would help victims of child sex trafficking by decriminalizing their behavior.

I thank Chairman KLINE from Minnesota and Ranking Member MILLER from California of the Education and the Workforce Committee for bringing this important bill to the floor for consideration. I also thank Representative WALBERG from Michigan, who is managing the bill today for the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Senator PORTMAN, whom I partnered with on this legislation earlier this year. Together we introduced bipartisan, bicameral legislation in order to assist victims of child sex trafficking and ensure that they are viewed and treated as victims and not criminals. We participated in a roundtable discussion with the Dominican Sisters of Peace in my district with diverse stakeholders who shared stories of victims and ideas of what we could do to further help these children who are trafficked.

We heard story after story, just like on the House floor today: the story of Caroline, in my district; the story of Teresa, who was a victim herself at a very young age and now is a national advocate against child sex trafficking.

As we know, human trafficking is one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world. In fact, according to the United States State Department, human trafficking is the world's second-largest criminal enterprise after the illegal drug trade.

□ 1815

In the United States, some 300,000 children are at risk each year for commercial sexual exploitation. Many of them come from family and social backgrounds that render them particularly at risk. These are children who fall through the cracks in our society.

Mr. Speaker, many are runaways, homeless, and in and out of foster care. These children deserve better. The average age of a traffic victim in the United States is 12 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful. At 12 years of age, girls and boys should be playing youth sports, participating in their school science fair, learning a new language, or just being able to be a child.

In my home State of Ohio, each year, an estimated 1,078 Ohio children become victims of human trafficking, and over 3,000 more are at risk. Ohio is the fifth leading State for human trafficking because of its proximity to a waterway that leads to an international border and a system of interstate highways that allows an individual to exit the State within 2 hours to almost anywhere.

The I–75 corridor—which runs through Toledo, Dayton, and Cincinnati—is infamous for subjecting children to the horrors of sex trafficking, with reports of victims being repeatedly abused.

Just last week, my hometown paper, The Columbus Dispatch, reported that Ohio children younger than 6 years old have been sexually trafficked by their parents in exchange for drugs, for rent, or cash.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter a copy of this article into the RECORD.

[From the Columbus Dispatch, July 11, 2014.]

OHIOANS SELLING SEX WITH THEIR OWN KIDS

(By Alan Johnson)

Ohio children younger than 6 have been sexually trafficked by their own parents in exchange for drugs, rent and cash, a new report indicates.

Information from the Ohio Network of Children's Advocacy Centers shows that 51 minors from across the state were potential human-trafficking victims—five of them age 6 or younger—over a nine-month period. The network has a state contract to screen children referred by law enforcement, children's services agencies and others, to determine whether they may have been trafficked.

Statistics from July 2013 to March 2014 showed all but five of the 51 minors reported were 13 to 18 years old. Only one case involved a male. They came from both urban and rural areas of the state.

''I'm most shocked that families are doing this to their own children,'' said the director of the advocacy center that originally detected three of the cases involving the youngest children. She asked not to be identified for this story to avoid pinpointing specific details about the cases that might cause problems for the children, or jeopardize legal proceedings.

''We think it happens to young girls who are runaways. But with these youngest kids, it's their actual families who are trafficking them.''

She said more information about what happened to very young children gradually comes out over time as they are in counseling and other therapeutic programs.

Information on at least three of the five youngest victims indicated they were trafficked sexually by one or both of their parents in ''exchange for drugs, rent, goods or money,'' said Amy Deverson Roberts of the children's advocacy network.

She said some cases have been referred for prosecution and others are pending. She could not release specifics about any cases.

The suspected victims were referred for help to law enforcement, children's services, mental-health providers and other agencies as needed, Roberts said.

''It's all about collaboration to provide the best services for victims,'' Roberts said.

The network last year received a $523,000, two-year grant from the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services to provide training to detect signs of trafficking, to put on education programs, and to handle child referrals. The grant came from a trafficking task force created in an executive order by Gov. John Kasich.

Officials estimate that 1,100 children are forced into the sex trade each year in Ohio; 13 is the most common age for children to be victimized.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, more must be done to assist these children, these children who are victims, not criminals, and need our help.

We know that no single system can successfully combat trafficking. Preventing, identifying, and serving victims of trafficking requires a multi-coordinated approach across all levels of government. We need to encourage all people, when they see something, say something.

Currently, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates a CyberTipline, which receives leads and tips regarding suspected crimes of sexual exploitation committed against children. More than 2.3 million reports of suspected child sexual exploitation have been made to the CyberTipline between 1998 and March of this year.

In identifying the types of sexual exploitation that should be reported to the CyberTipline, current law does not specifically mention ''child sex trafficking'' as one of its reporting categories, even though the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children encounters child victims of sex trafficking and currently uses this term on its Web site in order to encourage the public's reporting of these types of crimes.

Instead, the statute uses the term ''child prostitution,'' which we know does not fully and accurately capture these types of crimes against children.

My bill would add the phrase ''child sex trafficking,'' including ''child prostitution'' to the section b(1)(p) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

Working with my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee and Congressman CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey, we have crafted legislation in order to improve and update the law in order to reflect the current state of Federal law and to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims and not criminals.

Mr. Speaker, children in sex trafficking situations are often misidentified as ''willing'' participants. We know there is widespread lack of

awareness and understanding of trafficking.

By adding the term ''child sex trafficking,'' including ''child prostitution,'' the Missing Children's Assistance Act will continue to fight the perception that sex trafficking is a voluntary, victimless crime.

Child sex trafficking is an issue of abuse and exploitation of children.

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

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5111, a bill to improve the response to victims of child trafficking.

First, I would like to commend my colleague, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, for her commitment to transforming the language that we use to discuss child victims of sex trafficking and for taking the lead on this important legislation.

While antitrafficking advocates and organizations have worked tirelessly over the years to ensure that the framework and language that we use to describe child victims of trafficking recognize that they are, in fact, victims, we still have a long way to go.

For example, men who exploit the children, we call them ''johns.'' We arrest the traffickers, we arrest the victims, but the men are seldom arrested, and when they are, it is for soliciting.

As we change the way we speak about the girls, we must change the way we speak about the men, the men who are not johns, but child molesters.

Representative BEATTY's bill is another critical building block to transforming the framework and dialogue around child victims of sex trafficking. I look forward to continuing to change the conversation and urge my colleagues in the House to support this important legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me conclude by saying that I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support H.R. 5111.

This is a very important piece of legislation that will help the victims of child sex trafficking. It will decriminalize their behavior. It will help rescue them from the horrible situations that we have heard tonight.

Let me also share that it is not only about H.R. 5111, but it is about all of the bills that we are hearing tonight that I ask this House to support.

I would certainly be remiss if I did not thank the House leadership on both sides of the aisle for allowing us to bring these important bills forward and also my entire staff, but specifically my legislative director for all of her hard work.

Lastly, to Congresswoman BASS, let me say thank you for being someone who has led this charge and has been willing to work with me and others on helping bring all of our bills forward.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The passage of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, shows the House's commitment to not only bolstering enforcement efforts against human traffickers, but also ensuring that we properly identify victims.

I urge all Members to lead efforts in their districts, to continue the conversation, as I have done in mine, about human trafficking, to learn what more we can do in our communities to curtail this hideous crime.

During the human trafficking roundtables I have held in my district, law enforcement officials have consistently raised the need to make community members aware of the real and present threat of human trafficking. We must work to not only educate children, but also families and the general public about the safety risks.

H.R. 5111 is another step to educating our communities about human trafficking victims, and it continues our work to ensure that we are doing what we can to help reduce this horrible crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5111, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5111, "An Act to Improve the Response To victims Of Child Sex Trafficking." I would like to congratulate Representative BEATTY for her work.

Youth sexual exploitation and trafficking is a major issue in this country that affects more than 293,000 young Americans.

As a Representative of Texas, this issue is close to my heart as my state is plagued by this problem. For example, multiple sporting events, conventions, and other large festivities make Houston a prime location for trafficking.

Another metric demonstrating the high level of trafficking in Houston is the high volume of calls to National Trafficking Hotline coming from Houston.

I have worked on this issue for a very long time as a member of the Anti-Human Trafficking Caucus and recognize the enormous damage that human trafficking does to its victim and to society.

There have been many efforts made to improve how our system addresses the issue of sex trafficking. However, there is still a great deal of work to be done to reframe the issue as one of abuse and exploitation of children rather than one of teenage prostitution.

The legal definition of sex trafficking states that "any individual induced or caused to engage in commercial sex activity who is under 18 is a victim of trafficking,"

But what about those who are teenagers and voluntarily engage in this sort of activity?

We need to update the Missing Children's Assistance Act so that it better recognizes these young people as victims of a serious crime and reports the information accordingly.

Under current law, (42 U.S.C. 5773 (b)(1)(P)), the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates a cyber tipline to provide online users and electronic service providers a means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in many areas, including child prostitution.

Children, who are sex trafficked or sexually exploited, even if they are in their teens, are victims. They are not criminals and should not be categorized as such.

H.R. 5111 would replace the term "child prostitution" with "child sex trafficking" in order to reinforce that children who are sex trafficked or sexually exploited are victims whose situation should be taken seriously when reported on the online tipline.

I believe that this bill is a step in the right direction for recognizing the broad impact of sex trafficking in the United States and assisting those who are exploited by it.

I urge all members to join me in supporting H.R. 5111 so we can all work towards a society where we no longer have to worry about our children being exploited by the sex trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5111, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PREVENTING SEX TRAFFICKING AND STRENGTHENING FAMILIES ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4980) to prevent and address sex trafficking of children in foster care, to extend and improve adoption incentives, and to improve international child support recovery.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4980

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the amendment shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK OF SEX TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Identifying and Protecting Children and Youth at Risk of Sex Trafficking

SEC. 101. IDENTIFYING, DOCUMENTING, AND DETERMINING SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 471(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) not later than—

''(i) 1 year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, demonstrate to the Secretary that the State agency has developed, in consultation with State and local law enforcement, juvenile justice systems, health care providers, education agencies, and organizations with experience in dealing with at-risk children and youth, policies and procedures (including relevant training for caseworkers) for identifying, documenting in agency records, and determining appropriate services with respect to—

''(I) any child or youth over whom the State agency has responsibility for placement, care, or supervision and who the State has reasonable cause to believe is, or is at risk of being, a sex trafficking victim (including children for whom a State child welfare agency has an open case file but who have not been removed from the home, children who have run away from foster care and who have not attained 18 years of age or such older age as the State has elected under section 475(8) of this Act, and youth who are not in foster care but are receiving services under section 477 of this Act); and

''(II) at the option of the State, any individual who has not attained 26 years of age, without regard to whether the individual is or was in foster care under the responsibility of the State; and

''(ii) 2 years after such date of enactment, demonstrate to the Secretary that the State agency is implementing the policies and procedures referred to in clause (i).''.

(b) DEFINITION OF SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIM.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The term 'sex trafficking victim' means a victim of—

''(A) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000); or

''(B) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act.''.

SEC. 102. REPORTING INSTANCES OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 471(a) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (32);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (33) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(34) provides that, for each child or youth described in paragraph (9)(C)(i)(I), the State agency shall—

''(A) not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, report immediately, and in no case later than 24 hours after receiving information on children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim, to the law enforcement authorities; and

''(B) not later than 3 years after such date of enactment and annually thereafter, report to the Secretary the total number of children and youth who are sex trafficking victims.''.

(b) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 471 (42 U.S.C. 671) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY ON NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH REPORTED BY STATES TO BE SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress and make available to the public on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services the number of children and youth reported in accordance with subsection (a)(34)(B) of this section to be sex trafficking victims (as defined in section 475(9)(A)).''.

SEC. 103. INCLUDING SEX TRAFFICKING DATA IN THE ADOPTION AND FOSTER CARE ANALYSIS AND REPORTING SYSTEM.

Section 479(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 679(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking ''and'' after the comma; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the annual number of children in foster care who are identified as sex trafficking victims—

''(i) who were such victims before entering foster care; and

''(ii) who were such victims while in foster care; and''.

SEC. 104. LOCATING AND RESPONDING TO CHILDREN WHO RUN AWAY FROM FOSTER CARE.

Section 471(a) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)), as amended by section 102(a) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (34) and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(35) provides that—

''(A) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the State shall develop and implement specific protocols for—

''(i) expeditiously locating any child missing from foster care;

''(ii) determining the primary factors that contributed to the child's running away or otherwise being absent from care, and to the extent possible and appropriate, responding to those factors in current and subsequent placements;

''(iii) determining the child's experiences while absent from care, including screening the child to determine if the child is a possible sex trafficking victim (as defined in section 475(9)(A)); and

''(iv) reporting such related information as required by the Secretary; and

''(B) not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, for each child and youth described in paragraph (9)(C)(i)(I) of this subsection, the State agency shall report immediately, and in no case later than 24 hours after receiving, information on missing or abducted children or youth to the law enforcement authorities for entry into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, established pursuant to section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.''.

SEC. 105. INCREASING INFORMATION ON CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE TO PREVENT SEX TRAFFICKING.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a written report which summarizes the following:

(1) Information on children who run away from foster care and their risk of becoming sex trafficking victims, using data reported by States under section 479 of the Social Security Act and information collected by States related to section 471(a)(35) of such Act, including—

(A) characteristics of children who run away from foster care;

(B) potential factors associated with children running away from foster care (such as reason for entry into care, length of stay in care, type of placement, and other factors that contributed to the child's running away);

(C) information on children's experiences while absent from care; and

(D) trends in the number of children reported as runaways in each fiscal year (including factors that may have contributed to changes in such trends).

(2) Information on State efforts to provide specialized services, foster family homes, child care institutions, or other forms of placement for children who are sex trafficking victims.

(3) Information on State efforts to ensure children in foster care form and maintain long-lasting connections to caring adults, even when a child in foster care must move to another foster family home or when the child is placed under the supervision of a new caseworker.

Subtitle B—Improving Opportunities for Children in Foster Care and Supporting Permanency

SEC. 111. SUPPORTING NORMALCY FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE.

(a) REASONABLE AND PRUDENT PARENT STANDARD.—

(1) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO THE STANDARD.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675), as amended by section 101(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10)(A) The term 'reasonable and prudent parent standard' means the standard characterized by careful and sensible parental decisions that maintain the health, safety, and best interests of a child while at the same time encouraging the emotional and developmental growth of the child, that a caregiver shall use when determining whether to allow a child in foster care under the responsibility of the State to participate in extracurricular, enrichment, cultural, and social activities.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'caregiver' means a foster parent with whom a child in foster care has been placed or a designated official for a child care institution in which a child in foster care has been placed.

''(11)(A) The term 'age or developmentally-appropriate' means—

''(i) activities or items that are generally accepted as suitable for children of the same chronological age or level of maturity or that are determined to be developmentally-appropriate for a child, based on the development of cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities that are typical for an age or age group; and

''(ii) in the case of a specific child, activities or items that are suitable for the child based on the developmental stages attained by the child with respect to the cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities of the child.

''(B) In the event that any age-related activities have implications relative to the academic curriculum of a child, nothing in this part or part B shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State or local educational agency, or the specific instructional content, academic achievement standards and assessments, curriculum, or program of instruction of a school.''.

(2) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a)(24) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(24)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''include'' and inserting ''includes'';

(B) by striking ''and that such preparation'' and inserting ''that the preparation''; and

(C) by inserting '', and that the preparation shall include knowledge and skills relating to the reasonable and prudent parent standard for the participation of the child in age or developmentally-appropriate activities, including knowledge and skills relating to the developmental stages of the cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities of a child, and knowledge and skills relating to applying the standard to decisions such as whether to allow the child to engage in social, extracurricular, enrichment, cultural, and social activities, including sports, field trips, and overnight activities lasting 1 or more days, and to decisions involving the signing of permission slips and arranging of transportation for the child to and from extracurricular, enrichment, and social activities'' before the semicolon.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide assistance to the States on best practices for devising strategies to assist foster parents in applying a reasonable and prudent parent standard in a manner that protects child safety, while also allowing children to experience normal and beneficial activities, including methods for appropriately considering the concerns of the biological parents of a child in decisions related to participation of the child in activities (with the understanding that those concerns should not necessarily determine the participation of the child in any activity).

(b) NORMALCY FOR CHILDREN IN CHILD CARE INSTITUTIONS.—Section 471(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(10)) is amended to read as follows:

''(10) provides—

''(A) for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities that shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for foster family homes and child care institutions which are reasonably in accord with recommended standards of national organizations concerned with standards for the institutions or homes, including standards related to admission policies, safety, sanitation, and protection of civil rights, and which shall permit use of the reasonable and prudent parenting standard;

''(B) that the standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be applied by the State to any foster family home or child care institution receiving funds under this part or part B and shall require, as a condition of each contract entered into by a child care institution to provide foster care, the presence on-site of at least 1 official who, with respect to any child placed at the child care institution, is designated to be the caregiver who is authorized to apply the reasonable and prudent parent standard to decisions involving the participation of the child in age or developmentally-appropriate activities, and who is provided with training in how to use and apply the reasonable and prudent parent standard in the same manner as prospective foster parents are provided the training pursuant to paragraph (24);

''(C) that the standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include policies related to the liability of foster parents and private entities under contract by the State involving the application of the reasonable and prudent parent standard, to ensure appropriate liability for caregivers when a child participates in an approved activity and the caregiver approving the activity acts in accordance with the reasonable and prudent parent standard; and

''(D) that a waiver of any standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be made only on a case-by-case basis for non-safety standards (as determined by the State) in relative foster family homes for specific children in care;''.

(c) SUPPORTING PARTICIPATION IN AGE-APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Section 477(a) (42 U.S.C. 677(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) to ensure children who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age have regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally-appropriate activities as defined in section 475(11).''.

(2) Section 477(h)(1) (42 U.S.C. 677(h)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or, beginning in fiscal year 2020, $143,000,000'' after ''$140,000,000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 112. IMPROVING ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT AS A PERMANENCY OPTION.

(a) ELIMINATION OF ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT FOR CHILDREN UNDER AGE 16.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 475(5)(C)(i) (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(C)(i)) is amended by inserting

''only in the case of a child who has attained 16 years of age'' before ''(in cases where''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 422(b)(8)(A)(iii)(II) (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(8)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by inserting '', subject to the requirements of sections 475(5)(C) and 475A(a)'' after ''arrangement''.

(3) DELAYED APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CHILDREN.—In the case of children in foster care under the responsibility of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium (either directly or under supervision of a State), the amendments made by this subsection shall not apply until the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part E of title IV (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 475 the following:

''SEC. 475A. ADDITIONAL CASE PLAN AND CASE REVIEW SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT.—In the case of any child for whom another planned permanent living arrangement is the permanency plan determined for the child under section 475(5)(C), the following requirements shall apply for purposes of approving the case plan for the child and the case system review procedure for the child:

''(1) DOCUMENTATION OF INTENSIVE, ONGOING, UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORTS FOR FAMILY PLACEMENT.—At each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the State agency documents the intensive, ongoing, and, as of the date of the hearing, unsuccessful efforts made by the State agency to return the child home or secure a placement for the child with a fit and willing relative (including adult siblings), a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, including through efforts that utilize search technology (including social media) to find biological family members for the children.

''(2) REDETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATENESS OF PLACEMENT AT EACH PERMANENCY HEARING.—The State agency shall implement procedures to ensure that, at each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the court or administrative body appointed or approved by the court conducting the hearing on the permanency plan for the child does the following:

''(A) Ask the child about the desired permanency outcome for the child.

''(B) Make a judicial determination explaining why, as of the date of the hearing, another planned permanent living arrangement is the best permanency plan for the child and provide compelling reasons why it continues to not be in the best interests of the child to—

''(i) return home;

''(ii) be placed for adoption;

''(iii) be placed with a legal guardian; or

''(iv) be placed with a fit and willing relative.

''(3) DEMONSTRATION OF SUPPORT FOR ENGAGING IN AGE OR DEVELOPMENTALLY-APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES AND SOCIAL EVENTS.—At each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the State agency shall document the steps the State agency is taking to ensure that—

''(A) the child's foster family home or child care institution is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard; and

''(B) the child has regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities (including by consulting with the child in an age-appropriate manner about the opportunities of the child to participate in the activities).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) PART B.—Section 422(b)(8)(A)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting ''and in accordance with the requirements of section 475A'' after ''section 475(5)''.

(ii) PART E.—Section 471(a)(16) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(16)) is amended—

(I) by inserting ''and in accordance with the requirements of section 475A'' after ''section 475(1)''; and

(II) by striking ''section 475(5)(B)'' and inserting ''sections 475(5) and 475A''.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''meets the requirements of section 475A and'' after ''written document which''; and

(ii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following ''and, for a child for whom another planned permanent living arrangement has been determined as the permanency plan, the steps the State agency is taking to ensure the child's foster family home or child care institution is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard and to ascertain whether the child has regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities (including by consulting with the child in an age-appropriate manner about the opportunities of the child to participate in the activities);''; and

(II) in subparagraph (C)—

(aa) by inserting '', as of the date of the hearing,'' after ''compelling reason for determining''; and

(bb) by inserting ''subject to section 475A(a),'' after ''another planned permanent living arrangement,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 113. EMPOWERING FOSTER CHILDREN AGE 14 AND OLDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR OWN CASE PLAN AND TRANSITION PLANNING FOR A SUCCESSFUL ADULTHOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 475(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 675(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''With respect to a child who has attained 14 years of age, the plan developed for the child in accordance with this paragraph, and any revision or addition to the plan, shall be developed in consultation with the child and, at the option of the child, with up to 2 members of the case planning team who are chosen by the child and who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child. A State may reject an individual selected by a child to be a member of the case planning team at any time if the State has good cause to believe that the individual would not act in the best interests of the child. One individual selected by a child to be a member of the child's case planning team may be designated to be the child's advisor and, as necessary, advocate, with respect to the application of the reasonable and prudent parent standard to the child.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO INCLUDE CHILDREN 14 AND OLDER IN TRANSITION PLANNING.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking ''Where appropriate, for a child age 16'' and inserting ''For a child who has attained 14 years of age''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''16'' and inserting ''14'';

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: ''and (iv) if a child has attained 14 years of age, the permanency plan developed for the child, and any revision or addition to the plan, shall be developed in consultation with the child and, at the option of the child, with not more than 2 members of the permanency planning team who are selected by the child and who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child, except that the State may reject an individual so selected by the child if the State has good cause to believe that the individual would not act in the best interests of the child, and 1 individual so selected by the child may be designated to be the child's advisor and, as necessary, advocate, with respect to the application of the reasonable and prudent standard to the child;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''16'' and inserting ''14''.

(c) TRANSITION PLANNING FOR A SUCCESSFUL ADULTHOOD.—Paragraphs (1)(D), (5)(C)(i), and (5)(C)(iii) of section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) are each amended by striking ''independent living'' and inserting ''a successful adulthood''.

(d) LIST OF RIGHTS.—Section 475A, as added by section 112(b)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(b) LIST OF RIGHTS.—The case plan for any child in foster care under the responsibility of the State who has attained 14 years of age shall include—

''(1) a document that describes the rights of the child with respect to education, health, visitation, and court participation, the right to be provided with the documents specified in section 475(5)(I) in accordance with that section, and the right to stay safe and avoid exploitation; and

''(2) a signed acknowledgment by the child that the child has been provided with a copy of the document and that the rights contained in the document have been explained to the child in an age-appropriate way.''.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to Congress regarding the implementation of the amendments made by this section. The report shall include—

(1) an analysis of how States are administering the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (5)(C) of section 475 of the Social Security Act, as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section, that a child in foster care who has attained 14 years of age be permitted to select up to 2 members of the case planning team or permanency planning team for the child from individuals who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child; and

(2) a description of best practices of States with respect to the administration of the requirements.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 114. ENSURING FOSTER CHILDREN HAVE A BIRTH CERTIFICATE, SOCIAL SECURITY CARD, HEALTH INSURANCE INFORMATION, MEDICAL RECORDS, AND A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR EQUIVALENT STATE-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) CASE REVIEW SYSTEM REQUIREMENT.—Section 475(5)(I) (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and receives assistance'' and inserting ''receives assistance''; and

(2) by inserting '', and, if the child is leaving foster care by reason of having attained 18 years of age or such greater age as the State has elected under paragraph (8), unless the child has been in foster care for less than 6 months, is not discharged from care without being provided with (if the child is eligible to receive such document) an official or certified copy of the United States birth certificate of the child, a social security card issued by the Commissioner of Social Security, health insurance information, a copy of the child's medical records, and a driver's license or identification card issued by a State in accordance with the requirements of section 202 of the REAL ID Act of 2005'' before the period.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 115. INFORMATION ON CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE IN ANNUAL REPORTS USING AFCARS DATA; CONSULTATION.

Section 479A (42 U.S.C. 679b) is amended—

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

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) include in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (5) for fiscal year 2016 or any succeeding fiscal year, State-by-State data on—

''(A) children in foster care who have been placed in a child care institution or other setting that is not a foster family home, including—

''(i) the number of children in the placements and their ages, including separately, the number and ages of children who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement;

''(ii) the duration of the placement in the settings (including for children who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement);

''(iii) the types of child care institutions used (including group homes, residential treatment, shelters, or other congregate care settings);

''(iv) with respect to each child care institution or other setting that is not a foster family home, the number of children in foster care residing in each such institution or non-foster family home;

''(v) any clinically diagnosed special need of such children; and

''(vi) the extent of any specialized education, treatment, counseling, or other services provided in the settings; and

''(B) children in foster care who are pregnant or parenting.

''(b) CONSULTATION ON OTHER ISSUES.—The Secretary shall consult with States and organizations with an interest in child welfare, including organizations that provide adoption and foster care services, and shall take into account requests from Members of Congress, in selecting other issues to be analyzed and reported on under this section using data available to the Secretary, including data reported by States through the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System and to the National Youth in Transition Database.''.

Subtitle C—National Advisory Committee

SEC. 121. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE SEX TRAFFICKING OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Title XI (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1114 the following:

''NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE SEX TRAFFICKING OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE UNITED STATES

''SEC. 1114A. (a) OFFICIAL DESIGNATION.—This section relates to the National Advisory Committee on the Sex Trafficking of Children and Youth in the United States (in this section referred to as the 'Committee').

''(b) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish and appoint all members of the Committee.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 21 members whose diverse experience and background enable them to provide balanced points of view with regard to carrying out the duties of the Committee.

''(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General and National Governors Association, shall appoint the members to the Committee. At least 1 Committee member shall be a former sex trafficking victim. 2 Committee members shall be a Governor of a State, 1 of whom shall be a member of the Democratic Party and 1 of whom shall be a member of the Republican Party.

''(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Committee. A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Committee.

''(4) COMPENSATION.—Committee members shall serve without compensation or per diem in lieu of subsistence.

''(d) DUTIES.—

''(1) NATIONAL RESPONSE.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary and the Attorney General on practical and general policies concerning improvements to the Nation's response to the sex trafficking of children and youth in the United States.

''(2) POLICIES FOR COOPERATION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary and the Attorney General on practical and general policies concerning the cooperation of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, child welfare agencies, social service providers, physical health and mental health providers, victim service providers, State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child welfare or social services for children and their families, Federal, State, and local police, juvenile detention centers, and runaway and homeless youth programs, schools, the gaming and entertainment industry, and businesses and organizations that provide services to youth, on responding to sex trafficking, including the development and implementation of—

''(A) successful interventions with children and youth who are exposed to conditions that make them vulnerable to, or victims of, sex trafficking; and

''(B) recommendations for administrative or legislative changes necessary to use programs, properties, or other resources owned, operated, or funded by the Federal Government to provide safe housing for children and youth who are sex trafficking victims and provide support to entities that provide housing or other assistance to the victims.

''(3) BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Within 2 years after the establishment of the Committee, the Committee shall develop 2 tiers (referred to in this subparagraph as 'Tier I' and 'Tier II') of recommended best practices for States to follow in combating the sex trafficking of children and youth. Tier I shall provide States that have not yet substantively addressed the sex trafficking of children and youth with an idea of where to begin and what steps to take. Tier II shall provide States that are already working to address the sex trafficking of children and youth with examples of policies that are already being used effectively by other States to address sex trafficking.

''(B) DEVELOPMENT.—The best practices shall be based on multidisciplinary research and promising, evidence-based models and programs as reflected in State efforts to meet the requirements of sections 101 and 102 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

''(C) CONTENT.—The best practices shall be user-friendly, incorporate the most up-to-date technology, and include the following:

''(i) Sample training materials, protocols, and screening tools that, to the extent possible, accommodate for regional differences among the States, to prepare individuals who administer social services to identify and serve children and youth who are sex

trafficking victims or at-risk of sex trafficking.

''(ii) Multidisciplinary strategies to identify victims, manage cases, and improve services for all children and youth who are at risk of sex trafficking, or are sex trafficking victims, in the United States.

''(iii) Sample protocols and recommendations based on current States' efforts, accounting for regional differences between States that provide for effective, cross-system collaboration between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, child welfare agencies, social service providers, physical health and mental health providers, victim service providers, State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child welfare or social services for children and their families, the gaming and entertainment industry, Federal, State, and local police, juvenile detention centers and runaway and homeless youth programs, housing resources that are appropriate for housing child and youth victims of trafficking, schools, and businesses and organizations that provide services to children and youth. These protocols and recommendations should include strategies to identify victims and collect, document, and share data across systems and agencies, and should be designed to help agencies better understand the type of sex trafficking involved, the scope of the problem, the needs of the population to be served, ways to address the demand for trafficked children and youth and increase prosecutions of traffickers and purchasers of children and youth, and the degree of victim interaction with multiple systems.

''(iv) Developing the criteria and guidelines necessary for establishing safe residential placements for foster children who have been sex trafficked as well as victims of trafficking identified through interaction with law enforcement.

''(v) Developing training guidelines for caregivers that serve children and youth being cared for outside the home.

''(D) INFORMING STATES OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Committee, in coordination with the National Governors Association, Secretary and Attorney General, shall ensure that State Governors and child welfare agencies are notified and informed on a quarterly basis of the best practices and recommendations for States, and notified 6 months in advance that the Committee will be evaluating the extent to which States adopt the Committee's recommendations.

''(E) REPORT ON STATE IMPLEMENTATION.—Within 3 years after the establishment of the Committee, the Committee shall submit to the Secretary and the Attorney General, as part of its final report as well as for online and publicly available publication, a description of what each State has done to implement the recommendations of the Committee.

''(e) REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall submit an interim and a final report on the work of the Committee to—

''(A) the Secretary;

''(B) the Attorney General;

''(C) the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

''(D) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

''(2) REPORTING DATES.—The interim report shall be submitted not later than 3 years after the establishment of the Committee. The final report shall be submitted not later than 4 years after the establishment of the Committee.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) AGENCY SUPPORT.—The Secretary shall direct the head of the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services to provide all necessary support for the Committee.

''(2) MEETINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee will meet at the call of the Secretary at least twice each year to carry out this section, and more often as otherwise required.

''(B) ACCOMMODATION FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND IN PERSON.—The Secretary shall create a process through which Committee members who are unable to travel to a Committee meeting in person may participate remotely through the use of video conference, teleconference, online, or other means.

''(3) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may establish subcommittees or working groups, as necessary and consistent with the mission of the Committee. The subcommittees or working groups shall have no authority to make decisions on behalf of the Committee, nor shall they report directly to any official or entity listed in subsection (d).

''(4) RECORDKEEPING.—The records of the Committee and any subcommittees and working groups shall be maintained in accordance with appropriate Department of Health and Human Services policies and procedures and shall be available for public inspection and copying, subject to the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

''(g) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate 5 years after the date of its establishment, but the Secretary shall continue to operate and update, as necessary, an Internet website displaying the State best practices, recommendations, and evaluation of State-by-State implementation of the Secretary's recommendations.

''(h) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'sex trafficking' includes the definition set forth in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) and 'severe form of trafficking in persons' described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act.''.

TITLE II—IMPROVING ADOPTION INCENTIVES AND EXTENDING FAMILY CONNECTION GRANTS

Subtitle A—Improving Adoption Incentive Payments

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2016.

Section 473A (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2013 through 2015''; and

(2) in each of paragraphs (1)(D) and (2) of subsection (h), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2016''.

SEC. 202. IMPROVEMENTS TO AWARD STRUCTURE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD.—Section 473A(b) (42 U.S.C. 673b(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

(b) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—Section 473A(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 673b(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''NUMBERS OF ADOPTIONS'' and inserting ''RATES OF ADOPTIONS AND GUARDIANSHIPS'';

(2) by striking ''the numbers'' and all that follows through ''section,'' and inserting ''each of the rates required to be determined under this section with respect to a State and a fiscal year,''; and

(3) by inserting before the period the following: '', and, with respect to the determination of the rates related to foster child guardianships, on the basis of information reported to the Secretary under paragraph (12) of subsection (g)''.

(c) AWARD AMOUNT.—Section 473A(d) (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

''(A) $5,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year;

''(B) $7,500, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age; and

''(C) $10,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 14 years of age; and

''(D) $4,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.''; and

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

''(3) INCREASED ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENT FOR TIMELY ADOPTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If for any of fiscal years 2013 through 2015, the total amount of adoption and legal guardianship incentive payments payable under paragraph (1) of this subsection are less than the amount appropriated under subsection (h) for the fiscal year, then, from the remainder of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year that is not required for such payments (in this paragraph referred to as the 'timely adoption award pool'), the Secretary shall increase the adoption incentive payment determined under paragraph (1) for each State that the Secretary determines is a timely adoption award State for the fiscal year by the award amount determined for the fiscal year under subparagraph (C).

''(B) TIMELY ADOPTION AWARD STATE DEFINED.—A State is a timely adoption award State for a fiscal year if the Secretary determines that, for children who were in foster care under the supervision of the State at the time of adoptive placement, the average number of months from removal of children from their home to the placement of children in finalized adoptions is less than 24 months.

''(C) AWARD AMOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the award amount determined under this subparagraph with respect to a fiscal year is the amount equal to the timely adoption award pool for the fiscal year divided by the number of timely adoption award States for the fiscal year.''.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 473A(g) (42 U.S.C. 673b(g)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (8) and inserting the following:

''(1) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'foster child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(2) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of foster child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(3) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'foster child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who, at the time of adoptive placement, was in foster care under the supervision of the State.

''(4) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age.

''(5) BASE RATE OF PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTIONS AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(6) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship' means the final adoption, or the placement into foster child guardianship (as defined in paragraph (12)) of a child who has attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive or foster child guardianship placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473(a) with respect to the child.

''(7) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 14 years of age.

''(8) BASE RATE OF OLDER CHILD ADOPTIONS AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(9) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'older child adoption and older foster child guardianship' means the final adoption, or the placement into foster child guardianship (as defined in paragraph (12)) of a child who has attained 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive or foster child guardianship placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473(a) with respect to the child.

''(10) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child guardianships occurring in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(11) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(12) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'foster child guardianship' means, with respect to a State, the exit of a child from foster care under the responsibility of the State to live with a legal guardian, if the State has reported to the Secretary—

''(A) that the State agency has determined that—

''(i) the child has been removed from his or her home pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement or as a result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the welfare of the child;

''(ii) being returned home or adopted are not appropriate permanency options for the child;

''(iii) the child demonstrates a strong attachment to the prospective legal guardian, and the prospective legal guardian has a strong commitment to caring permanently for the child; and

''(iv) if the child has attained 14 years of age, the child has been consulted regarding the legal guardianship arrangement; or

''(B) the alternative procedures used by the State to determine that legal guardianship is the appropriate option for the child.''.

SEC. 203. RENAMING OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The section heading of section 473A (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 473A. ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 473A is amended in each of subsections (a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 673b(a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B)) by inserting ''and legal guardianship'' after ''adoption'' each place it appears.

(2) The heading of section 473A(d) (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended by inserting ''AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP'' after ''ADOPTION''.

SEC. 204. LIMITATION ON USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Section 473A(f) (42 U.S.C. 673b(f)) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting '', and shall use the amount to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E'' before the period.

SEC. 205. INCREASE IN PERIOD FOR WHICH INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE.

Section 473A(e) (42 U.S.C. 673b(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''24-MONTH'' and inserting ''36-MONTH''; and

(2) by striking ''24-month'' and inserting ''36-month''.

SEC. 206. STATE REPORT ON CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE; REQUIREMENT TO SPEND 30 PERCENT OF SAVINGS ON CERTAIN SERVICES.

Section 473(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8)(A) A State shall calculate the savings (if any) resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, using a methodology specified by the Secretary or an alternate methodology proposed by the State and approved by the Secretary.

''(B) A State shall annually report to the Secretary—

''(i) the methodology used to make the calculation described in subparagraph (A), without regard to whether any savings are found;

''(ii) the amount of any savings referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(iii) how any such savings are spent, accounting for and reporting the spending separately from any other spending reported to the Secretary under part B or this part.

''(C) The Secretary shall make all information reported pursuant to subparagraph (B) available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible to the public.

''(D)(i) A State shall spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under this part resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, to provide to children of families any service

that may be provided under part B or this part. A State shall spend not less than 30 percent of any such savings on post-adoption services, post-guardianship services, and services to support and sustain positive permanent outcomes for children who otherwise might enter into foster care under the responsibility of the State, with at least ⅔ of the spending by the State to comply with such 30 percent requirement being spent on post-adoption and post-guardianship services.

''(ii) Any State spending required under clause (i) shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or this part.''.

SEC. 207. PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.

Section 473(d)(3) (42 U.S.C. 673(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ELIGIBILITY NOT AFFECTED BY REPLACEMENT OF GUARDIAN WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.—In the event of the death or incapacity of the relative guardian, the eligibility of a child for a kinship guardianship assistance payment under this subsection shall not be affected by reason of the replacement of the relative guardian with a successor legal guardian named in the kinship guardianship assistance agreement referred to in paragraph (1) (including in any amendment to the agreement), notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and section 471(a)(28).''.

SEC. 208. DATA COLLECTION ON ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP DISRUPTION AND DISSOLUTION.

Section 479 (42 U.S.C. 679) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) To promote improved knowledge on how best to ensure strong, permanent families for children, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the collection and analysis of information regarding children who enter into foster care under the supervision of a State after prior finalization of an adoption or legal guardianship. The regulations shall require each State with a State plan approved under this part to collect and report as part of such data collection system the number of children who enter foster care under supervision of the State after finalization of an adoption or legal guardianship and may include information concerning the length of the prior adoption or guardianship, the age of the child at the time of the prior adoption or guardianship, the age at which the child subsequently entered foster care under supervision of the State, the type of agency involved in making the prior adoptive or guardianship placement, and any other factors determined necessary to better understand factors associated with the child's post-adoption or post-guardianship entry to foster care.''.

SEC. 209. ENCOURAGING THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE WITH SIBLINGS.

(a) STATE PLAN AMENDMENT.—

(1) NOTIFICATION OF PARENTS OF SIBLINGS.—Section 471(a)(29) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(29)) is amended by striking ''all adult grandparents'' and inserting ''the following relatives: all adult grandparents, all parents of a sibling of the child, where such parent has legal custody of such sibling,''.

(2) SIBLING DEFINED.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675), as amended by sections 101(b) and 111(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) The term 'sibling' means an individual who satisfies at least one of the following conditions with respect to a child:

''(A) The individual is considered by State law to be a sibling of the child.

''(B) The individual would have been considered a sibling of the child under State law but for a termination or other disruption of parental rights, such as the death of a parent.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as subordinating the rights of foster or adoptive parents of a child to the rights of the parents of a sibling of that child.

SEC. 210. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect as if enacted on October 1, 2013.

(b) RESTRUCTURING AND RENAMING OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 202 and 203 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount payable to a State under section 473A of the Social Security Act for fiscal year 2014 shall be an amount equal to ½ of the sum of—

(i) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 if the amendments made by section 202 of this Act had not taken effect; and

(ii) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 in the absence of this paragraph.

(B) PRO RATA ADJUSTMENT IF INSUFFICIENT FUNDS AVAILABLE.—If the total amount otherwise payable under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014 exceeds the amount appropriated pursuant to section 473A(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(h)) for that fiscal year, the amount payable to each State under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014 shall be—

(i) the amount that would otherwise be payable to the State under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014; multiplied by

(ii) the percentage represented by the amount so appropriated for fiscal year 2014, divided by the total amount otherwise payable under subparagraph (A) to all States for that fiscal year.

(c) USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS; ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN; DATA COLLECTION.—The amendments made by sections 204, 207, and 208 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.—The amendment made by section 206 shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(e) NOTIFICATION OF PARENTS OF SIBLINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 209 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan approved under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by section 209, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the close of the 1st regular session of the State legislature that ends after the 1-year period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

Subtitle B—Extending the Family Connection Grant Program

SEC. 221. EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 427(h) (42 U.S.C. 627(h)) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF UNIVERSITIES FOR MATCHING GRANTS.—Section 427(a) (42 U.S.C. 627(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking ''and'' before ''private''; and

(2) by inserting ''and institutions of higher education (as defined under section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)),'' after ''arrangements,''.

(c) FINDING FAMILIES FOR FOSTER CHILDREN WHO ARE PARENTS.—Section 427(a)(1)(E) (42 U.S.C. 627(a)(1)(E)) is amended by inserting ''and other individuals who are willing and able to be foster parents for children in foster care under the responsibility of the State who are themselves parents'' after ''kinship care families''.

(d) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Section 427(g) (42 U.S.C. 627(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if enacted on October 1, 2013.

TITLE III—IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESS TO CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT CASES.

(a) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF HHS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH MULTILATERAL CHILD SUPPORT CONVENTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (l) (as added by section 7306 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005) as subsection (m); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) The Secretary shall use the authorities otherwise provided by law to ensure the compliance of the United States with any multilateral child support convention to which the United States is a party.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 453(k)(3) (42 U.S.C. 653(k)(3)) is amended by striking ''452(l)'' and inserting ''452(m)''.

(b) ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE.—Section 453(c) (42 U.S.C. 653(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) an entity designated as a Central Authority for child support enforcement in a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country for purposes specified in section 459A(c)(2).''.

(c) STATE OPTION TO REQUIRE INDIVIDUALS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO APPLY THROUGH THEIR COUNTRY'S APPROPRIATE CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—Section 454 (42 U.S.C. 654) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A)(ii), by inserting before the semicolon ''(except that, if the individual applying for the services resides in a foreign reciprocating country or foreign treaty country, the State may opt to require

the individual to request the services through the Central Authority for child support enforcement in the foreign reciprocating country or the foreign treaty country, and if the individual resides in a foreign country that is not a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country, a State may accept or reject the application)''; and

(2) in paragraph (32)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', a foreign treaty country,'' after ''a foreign reciprocating country''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or foreign obligee'' and inserting '', foreign treaty country, or foreign individual''.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 459A (42 U.S.C. 659a) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REFERENCES.—In this part:

''(1) FOREIGN RECIPROCATING COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign reciprocating country' means a foreign country (or political subdivision thereof) with respect to which the Secretary has made a declaration pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) FOREIGN TREATY COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign treaty country' means a foreign country for which the 2007 Family Maintenance Convention is in force.

''(3) 2007 FAMILY MAINTENANCE CONVENTION.—The term '2007 Family Maintenance Convention' means the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''foreign countries that are the subject of a declaration under this section'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and foreign treaty countries'' after ''foreign reciprocating countries''; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''the subject of a declaration pursuant to subsection (a)'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''.

(e) COLLECTION OF PAST-DUE SUPPORT FROM FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS.—Section 464(a)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 664(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''under section 454(4)(A)(ii)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (4)(A)(ii) or (32) of section 454''.

(f) STATE LAW REQUIREMENT CONCERNING THE UNIFORM INTERSTATE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT (UIFSA).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 466(f) (42 U.S.C. 666(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''on and after January 1, 1998,'';

(B) by striking ''and as in effect on August 22, 1996,''; and

(C) by striking ''adopted as of such date'' and inserting ''adopted as of September 30, 2008''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1738B of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant or the parties have consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order,'';

(B) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant and the parties have not consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the other State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order''; and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking '' 'child' means'' and inserting ''(1) The term 'child' means'';

(ii) by striking '' 'child's State' means'' and inserting ''(2) The term 'child's State' means'';

(iii) by striking '' 'child's home State' means'' and inserting ''(3) The term 'child's home State' means'';

(iv) by striking '' 'child support' means'' and inserting ''(4) The term 'child support' means'';

(v) by striking '' 'child support order' '' and inserting ''(5) The term 'child support order' '';

(vi) by striking '' 'contestant' means'' and inserting ''(6) The term 'contestant' means'';

(vii) by striking '' 'court' means'' and inserting ''(7) The term 'court' means'';

(viii) by striking '' 'modification' means'' and inserting ''(8) The term 'modification' means''; and

(ix) by striking '' 'State' means'' and inserting ''(9) The term 'State' means''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE; GRACE PERIOD FOR STATE LAW CHANGES.—

(A) PARAGRAPH (1).—(i) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect with respect to a State no later than the effective date of laws enacted by the legislature of the State implementing such paragraph, but in no event later than the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i), in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(B) PARAGRAPH (2).—(i) The amendments made by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date on which the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance enters into force for the United States.

(ii) The amendments made by subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) TRIBAL ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE.—Section 453(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 653(c)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or Indian tribe or tribal organization (as defined in subsections (e) and (l) of section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)),'' after ''any State''.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR INDIAN TRIBES OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 1115(b) (42 U.S.C. 1315(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and realigning the left margin of subparagraph (C) so as to align with subparagraphs (A) and (B) (as so redesignated);

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) An Indian tribe or tribal organization operating a program under section 455(f) shall be considered a State for purposes of authority to conduct an experimental, pilot, or demonstration project under subsection (a) to assist in promoting the objectives of part D of title IV and receiving payments under the second sentence of that subsection. The Secretary may waive compliance with any requirements of section 455(f) or regulations promulgated under that section to the extent and for the period the Secretary finds necessary for an Indian tribe or tribal organization to carry out such project. Costs of the project which would not otherwise be included as expenditures of a program operating under section 455(f) and which are not included as part of the costs of projects under section 1110, shall, to the extent and for the period prescribed by the Secretary, be regarded as expenditures under a tribal plan or plans approved under such section, or for the administration of such tribal plan or plans, as may be appropriate. An Indian tribe or tribal organization applying for or receiving start-up program development funding pursuant to section 309.16 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not be considered to be an Indian tribe or tribal organization operating a program under section 455(f) for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 453(f) (42 U.S.C. 653(f)) is amended by inserting ''and tribal'' after ''State'' each place it appears.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING OFFERING OF VOLUNTARY PARENTING TIME ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The separation of a child from a parent does not end the financial or other responsibilities of the parent toward the child.

(2) Increased parental access and visitation not only improve parent-child relationships and outcomes for children, but also have been demonstrated to result in improved child support collections, which creates a double win for children—a more engaged parent and improved financial security.

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

(1) establishing parenting time arrangements when obtaining child support orders is an important goal which should be accompanied by strong family violence safeguards; and

(2) States should use existing funding sources to support the establishment of parenting time arrangements, including child support incentives, Access and Visitation Grants, and Healthy Marriage Promotion and Responsible Fatherhood Grants.

SEC. 304. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652), as amended by section 301(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section. The rule shall identify federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify State implementation options and describe future milestones.

SEC. 305. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) in conjunction with the strategic plan, review and provide recommendations for cost-effective improvements to the child support enforcement program under part D of title IV of the Social Security Act, and ensure that the plan addresses the effectiveness and performance of the program, analyzes program practices, identifies possible new collection tools and approaches, and identifies strategies for holding parents accountable for supporting their children and for building the capacity of parents to pay child support, with specific attention given to matters including front-end services, ongoing case management, collections, Tribal-State partnerships, interstate and intergovernmental interactions, program performance, data analytics, and information technology;

(2) in carrying out paragraph (1), consult with and include input from—

(A) State, tribal, and county child support directors;

(B) judges who preside over family courts or other State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child support enforcement, child welfare, or social services for children and their families, and organizations that represent the judges;

(C) custodial parents and organizations that represent them;

(D) noncustodial parents and organizations that represent them; and

(E) organizations that represent fiduciary entities that are affected by child support enforcement policies; and

(3) in developing the report required by paragraph (4), solicit public comment;

(4) not later than June 30, 2015, submit to the Congress a report that sets forth policy options for improvements in child support enforcement, which report shall include the following:

(A) A review of the effectiveness of State child support enforcement programs, and the collection practices employed by State agencies administering programs under such part, and an analysis of the extent to which the practices result in unintended consequences or performance issues associated with the programs and practices.

(B) Recommendations for methods to enhance the effectiveness of child support enforcement programs and collection practices.

(C) A review of State best practices in regards to establishing and operating State and multistate lien registries.

(D) A compilation of State recovery and distribution policies.

(E) Options, with analysis, for methods to engage noncustodial parents in the lives of their children through consideration of parental time and visitation with children.

(F) An analysis of the role of alternative dispute resolution in making child support determinations.

(G) Identification of best practices for—

(i) determining which services and support programs available to custodial and noncustodial parents are non-duplicative, evidence-based, and produce quality outcomes, and connecting custodial and noncustodial parents to those services and support programs;

(ii) providing employment support, job training, and job placement for custodial and noncustodial parents; and

(iii) establishing services, supports, and child support payment tracking for noncustodial parents, including options for the prevention of, and intervention on, uncollectible arrearages, such as retroactive obligations.

(H) Options, with analysis, for methods for States to use to collect child support payments from individuals who owe excessive arrearages as determined under section 454(31) of such Act.

(I) A review of State practices under 454(31) of such Act used to determine which individuals are excluded from the requirements of section 452(k) of such Act, including the extent to which individuals are able to successfully contest or appeal decisions.

(J) Options, with analysis, for actions as are determined to be appropriate for improvement in child support enforcement.

SEC. 306. REQUIRED ELECTRONIC PROCESSING OF INCOME WITHHOLDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 454A(g)(1) (42 U.S.C. 654a(g)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking '', to the maximum extent feasible,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i);

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end of clause (ii); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) at the option of the employer, using the electronic transmission methods prescribed by the Secretary;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 401. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of this legislation, which is designed to prevent sex trafficking of youth in foster care, encourage the adoption of more children from foster care, and increase child support collected to support children, among other important purposes.

I will focus my comments on the important adoption provisions in the legislation and then recognize subcommittee Chairman REICHERT to discuss the provisions designed to prevent sex trafficking.

I have spent much of my professional career promoting adoption of children by loving parents. As an attorney in private practice, I worked with parents and children in the foster care system. Those sorts of experiences provided much of the background for changes in landmark adoption legislation Congress has approved in recent years.

In 1997, my colleagues and I on the Ways and Means Committee crafted the Adoption and Safe Families Act. That legislation streamlined the adoption process to help more children in foster care quickly move into permanent adoptive homes. It also, for the first time, offered incentives to States to safely increase the number of children from foster care. It worked.

In the decade following that legislation, the number of U.S. children adopted from foster care increased by 71 percent. In the years since, adoptions have continued to remain higher, even as the foster care caseload started to decline.

Overall, almost 300,000 children have been adopted as a result of the increase in adoptions starting in 1997. While placing children in permanent loving homes is the most important benefit of the legislation, one study estimated the Federal Government saved $1 billion over 8 years by ensuring people were adopted, instead of remaining in foster care.

That is the successful incentive program this legislation extends and updates. With this bill today, we add a new award for States that increase adoptions of older children, who are the hardest to adopt and have the worst outcomes if they ''age out'' of foster care without a family to call their own.

We also add a new award for increases in guardianship when family members step up to care for their nieces and nephews, grandsons and

granddaughters. This bill ensures that States maintain their commitment to post-adoption and related services, so children truly have a forever family.

Finding a forever family is the goal of this legislation, and forever homes are possible. Just last year, I met with the Johns family of Midland, Michigan. The Johns family has adopted three children and was honored during their visit to Washington as an Angels in Adoption family, but before they adopted, they were foster parents to Austin and Katie, their first two children.

They adopted them and later adopted their third child, Aliyah. The Johns family made a safe, permanent, and loving home a reality for three children, and with this legislation, we can continue to build on that success.

I note that this legislation is fully paid for by expecting all States to use electronic methods that will do a better job collecting child support, increasing family incomes, and reducing the amount of welfare benefits taxpayers pay.

Those savings not only cover the cost of this legislation, but reduce the deficit by $19 million over the next 10 years. That is a win-win for children, families, and hardworking taxpayers alike.

This legislation reflects bipartisan, bicameral agreements on all these policy areas, and I thank my colleagues who joined me in introducing this legislation: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. REICHERT of Washington, and Mr. DOGGETT of Texas, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senators WYDEN and HATCH.

They are all leaders on these issues, and I value their help in developing and advancing this legislation.

□ 1830

This bill was crafted the way legislation is supposed to be: through hearings, markups, public comments, and negotiations with our colleagues in the Senate. The bill we are considering today incorporates many suggestions from experts in the child welfare field, as well as just interested citizens and adoptive parents. We are grateful for the public's comments and their participation in this process.

The bottom line is this: children in foster care deserve a place to call home not just for a few months or years, but for good. We have already seen great progress in increasing adoptions since the Adoption Incentives program was created in 1997, and it is our hope that we can continue this progress once this bill is signed into law.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill in the House, and I hope and expect the Senate to also act soon on this bill so we can continue to move more foster children into permanent, loving homes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a special responsibility to protect vulnerable children. This is bipartisan legislation that takes some important, though modest, steps toward meeting that responsibility by addressing three issues: combating the exploitation of at-risk children, promoting permanent homes for foster children, and strengthening international enforcement of child support obligations.

With a bipartisan, bicameral agreement between the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, this legislation combines modified versions of three bills that we previously passed here in the House earlier in the session. This measure has been endorsed by a number of important child advocacy groups, including the Children's Defense Fund, the Child Welfare League of America, and Voice for Adoptions.

I was pleased to work with Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, and certainly Human Resources Subcommittee Chairman REICHERT, as well as our colleagues in the Senate, as we came together with bipartisan agreement on this legislation.

There are still provisions in the bill that I think could use improvement, including the fact that an important program that helps link children in foster care to relatives, called Family Connection Grants, is extended only for a single year; but I think that even with some of its limitations, this legislation does make a positive difference in the lives of many children, particularly those who are vulnerable to sex trafficking.

When children come into foster care, they already have issues. They have suffered abuse or neglect. They have been exploited. They have suffered. They have a sense of isolation, and they often feel that they have been removed from one home and put out in a place with which they are not familiar. They are especially at prey for sex traffickers and are targets in that condition.

This bipartisan legislation attempts to combat trafficking in the foster care system by screening at-risk children and providing services, when necessary; by reporting the incidence of trafficking so we will have a clear indication of that among foster children; and by expediting the location of children who run away from foster care.

Additionally, this bill attempts to help children live more normal lives while in foster care by allowing them to more fully participate in the activities that most children enjoy, such as playing sports and an occasional sleepover at a friend's house.

This legislation also extends and adopts changes in the Adoption Incentives program to encourage States to find permanent homes for children in foster care, which is certainly the best approach. The bill increases the program's focus on promoting the adoption of older children in foster care.

It also, for the first time, provides an incentive for States to increase the number of children leaving foster care to live with a legal guardian. It includes a provision that I authored ensuring children won't lose their eligibility for Federal guardianship assistance if the guardian dies or becomes incapacitated.

Finally, the legislation would take necessary steps to implement a very important international treaty on enforcing child support obligations abroad so that leaving this country doesn't allow individuals to leave behind their responsibility for the children that they parented that are here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we still have much to do to ensure that the well-being of vulnerable children is receiving the attention that it deserves, but I think this is a good start with this bill. I urge its passage and swift action by the Senate in accord with our agreement to see that it gets to the President's desk soon for signature.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I rise today in strong support of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act and the other antitrafficking bills we have on the floor today in furtherance of our efforts to bring an end to this abhorrent crime.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking continues to be one of the world's great dangers, threatening millions of innocent lives, including right here at home in the United States. Our very own Department of Homeland Security describes human trafficking as ''a modern-day form of slavery involving the illegal trade of people for exploitation or commercial gain.''

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that between 100,000 and 300,000 children in America may be trafficked for commercial sex every year. These children represent the most vulnerable among us, and it is our responsibility to act now and do what we can to stop these heinous crimes. Ending human trafficking is a goal that both parties share, and today we can take one step closer to achieving that goal.

Some of the most vulnerable to this crime are America's foster children, as the gentleman from Texas just discussed. All too frequently, they fall through the cracks and become victims in these criminal schemes. The legislation before us today takes this problem head-on, encouraging States to tackle the issue of trafficking foster children and to ensure their placement into loving adoptive homes.

This is a great opportunity for us in the House to stand together to show the people that sent us here and the rest of this country and the world that our House is united to bringing an end to human trafficking.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington, Chairman REICHERT, Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT, and the rest of the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a minute to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman DAVE CAMP, one of our great leaders in Congress, who has not only led on this issue, but has been a tireless champion for families and children throughout his career.

Over the years, Chairman CAMP has advocated and succeeded in bringing much-needed reforms to our foster care system. The Adoption and Safe Families Act, which Chairman CAMP introduced in the House and President Clinton then signed, streamlined the adoption process, making it easier for kids to move out of foster care and into more permanent homes. In 2003, President Bush signed then-Congressman, now-Chairman, CAMP'S Adoption Promotion Act, which provides financial incentives for States that increase adoption among older children. These are just a few of Chairman CAMP's many great accomplishments, and today's bill is just another example of his heartfelt dedication to putting America's kids first.

Few have had the impact on creating a better future for our children than DAVE CAMP. Because of Chairman CAMP, children all over America have the opportunity to live in safe homes and to pursue their dreams. I have been very proud to call him my colleague and honored to call him a dear friend.

Though I know we have still got several months before the end of this Congress, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate DAVE CAMP on a terrific and wonderful career. I want to thank the gentleman for his service and wish him the very best in his retirement. The Congress will certainly miss the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who cochairs the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth. I don't know another Member of this Congress who has expressed more concern in going all over the country to work and seek improvements in the lives of our foster children.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

First, I would like to commend Chairmen CAMP and REICHERT and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT for their work on this important legislation and for their ongoing commitment to our Nation's foster youth.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to hear stories from youth across the country during our listening tour. Many of the young people I have heard from share similar stories—from Washington State to Missouri—that they just want to be a part of loving families and have the ability to participate in sports, hang out with their friends, and have the same experiences as their peers. I strongly believe this legislation will help bring a greater sense of stability to foster youth and give kids a chance to be just like their friends.

Since 1997, when the adoption incentives legislation became law, we have seen a significant reduction in the number of kids in foster care. By improving adoption incentives, we help children find their forever families. This is why it is so critical to highlight this legislation's investment in legal guardianship and relative caregivers.

More than half of the youth in the child welfare system are placed with a relative caregiver: a grandmother, an aunt, uncle, or older sibling. Guardianship is often the preferred type of family permanence for relative caregivers.

In addition, parts of H.R. 4980 include the funding for Family Connection Grants, which provide critical resources to ensure children find permanent homes, oftentimes with relatives.

In my Los Angeles district, relative caregivers are the largest group of foster care providers. Research shows that foster placement with relatives are good for children. They allow children to stay in their schools, receive continued support from their community and culture, and feel connected to families that continue to love them.

Despite the importance of relative caregivers, they face unique obstacles. Becoming a caregiver changes lives in every way: physically, emotionally, and financially. Stable middle class families or seniors who live on their life savings are often pushed to the brink of poverty because they have accepted the unexpected financial burden of caring for a child.

I am greatly encouraged by the critical work this legislation before us encourages—children having forever families through both adoption and guardianship throughout the country—and hope to continue this work with my colleagues in the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add my compliments to Chairman CAMP.

Not to be repetitive, I think it is important to mention some of the fine work that Chairman CAMP has done in his time here in Congress, which has inspired all of us, I think, to move the legislation that we are discussing today. He has left an indelible stamp on our Nation's child welfare policy during the years he has served in Congress, and especially throughout his service on the Ways and Means Committee. He has a whole list of bills and initiatives and amendments that he has been associated with to champion this cause, but I think, suffice it to say, Mr. CAMP has probably done more than most in the last 20 years of his service here for the people of America to help children, and especially focused on foster care and adoption.

Again, I want to join in praising and thanking the chairman for his service and dedication to the children of this country and families in general.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

□ 1845

This bill, as the chairman said, reflects bipartisan agreement and bicameral agreement. So, after we pass this bill tonight, it goes back to the Senate, and this will go to the President's desk, I am sure, and be signed within, I hope, the next month or so.

This bill is designed to prevent sex trafficking involving youth in foster care. It is designed to strengthen families by increasing adoptions from foster care, and it is designed to improve child support collections.

This issue is a very personal issue for me. I have listened to the speeches tonight, and I appreciate the enthusiasm and the dedication and the focus that Members of Congress have put on this issue over the last year especially. This is our second week this month, I think, that we have focused on human trafficking in foster care.

Mr. Speaker, some people know that my previous career was in law enforcement. I spent 33 years in the sheriff's office. Many of those years were spent investigating a case that has been entitled the Green River murder case. We finally arrested that person. He says that he killed somewhere between 60 and 70 young girls in Seattle—60 to 70 children's lives taken. I collected a lot of those bodies, Mr. Speaker. I remember them, where they lay, 15-year-old girls.

We are not talking about a bill today, ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about a bill—legislation—that is just a piece of fluff, that is just a piece of legislation, that is just words. We are talking

about the lives of children and the monsters who are out there—and they have been discussed tonight—who are ready to prey on them, who are ready to take their lives, even if it is just to take a piece of their lives away from them for a moment, or maybe 20 times a night they take a piece of their lives. They survive physically, but mentally and emotionally, their lives have been ripped apart and so have the families'.

If you were to just drive down this street and see 10 young ladies standing on a street corner, Mr. Speaker, who were involved in human trafficking, six out of those 10 would be foster kids. These are kids we have responsibility for, whom we as a nation have the responsibility for—all of us in each one of our States who take care of foster children. We place them in foster homes, and they run away, and we don't find them, and we don't search for them, and they go on the streets, and they get scooped up by somebody who says: I love you. Stay with me. I will buy you clothes. I will buy you jewelry. I will put you on the street, too, and that is how you are going to make the money to buy those things—and guess what. You are going to provide me with some of those things, too.

It just makes me sick. It should make every American sick to his stomach. We need to stop this.

I have seen it with my own eyes for 19 years in having been involved in this case, trying to bring this monster, who not only took away their souls, but who also eventually ended up taking away their lives. He ripped those lives out of the families' hands—gone. My 15-year-old daughter—gone. Can you imagine?

That is why we need to help folks. This is such an important piece of legislation. One of the young ladies who was one of the first victims in this case was Wendy Coffield. She was a foster kid. She ran away from her foster home, and she ended up on the street, but nobody looked for Wendy Coffield until we found her one day, floating in the river just south of Seattle—dead.

One of the things that I wanted to do as the chair of the Human Resources Subcommittee was to help educate this country and other Members about this issue. We held hearings, and we had experts from DSHS and the State of Washington and human resources all across the country who were directors of DSHS, and we had social workers. They all provided great information.

But do you know? One of the most powerful witnesses and speakers we had was a young lady named Miss Ortiz Walker Pettigrew. She goes by the name of ''T.'' She was recently named by Time magazine as one of the 100 most influential people in the world. She is a young lady who spent the first 18 years of her life in foster care, and 7 of those years were in human trafficking. She is now one of the 100 most influential people in the world. She was trafficked on the streets. She was trafficked on the Internet. She was trafficked on the back pages of newspapers. Now she is speaking out, and she is the one—and people like her are the ones—who provides us with that information.

I think that we can all agree that our Nation's children deserve better, because her statement was and her comment was: I felt like I was part of a family. I identified with my pimp and with the other young ladies who were out working the street. That was my family—versus having a family that could hold them and love them.

This bill requires States to identify victims of sex trafficking and provide them with the services they need to heal. It will also improve data on instances of child sex trafficking so better policies can be developed to prevent it.

Also, on the prevention front, this bill makes sure that kids can be kids, that foster kids can participate in after-school events, which would, I think, make them less vulnerable, anyway, to getting involved in street activity and getting sucked into the life of human trafficking. It encourages States to move children out of the foster care system and into loving families more quickly.

The approach we are taking is practical. It is bipartisan. It is based on experiences from States around the country. It is evidence-based, and it is also real life experience-based. This bill incorporates a wide range of ideas gleaned from bills introduced by members of the Ways and Means Committee—like from Mr. PAULSEN, who will speak soon—and by other Members of the House and from over 150 pages of public comments received on our December 2013 discussion draft.

I want to thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. DOGGETT, who joins me on the floor today, as well as to thank the chairman, Mr. CAMP, and the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, for their support of this legislation and for their help throughout its development.

I also want to thank the many outside groups that offered their feedback and their support. As of today, we have received support for this bill from 48 child welfare groups, which is an indication of the high importance of this legislation. I can't think of a more important or a more bipartisan topic than protecting vulnerable children in foster care and working to find loving homes for each of them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to join in the accolades for our chairman, DAVE CAMP of Michigan, and to particularly recognize the key role he played in helping to create our child abuse commission, which is currently holding hearings. They had the first one down in San Antonio, in my district. They will be going to Michigan, and they have been in Florida. I think they are collecting data that will provide us another opportunity to act, to deal with some of the same issues that we are concerned with today. I appreciate the leadership that he has shown and, certainly, that Mr. REICHERT has shown.

I am pleased that among those groups that we have heard from is the American Academy of Pediatrics, which plays such a leading role. They say that this legislation is an essential step in improving the health and well-being of foster youths and in expanding their access to appropriate permanency options. The Children's Defense Fund was important in this legislation. It emphasized the importance of permanent placements for children as they leave foster care and of empowering our older youth. I believe that this bipartisan legislation is a good step forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members, while there are many issues that divide Washington, this is absolutely an area where there is agreement and bipartisan and bicameral work being done. We already passed five separate antitrafficking bills just a few months ago, in May, and I am very pleased we are taking additional action on these pieces of legislation tonight.

More than 100,000 children are at risk of being trafficked for commercial sex in the United States. Those most at risk of victimization are the vulnerable, including children from our foster care system. Many of these children face barriers to a real childhood, and they are unable to participate in school activities, to play after-school sports, or to even spend time with friends. Youths that have been involved in the foster care system are much more likely to become runaways or homeless at an early age. The preventative measures in this legislation will make a difference.

On any given night, 2,500 youths in Minnesota—my home State—will experience homelessness, and a majority of those homeless youths is solicited for sex within 48 hours of becoming homeless. In fact, law enforcement will say—and tells me—that the overwhelming majority of trafficking victims is part of that homeless population and that 60 percent of those victims were in foster care or group homes when they ran away.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that trafficking is a very complex problem that

requires many different solutions. It is going after the demand by punishing the johns. It is shutting off access to trafficking victims through Web sites like backpage.com. It is increasing international cooperation and passing safe harbor laws that ensure children are treated as victims of these heinous crimes and not as criminals.

Most importantly, as we have in this legislation, we need to prevent children from becoming potential victims in the first place. This bill takes important steps to improve the sharing of information as to what is happening, where and to whom. By identifying trends and filling in the gaps, we can help these children in foster care before they become victims in the first place.

I really want to thank not only Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN and Ranking Member DOGGETT, but I want to thank Subcommittee Chairman REICHERT for his passion, his advocacy, and his hard work on this legislation. We brought this together in a bipartisan manner.

I also want to thank them in particular for including provisions from the legislation, which I authored with Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, that address the lack of reliable data and reporting to law enforcement as it relates to runaway youth from the child welfare system. I look forward to its passage and to the passage of all of these bipartisan bills this evening because, together, we can end trafficking.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, would you report on the time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

I am so pleased tonight to hear one colleague after another indicate that they are ready to act in a bipartisan way on this issue and that it should be a bipartisan commitment to addressing the vulnerability of our children. I think that needs to apply to all children. This legislation that we are considering at the moment is one of seven bills that we are going to approve here in the House today that deal with trafficking because trafficking remains a serious problem here and around the world.

Several of the bills that we are considering recognize that there is an international dimension to this problem. Therefore, I would particularly urge my Republican colleagues and all of our colleagues tonight to remember next week the statements that are being made this evening and to be as concerned about the vulnerability and the exposure to the trafficking of those children who have recently sought refuge in our country as we are about foster children or any other children in our country.

While the sex trafficking prevention in this bill addresses, specifically, problems within the foster care system, the scourge of youth sex trafficking extends far beyond this population. As we are all well aware, we have had a recent influx of children come across our southern border, many of whom have been abused at home, abused along the 1,000-plus-mile track, and could be subject to abuse or to being involved again in sex trafficking.

□ 1900

Polaris, a group that works to help end modern-day slavery, notes that undocumented immigrants are ''highly vulnerable'' to sex trafficking due to their ''lack of legal status and protections, language barriers, limited employment options, immigration-related debts, and social isolation.'' Most of these vulnerabilities are amplified when the immigrants are children. We have an obligation in this Congress to take their unique situation into account and provide them with the protection and the care that they deserve.

The steady drumbeat to remove the very protections that help vulnerable children from becoming sex slaves or remaining in slavery is wrong, and that is why 37 Latino organizations, including MALDEF, the National Council of La Raza, and the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, among them, all have urged this Congress to assure due process for these kids rather than stripping away rights that this Congress provided in current United States law.

A diverse group of faith leaders, including the Southern Baptist Convention, the Sojourners, and the National Association of Evangelicals have joined with these Latino groups in calling to assure that these children are not denied their due process rights, and that they do not have rights guaranteed by American law today taken away next week.

Over 50 child development experts from around the country, many of the same people that supported our effort in today's legislation, wrote this Congress yesterday and urged that we change course before we put thousands of traumatized children into danger. They describe an expedited screening process that would leave children in danger. It is the expedited screening process that applies today to Mexican children, and it is flawed.

Children who fear trafficking, or were previously trafficked, can be returned to Mexico to reenter that trafficking trade and come back again. We shouldn't subject the Central American children to the same process, yet, that is what has been recommended today.

I am concerned about what happens to children along the Green River, about what happens along the Potomac River, about what happens along the Colorado River, but I am also concerned about what is happening to the many who have just crossed the Rio Grande River.

When children are asked about whether they have been trafficked by a police officer, who may not speak their native language, in a rushed interview in what may be a chaotic situation in a detention center that is much like a police station, where someone who just abused them or who may actually have been involved in the trafficking and smuggling process is nearby and can perhaps overhear these tales, they will be reluctant to articulate the sexual trauma, the very private trauma to which they have been subjected.

These children who have been traumatized, in some cases, multiple times, who may well have left their native country because of abuse, deserve to be interviewed and evaluated in an environment that takes into consideration their youth, their vulnerability, all of the factors that we have been talking about on this piece of legislation, and the other six pieces of legislation that the House is about to approve.

These children deserve the same type of protections, not an intimidating environment that is made all the more unfamiliar to them by virtue of the fact that they are in a land that they have never been to before.

This special treatment does not occur and happen if you have an expedited screening process. That is why we unanimously passed the guarantees that are in the 2008 law. If we want to protect these children, we should abandon a plan to throw out these children by the wayside by abandoning those protections.

I believe that we shouldn't let our desire, the fears of some, perhaps the hate of others, to result in the quick deportation of children and return them to a live of sex slavery. They are vulnerable children. We don't assure them amnesty. Certainly, we cannot accept every child that wants to enter this country.

I am not in favor of amnesty, but I do think we need a little humanity, a little human decency, and that those children deserve the same respect and due process as any child that we are talking about tonight.

So I am pleased that we are making progress on this piece of legislation and another six bills. I think they are an important step forward in dealing with a serious international problem. But it is critical that this interest in bipartisan concern for the vulnerability of children extend to those children who are now in my home State, and about whom we will be talking in the few days that remain in this Congress, and that we apply the same kind of standard then as we are applying tonight.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a list of the organizations in support of this legislation.

ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PREVENTING SEX TRAFFICKING AND STRENGTHENING FAMILIES ACT (H.R. 4980)

1. American Academy of Pediatrics (letter)

2. American Psychological Association (letter)
3. Association on American Indian Affairs (email)
4. Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (letter)
5. Cherokee Nation (letter)
6. Children Awaiting Parents (Senate)
7. Children's Defense Fund (letter)
8. Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption (letter)
9. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (letter)
10. Eastern Shashone Tribe (letter)
11. First Focus Campaign for Children (letter)
12. Fort Belknap Child Support Program (letter)
13. Foster Club (letter)
14. Foster Family-Based Treatment Association (letter)
15. Generations United (letter)
16. Holt International (letter)
17. Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (letter)
18. Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
19. Love 146 (letter)
20. Menominee Tribal Child Support Agency (letter)
21. Mescalero Apache Tribe (letter)
22. Meskwaki Nation Child Support Services (letter)
23. National Adoption Center (letter)
24. National Child Support Enforcement Association (letter with concerns)
25. National Children's Alliance (letter)
26. National Foster Parent Association (letter)
27. National Indian Child Welfare Association (email)
28. Nebraska Families Collaborative (letter)
29. Nez Perce Tribe (letter)
30. North American Council on Adoptable Children (letter)
31. NYS Citizens' Coalition for Children (letter)
32. Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin (letter)
33. Oregon Post Adoption Resource Center (letter)
34. Penobscot Nation Child Support Agency (letter)
35. Red Cliff Tribal Child Support Services Agency (letter)
36. Rights4Girls (letter)
37. Stockbridge-Munsee Community (letter)
38. Suquamish Tribe (letter)
39. The Adoption Exchange (email)
40. The Attachment and Trauma Network (Senate)
41. The California Alliance of Child and Family Services (Senate)
42. The Child Welfare League of America (letter)
43. The Donaldson Adoption Institute (letter)
44. The National Crittenton Foundation (email)
45. Tribal Child Support Enforcement, Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma (letter)
46. Voice for Adoption (letter)
47. You Gotta Believe (letter)
48. Yurok Tribe (letter).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as I said earlier, represents bipartisan, bicameral progress in protecting our Nation's most vulnerable children.

So, in plain language, the House of Representatives cooperated together and developed a bill. The Senate cooperated together, Senators HATCH and WYDEN worked together to develop a bill on the Senate side. They agreed and passed a bill, we agreed and passed a bill.

This bill that we are talking about today is one of those rare moments in history where not only did Democrats and Republicans agree, but the Senate and the House agreed this was a good bill, and here it is today.

After we pass this bill tonight, it will move to the Senate, and we already know we have agreement there. It will be passed in the Senate, hopefully, some time early next week, and move on to the President's desk for signing.

We are focused tonight on this bill, with foster kids, because this is the jurisdiction that I have, as the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, and that Mr. DOGGETT, as the ranking member, has too. We are focused on foster kids and human trafficking, and helping them find loving homes so they can have a productive life, so they can have hope, hope for the future.

We need to pass this bill tonight.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act. This bill advances child welfare policy in many important ways. For over a decade, I have advocated via the Stronger Families Act or the Investing in Permanency for Youth in Foster Care Act that federal policy should incentivize permanency for all foster youth regardless of how they exit care—adoption, guardianship, or reunification. I am especially pleased that H.R. 4980 takes a tremendous step forward in recognizing guardianship as an important permanency option for foster children who cannot return home. For the first time, the bill provides incentives for states for placing foster children with legal guardians.

Guardianship and kinship caregiving are very significant for Chicago, for Illinois, and for the African American community. My Congressional District has the highest percentage of children living with grandparent caregivers in the nation, followed closely by two other Congressional Districts in Illinois. Nearly 400,000 children make up our nation's foster care population, with more than one in four (approximately 28%) of these vulnerable children living with a grandparent or other relative. Research clearly shows that kinship foster care families are safer, more stable placements that are more likely to keep children connected with their siblings and communities than non-relative placements.

Adoption is not a viable option for many children to exit foster care, with courts explicitly ruling out this option for thousands of children each year. Moreover, adoption is not equally availed by families of all races and ethnicities, especially those in African-American and Native-American communities. Research—including a report by the Government Accountability Office—indicates that African American children stay in foster care longer because of difficulties in recruiting adoptive parents and a hesitancy to terminate parental rights, as is required for adoption. Importantly, a study of the Illinois Subsidized Guardianship Demonstration Waiver showed that the offer of subsidized guardianship increased overall rates of family permanency by six percentage points over and above the level of performance in a randomly assigned control group that was limited to the option of adoption only. African American and Native American families tend to choose guardianship as a route to permanency rather than adoption because they do not see a need to legally sever the connection between parent and child. A grandmother raising her grandchild does not want to erase the legal connection of her child to her grandchild. Guardianship affords the same legal responsibility for a child as adoption only without legally severing the familial connection.

Thus, I applaud the bill for including an incentive for guardianship that is four-fifths the incentive for adoption as well as a guardianship incentive equal to that for that for adoption for older youth. Rewarding states for helping foster youth find permanent, loving homes via guardianship or adoption allows families to make the right permanency choice that best fits the particular needs and circumstances of their family, rather than incentivizing states to prioritize adoption alone.

To further support relative caregivers, I am very pleased that the bill extends the Family Connection Grants for one year. These grants provide funding for intensive family finding, kinship navigator programs, family group decision-making meetings, and residential family treatment programs. These programs promote permanency for children in care. In addition to the positive outcomes for foster children in relative care, research shows that kinship care placements are cost effective. In Illinois, cost studies estimated an average of $4,778 in savings of IV-E administrative expenses over an 8 year period compared to a matched control group that did not have this option. Extrapolating to the 10,000 children in Illinois discharged to guardianship between 1997 and 2007, the projected savings was approximately $48 million for the state of Illinois. Thus, Family Connection Grants improves the access of foster youth to safer, more stable family placements and reduce costs for state and federal governments.

Further, I am delighted that the bill includes comparable successor-guardian protections for children who exit to guardianship as those protections provided to youth who exit to adoption. Given that guardianship is an important permanency option for grandparent caregivers who are older and have health problems, the issue of continuity of care via successor guardianship is especially needed to protect children. Current law already provides this protection for adoptive parents; extending this protection to children in guardianship is a reasonable step to protect youth and keep them from re-entering the foster care system.

The bill implements many important changes to child welfare law, including: protecting children and youth at risk for sex trafficking; ensuring the foster youth have important documents when exiting care; empowering foster youth in the development of their

own case plans; improving information in child welfare reports; modifying the calculation of permanency incentives based on improvements in rate rather than number to better capture placement success; enhancing reporting requirements related to the use of state dollars; strengthening benefits and services; and increasing funding for the Chafee Independent Living program.

Given the dramatic improvements to child welfare policy made by this bill, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of H.R. 4980, which would prevent the sex trafficking of foster youth, promote adoption, and strengthen international child support

This measure represents an agreement with Senators WYDEN and HATCH on three bipartisan bills that the House passed overwhelmingly: the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act, and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Improving Opportunities for Youth in Foster Care Act. I voted to approve all three.

While this bill does not address every challenge of foster youth and child sex trafficking facing our nation, it is a positive first step. It also demonstrates Congress can work together to prevent the negative treatment of foster youth that can lead to child sex trafficking. For children involved with the state child welfare agency, states must develop methods to identify, document, and determine services for victims of child sex trafficking and those who are at risk of becoming victims. The legislation also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a national advisory committee which will have two years to review, and recommend best practices to states to address sex trafficking of children and youth.

In my home state of Oregon, 8,686 children were in foster care on an average daily basis last year and 12,366 children spent at least one day in foster care of some kind. Nationally, the average foster child will spend nearly two years in foster care and will change homes an average of three times. The legislation also provides a much needed continuation of adoption incentives and FY14 Family Connection grants. It also includes a number of helpful provisions targeted at protecting our most vulnerable youth from becoming victims and oftentimes repeat victims of trafficking.

I will continue to work towards further efforts in Congress to end child sex trafficking and improve our foster care system so that our communities can be safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4980.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5135) to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5135

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogues the activities of the Federal Government and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses, preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children, and other similar topics that the Task Force determines appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(1) information on the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) information on each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking''.

SEC. 5. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this Act, the term and ''victim of trafficking'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5135, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014, introduced by Representative KRISTI NOEM.

The crisis of human trafficking is ruinous to the lives of its victims, many of whom are drawn from the ranks of the most vulnerable in our society. This crisis has touched nearly every corner of the globe, and even exists here in the United States.

The Justice Department, and its many State and local partners, have made great strides to rescue children and other victims from the terrible crime of sex trafficking. Last month, the FBI announced a successful nationwide sting that led to the rescue of 168 children and the arrest of 281 pimps in more than 100 cities.

Also last month, the Justice Department seized a major Web site known for promoting illegal sex trafficking and indicted its owner. Both of these cases, and the many other trafficking cases that have been brought in recent years, show that law enforcement is making progress in the fight against child exploitation. But sadly, there remains more work to be done.

Studies suggest that over 290,000 youth are at risk of commercial sexual exploitation in the United States. To effectively combat human trafficking, we must cut it off at its root by trying to prevent the trafficking before it can occur.

H.R. 5135 requires the existing Interagency Task Force to Monitor and

Combat Trafficking to survey and catalog the methods being employed by our Federal and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and children from being victimized.

The bill also directs the task force to identify best practices and what gaps might exist, if any, in research and data so that we can place new and valuable tools in the hands of law enforcement.

One challenge that victims of sex trafficking often face is a lack of financial independence that keeps them trapped in a life of prostitution. H.R. 5135 helps to address that by clarifying that existing Federal trafficking grants may be used for programs that provide housing for victims of sex trafficking.

As I have said before, sex traffickers, and the buyers who enable them to stay in business, dehumanize their victims, treating them as objects to be used for the profit and pleasure of others, instead of human beings creating in the image of God.

In May of this year, the House passed a number of antitrafficking bills that originated in the House Judiciary Committee, which are all awaiting consideration by the Senate. I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Hill to move swiftly to pass those bills.

I am pleased that we can consider another set of bipartisan antitrafficking bills here today. It is important that we do everything that we can to bring an end to this illicit industry. H.R. 5135 will help us to do just that. I hope that this body will join with me and Congresswoman NOEM in supporting this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014. This bill is vital to identifying best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims, and it, therefore, enjoys bipartisan support in the House.

This bill will encourage Federal, State, and local governments to work together as an Interagency Task Force to investigate and enforce the existing laws. This task force will emphasize prosecution of the purchasers of sex with children as child rapists. These purchasers are usually referred to as ''johns'' who pay for sex with children, but insofar as children cannot consent to sex, the johns are legally committing rape and should be prosecuted as rapists.

The bill encourages law enforcement coordination with intergovernment organizations and academics who will put into practice what research and data demonstrate will work to prevent these crimes.

The GAO will submit a report on how the Federal grant programs' funds have been used to combat human trafficking or to assist victims of trafficking. An Interagency Task Force will submit a report to Congress on its findings.

The bill will also provide housing to protect and assist children in recovering victims of trafficking. To date, the number of victims, especially child victims, greatly exceeds the number of available shelter beds.

Without a safe place to stay, many rescued victims will end up running away and returning to their abusers due to the unique trauma bond that occurs in these cases.

□ 1915

Along those lines, we must do more to rescue child victims and expand the services they need. Our country has a moral imperative to protect and help these children who are vulnerable, warrant special protection, and need these services, even in the best of circumstances.

This vulnerability is compounded amongst children who have been victims of sexual exploitation, physical violence, trauma, and extreme poverty. With our protection, support, and assistance, we can help them survive.

I commend my colleague from Virginia, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for working to bring the bill to the floor, and I commend our colleague from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for introducing the legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in prosecuting those who rape children, protecting and rescuing child victims, and providing the victims with the support that they need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, my eyes have really been opened to the disturbing type of slavery that we have seen across the world and here at home.

I have heard about human trafficking before and young children being sold for sex overseas, but I guess I didn't really realize how much it was happening here in the United States and even in my home State of South Dakota. The more I learned about human trafficking and the risk that it posed to our kids, the more I became convicted that I needed to do something about it.

The average age of a child that is trafficked is just 11 to 14 years old. Many times, the trafficker will lure these children in, pretending to be their friend or their boyfriend, control them through the use of drugs or alcohol, and give them the comfort and stability that they may be lacking at home. After they have them isolated and dependent, they sell them for sex.

It is heartbreaking for me as a mom, as an aunt of many nieces and nephews, as a 4–H leader, and as a person who works with our youth every single day to think about the innocent children that are being forced into this disgusting industry and becoming slaves to these predators.

Every year, hundreds of thousands of children are at risk to being trafficked here in the United States, so this isn't a problem that is far away. It is a problem that is right here in our backyards.

Back in South Dakota, I held a lot of roundtables and a Justice Against Slavery Summit. I heard from local shelters, from law enforcement officers, tribal leaders, from victims and advocate groups and learned from their expertise.

I learned a lot about what was being done to stop human trafficking and what additional tools they needed from Congress and what we should pursue. While we talked about the problem, I wanted them to focus on what they needed for solutions. With the insight of all these community leaders, we identified ways we could rout out the disgusting industry and help victims recover.

That is why I am so proud to be here today to introduce H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act. This bipartisan bill was based on those conversations that I had during those roundtables and the summit that I held in South Dakota on how best to prevent and combat human trafficking. The best way to stop human trafficking in its tracks is to prevent it.

My bill launches a task force review to look into Federal and State trafficking-prevention activities. The review will be in done in consultation with nongovernmental organizations, like those I heard from in South Dakota, and will work to identify and develop best practices to prevent trafficking.

Next, it requires an inventory to be done of existing antitrafficking efforts by the Federal Government. It is important to take a hard look at all of these programs across the Federal Government to ensure that Federal resources are targeted and that they are used where they are needed.

We can also identify any gaps in Federal programs that need to be filled, and finally, my bill improves existing Department of Justice grants and allows them to be used for shelters for survivors.

Did you know, nationwide, there is only about 200 beds available for underage victims of sex trafficking? Many of

these kids, once they are rescued from their trafficker, have nowhere safe to go. They don't have any other option, and so often, what they are forced to do is to return to their trafficker.

Many who are in the foster care system don't have the family support that is necessary to be safe and to recover. Sadly, without a place to recover from the trauma that has happened in their lives, kids return back to those traffickers, and that is why it is important that we use Federal resources wisely to promote more facilities to help these recovering children.

I am proud to be standing here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take action on this bill today and the other bills that were brought to deal with sex trafficking. It is an issue that we can and we should all stand together on. Together, these bills will do more to prevent trafficking, give law enforcement more tools to deal with it, and help our victims recover.

I am grateful for my colleagues and to the leadership for making this a priority in the House. I urge my colleagues to support this package and continue our fight to end human trafficking.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who has also been a leader on this issue of combating sex trafficking.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government reports that as many as 17,500 people are trafficked into our country annually. With the rise of the Internet, the number of sex trafficking incidents in particular has exploded. We must do what we can to combat this rising epidemic by identifying best practices in combating trafficking, so that others can duplicate these successful models.

I am proud that in my home State of Tennessee, the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation has developed a card that would identify an algorithm of how law enforcement would interview those who potentially have been sex-trafficked, as well as on the back of the card, those kinds of resources that can be used to help those who are in this situation.

Systems like this must be identified, studied, and duplicated to combat trafficking, and I am proud to support this bill from Congresswoman NOEM, which would help to make this very important work successful.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that my home State of North Dakota is enjoying the blessing of an energy boom, an economic boom, which is driven largely by an oil and gas renaissance that has us contributing now over 1 million barrels of oil per day toward America's energy security, but with the blessing of this energy boom comes some unwanted consequences, and chief among them is a growing demand for the product of human trafficking. It has caused the citizens of our clean and beautiful State to be somewhat alarmed and rightfully so.

Our local and State law enforcement agencies are stressed to the max. Our nonprofit and faith-based communities are doing all that they can to assist, and they are doing it with great effort, but they need some additional help and encouragement.

So this and the many other House bills that will be passed in the next couple of days dealing with this plague of human trafficking will provide the tools that, frankly, only the Federal Government can provide to assist—not replace, but assist local, State, and nonprofit agencies in this fight against the plague of human trafficking in our society.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this and the other bills before us.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to all that, as the chair of the Judiciary Committee, I appreciate the bipartisan work that has been done on many of these sex trafficking bills.

I appreciate especially the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the ranking member on the Crime Subcommittee, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, as well. I commend the chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, as well as Congresswoman NOEM for their leadership on this issue.

Sex trafficking is a serious problem, and while we see it around the world, we should not overlook the fact that it is a serious problem right here in the United States.

This bill joins several others that we have already passed through the House of Representatives to address this serious problem, and it deserves the same bipartisan support that the others received, and it also deserves the consideration of the other side of the Capitol, by the other body which needs to take these bills up and pass them as well, so they can go to the President's desk and be signed into law.

This is truly a bipartisan effort to address a serious national problem, and we all need to join into the solution.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5135.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETECTION ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5116) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5116

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term ''human trafficking'' means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, how to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department's initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(b) TRAINING DESCRIBED.—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, where appropriate, in a manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training.

(c) TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that all personnel referred to in section 3(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees the overall effectiveness of the program required by this Act, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of such trafficking.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any State, local, or tribal government or private organization to assist such entity in establishing its program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from such entity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014, sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

This bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to implement a human trafficking awareness training program for Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other DHS personnel which is tailored to their professional roles and responsibilities.

Additionally, it directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to annually assess and update training, as needed, based on current human trafficking trends and then report to Congress on the number of suspected and confirmed trafficking cases reported by DHS officials.

Lastly, it authorizes DHS to provide training curricula to non-Federal entities that request assistance in setting up their own programs. The Committee on Homeland Security expects that this bill will primarily codify already existing training programs within the Department, thereby having little or no implementation costs.

Mr. Speaker, DHS plays a critical role in combating human trafficking which has, unfortunately, become one of the most profitable forms of transnational crime in the world, amounting to a $32 billion per year industry.

Trafficked individuals are often forced into prostitution and labor, and an estimated 100,000 U.S. children are victims of trafficking each year. This modern-day form of slavery is a heinous stain on our society.

Moreover, CBP personnel are often the first to come into contact with unaccompanied minors crossing the border, which we are seeing on a daily basis now. It has become a significant humanitarian crisis that must be addressed.

While these children are crossing under a variety of circumstances, it is imperative that DHS personnel encountering them are adequately trained to detect potential victims of trafficking and respond most appropriately.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and chair of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I believe it is critical that we continue to equip Department of Homeland Security personnel with up-to-date training and the tools to detect and counter this growing challenge, including Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, employees and others who often are working on the front lines with local communities, and we know they are working on the front lines of the southern border as we speak.

□ 1930

H.R. 5116 would not only strengthen and codify training requirements for DHS, but it would also provide Congress with a clearer picture of the effectiveness of the training, as well as the number of suspected and confirmed instances of human trafficking reported by DHS officials.

Finally, this bill will encourage partnerships between DHS, State, local, and tribal governments, as well as private organizations, to set up additional training programs, raise broader awareness, and further enable these entities to become a force multiplier in human trafficking detection and prevention efforts.

I commend Congressman MEADOWS for introducing this bill, as well as the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCALL, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON, and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the ranking member, who is here in the Chamber today, for the fact that we are working on this in a bipartisan way. I appreciate their continued attention to this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5116, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This whole issue of human trafficking is one, in my 18 years in the Congress, that I have been working significantly on. I sit on the Homeland Security Committee, and one of the things that we were able to do many years ago was to direct funds actually into my area, into Orange County, California, to work on a collaboration of State agencies, police officers, and the Federal Government, and we funded this to make one of the first task forces on human trafficking in our Nation. Originally, there were six, and we were one of six. Now they are, I think, in the double digits.

So we have learned a lot. We have learned a lot about human trafficking. We have learned that there are some countries that are initiation or supply countries. There are some that just transit these young people, these children, these women. We have also learned that there are destination countries or demand countries, and, of course, the United States is one of the largest demand countries. We are also a transit country because we take our own children from one State and put them in the other States. We are also a supply country because we use our own children in this human trafficking process, these terrible people who do this. They are really just, most of the time, about making money any way they can.

So what we know is that there are many children being trafficked across our State lines, but also across our borders. They come in through our airports. They come in through boats in Miami and my State of California, and, yes, they pour across our borders just as we see the humanitarian crisis that my colleague mentioned earlier.

So some of the people who first see these young children, for example, or

these women who are being trafficked are going to be our Customs people. They are going to be our Border Patrol. As you can imagine, depending on the circumstance, they have got a lot of other things going on in their mind. They are trying to stem people from coming across. They are trying to figure out whether these people have drugs in their stuff, and so they may not notice what you can notice, and that is the trafficking of people, because in order to traffic that person, you have got to have the trafficker coming along with them.

So, if we train them, if we give them the tools, our Department of Homeland Security, our Customs, our Border Patrol people, our transport people will have a better idea and will be able to see almost immediately, which is what I have learned to do through this task force that we have. The signs are always there. It is do we know, do we have something in our mind that can show us what is happening?

Now, the Department of Homeland Security has obviously tried, but they have got a lot of things that they have got to work with. So by actually doing and increasing the awareness and increasing the training of our frontline employees, we will do a better job. We will do a better job of stopping this trafficking.

I thank the other side for working with us to ensure that this bill moves forward and becomes law to give that additional training that I believe our Department of Homeland Security employees need and want.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for her leadership on this particular issue and for her time and her eloquent remarks in introducing this particular piece of legislation.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California who is leading from the other side of the aisle. Much is made of headlines where the dysfunction of Washington, D.C., is in every newspaper on how things do not work, and yet a few hundred feet away from me is a gentlewoman from California representing a constituency many, many miles away from my home State of North Carolina. So today we are not only reaching across the aisle, but we are reaching across the country from California to North Carolina, because human trafficking affects us all.

I was first made aware of this by my daughter who was 15 years old when she did a report on human trafficking. I thought it was one of those things that was not a big deal until she informed me that it was in our backyard. It was in our neighborhoods. It was in our communities. Right now, some estimated 23 million people are trafficked, are caught up in human trafficking. And to give you a perspective of that, that equals a number that is very close to another slavery that we know as a horrific blight on our Nation and our world—the African slave trade. Today we have more people caught up in modern-day slavery than at the height of that particular time, yet somehow we continue to not address it. So hopefully on our watch, Mr. Speaker, we will address that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to provide a little bit of the context of this particular bill. The genesis of it came from a hearing. Many times we have hearings over and over, Mr. Speaker. Some people say, well, why do you continue to have those hearings?

We had some Delta Airline flight attendants who came in to a hearing. They were talking about the effort that they went through, on a voluntary basis, to set up a program to train their flight attendants and, ultimately, now all of their customer service representatives who see people on a day-by-day basis, they trained them to recognize those that are being trafficked. Yet they did this on their own. So from that, we felt like it would be a good idea to not only partner with them, but to provide that same type of training for the Federal workers that get to see these people at our borders, in our airports, and places across our Nation.

I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Chairman HUDSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, and the entire Homeland Security Committee staff for their hard work on working on this bill to make it not only one that hopefully will be a useful tool, but also one that will make a difference. It is estimated that there is no additional cost for providing this training, and yet the benefits will be great.

Tens of thousands of people are trafficked through the United States every year, 80 percent of whom are exploited sexually, two-thirds of them women, but more accurately, most of them little girls.

We must stand together in a bipartisan way, and I thank my colleague across the aisle for working with us and her leadership on this. But if we are successful—well, the word should not be ''if.'' When we are successful, Mr. Speaker, we will have saved thousands of lives, and we will have changed thousands of lives. So it is with great humility that I ask my colleagues to come together and support this piece of legislation.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. If the gentlewoman from Indiana has no more speakers, then I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to applaud Representative MEADOWS for introducing what I think is a very important piece of legislation in a bipartisan manner, and I am thankful that he cares enough and that he has a daughter who wrote a report.

These people who are trafficked live amongst us. In particular, they live in areas where there is lots of diversity, where there are lots of people going about doing their business, in crowded areas a lot. Trafficked, you are right, they are exploited for sexual purposes, about 70 percent of them; but the other 30 percent are used in homes in domestic servitude not even getting, sometimes, to sleep in a bed of the very house where they are worked as a slave, sleeping on the floor and getting the crumbs off the table. We have seen that. We have seen that in Orange County, California, in one of the richest areas of the Nation. In one of the nicest homes this was happening with a little Egyptian girl who was there who had been trafficked in by a family.

If it is not domestic and it is not sexual, then it is sweatshops where people literally have their passports and their papers taken away and they are working 18 or 19 hours a day, not being paid and barely being fed. So they are all around us.

Americans have to open up their eyes. We have to see it in our neighborhoods, and, of course, we have to stop them as they bring them from other countries. That is why I believe that our Nation's screeners and our Customs officers serve as the eyes and the ears on the front line of our ports of entry and exit from the United States. If they are properly trained, then they will see it, and they can help stop it.

Lastly, I am very grateful that tonight we have had a series of bills with respect to human trafficking. I just want to remind my colleagues that this humanitarian crisis we see on our southern border, that many of those children also have faced what we are talking about tonight; and, in order to stop it, we have to be as generous as possible with those young people to restart their lives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to say ''yes'' to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I close, this bill, which will ensure that valuable human trafficking awareness training is provided to DHS employees, and that is so very important, the gentlewoman from California reminded me that when I was United States attorney between 2001 and 2007, we started one of the human trafficking task forces in Indianapolis.

At that time, human trafficking was not really a concept that law enforcement really understood, and so trafficking task forces did start up in this country. They have grown, and we have put a lot of resources at the local and State level educating law enforcement, nonprofit groups, and neighborhood groups to understand what human trafficking is.

□ 1845

I think what this bill does is it strengthens for the Federal employees, the Department of Homeland Security employees, their training so that they, as the gentlewoman from California mentioned, they who have so many responsibilities, whether they are coming through our ports, whether they are coming through our airports, whether they are coming through our borders, they need the same type of training, if not enhanced training, than what they already have. And providing DHS employees with the tools to identify and appropriately respond to the potential victims of human trafficking will only serve as a force multiplier as we work to combat this terrible crime. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, ''Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014.''

I support this bipartisan legislation which ensures that Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and other Department of Homeland Security (DHS) personnel the Secretary deems appropriate are trained to effectively detect, intercept, and disrupt human trafficking in a manner relevant to their professional roles and responsibilities.

As the ranking member on the House Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency who do yeoman work on the front lines in combating human trafficking and rescuing its victims.

Mr. Speaker, worldwide there are at least 20.9 million adults and children human trafficking victims living as forced low-wage workers and exploited as objects of sexual pleasure; and 1.4 million persons are victims of national and transnational sex trafficking.

I have long advocated declaring unconditional war on human trafficking and I am pleased that the Homeland Security Committee is taking a leading role in this effort.

The legislation before us will result in a significant enhancement of DHS's capability to combat human trafficking and does so in a way that allows the department necessary flexibility in providing training.

Departmental personnel may be trained in-class or through virtual, computer-based learning programs. In either case, the training provided will include methods for:

1. identifying specific indicators of human trafficking victims and perpetrators; and

2. where appropriate, approaching victims of trafficking in a manner that is sensitive to the potential victim and includes steps to avoid alerting potential perpetrators of human trafficking.

The legislation requires the Secretary to certify to the relevant committees that all described personnel have received the training, as well as submit a report to the committees on the overall effectiveness of the program, as well as the number of reported cases by DHS personnel and which of those cases were confirmed cases of human trafficking no later than one year after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society. Those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Approximately 600,000 and 800,000 victims are moved across international borders every year and subjected to compelled service and millions more are enslaved domestically within their own countries.

Mr. Speaker, Texas has one of the longest international borders in the world, a 1254 mile border it shares with Mexico, our good neighbor to the South.

Texas also has a major federal highway Interstate I–10 which traverses the Southern United States from the state of Florida to the state of California.

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

I support H.R. 5116 because it is another important tool in the national arsenal to combat and eradicate the scourge of human trafficking.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 5116.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5116, The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important, bipartisan legislation, which will ensure that DHS personnel continue to receive the training they need to detect and disrupt human trafficking.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I recently convened a field hearing in Houston to examine the issue of human trafficking. At the hearing, the Committee heard compelling and disturbing testimony on how human trafficking is destroying the lives of vulnerable populations across the globe, including here in the United States.

Simply put, human trafficking is a despicable crime, and it must be stopped. I believe this bill is an excellent step towards that goal.

The Human Trafficking Detecting Act of 2014 would ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other Department of Homeland Security personnel are trained to effectively detect, and to the extent appropriate, intercept and disrupt trafficking in persons during the course of their normal roles and responsibilities. Not only would this legislation require effective training, it would also ensure that these employees are regularly provided with the most current trends and information on human trafficking and are adequately equipped to counter this growing problem.

While the men and women at DHS carry out their everyday work, many of them are well-positioned to spot traffickers who may try to exploit our nation's transportation systems to move their victims, both from overseas and within our borders.

H.R. 5116 also ensures that Congress has insight into the level of success of the training being provided, and that the Department's State and local partners have full access to training curricula to establish their own trafficking awareness programs.

I applaud Mr. MEADOWS for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on this common-sense measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5116.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PRIORITIZATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2283) to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2283

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Trafficking Prioritization Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The International Labor Organization estimates that nearly 21,000,000 people are subjected to modern slavery around the world at any given time and that the majority of the enslaved are women and girls.

(2) Congress authorized the creation of a Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (division A of Public Law 106–386) in order to directly assist the Secretary of State in his or her effort to coordinate a United States Government interagency response to domestic and international trafficking in persons.

(3) The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons monitors trafficking worldwide and produces the online and printed versions of the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis, and recommendations on the United States and 186 countries around the world.

(4) The annual Trafficking in Persons Report contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, and these tier rankings have become an essential diplomatic tool for promoting protection for victims, prevention of trafficking, and prosecution of perpetrators.

(5) Some countries have openly stated, and many others have confided, that dramatic improvements in the country's human trafficking record were directly related to avoidance of a low tier ranking in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report.

(6) Ambassador Mark Lagon, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2007–2009), testified before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 18, 2013, that ''[T]he State Department does a tremendous job in producing a report which tells it like it is, offering objective rankings. Yet at times it pulls punches, typically due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office's dedicated experts on trafficking.''.

(7) Ambassador John Miller, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2002–2006), recently stated that, ''Upgrading the status of the Office to a Bureau will not create additional bureaucracy—it will simply give JTIP and the Ambassador-at-large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the State Department. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.''.

(8) The tier ranking process authorized by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 has been in some instances compromised by the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking subordinate stature within the Department of State.

(9) It is essential for Congress and the Secretary of State to be accurately informed regarding United States and foreign country successes and failures in the fight against human trafficking.

(10) The diplomatic power and credibility of the Trafficking in Persons Report is based on rigorous scholarship and scrupulous application of the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking and is undermined by political, rather than factual, tier rankings.

(11) Strong and effective anti-slavery policy requires that officials from the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking have equal hierarchical standing with State Department regional bureaus and direct access to the Secretary of State.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State will be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Office status is changed to that of a Bureau within the Department hierarchy;

(2) the change in status from Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to a Bureau can be accomplished without increasing the number of personnel or the budget of the current Office;

(3) a Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Bureau were headed by an Assistant Secretary with direct access to the Secretary of State, rather than an Ambassador-at-Large; and

(4) the Secretary of State should review the current use of the 24 Assistant Secretary positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) and make appropriate revisions, consolidations, and eliminations, to ensure that those positions reflect the highest Departmental needs and foreign policy priorities of the United States, including efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

SEC. 4. BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(e) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(e)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING'' and inserting ''BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' and inserting ''Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons'';

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''Office'' and inserting ''Bureau''; and

(C) in the sixth sentence, by striking ''Office'' and inserting ''Bureau''; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking ''Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' and inserting ''Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or in any other Act to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

SEC. 5. REPORT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) for each current Assistant Secretary of State position—

(A) the title of that Assistant Secretary of State;

(B) how long that particular Assistant Secretary designation has been in existence; and

(C) whether that particular Assistant Secretary designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation for such mandate or authorization; and

(2) whether the Secretary intends to designate one of the Assistant Secretary of State positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

SEC. 6. COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.

Section 110(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (D) and (E), a country that—

''(i) was included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for 4 consecutive years after the date of the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, and

''(ii) was subsequently included on the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(C),

may not thereafter be included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for more than 1 consecutive year.''.

SEC. 7. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today is an historic day for the House of Representatives, so I would like to begin by offering my profound appreciation for the extraordinary leadership of Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for encouraging and moving through this House this very comprehensive package of antitrafficking legislation. I have been in Congress now 34 years, and I have never seen so many bills that are mutually reinforcing, that send a clear, unambiguous message to the world, as well as to our fellow Americans, that we care and we care deeply about the victims, and we want to put the perpetrators behind bars for a very, very long time. Again, I want to thank ERIC CANTOR for his leadership.

I am very proud to say that the United States continues to lead the world in our trafficking responses at home and abroad. The bills we debate today not only bring relief to trafficking victims, but light the way for the rest of the world to do likewise.

One of the greatest and most successful efforts to transmit our best practices to the rest of the world and to ensure accountability for minimum standards that we created in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act is the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons housed in the U.S. Department of State, created by the legislation I authored known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.

Over the last 15 years, this office has been led by several incredibly talented and dedicated ambassadors who, through their persistence and grit, have turned out the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, laying bare the record of each country for the world to see, and summarizing the country's progress in an annual tier ranking.

Tier 1 countries, for the record, are countries that fully meet the minimum standards prescribed by the act. Tier 2 countries do not meet the minimum standards but are making significant efforts to do so. Tier 3 countries do not meet the standards and are not making significant efforts to do so, and those countries can be held liable through a series of sanctions that are imposed by our government.

Along with Tier 1, 2 and 3, we also have what we call a watch list. Since the TIP report's inception, Mr. Speaker, more than 100 countries have enacted antitrafficking laws, and many countries have taken other steps required to significantly raise their tier

rankings, many citing the TIP Report as a key factor in their increased antitrafficking response.

The importance of accurate tier rankings cannot be overstated. Over the years, we have seen countries begin in earnest the hard work of reaching the minimum standards after the TIP Report accurately exposed—with a Tier 3 ranking—each country's failure to take significant action against human trafficking. Whether that country be a close ally or foe, the TIP Report is designed to speak truth to power. And even some of our greatest friends and allies, like South Korea and Israel, have found themselves on Tier 3, only to engage in Herculean efforts to get off Tier 3 and to protect victims and to prosecute the traffickers.

The tier rankings were meant to be and in large part have become a very powerful tool in the fight against trafficking. We have found a system that works. But tragically, it is sometimes muffled, misguided, and marginalized by unrelated bilateral concerns and by the internal structure of the State Department itself.

In the words of Ambassador Mark Lagon, who from 2007 to 2009 was our Ambassador-at-Large to combat human trafficking:

> The State Department does a tremendous job in producing a report which tells it like it is, offering objective rankings. Yet at times it pulls punches, typically due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office's dedicated experts on trafficking.

This problem is what my bill, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, H.R. 2283, seeks to remedy. The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will keep the fight against human trafficking from being lost in the politics of other U.S. interests by raising the status of the J/TIP ''office'' to that of a ''bureau'' within the U.S. Department of State.

In the words of Ambassador John Miller, who served from 2002 to 2006 as Ambassador-at-Large:

> Upgrading the status of the office to a bureau will not create additional bureaucracy, it will simply give J/TIP and the Ambassador-at-Large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the Department of State. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.

H.R. 2283 encourages the Secretary of State to upgrade the ''ambassador-at-large'' position to that of ''Assistant Secretary,'' to lead the bureau without adding to the number of Assistant Secretaries the State Department is permitted by law.

In addition, H.R. 2283 will make it more difficult for countries and some State Department bureaus to game the tier-ranking system by limiting the time period countries can use promises of action to avoid tier downgrading. Currently, a country can sit on the Tier 2 watch list for up to 4 years with Presidential waivers, effectively stringing the U.S. along with promises to take action without ever actually taking action. After 4 years, by law, the country must be automatically downgraded to Tier 3 and, therefore, subject to sanctions.

The law worked very well upon its first implementation in the 2013 reporting cycle. But we discovered a problem this year when China was wrongly and foolishly upgraded from Tier 3 to Tier 2 Watch List. As the law is currently written, China and its enablers at the U.S. Department of State can again game the system for 4 more years. H.R. 2283 will hold countries like China accountable by limiting to 1 year the amount of time a country can stay on the Tier 2 Watch List after the country was previously ordered downgraded to Tier 3.

H.R. 2283 builds on the success of the TIP Office for the sake of the 21 million people still living in modern day slavery, and does so without increasing the cost of government. H.R. 2283 will give the TIP Office the integration and voice it deserves within the State Department and ensure accurate accountability for countries failing to meet the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support the bill. I would also like to offer special thanks to Gary Haugen, Holly Burkhalter, Tim Gehring, and the grassroots efforts of the International Justice Mission, which has worked so tirelessly to educate Members of Congress on the importance of this bill. I would note parenthetically that at least two of those people, Holly and Gary, especially Gary when we were first writing the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, was a frequent contributor to hearings as we crafted the bill, and then when we did the oversight as to how well or poorly the U.S. Department of State was implementing the law. You could always count on Gary Haugen to be there to give a very incisive look at the work that was being done or not being done. So a very special thanks to them for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in strong support of H.R. 2283, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act.

First, let me thank my friend and colleague, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this important piece of legislation which elevates the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to the status of a bureau within the State Department.

Put simply, as we have heard this evening, human trafficking is modern day slavery. It represents a brutal violation of individual freedom and human dignity. Unfortunately, this practice is all too common around the world and in our own neighborhoods. But, fortunately, the United States is committed to responding to this crime here at home and around the world. Since this Congress passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act in 2000, leaders on both sides of the aisle have rallied around this issue. Indeed, three administrations have made this effort a priority. Our coordination across government through the President's Interagency Task Force on Human Trafficking has never been stronger.

Mr. Speaker, today we can take another step forward by making the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons a full bureau within the State Department. This office is already doing critical work. Its annual Trafficking in Persons Report has become the global gold standard in assessing how well governments around the world are meeting this important challenge.

Elevating the trafficking office to a State Department bureau would send a strong message to the world that combating modern day slavery remains a top priority to the United States. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2283, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to rise in support of this particular legislation and follow-up on what the gentleman from New Jersey shared regarding the importance of not only the TIP Report but to remain vigilant with a number of the countries abroad where trafficking has become very commonplace.

Just in the last week, we had an ambassador from one of those countries come to us and share the fact that they are a Tier 3 country. They were very concerned and wanted to outline the things that they were doing to try to combat human trafficking.

It was very obvious to me that with the emphasis we have placed on that, not only here in Congress but with the State Department, that making human trafficking a priority for them to correct and combat was certainly something that has drawn great attention.

To strengthen the efforts there, to continue to strengthen the State Department, to raise and elevate this position to bureau status, certainly will send a message not only to our country, not only to countries abroad, but hopefully will give hope to the young girls and young men that are being trafficked in so many of these foreign countries that the United States is serious about this, and that it is not just a few words that perhaps are shared by myself and the gentleman from New York here on the House floor today but that it goes to the very core of who we are, that we must stand up and be a voice for those who have no voice.

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

□ 2000

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I listened with great interest to his words earlier. I would like to thank him and acknowledge him for his leadership on this issue. It is so great to see him reaching across the aisle to do so, and I want to acknowledge his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation and many other bills we are considering that deal with human and sex trafficking—an important issue, a critical issue, that especially relates to protecting children who are too often victims of abuse and violence. I commend the Speaker for bringing these bills up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, as I was watching the debate this evening, I couldn't help but come back to the floor. I hope all of my colleagues that are speaking tonight on the importance of passing these human trafficking bills will join us next week to talk about the importance of protecting children.

It was with alarm, Mr. Speaker, that I read a letter that Speaker BOEHNER penned to President Barack Obama that appears that my Republican colleagues, when they left a meeting earlier this afternoon, are asking to take away the very protections from children during a law that was passed in 2008 that we are asking to protect these children tonight.

So I come today to ask my colleagues to read the transcripts, to hear the debate this evening, and to think about it, to go home this weekend and, whatever faith that we may be, that we pray about it and we talk to our pastors and our religious leaders about it because these kids that we are going to be talking about next week are the very children that need protections as well.

The motivation to pass these bills today is the same motivation that moved this body to pass legislation that became law in 2008, to protect children. This law has since become the subject of much condemnation for many of my Republican colleagues as we discuss the humanitarian crisis on the border.

We are here on this floor debating legislation to protect children, yet many of my colleagues want to take away due process from children who are trying to escape unimaginable violence in Central America. In Honduras, the murder capital of the world, the violence was captured in a story recently—and I apologize for the graphic nature of this story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. This is a story from The New York Times:

> During a recent late-night visit to the San Pedro Sula morgue, more than 60 bodies, all victims of violence, were seen piled in a heap, each wrapped in a brown plastic bag. While picking bullets out of a 15-year-old boy shot 15 times, technicians discussed how they regularly received corpses of children under 10 and sometimes as young as 2. Last week, in nearby Santa Barbara, an 11-year-old had his throat slit by other children because he did not pay a 50-cent extortion fee.

The doctor at the morgue said: before, we saw children being killed because they were at the scene when gangs were coming to prey on families and they just happened to be there; now, we are seeing kids kill kids.

There are hundreds of other stories like this.

Mr. Speaker, I beg and I plead of my colleagues, each and every one of us that may or may not have been here when the law passed, but those of us that are here now, these are kids. I know that you and I, Mr. Speaker, that we love children, and we want to make sure that they are not victims of these horrific crimes.

Please, please, take this weekend and ask the Speaker to remove the provisions that will take away the due process from these children. As we pass these bills together, let us not forget what brought this Congress together in 2008, to protect these children.

Let us show the same compassion that is a driving force of these bills tonight.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his eloquent and passionate remarks, a concern so many of us share.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, H.R. 2283, and commend my friend and colleague Rep. CHRIS SMITH for introducing it. Congressman SMITH is a leader in the global fight against sex slavery and I thank him for all he has done and the leadership he continues to provide.

The State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (J/TIP) does a fantastic job of maintaining U.S. leadership and accountability in the worldwide effort to combat human trafficking.

Today, human trafficking represents a modern form of slavery. It is a crisis that victimizes 21 million people worldwide.

In my home state of Illinois, the National Human Trafficking Resource Center estimates 25,000 women and girls are exploited each year by sex traffickers.

More than 130 countries have created or strengthened their anti-trafficking laws largely due to the work carried out by the J/TIP. It's important, therefore, to provide the J/TIP with the standing it needs to maintain the momentum that has resulted in increased prosecution of traffickers, protection of victims, and prevention of human trafficking.

The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act does just that. By raising the status of the J/TIP "office" to that of a "bureau" and encouraging the Secretary of State to upgrade the "ambassador-at-large" position to that of an "assistant secretary," H.R 2283 builds upon the acknowledged accomplishments of the J/TIP.

It will give the J/TIP and the Ambassador-at-Large who leads it level standing with regional and functional bureaus within the State Department and prevent countries and other bureaus at the agency from gaming the tier ranking system. It achieves this without creating additional bureaucracy or additional cost to the government.

As a member of the Congressional Human Trafficking Task Force working with the congressional leadership, J/TIP, and international anti-trafficking groups to end sex slavery, I know it is critical to keep the fight against human trafficking from being consumed in a bureaucratic shuffle. I am convinced that the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will only serve to enhance the vital work undertaken by the J/TIP.

Human trafficking targets the most vulnerable in a society. The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will give the J/TIP the integration and voice it deserves within the Department of State to ensure nations are diligent in their efforts to protect the victims and punish the perpetrators of human trafficking.

Again, I thank Mr. SMITH for introducing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2283, "Human Trafficking Prioritization Act of 2014."

I support this bipartisan legislation which modifies the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to elevate the status of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to that of the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons, which shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of State.

The office produces the annual Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP Report), which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking

reporting, analysis and recommendations for the United States and 186 countries around the world. The TIP Report also contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, which are used to help protect victims, prevent trafficking and prosecute traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many thoughtful observers that the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be even more effective in carrying out the duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if its status was elevated from that of ''Office'' to a ''Bureau'' within the department hierarchy and the title of its chief administrator elevated from ''director'' to ''Assistant Secretary of State.''

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry. Children who are abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic clubs and much worse.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the Secretary of State to report to Congress within 90 days of enactment on how long each assistant secretary designation has been in existence, and whether the designation was legislatively mandated or authorized.

According to a Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights Report Mexican authorities are working to address the problem of trans-border human trafficking, but the country's ''legal framework remains largely untouched and hence limited in its crime-fighting scope and effectiveness.''

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation's largest hubs for human trafficking, with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year's massive effort ''Operation Cross Country'' led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

In 2006, the Department of Justice National Conference on Human Trafficking identified the I–10 corridor as one of the main routes for traffickers. Interstate I–10 links the major Texas urban areas Houston, San Antonio and El Paso and dozens of mid- and small sized towns in between.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness of the continuing prevalence of modern day slavery and human trafficking.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entity charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes, and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 2283.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, which will bolster America's efforts to prevent human trafficking.

I want to commend Chairman ROYCE and Representative CHRIS SMITH for bringing this measure forward.

Despite international condemnation, trafficking in persons is still a prolific violation of human rights that affects people in every country, including the United States.

This transnational crime exploits the most vulnerable and often subjects the victims to mental and physical abuse.

The United States has responded to this widespread human rights violation by creating in the State Department the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, which focuses on the prevention and prosecution of human trafficking, and the protection of its victims.

This legislation would further strengthen U.S. anti-trafficking policies by designating this office as a bureau with direct access to the Secretary of State, all without expanding the role of the Federal government.

A vote for this legislation is a vote in favor of prioritizing the protection of human dignity.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2283, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4449) to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4449

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Trafficking Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. EXPANDED TRAINING RELATING TO TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', including members of the Service (as such term is defined in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903))'' after ''Department of State''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''Training under this paragraph shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) A distance learning course on trafficking-in-persons issues and the Department of State's obligations under this Act, targeted for embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus' trafficking-in-persons coordinators, and their superiors.

''(B) Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their posts.

''(C) At least annual reminders to all such personnel, including appropriate personnel from other Federal departments and agencies, at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons specific to the country or jurisdiction in which each such post is located, and appropriate procedures to report information that any such personnel may acquire about possible cases of trafficking in persons.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 4449, to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership in addressing this issue.

As we look at this, this particular bill would require appropriate personnel of the Department of State, that they would be trained in identifying victims of severe forms of trafficking and provide for the protection of those victims.

H.R. 4449 would specify three minimum training requirements in that underlying statute: one, a distance learning course for Embassy and bureau personnel dealing with trafficking issues; two, trafficking briefings for all ambassadors and DCMs before they head to their postings; and, three, annual reminders to appropriate personnel regarding key trafficking problems and issues related to their countries.

The State Department believes that these specified forms of training largely track their current activities; thus, while adding these examples to the statute will ensure that these types of training will continue, it will not result in a substantial and additional cost.

Again, I thank the leadership, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) as the primary sponsor of this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank my colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, for his leadership on this bill. I would like to thank the Democratic whip—my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER—and his staff for the work they dedicated to this piece of legislation and to my own staff.

Worldwide, less than 1 percent of an estimated 27 million victims of human trafficking have been reported, and in the past year, only about 44,000 survivors have been identified.

Millions—literally millions of children, women, and men are trafficked each year and forced into modern-day slavery as part of the world's most evil and fastest growing industry. It may seem like it only happens on the other side of the world, but it is happening here in quiet neighborhoods across our country.

Some of those survivors are from neighborhoods I represent in the Hudson Valley of New York. In New Windsor and Newburgh, for nearly 4 years, one man would troll the streets, coercing at least 10 women to work for him as sex workers in local motels.

Last year, law enforcement authorities uncovered an international sex trafficking ring operating brothels in Yonkers, Poughkeepsie, and Newburgh, where women were brutalized and forced to have sex 10, 20, 30 times a day.

It is a hard truth, but it is a truth nonetheless. This disgusting, this horrifying practice of modern-day slavery happens here, right here in our own neighborhoods, in our own backyards, in our own country.

Even with the assistance of law enforcement and dedicated organizations like My Sister's Place in Westchester and Safe Homes of Orange County, groups which help survivors rebuild their lives, New York continues to be one of the top hubs of human trafficking where sex trafficking, child labor, child sex trafficking, and indentured servitude happen all too frequently.

In another community in Hudson Valley about an hour away from New York City, a man tricked teenage girls to travel to the United States on tourist visas from countries like Brazil, Hungary, and France. He instructed these women to lie to both Immigration and State Department officials in order to gain access to our country.

It is precisely this kind of situation that my legislation seeks to stop. We must ensure that our men and women on the front lines of our borders have the resources and training they need in order to identify and stop human trafficking at its source before these women and children and men become victims.

As part of our goal to end human trafficking, we can make sure that our foreign service officers and other government personnel have the tools and training they need to spot, to identify these victims and stop this trafficking across international borders.

In the past, the State Department estimated that between 14,500 and 17,000 foreign nationals were trafficked into the United States every single year. Although the Federal Government has a zero tolerance policy on human trafficking, our foreign service officers, who often have face-to-face contact with these victims when they are obtaining U.S. visas, currently undergo minimal training to define, identify, and recognize the indicators of human trafficking or smuggling.

My legislation would expand new minimum training procedures for foreign service officers and other government personnel in order to identify and stop human trafficking at its source and take action before people are trafficked across international borders before it becomes too late, when they are already in the United States and already victimized.

Since we know criminals will do just about anything to adapt and to avoid being caught, this legislation also requires annual updates on key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking.

I want to thank my colleagues across the aisle because, by working across the aisle, we have a new opportunity to come together to combat this absolutely monstrous practice of trafficking in children, women, and men.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to close by saying that anything we can do, certainly, to continue to highlight this particular issue, whether it is with the State Department or laws within our Nation, gives us a rare opportunity to affect lives not only here in the United States, but across the world.

I would like to thank the committee work for those on the Foreign Affairs Committee, their diligence and hard work here at a late hour—certainly our own personal staffs, congressional staffs, for their work too. So many times, they don't get mentioned.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4449, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4449, the ''Human Trafficking Prevention Act.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to expanding the training and capability of Federal government personnel in detecting and combating human trafficking and assisting its victims.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and a founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have advocated on behalf of victims of human trafficking, especially children, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims.

I am also committed to ensure that law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in people.

H.R. 4449 strengthens the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by amending it to require training related to trafficking in persons for all State Department personnel. Specifically, the bill requires the following:

1. A distance learning course on trafficking in persons issues and the Department of State's obligations under the Act to be completed by embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus' trafficking in persons coordinators, and their supervisors;

2. Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before they depart for their posts; and

3. Annual reminders to all such personnel and other federal personnel at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key human trafficking problems, threats, methods, and warning signs.

This legislation does for the State Department what the Jackson Lee to H.R. 4660, ''Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Act for 2015,'' does for the Justice Department.

That amendment, adopted earlier this year by the House, provides another tool in law enforcement's arsenal to tip the balance in favor of victims by ensuring funding for the Attorney General to provide training for State and local law enforcement agencies on immigration law that may be useful for the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to trafficking in persons.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society and those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

To effectively combat human trafficking, we need to provide resources and training to government personnel to assist victims and apprehend criminals.

By providing the necessary training and support, we will catch more human trafficking criminals and save lives, and prevent many

other persons, including children, from becoming human trafficking victims.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act of 2014.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article:

[From the New York Times, July 11, 2014]

THE CHILDREN OF THE DRUG WARS: A REFUGEE CRISIS, NOT AN IMMIGRATION CRISIS

(By Sonia Nazario)

Cristian Omar Reyes, an 11-year-old sixth grader in the neighborhood of Nueva Suyapa, on the outskirts of Tegucigalpa, tells me he has to get out of Honduras soon—''no matter what.''

In March, his father was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. His mother used the life insurance payout to hire a smuggler to take her to Florida. She promised to send for him quickly, but she has not.

Three people he knows were murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of two weeks at the beginning of this year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of $5. She was clubbed over the head and dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat, stuffed her panties in it, and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

''I'm going this year,'' he tells me.

I last went to Nueva Suyapa in 2003, to write about another boy, Luis Enrique Motiño Pineda, who had grown up there and left to find his mother in the United States. Children from Central America have been making that journey, often without their parents, for two decades. But lately something has changed, and the predictable flow has turned into an exodus. Three years ago, about 6,800 children were detained by United States immigration authorities and placed in federal custody; this year, as many as 90,000 children are expected to be picked up. Around a quarter come from Honduras—more than from anywhere else.

Children still leave Honduras to reunite with a parent, or for better educational and economic opportunities. But, as I learned when I returned to Nueva Suyapa last month, a vast majority of child migrants are fleeing not poverty, but violence. As a result, what the United States is seeing on its borders now is not an immigration crisis. It is a refugee crisis.

Gangs arrived in force in Honduras in the 1990s, as 18th Street and Mara Salvatrucha members were deported in large numbers from Los Angeles to Central America, joining homegrown groups like Los Puchos. But the dominance in the past few years of foreign drug cartels in Honduras, especially ones from Mexico, has increased the reach and viciousness of the violence. As the United States and Colombia spent billions of dollars to disrupt the movement of drugs up the Caribbean corridor, traffickers rerouted inland through Honduras, and 79 percent of cocaine-smuggling flights bound for the United States now pass through there.

Narco groups and gangs are vying for control over this turf, neighborhood by neighborhood, to gain more foot soldiers for drug sales and distribution, expand their customer base, and make money through extortion in a country left with an especially weak, corrupt government following a 2009 coup.

Enrique's 33-year-old sister, Belky, who still lives in Nueva Suyapa, says children began leaving en masse for the United States three years ago. That was around the time that the narcos started putting serious pressure on kids to work for them. At Cristian's school, older students working with the cartels push drugs on the younger ones—some as young as 6. If they agree, children are recruited to serve as lookouts, make deliveries in backpacks, rob people and extort businesses. They are given food, shoes and money in return. Later, they might work as traffickers or hit men.

Teachers at Cristian's school described a 12-year-old who demanded that the school release three students one day to help him distribute crack cocaine; he brandished a pistol and threatened to kill a teacher when she tried to question him.

At Nueva Suyapa's only public high school, narcos ''recruit inside the school,'' says Yadira Sauceda, a counselor there. Until he was killed a few weeks ago, a 23-year-old ''student'' controlled the school. Each day, he was checked by security at the door, then had someone sneak his gun to him over the school wall. Five students, mostly 12- and 13-year-olds, tearfully told Ms. Sauceda that the man had ordered them to use and distribute drugs or he would kill their parents. By March, one month into the new school year, 67 of 450 students had left the school.

Teachers must pay a ''war tax'' to teach in certain neighborhoods, and students must pay to attend.

Carlos Baquedano Sánchez, a slender 14-year-old with hair sticking straight up, explained how hard it was to stay away from the cartels. He lives in a shack made of corrugated tin in a neighborhood in Nueva Suyapa called El Infiernito—Little Hell—and usually doesn't have anything to eat one out of every three days. He started working in a dump when he was 7, picking out iron or copper to recycle, for $1 or $2 a day. But bigger boys often beat him to steal his haul, and he quit a year ago when an older man nearly killed him for a coveted car-engine piston. Now he sells scrap wood.

But all of this was nothing, he says, compared to the relentless pressure to join narco gangs and the constant danger they have brought to his life. When he was 9, he barely escaped from two narcos who were trying to rape him, while terrified neighbors looked on. When he was 10, he was pressured to try marijuana and crack. ''You'll feel better. Like you are in the clouds,'' a teenager working with a gang told him. But he resisted.

He has known eight people who were murdered and seen three killed right in front of him. He saw a man shot three years ago and still remembers the plums the man was holding rolling down the street, coated in blood. Recently he witnessed two teenage hit men shooting a pair of brothers for refusing to hand over the keys and title to their motorcycle. Carlos hit the dirt and prayed. The killers calmly walked down the street. Carlos shrugs. ''Now seeing someone dead is nothing.''

He longs to be an engineer or mechanic, but he quit school after sixth grade, too poor and too afraid to attend. ''A lot of kids know what can happen in school. So they leave.''

He wants to go to the United States, even though he knows how dangerous the journey can be; a man in his neighborhood lost both legs after falling off the top of a Mexican freight train, and a family friend drowned in the Rio Grande. ''I want to avoid drugs and death. The government can't pull up its pants and help people,'' he says angrily. ''My country has lost its way.''

Girls face particular dangers—one reason around 40 percent of children who arrived in the United States this year were girls, compared with 27 percent in the past. Recently three girls were raped and killed in Nueva Suyapa, one only 8 years old. Two 15-year-olds were abducted and raped. The kidnappers told them that if they didn't get in the car they would kill their entire families. Some parents no longer let their girls go to school for fear of their being kidnapped, says Luis López, an educator with Asociación Compartir, a nonprofit in Nueva Suyapa.

Milagro Noemi Martínez, a petite 19-year-old with clear green eyes, has been told repeatedly by narcos that she would be theirs—or end up dead. Last summer, she made her first attempt to reach the United States ''Here there is only evil,'' she says. ''It's better to leave than have them kill me here.'' She headed north with her 21-year-old sister, a friend who had also been threatened, and $170 among them. But she was stopped and deported from Mexico. Now back in Nueva Suyapa, she stays locked inside her mother's house. ''I hope God protects me. I am afraid to step outside.'' Last year, she says, six minors, as young as 15, were killed in her neighborhood. Some were hacked apart. She plans to try the journey again soon. Asking for help from the police or the government is not an option in what some consider a failed state. The drugs that pass through Honduras each year are worth more than the country's entire gross domestic product. Narcos have bought off police officers, politicians and judges. In recent years, four out of five homicides were never investigated. No one is immune to the carnage. Several Honduran mayors have been killed. The sons of both the former head of the police department and the head of the national university were murdered, the latter, an investigation showed, by the police.

''You never call the cops. The cops themselves will retaliate and kill you,'' says Henry Carías Aguilar, a pastor in Nueva Suyapa. A majority of small businesses in Nueva Suyapa have shuttered because of extortion demands, while churches have doubled in number in the past decade, as people pray for salvation from what they see as the plague predicted in the Bible. Taxis and homes have signs on them asking God for mercy.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees recently interviewed 404 children who had arrived in the United States from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico; 58 percent said their primary reason for leaving was violence. (A similar survey in 2006, of Central American children coming into Mexico, found that only 13 percent were fleeing violence.) They aren't just going to the United States: Less conflicted countries in Central America had a 712 percent increase in asylum claims between 2008 and 2013.

''If a house is burning, people will jump out the window,'' says Michelle Brané, director of the migrant rights and justice program at the Women's Refugee Commission.

To permanently stem this flow of children, we must address the complex root causes of violence in Honduras, as well as the demand for illegal drugs in the United States that is fueling that violence.

In the meantime, however, we must recognize this as a refugee crisis, as the United Nations just recommended. These children are facing threats similar to the forceful conscription of child soldiers by warlords in Sudan or during the civil war in Bosnia. Being forced to sell drugs by narcos is no different from being forced into military service.

Many Americans, myself included, believe in deporting unlawful immigrants, but see a different imperative with refugees.

The United States should immediately create emergency refugee centers inside our borders, tent cities—operated by the United Nations and other relief groups like the International Rescue Committee—where immigrant children could be held for 60 to 90 days instead of being released. The government would post immigration judges at these centers and adjudicate children's cases there.

To ensure this isn't a sham process, asylum officers and judges must be trained in child-sensitive interviewing techniques to help elicit information from fearful, traumatized youngsters. All children must also be represented by a volunteer or government-funded lawyer. Kids in Need of Defense, a nonprofit that recruits pro bono lawyers to represent immigrant children and whose board I serve on, estimates that 40 percent to 60 percent of these children potentially qualify to stay under current immigration laws—and do, if they have a lawyer by their side. The vast majority do not. The only way to ensure we are not hurtling children back to circumstances that could cost them their lives is by providing them with real due process.

Judges, who currently deny seven in 10 applications for asylum by people who are in deportation proceedings, must better understand the conditions these children are facing. They should be more open to considering relief for those fleeing gang recruitment or threats by criminal organizations when they come from countries like Honduras that are clearly unwilling or unable to protect them.

If many children don't meet strict asylum criteria but face significant dangers if they return, the United States should consider allowing them to stay using humanitarian parole procedures we have employed in the past, for Cambodians and Haitians. It may be possible to transfer children and resettle them in other safe countries willing to share the burden. We should also make it easier for children to apply as refugees when they are still in Central America, as we have done for people in Iraq, Cuba, countries in the former Soviet Union, Vietnam and Haiti. Those who showed a well-founded fear of persecution wouldn't have to make the perilous journey north alone.

Of course, many migrant children come for economic reasons, and not because they fear for their lives. In those cases, they should quickly be deported if they have at least one parent in their country of origin. By deporting them directly from the refugee centers, the United States would discourage future non-refugees by showing that immigrants cannot be caught and released, and then avoid deportation by ignoring court orders to attend immigration hearings.

Instead of advocating such a humane, practical approach, the Obama administration wants to intercept and return children en route. On Tuesday the president asked for $3.7 billion in emergency funding. Some money would be spent on new detention facilities and more immigration judges, but the main goal seems to be to strengthen border control and speed up deportations. He also asked Congress to grant powers that could eliminate legal protections for children from Central America in order to expedite removals, a change that Republicans in Congress have also advocated.

This would allow life-or-death decisions to be made within hours by Homeland Security officials, even though studies have shown that border patrol agents fail to adequately screen Mexican children to see if they are being sexually exploited by traffickers or fear persecution, as the agents are supposed to do. Why would they start asking Central American children key questions needed to prove refugee status?

The United States expects other countries to take in hundreds of thousands of refugees on humanitarian grounds. Countries neighboring Syria have absorbed nearly 3 million people. Jordan has accepted in two days what the United States has received in an entire month during the height of this immigration flow—more than 9,000 children in May. The United States should also increase to pre-9/11 levels the number of refugees we accept to 90,000 from the current 70,000 per year and, unlike in recent years, actually admit that many.

By sending these children away, ''you are handing them a death sentence,'' says José Arnulfo Ochoa Ochoa, an expert in Honduras with World Vision International, a Christian humanitarian aid group. This abrogates international conventions we have signed and undermines our credibility as a humane country. It would be a disgrace if this wealthy nation turned its back on the 52,000 children who have arrived since October, many of them legitimate refugees.

This is not how a great nation treats children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4449.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 702 of the Senate amendment (relating to the approval of courses of education provided by public institutions of higher learning for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program conditional on in-State tuition rate for veterans); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2015

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

I rise today in strong support of the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, which the Senate passed on a bipartisan 93–3 vote last month.

It is no secret that the Department of Veterans Affairs is failing to keep our Nation's promise to our veterans and their families.

Ensuring that our veterans have access to the medical care and benefits that they have earned is one of the most important jobs of Congress and a top priority of mine, given the more than 200,000 veterans who live in San Diego County.

In recent months, failures at the Phoenix VA and other facilities across the country demonstrated a culture of complacency and ineptitude that is unacceptable and must change.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Phoenix, KYRSTEN SINEMA.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS) for offering this motion to instruct and for his leadership and work on behalf of veteran and military families.

This motion urges House conferees to accept language in the Senate bill that ensures post-9/11 veterans receive instate tuition at colleges and universities, regardless of their home State. This concept was overwhelmingly supported by the House of Representatives when it passed the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act in February.

I am a cosponsor of the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, authored by Chairman MILLER, and I appreciate his bipartisan leadership and dedication to improving opportunities for veterans. Tuition fairness gives our veterans a better chance to achieve the American Dream.

In April of 2011, as a State senator, I authored and led the effort to pass this same law in Arizona. I am proud to now be a part of the national effort to make college more affordable for our veterans.

As David Lucier, president of the Arizona Veterans and Military Leadership Alliance, said:

This is an opportunity to create the 'next greatest generation' by investing in our veterans as they move out of uniform—to being scholars—to becoming national and global leaders.

I couldn't agree more. Acting on tuition fairness is the right thing to do. Acting on a VA reform bill is also the right thing for Congress to do. But in Arizona, we are not waiting for Congress to act. We are making sure that

veterans receive the care they need right now.

In Phoenix, we recently cohosted the Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans access services. We are leveraging community-based providers to make sure veterans receive timely access to care, and we are holding the VA accountable through monthly reporting meetings. We are moving forward while Washington drags its feet, because in Arizona we believe that veterans and their families should come first. But more action is required.

I appreciate the bipartisan work to advance a VA reform bill, especially from Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD. I call on the conferees to move quickly to produce commonsense reforms that can be signed into law. By working together, we can address this crisis and create a VA system that our veterans deserve.

Again, I thank my colleague from California for offering this motion.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank my colleague, Ms. SINEMA.

While San Diego's VA centers have performed better than most, and the backlog of benefits claims has been reduced significantly in my region, we can't ignore the larger structural reforms that the entire VA system clearly needs.

In San Diego, my district office staff has been working to help veterans and their families who have experienced the bureaucratic red tape at the VA firsthand. Since coming to Congress last year, we have handled more than 400 veterans' cases and have recovered more than $750,000 in benefits to which these veterans were entitled.

I have also focused on ways to make the transition from Active Duty service back to civilian life an easier one for veterans and their families. Last year, I engaged with military commanders, nonprofits, and veterans' advocacy organizations to launch the Military Transition Support Project. This collaborative community effort will provide a central hub of information for servicemembers as they become veterans and search for housing, employment, and benefits. It is on its way to being a national model and doesn't cost the Federal Government or taxpayers a dime.

The experience of Dr. Howard and Jean Somers, constituents of mine from Coronado, has only added to my urgency in addressing reform at the VA. The Somers' son Daniel served our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. As the Somers testified in the House Veterans Affairs Committee 2 weeks ago, their son made several attempts after returning home from combat to seek help and counseling for posttraumatic stress but was ultimately unsuccessful, and eventually he took his own life. The VA system failed Daniel Somers; it failed his parents; and that is unacceptable.

Both the Senate and the House have taken action to make real, substantive changes at the VA. I voted for many of these measures in the House, but the Senate's plan is comprehensive, bipartisan, and is the best opportunity for the quick action that our veterans deserve.

It will benefit thousands of veterans by increasing their access to care by allowing the VA to lease more facilities, hire doctors and nurses to fill their most pressing staff shortages, and by allowing veterans to see non-VA providers if they have been forced to wait for an appointment or live too far from the closest facility.

It would increase accountability on those responsible for the recent failures by allowing the VA Secretary to fire complacent employees, and through changes to the scheduling, staffing, and administrative processes in each facility.

Part of my motion also has to do with ensuring that our veterans and their spouses are able to access a high-quality education after their time of Active Duty has ended.

Veterans are advancing themselves at colleges and universities across my district, across San Diego, and across the country. Expanding instate tuition to our veterans, regardless of where they live, would expand their educational opportunities significantly and potentially reduce the financial burden that many of them face.

As of today, only 24 States offer instate tuition benefits for veterans who have not yet met the standard residency requirements of that State. My home State of California is one of those that does not offer it.

In the University of California system, one of the premier public university systems in the entire world, more than 1,600 veterans are currently enrolled. The instate tuition at a UC school averages $13,200 per year. For nonresidents, it is $36,000. That is a difference of $23,000 that veterans must pay out of pocket.

UC San Diego, part of which is in my district, enrolls 324 veterans, and nearby San Diego State has 1,127 veterans. In the California State University system, being a non-California resident costs nearly double the tuition, to the tune of more than $4,000 per year.

By forcing veterans who fought not just for one State or for their home State but for the entire United States, to fit into the standard residency requirements, in many instances we are forcing them to delay their education or vocational training they need for career advancement. Instead of making it more difficult to use their earned GI Bill benefits, we should be making it easier and more financially feasible.

A recent national investigation called ''Back Home: The Enduring Battle Facing Post-9/11 Veterans,'' noted the example of Marine Corps Corporal veteran Brian Oller, a student at UC San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, who is paying out of pocket to cover part of the $22,000 tuition, which his GI benefits don't fully pay.

Fifteen thousand veterans are discharged in the San Diego region each year, and about half decide to stay in the area to restart their civilian lives. Many of them are not from California, but they should have access immediately to the instate tuition rate.

Giving veterans the instate tuition rate is a bipartisan idea that I know our chairman, Mr. MILLER, supports. The House passed a bill 390–0 to provide this benefit. The comprehensive Senate bill I want us to vote on also includes that language.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can pass the Veterans Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act in its entirety and provide the necessary relief and support to our veterans and show the American people that Congress is capable of passing comprehensive reforms to what is clearly a broken system.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to instruct. Let's actually get the needed reforms in place and expand educational opportunities and our support for our veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, as I said during the debate last week on other motions to instruct that were brought to the floor, improving timely access to quality health care and imposing true accountability for senior managers are the keys to beginning the long process of restoring trust at the Department of Veterans Affairs. This was the central charge to the conferees that are currently meeting at the beginning of our conference, and it remains the same charge tonight.

As I said last week, now is not the time to tie the hands of the conferees with an unnecessary motion on the floor.

I know my colleague, Mr. PETERS, has the best of intentions. They are rooted in his desire to serve veterans of this country, but unfortunately, somebody somewhere has different ideas.

Veterans expect us to do what is best to improve the quality of care that they receive and the delivery of the benefits that they have earned. I certainly expect that none of these votes that have been taken—in fact, I believe we have done four, and another was noticed today—will be used by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in 30-second political ads.

By adopting the motion to instruct, we would be telling our conferees to recede to the Senate's position on all provisions of the Senate bill.

While I am still hopeful that a deal is possible, Senator SANDERS and I and our staffs and other conferees continue to work each day and into the night. It is becoming more difficult, though, because the Senate has once again changed the goalposts, and I don't know what the Senate's real position is today. In fact, I said last week I don't know if the Senate could vote for their own bill now.

Senator SANDERS has recently indicated his desire to expand the scope of our conference committee's work by adding VA's request—and I say ''request,'' but I really don't know. Is it an emergency request? Is it a supplemental request? Nobody seems to be sure exactly what it is. Most importantly, the VA doesn't know what it is. Senator SANDERS is asking for the inclusion of an additional $17.6 billion into our conversation.

As I said last week, both the VA Office of Inspector General and the General Accountability Office have said on numerous occasions that they do not have any confidence in the numbers that VA provides right now. Moreover, at every budget hearing before our committee in recent years, the Secretary has sat at the witness table and clearly said—when asked by members: Do you have the funds necessary?—the Secretary says: We have the funds necessary to meet the needs of our veterans.

So why all of a sudden would we believe that VA sees this need for an additional $10 billion to hire 10,000 more health care staff and $6 billion in new construction without thoroughly vetting the numbers—also, add an additional $1.5 billion for IT—when we already know that VA has squandered hundreds of millions of dollars in IT money over the years?

But what I want to do for the Members here tonight is to show you a typical budget submission, a request from the administration on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is over 1,300 pages in four volumes to justify the money that is spent at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, here is the explanation that was given to us for the $17.6 billion ask by the Department. I have in recent days called it a three-page document—$17.6 billion justified by a three-page document—but actually, if you take the cover letter off and if you take the closing page off, you have one page to justify $17.6 billion.

Now, in talking with Senator SANDERS and Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson on the phone a couple of days ago, I expressed that this was not the way to justify this type of expenditure to this Congress. I believe people on both sides of the aisle will clearly admit that this is not what we would call ''regular order,'' but the Acting Secretary said, by noon yesterday, I would receive much more detailed information on this ask. So noon came and it rolled by, and it was at 9 o'clock last night when, finally, we got this deep dive—additional information—and they doubled the pages to two pages of information for a $17.6 billion ask—two pages. The Acting Secretary will be before our committee tomorrow morning. I hope he brings three pages with him to justify this request.

This is not enough information for such a huge ask by the VA. It is not some unsubstantiated guess put together in the back room of a massive bureaucracy. In fact, interestingly enough, it is titled, ''A Working Estimate,'' as of July 22. This isn't even the number that they are sure that they want to ask for.

What is really disappointing is that I actually believe that we could have already come to an agreement if Senator SANDERS had not insisted on moving the goalpost and adding this $17.6 billion ask into a clearly defined conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the House has almost a dozen bills that sit, languishing in the Senate right now, including the authorization of 27 VA clinics that passed in December—important changes to the processing of disability claims that has been so backlogged over the last few years, education benefits, including the instate tuition bill that passed unanimously out of this House, that has sat, languishing with the other 11 bills in the Senate that are waiting to be brought up for a vote. The Senate could pass these bills and send them straight to the President, and they would become law right away.

Again, to my colleague from California, I would remind you that H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, did pass this House unanimously, and you were a cosponsor of the bill that passed by 390–0 in February. It gives States the incentive to provide all veterans instate tuition rates. It is very similar to the provision in the Senate bill that Mr. PETERS wants our conferees to recede to in conference. Once again, this bipartisan bill could be sent to the President if the Senate would just bring it up for a vote.

We are trying to work out a deal with the Senate, but I submit to this body today that these motions to instruct are clearly becoming unproductive, are slowing down our process, and unfortunately, I think they are being used as nothing more than a political ploy. I find it very interesting that not one member of the minority side on our VA Committee has offered over the last four times a motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, first, I lament the notion that this is motivated entirely by politics; although, I understand that would not be entirely unusual in this body. It was 80 degrees in San Diego today—a beautiful day. I don't fly all the way over here to the 91-degree heat that feels like 100 not to do something, and veterans are a top priority for me.

The point of this motion is that we have something right before us that would deal with the culture of complacency that has failed our veterans, and we could pass the bill supported both by Senator BERNIE SANDERS and Senator JOHN MCCAIN, which was passed by a vote of 93–3—I don't think you could get more bipartisan than that—and it would not raise the issues that Chairman MILLER has discussed because, if we wanted to add more money, as Senator SANDERS may want, we could take that up later.

There are very, very many points of agreement in the Senate bill, and it would incorporate many of the things we did here in the House if we would pass it just like this. So it makes all the sense in the world to go ahead and have that bill before us so that we could pass it. It could be on the President's desk tomorrow, and at least many of the points of agreement, like the instate tuition, for example, would be on their way to helping veterans right away.

Last week, I attended part of the stand down for homeless veterans in San Diego. The Veterans Village of San Diego organized the first stand down in 1988, and there are more than 200 similar programs nationwide that help provide a hand up, not a hand out for homeless vets. No one at the event asked me whether I thought the House or the Senate or the President had the best plan for keeping our promise to America's veterans. They want action, and they want it now. They don't want to hear about how the procedural rules of this place are some way to hide behind our lack of action.

They fought for our country in the jungles of Vietnam, in the deserts of Iraq, and in the mountains of Afghanistan. The fact that this House can't put aside partisan politics to do the right thing for our veterans is even more messed up than anyone can imagine.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, surely, the gentleman did not insinuate that I, as the chairman of the most bipartisan committee in this Congress, was being partisan in any anything that I have said or done.

Mr. PETERS of California. Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. What I am suggesting is that the effect of our inability to vote on this Senate bill, which passed 93–3, sends the message that we just can't get it together.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I do know one bill that is much more bipartisan than the Senate's 93–3 vote, and that was the House's bill that passed 430–0.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. MILLER, I could not argue with you. The only other point I would make is that the provisions of that bill are contained within the Senate bill that I hope we are able to vote on. That is why we could kill two birds with one stone.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, if we can't get this kind of thing done, it is no wonder that the approval rating of the body is at 9 percent. It is a shame.

I do urge my colleagues to adopt the motion to instruct so that we can get this effort moving and provide our veterans with the educational opportunities that they deserve, with the support they deserve, and with the opportunities that they deserve because they fought so hard and so bravely for us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING HELEN MADDOX ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that you have a constituent who reaches the century mark, but I have one, a young lady named Helen Maddox in Arlington, Texas, who will be celebrating her 100th birthday later this week.

Helen was not born a native Texan, but she got there as soon as she could. She and her husband moved to Arlington, Texas, over half a century ago, and she has lived there ever since. Her husband is now deceased.

Helen has been very active in the Republican Women, in numerous civic clubs, and has been a very strong personal friend of mine and also a political supporter. She will be celebrating her 100th birthday this week.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I want to wish her the absolute very best birthday and hope that the next 100 are as happy and positive as her first 100 have been.

Happy birthday, Helen Maddox, of Arlington, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to what I just said.

HONORING HELEN MADDOX ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special woman on a very special day—her 100th birthday. Helen Maddox was born on her family's small family farm in Romulus, Michigan on July 28, 1914.

She was the youngest of three and admits that while she was surrounded by love, life back then wasn't always easy. There was always a long list of chores that included taking care of the animals and helping with the crops.

Helen worked at a roadside stand selling fruits and vegetables and says her curly hair was a great marketing tool. People would stop because of her cute curls, and then buy something.

Her parents were community leaders and that is a trait that rubbed off on Helen.

Like many people who weren't lucky enough to be born in Texas, she moved there as an adult. She immediately became involved in the small, but growing community of Arlington, Texas. Back then it was a town of just 15,000, now it is close to 400,000. Helen Maddox played a role in making it a big city with a small town feel.

She started attending city council meetings so she could keep up with what was going on and support city leaders. Helen founded the Arlington Women's Club in 1957 and it is still going strong. She also worked with longtime Mayor Tom Vandergriff to organize the YMCA.

She and her late husband loved to travel, many times hitting the road in their Winnebago.

Helen slowly got more involved in Republican politics. In 1986 she got an invitation to have tea at the White House with Nancy Reagan.

When Arlington became part of my district 20 years ago, Helen was one of the first people to welcome me. She was 80 at the time, but still full of life and her love of Arlington and America was infectious.

As she hits 100 she is still active in the community. I am proud today to say Happy 100th Birthday to my friend—Helen Maddox!

CHRISTIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to yield to a friend, a colleague, a guy I came in with in the class of 2004, my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, Congressman GOHMERT. I appreciate your yielding, and I appreciate your willingness to engage in the most important dialogues facing our Nation night after night. Thank you again for allowing me to intrude a bit on your time.

I wanted to raise something of the utmost urgency, Mr. Speaker.

Mosul is Iraq's second largest city. For 1600 years, Mosul has been a center of Christian life, and, today, not a single Christian remains.

Now, who could have imagined that 1 month ago—just a month ago—large swaths of the country of Iraq would be invaded—conquered—by an army of religious fanatics who would fly a flag that is a black banner of death.

After capturing Mosul, this group, known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, commonly called ISIS, issued an ultimatum to the Christians who lived in this city. They said three things: you must depart; you must convert to Islam—or you will die by the sword.

They did more than that.

Mr. Speaker, they did this: this is the Arabic letter for ''N,'' and it is pronounced ''none.'' It is a symbol that stands for the word ''Nazarene,'' which is a denigrating term used to describe Christians in the area by some. In their brutal campaign against Christians and other religious minorities, ISIS spray-painted this letter on the doors of the remaining Christians' homes, their businesses and their churches, except they didn't do it in gold. They did it in red—blood red.

Leave, convert, or die.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq's Christians have just as much right as anybody else to be there. That community has traditionally served—even in a minority status—as a leavening influence, oftentimes trying to build bridges where there were ethnic or religious tensions.

People all around the world, fortunately, are recognizing the grotesque injustice that is happening. Even though we are busy here, debating all types of other concerns, nonetheless, in a land very, very far away, people are being told that they must leave their homes—their ancestral homelands—and go to who knows where or they will die.

Fortunately, there is a movement that is now happening. Many people around the world are taking that red symbol of death that was painted on those Christians' homes, and they are turning it into this gold symbol of solidarity, saying that, if we are going to

find peace in the world—if we are ever at least going to find a bit of stability—we are going to have to come to some deeper awareness of understanding of the nature and dignity of all human persons and of that most sacred right of religious liberty: to be able to express one's faith tradition, particularly an ancient faith tradition which has existed in this area for 1600 years.

□ 2045

We must find a way to elevate that value. So, in the midst of this chaos, this horror, this grotesque injustice, there is a little bit of glimmering light, in that people all around the world are starting to use this symbol on Facebook and social media.

Mr. Speaker, all I wanted to do tonight is say I stand with them in solidarity.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. I am immensely grateful to my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for bringing this point home. It is a point that has been brought home repeatedly to me in different places in the world.

In Afghanistan, where this country helped with a constitution that would be shari'a law-based, my country, my country, where Americans have fought and died for freedom, my country, where the most valuable commodity we have, human life, has been sacrificed on the altar of freedom because we believed where there was a threat like Afghanistan to us as Americans, we could repel the Taliban, and the world would benefit and certainly America would benefit, and Christians around the world would benefit, who were being so persecuted by the Taliban in control in Afghanistan.

But we weren't alone. Moderate Muslims in Afghanistan were being persecuted. That is why there were plenty, there were plenty of groups willing to rise and fight with America, for America, against the radical Islamists of the Taliban.

The moderate Muslims didn't want radical Islamists running their country. They were perfectly willing to allow Christians or Buddhists or secularists, Jews, to live and worship or not worship as they saw fit in their country.

So the people that some in this administration call war criminals, the Northern Alliance, fought for us, and they defeated the Taliban in a matter of months.

It was in October of 2001, a month or so after the worst attack on the United States in our history killed over 3,000 people here in our homeland. We finally figured out that planning and preparation occurred in Afghanistan.

And there did have to be some diplomatic negotiations to get some of the tribes to be willing to fight together because they didn't like each other sufficiently, at least, to work together and be under each others' control and command.

Diplomatically, there may have been some money that changed hands, we are told, to get one tribal leader to subjugate to another.

General Dostum, legendary in the region, in the whole continent, for courage, led. We had less than 500, around 300 or so, embedded military, special ops guys, as well as intelligence. And within about 4 or 5 months, the Taliban were totally routed, totally defeated.

Then the administration, under the leadership of the State Department, decided the best thing for Afghanistan would be to have a stove-piped, centralized, top-heavy government, even though this was a regional, tribal country, had been for millennia.

That was a mistake that was not the Obama administration's; that happened before President Obama took office.

But, from those I talked with, they could see problems, and I believe, if there had been a President Bush clone he would have been willing to admit we needed a change.

But the new President accepted Afghanistan, with its top-heavy government, where the President can appoint the governors, appoint the mayors, appoint the police chief, appoint the highest level teachers, appoint a slate of a big portion of the legislature. Incredible powers.

If you were looking for a formula that would help you create corruption, we helped provide it to the Afghans. If you were looking for an environment that could be created that would encourage corruption, we helped provide it to the Afghans.

Well, everybody makes mistakes. But the important thing is, after you have made them, recognize them and correct them.

Instead, this administration came in and really doubled down and bet on the top-heavy, corrupt Karzai administration. As a result, synagogues really can't be found in Afghanistan. Christian churches—you would be hard-pressed to find a church in Afghanistan, not that they are not there somewhere.

But the Taliban, one of whose leaders has been on national television in Afghanistan, on behalf of the Taliban, citing shari'a law and, basically, announcing if you have been an opposing the Taliban, if you have not actually supported us, then everyone knows when the Americans leave, which will be this year, then we, the Taliban will be back in charge here in Afghanistan.

So under shari'a law, you must come to us, admit your mistakes, ask forgiveness, and ask for our protection, swear allegiance to the Taliban. We will forgive you and we will provide you protection. But if you fail to do so, then you will be fodder for death.

So, we have helped create a situation in Afghanistan, under this administration, where now, if you are not going to be a radical Islamist, your life is going to be miserable, which were the conditions in Afghanistan before we went in.

We have set up a situation in Afghanistan that will be ripe for further Taliban development, further Taliban training, and planning for a more glorious 9/11 attack that can and would kill more Americans.

And although that would most likely occur after this President leaves office, it would only be the mainstream media who would not recognize that it was this administration that made this possible.

Yes, the Bush administration would have contributed some by the government so centralized that was set up. But all but the most deaf and blind to the mistakes of the current administration would say the Bush administration would have allowed it to get to this point in Afghanistan, where Christians and Jews have to fear for their lives, where moderate Muslims have to fear for their lives, and where those who fought for and with America will likely be killed.

Now, knowing some of these people, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you they are not going to go down without a fight. So most likely, our President, here in the United States, by siding with the bullies, is likely to contribute to a massive, ugly, destructive civil war in Afghanistan.

But it is one of the situations that has led our allies around the world to say, wait a minute. The Northern Alliance in Afghanistan fought for America. They fought for you. They defeated radical Islamic Taliban in Afghanistan. They were defeated. They were overrun.

That last incredible battle where General Dostum—and I have talked with him personally about it in Afghanistan, how he knew that they couldn't send tanks up to this last fortification of the Taliban because they could get blown up and they would block the way up.

He knew that he couldn't send massive numbers of infantry until, eventually, they prevailed because they are fighting uphill against artillery, rocket propelled grenades, and gunfire, and they wouldn't have a chance, no matter how many they sent.

He felt the only chance was if they put the 1,000 fastest, most courageous, best horseback riders they had on horses and sent them uphill into this Taliban stronghold. And they did, and these 1,000 courageous freedom fighters, Muslims who wanted freedom from these cruel, uncivilized, brutal beasts called the Taliban, they wanted them defeated, and they went after them.

Riding as fast as they can, they head up the hill, rocket propelled grenades, artillery, gunfire coming their way, and they lost 30 percent of the 1,000 riders.

They didn't slow down, they didn't stop, they didn't watch and see as someone fell. They knew their only chance of victory was to keep heading up that hill to the fortification. Around 700 got there and wiped out the Taliban, destroyed the last fortification, the last stronghold of the Taliban, and there was victory in Afghanistan.

Now, all these years later, 12 years later, with an administration that keeps helping the bullies of the world and hurting those who are oppressed in the world, the Taliban is poised to take back over.

Our allies are wondering, why did we trust you? Why did we fight with you?

You said when we defeated the Taliban for you that we could trust you, we could give you our weapons because we had nothing to fear; the United States would always stand with us and make sure the Taliban would never take back over.

Now, 12 years after we trusted you, we put our lives in your hands, we gave these weapons to you, you are turning your back on us in Afghanistan who fought for you and with you, lost family, lost limbs, fighting for you and with you, and now you are going to walk away and leave this country to fall back in the hands of the Taliban.

We are not going to let it happen without a fight. But we can't believe you would do this to someone to whom you said, hey, trust us, you can trust us, and we did, and now the current administration is turning its back on us, calling us war criminals.

□ 2100

Other allies around the world see this, and they say, wow. You know, we can't say this to Secretary of State Kerry. We couldn't say it to Secretary of State Clinton. We couldn't say this to President Obama, but we can say this to you. We trust you, but we are wondering if we are going to be the next allies to be thrown under the bus.

People around the world are saying—it seems to be pretty clear—you can't trust the United States, or you will pay with your life. That is not the America that gained the trust and respect around the world from everyone except the radical Islamists and some of the mainstream media.

The America that became the most free, the most affluent nation in world history has also been the most generous nation in world history, and what we have done and given and lost on behalf of other people—not to create an empire, not to build an empire, not to force people to speak English and to follow American ways—but so they could be free to choose the way in which they should go.

Countries historically have not done that, and we have, and now, that generous nature has been used by this administration until it has become a vice, a vice that would allow our allies to be killed, to be oppressed and persecuted because we are going to let the bullies take over.

Not only did we watch and let bullies take over in other parts of the world, but we saw the Arab Spring that, in the not-so-distant future, would become a Christian and Jewish winter—a bleak, miserable winter for Jews and Christians and secularists.

We demanded that the leader of Egypt be ousted—never mind that this administration had agreements with the Egyptian leader—the President. We turned our back on them—and how about after the Soviet Union fell and the United States, particularly the Clinton administration, as I understand it, were the ones that guaranteed Ukraine that if you will give up the nuclear weapons that you hold and allow us to provide them to Russia—we know you don't want to give these weapons to Russia, we know you don't trust the Russians, but you can trust us, the United States.

President Clinton, as I understand it, worked this great deal with Ukraine: trust us, you can trust us—yes, let the Russians have the nuclear weapons that you possess, Ukraine; and we, the United States, will have your back, we will protect you. Russia wouldn't dare come against you because we will protect you. We will fight for you. We have got your back.

What this administration has done with the Ukrainians' back is to put a knife in it.

Well, you know, there were a lot of Russians in Crimea. Well, yes, there were. The Russians forced them in there and forced the Ukrainians out at one time. Gee, what a great way to claim this land is yours, by forcing the people out of there.

If you want to talk about earlier possession being the right to currently possess, you are going to be hard-pressed to find any Muslim that was a practicing Muslim 1,000 years before Christ, although you will find the Jews under King David, and you would find King David in the first 7 years of his reign in Hebron, leading Israel from Hebron.

This administration wants to say: oh, that is not Israel's land—the people that came along and worshiped Mohammed 1,600 years after King David ruled in this land, they are the ones that should have the land.

Really—that is this administration's position—seriously? What about the prophecies in the Old Testament that, in the mountains of Sumeria, there would be fruit, there would be grapes, there would be fine wine?

For decades, since Israel came back into the land, it was promised over 3,000 years ago. People are saying, well, you can't grow grapes there in those mountains. We don't know. The prophets really blew that one. You can't grow grapes in that area of Sumeria, except that I have been in that area of Sumeria where the prophet said that Israeli grapes would grow and provide great wine. I don't drink alcohol, but the grapes were amazing, and they are growing where the prophet said they would.

So how could land that was in Israel's possession, that was prophesied would be lost by the children of Israel, but God would return them to the area, and there would be fine grapes and fruit grown in that area, how could that be somebody else's prior claim when they were longer there than anybody still, any tribes in existence today?

Perhaps that is Israel's land, but not according to this administration. This administration is anxious to help those who are the most brutal in all of Israel.

So even though we have gotten used to seeing this administration turn its back on an ally in Egypt in favor of a radical Islamist Muslim brother, Morsi, who was in charge—and who, by the way, sent his wife to have a baby in America, who could be brought up and taught to hate America, just like Alamoudi, who is doing over 20 years in prison for supporting terrorism. His wife came to America and had a baby. They have got an American citizen.

Actually, it was rather interesting. I found out today that Osama bin Laden told his wife to come to America to have her baby. He wanted her to have an American citizen that they could raise up and teach to hate America who, because of their citizenship, would be able to come in and out. Fortunately, she ended up in Saudi Arabia, as I understand, before the child was born.

These radical Islamists may be crazy, but they are not stupid. They know as long as we have open borders and welcome people who are pregnant that hate us, they can get in and have baby American citizens and take them back to their country and, over their life, teach them to hate America.

I have talked about it for a number of years. There have been the naysayers, and at some point, they will wise up and see, wow, this has been happening for many years.

Well, the same administration that has condemned Israel at different times for not being willing to step up and do what we told them to do, the same administration that has left the leader of Israel sitting, waiting for the President for long periods of time while he went and ate and yet chastised him, well, you stay here and think about it, like a child, and when you come to the agreement I told you to, basically then I will get back together with you.

Like a child—really? We treat our allies like that?

Well, Prime Minister Netanyahu should be thankful because the way

this administration treated the ally leader in Egypt was to have him destroyed—his position, get him out of office, out of power, subject him to torture by the locals.

Look at the ally that this administration had in Libya. Qadhafi was not a good man, but he was scared so badly after we entered Iraq that he opened his doors: okay, guys—America, you tell me what I can keep, what I have to get rid of. I don't want you to invade me, so I would rather be your friend. You tell me what I can have in the way of weapons.

He really and truly did give up whatever we told him to, and he became an ally. I have even met Qadhafi's son here at the Capitol before—while President Obama has been President. Apparently, he had meetings here in Washington with the administration, with people on Capitol Hill, and yet this administration not only turned on their ally that they had in Qadhafi—who had supposedly given up his terrorist-supporting ways—and this administration supplied weapons into Libya to al Qaeda, to other rebels who were not al Qaeda, but to al Qaeda, to al-Shari'a, to other radical Islamists to take out Qadhafi.

Some have contended, if we had not gone in and bombed Qadhafi's caravan as he was trying to get away, they would not have caught him, and he would have gotten out, so it would appear that the United States contributed mightily to the torturous death of Qadhafi.

I am not saying he didn't deserve a rough death after what he had done to so many, Mr. Speaker. I am just pointing out that this administration had made agreements and discussions with him as an ally, and they turned on him, threw him away—and not only that, but they helped bring about his personal death and destruction.

When you deal with al Qaeda, when you deal with radical Islam, the Taliban, it is like handling a snake, a poisonous snake. Eventually, it will bite because it is a snake. That is what it does.

Now, in areas where this administration helped rebels, being a Christian or a Jew is the quickest route to death. This administration, sadly, has helped contribute to situations in the world where there is now more terror if you are a Christian or a Jew than there has been in centuries.

So I guess I shouldn't be surprised, but I am a little bit surprised that as Hamas—who does get some of our money. Money is fungible, and we are sending it to the Palestinians, and every dime of it ought to be cut off as long as they have a relationship with Hamas; but yet, because we are sending money that is being used for textbooks and things like street signs that are named for people who have killed innocent Jews, Israelis, Christians, we are contributing to what they are doing.

Then this administration, through the FAA, stuck a knife in Israel once again by having the administration, through the FAA, ban U.S. flights to and from Israel's main airport for a second day.

As even CNN reported, ''The FAA's ban on U.S. flights to and from Israel's main airport for a second day marks another blow to that country's economy and a success for Hamas militants, experts said Wednesday.''

□ 2115

As one said, quoted in the CNN story:

It is a big hit to the Israeli economy and to our pride, the director of the Civil Aviation Authority of Israel said. But he and other Israeli officials insisted their country's sophisticated antimissile system makes Ben Gurion Airport a safe place, even though a Hamas rocket from Gaza fell 1 mile away from the airfield, prompting the FAA temporary ban on U.S. flights.

''We knew about that rocket,'' said Israeli Government spokesman Mark Regev. ''We were tracking it for about 3 minutes, our air force. We could have taken it down, but because we saw that it wasn't going to hit inside the airport, we let it through.''

For some Americans, Gaza conflict strikes close to home. The FAA ban marks something of a victory for Hamas—as well as prudent decision to protect commercial airlines, one expert said.

But his quote included, ''What is the objective of terrorists? To incite terror in people.''

That was Tim Clemente, a retired FBI counterterrorism agent talking about Hamas.

Clemente said:

I think because they probably got lucky with this one rocket that came close enough to Ben Gurion to make it seem like the threat was legitimate.

Well, the truth is, maybe Mr. Clemente didn't know the Israelis were tracking it. They could have shot it down, but there have been so many. What? A couple thousand of these rockets have been sent in the last 15 days into Israel, they cannot afford to knock down ones that are not going to harm people or do damage, so they didn't take it down. They could see the trajectory. They knew where it was going to hit.

Yet the Obama administration decides to inflict even more damage on Israel by harming them economically. Oh, we are lifting bans. We are working with Iran, even though Iran said they want to wipe out the Little Satan, Israel, and the Great Satan, the United States. They made it clear, and they have never, ever ceased to pursue that dream of wiping out Israel and the United States.

Oh, we will give them some money. We will let them have proceeds, but when it comes to Israel, we are going to slap them around like a little kid again even though they have the sophisticated weaponry to knock down rockets and they let one go because it is not going to hurt anybody. This administration seizes on that to declare a ban on U.S. flights to and from Tel Aviv.

Fawzi Barhoum, a Hamas spokesman, described the missile landing near the airport as one victory in the ongoing war between Hamas and Israel in Gaza. The resistance success in stopping the air traffic and isolating Israel from the world is a great victory for the resistance, Barhoum told Al-Aqsa Television.

Great victory for Hamas. Great victory for radical Islam. They have gotten the United States administration under President Obama to ban air traffic into Tel Aviv, so we are sticking a knife in our friend.

It is not bad enough that Hamas is launching rockets nonstop into Israel, that they have made clear no matter how badly Israel wants a cease-fire, they are not going to stop the rockets, they are hoping they will kill innocent people because they have made clear before that to them, to these terrorists, they don't think there is an innocent child in all of Israel because ultimately they will be in the military, so they are doing the world a favor, they say, or they think, by killing every Israeli they can.

And what does this administration do? It says let's help Hamas by sticking, taking a stab into the heart of Israel's economy.

Here is an article from haaretz.com:

Will the threat to Israel's only international airport be a game-changer?

Whether or not flights in and out of Israel are suspended for any length of time, the suspension of flights by several major air carriers is Hamas' first major achievement of this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that the United States is the one who gave Hamas, the radical Islamists, their first big victory. It wasn't Israel that gave them a victory. Israel has defended itself, and that is all they are doing.

The article says:

With a single rocket, which evaded the Iron Dome missile defense system and exploded between two houses in the Tel Aviv suburb of Yehud, Hamas might just have achieved what it failed to do with nearly 2,000 rockets fired at Israel since the beginning of this round of warfare 15 days ago.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it should be clear that Israel tracked the missile, saw it wasn't going to hit anybody, and they let it go. It was not a mistake. It was something they saw would be harmless, and they let it go, the Israelis did.

But the article says:

The decision of the United States' Federal Aviation Administration to advise the three U.S. carriers flying to Israel, Delta, United, and US Airways, to suspend their flights to Israel for 24 hours, could just be just a temporary blip, another inconvenience caused by the current security situation. If the suspension is extended indefinitely, for as long as the rockets are flying, and if it spreads to the airlines of other countries—a number of European carriers have already followed suit

and Korean Air suspended flights already last week—it would create an intolerable situation for the government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Further in the article it says:

The rocket falling on Yehud did not change that situation. One factor that could have changed the FAA assessment was probably the downing of the Malaysian Airlines Boeing 777 over eastern Ukraine on Thursday, with the deaths of all 298 crew and passengers on board.

Tens of thousands of Israelis planning to fly abroad, tourists who were to leave, and those who were scheduled to arrive here in the next few days will have had their plans disrupted. The national carrier, El Al, however, will continue to fly, and since there have been many cancellations already, it will carry many of those who were set to fly on foreign airlines.

But the psychological effect on Israelis will be significant, and this could have a longer term implication for Israel's economy.

The last time there was a wide-scale suspension of flights to Israel by foreign airlines was not in 2001 after 9/11 when there were continued threats against Israel or 2002 with continued threats against Israel or 2003 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8. No. There were no flights suspended from the United States under the President George W. Bush administration, even though the threats at that time were probably more severe than now that they have such an effective Iron Dome. There were days before the effective Iron Dome that Israel was probably more at risk than they are with the Iron Dome, but Bush didn't call a suspension. But this administration has.

The last time there was a wide-scale suspension of flights to Israel by foreign airlines was in early 1991, when Iraqi scud missiles were falling on Israel during the first gulf war. Israelis then did not travel abroad as often as they do now, and that conflict did not happen during the summer vacation period. More significantly, the local economy was not integrated into the global markets as it is today, with hundreds of international companies having research centers in the Israeli high-tech hubs and thousands of companies here totally reliant on export markets. It took Israel's economy many years to break down the reluctance of foreign corporations to invest and work in Israel—a few days or a couple of weeks with limited air travel probably won't change that, but it may well create a temporary feeling of siege.

This may prove to be a game-changer in a conflict which is now entering its third week. It could provide further impetus for the government in seeking a speedy ceasefire with Hamas, but that seems doubtful.

It is much more likely that, faced with the prospect of more rockets cutting off Israel off from the international air routes, the government will be inclined to order a much more devastating blow, a wider ground operation to occupy the rocket-launching sites or even directed at Hamas' underground headquarters, with dreadful implications for the people of Gaza living above.

And that will be the fault of this administration by failing to put pressure on Hamas but instead putting pressure on the more reasonable people who have just tried to defend themselves and have made clear if you stop the rockets, we stop attacking.

All we are seeking is peace. Hamas holds the peace in its own hands, and with that hand, it keeps trying to murder Israelis. And then you end up having discussions in mainstream media—not that hardly anybody is watching. But on CNN when one commentator asked another, I think it was Wolf Blitzer, in effect, gee, these Hamas, they don't have near the weapons that Israel has, so are you seeing any let-up of Israel since they clearly have more fighting power than Hamas?

I am sorry. That is just really a stupid question. If somebody is coming at you with a rock with the intent to murder you and you have a gun, are you supposed to stand aside and say: Yeah, beat me as long as you want to until you kill me. I can't use a gun because it is more powerful than your rock?

Of course not. You can use self-defense when someone has murderous intent.

Israel does have the ability to go in and clean out the weapons in Gaza. I have pointed out to Prime Minister Netanyahu and other leaders of Israel that going back to the very inception of Israel—the very inception—before there was a king, even before there were judges, there has never been a time in Israel's history when Israel gave away its land trying to buy peace. Not only did they not get peace, that land they gave away was used as a staging area from which to attack it. Southern Lebanon and Gaza Strip are just more modern examples.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand until I went to Israel for the first time why in the world Israel would be willing to give away more land. But when you are there, you see it among the people. They were tired of suicide bombers, and they were tired of rockets. Look, if you will just leave us alone, we will give you land. But hopefully Israel has learned a lesson that even though you are tired of the rockets, you are as tired of the destruction from Hamas and from radical Islamists as you were from the PLO, you can't buy peace by giving away your country, not part of it, not all of it.

As long as you exist, they will want to kill you, eradicate you, and wipe you out. They have said they will create a worse holocaust than World War II, and I think they are quite serious.

What this administration ought to do for the good of mankind is to recognize that in Hamas are some of the most heinous war crimes in current days because Hamas is willing to take schoolchildren, the sick, the afflicted, and families and put weapons in their homes, their schools, and their hospitals, hiding them under, hiding them in, and then when Israel defends itself by taking out the weapons, they get to claim: Oh, gee, look. You killed innocent civilians. Shame on you.

The Hamas leaders ought to be tried for war crimes, convicted and killed.

□ 2130

They ought to be put to death in a war crimes system of justice for using children and innocent people as shields. And this administration ought to be leading the cry against Hamas' exposure of its children and its people. But unfortunately, because some of the American money we have spent is capable of being used to fund schoolbooks that teach the children to hate Israelis and hate Americans, hate Jews, hate Christians, you actually have families that say sure, you want to hide your weapons in here, gee, if we are taken out by the Israelis, then we are martyred and we will be heroes. What kind of sick thinking have we contributed to in the region?

It is time to cut off every dime that America is giving to the Palestinians, to Hamas, anybody working with Hamas, anybody having any relationship with Hamas. It is time to take President Bush's words that you are either with us or you are against us. If you are doing business with Hamas, if you are helping Hamas, if you are friendly with Hamas, then you are our enemy, and then we ought to enforce that.

Israel is standing in defense not only of itself but of the United States of America because the radical Islamists represented in Hamas don't just want an end to Israel. Anyone who wants the destruction and end of Israel wants the destruction and the end of the United States of America, and it is time that somebody in this administration recognized that. I think there are military leaders that recognize that, and some day they are going to grow a pair and tell the President of the United States that he is helping the wrong side, and God bless him when they do.

We even have Jewish self-loathers in this country and in the media—which there have always been—who want to beat up and vilify Israel when the country just wants to defend itself. But we know this has happened as long as there have been the Jewish people. I mean, going back to World War II, there were actually Jews who went and identified where other Jews lived for the Germans. So is it any surprise that you would have some Jewish people, self-loathing Jews, who would ridicule Israel when it is just trying to defend itself?

Here is another article, ''World suspension of Israel flights a 'great victory': Hamas'':

The success of Hamas in closing Israeli airspace is a great victory for the resistance, and is the crown of Israel's failure.

That is Hamas spokesman Sami Abu Zuhri. Well, he should give credit to this administration. This administration is the one who gave it to him.

And then here is an article from Reuters. Netanyahu asks Kerry to help resume flights to Israel. Well, good luck with that. As long as they think they are hurting Israel, they will probably keep it.

Sure, the President has already got his Nobel Peace Prize, he got that before he really got started. But Secretary Kerry doesn't have his yet, and the only chance he will have of bringing any peace to the Middle East from his perspective is if you put pressure on the only reasonable group over there, and that is the Israelis, because they are the only ones that recognize that human life is valuable and we ought to try to save as much as we can. They have shown great restraint in the Gaza Strip. They shouldn't have to. We should clean it up for them.

Another article by Andrew McCarthy, ''Palestinians Chose Hamas and the Mass Murder of Civilians, Including Their Own.'' He posted this July 22:

Today, we are yet again being inundated with tales of Palestinian woe after Hamas's familiar barbarism has provoked an Israeli military response. It thus bears remembering that the Palestinian people chose Hamas. Whatever happened to all of those Democracy Project paeans to self-determination? Hamas is Palestinian self-determination. Hamas was not forced on Palestinians. Hamas did not militarily conquer Gaza. No, Hamas swept parliamentary elections freely held in the Palestinian territories in 2006—thrashing its rival, Fatah, which is only marginally less committed to the destruction of Israel.

Anyway, Andrew McCarthy quotes from The Wall Street Journal:

The people of Gaza overwhelmingly elected Hamas, a terrorist outfit dedicated to the destruction of Israel as their designated representatives. Almost instantly Hamas began stockpiling weapons and using them against a more powerful foe with a solid track record of retaliation. What did Gazans think was going to happen? Surely they must have understood on election night that their lives would now be suspended in a state of utter chaos. Life expectancy would be miserably low. Children would be without a future. Staying alive would be a challenge, if staying alive even mattered anymore. To make matters worse, Gazans sheltered terrorists and their weapons in their homes, right beside ottoman sofas and dirty diapers. When Israel warned them of impending attacks, the inhabitants defiantly refused to leave.

On some basic level you forfeit your right to be called civilians when you freely elect members of a terrorist organization as statesmen, invite them to dinner with blood on their hands, and allow them to set up shop in your living room as their base of operations. At that point you begin to look a lot more like conscripted soldiers than innocent civilians. And you have wittingly made yourself targets.

It also calls your parenting skills into serious question. In the U.S. if a parent is found to have locked his or her child in a parked car on a summer day with the windows closed, a social worker takes the children away from the demonstrably unfit parent. In Gaza, parents who place their children in the direct line of fire are rewarded with an interview on MSNBC, where they can call Israel a genocidal murderer.

He says it is just a warmup for Jew hatred that pervades the Charter's Article 7, and then he quotes:

Hamas is one of the links in the Chain of Jihad in the confrontation with the Zionist invasion. It links up with the setting out of Martyr Izz-a-din al-Qassam and his brothers in the Muslim Brotherhood who fought the Holy War in 1936; it further relates to another link of the Palestinian Jihad and the Jihad and efforts of the Muslim Brothers during the 1948 war, and to the Jihad operations of the Muslim Brothers in 1968 and thereafter. But even if the links have become distant from each other, and even if the obstacles erected by those who revolved in the Zionist orbit, aiming at obstructing the road before the Jihad fighters, have rendered the pursuance of Jihad impossible, nevertheless, the Hamas has been looking forward to implement Allah's promise, whatever time it takes. The prophet, prayer and peace be upon him, said: The time will not come until Muslims will fight the Jews (and kill them); until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry: O Muslim! there is a Jew hiding behind me, come on and kill him. This will not apply to the Gharqad, which is a Jewish tree.

Anyway, Andrew McCarthy said:

This is what Palestinians voted for. The highlighted section of Article 7 comes straight from Islamic scripture, from the authoritative Bukhari and Muslim collections of hadith (the sayings and doings of the prophet Mohammed). It foretells an eternal struggle until the end of time, when, with Allah's intercession, the rocks and trees will help Muslims battalions find and kill every remaining Jew.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous time. Prime Minister Netanyahu seeks the help of his former ally, the United States, not the stabbing in the back by the ally, the United States. I have asked my office to try to set up an appointment with Prime Minister Netanyahu if he would see me this weekend. I know the Sabbath is coming up, but I would find a commercial way to fly in there because I believe in the Israeli people and their ability to keep me safe despite the efforts of the United States in consoling their enemy.

Just as my friend DANA ROHRABACHER came to me several years ago and said, look, the U.S. State Department is saying we cannot go into northern Iraq, the Kurdish area, for more than just maybe a meal because if we do, they won't protect us. They say it is too dangerous. Well, it was the safest area in Iraq, and the Kurdish people were begging for our help. Well, we went in. We were protected 3 days, and I know and I would put my life in the hands of the Israelis. I trust them and I wish the rest of the United States would trust them despite this administration.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 609. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6535. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0101] (RIN: 0579-AD83) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6536. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-74; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0052, Sequence No. 2] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6537. A letter from the Attorney Advisor/Federal Register Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Government Securities Act Regulations; Replacements of Reference to Credit Ratings and Technical Amendments [Docket No.: BPD GSRS 11-01] (RIN: 1535-AA02) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6538. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — CLIA Program and HIPAA Privacy Rule; Patients' Access to Test Reports [CMS-2319-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ38) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6539. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drug Applications; Confidentiality of Data and Information in a New Animal Drug Application File; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0108] received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6540. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings; Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [WT Docket No.: 12-269] [Docket No.: 12-268] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6541. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Person from the Entity List Based on Removal Request [Docket No.: 140522446-4446-01] (RIN: 0694-AG19) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6542. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Control of Military Electronic Equipment and Other Items the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML) [Docket No.: 120330233-4307-03] (RIN: 0694-AF64) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6543. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measure for Greater Amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XD230) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6544. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XD251) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6545. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measures for Red Grouper in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 120717247-3029-02] (RIN: 0648-XD231) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6546. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System; Regulations to Certify and Integrate Regional Information Coordination Entities [Docket No.: 120813326-4163-02] (RIN: 0648-BC18) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6547. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure [Docket No.: 121210694-3514-02] (RIN: 048-XD238) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6548. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 131231999-4319-01] (RIN: 0648-XD331) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6549. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Re-Establishing the Sanctuary Nomination Process [Docket No.: 130405334-3717-02] (RIN: 0648-BD20) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6550. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopters Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0574; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-22-AD; Amendment 39-17766; AD 2014-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6551. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; I-90 Inner-belt Bridge Demolition, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0425] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6552. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cape Fear River; Wilmington, NC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0413] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6553. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Urbanna Creek; Saluda, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0372] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6554. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chesapeake Bay; Cape Charles, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0298] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6555. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River mile 4.8 to 5.8; Ledbetter, KY [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0301] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6556. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hackensack River, Jersey City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6557. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0334; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17858; AD 2014-0-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6558. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0938; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-057-AD; Amendment 39-17852; AD 2014-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6559. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Albion, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0595; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-10] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6560. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0141; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-17871; AD 2014-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6561. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1056; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-046-AD; Amendment 39-17849; AD 2014-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6562. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (BHTI) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0415; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-17865; AD 2014-12-04] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6563. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0378; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-050-AD; Amendment 39-17868; AD 2014-12-07] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6564. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0379; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-17870; AD 2014-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6565. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiebiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa ''PZL-Bielsko'' Model SZD-50-3 ''Puchacz''

Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0180; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-17869; AD 2014-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6566. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0340; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-084-AD; Amendment 39-17867; AD 2014-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6567. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0882; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-17864; AD 2014-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA 4) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6568. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A) (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0943; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-17836; AD 2014-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6569. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants for Adaptive Sports Programs for Disabled Veterans and Disabled Members of the Armed Forces (RIN: 2900-AP07) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6570. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rev. Proc. 2014-30) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6571. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — May 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-13) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6572. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Purchase Price Safe Harbors for Sections 143 and 25 (Rev. Proc. 2014-31) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6573. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Electronic Substitutions for SSA-538 [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0027] (RIN: 0960-AH02) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6574. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Maritime Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retrospective Review Under E.O. 13563: War Risk Insurance (RIN: 2133-AB82) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 103. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 113–549). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3696. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–550, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5171. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 680. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit (Rept. 113–552). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3696 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VELA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5170. A bill to improve Federal employee compliance with the Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 5172. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the list of veterans designated as former prisoners of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5174. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 5175. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal the risk corridor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5176. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MAFFEI (for himself, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia):

H.R. 5177. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to eliminate benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program for Members of Congress so they are treated the same way as other taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may provide certain basic financial services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight

Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the retention of records of high level officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5182. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for equal treatment of individuals in same-sex marriages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5183. A bill to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 120. A joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to extending the interim agreement with the Government of Iran regarding its nuclear program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 681. A resolution recognizing the National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as America's National World War II Aviation Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 5168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 5171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 5174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 5177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes'') and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have the Power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof'').

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which states, ''(t)he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 36: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 259: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 333: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 401: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 445: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 494: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 543: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 594: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 721: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 851: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1024: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1070: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1094: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1125: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1201: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1313: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1318: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1389: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1507: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1563: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1652: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1666: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1698: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1699: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1812: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1914: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2084: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2283: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2433: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2453: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2480: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2529: Mr. BARBER, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2536: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2607: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2664: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2673: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2745: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2780: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2831: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2856: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2957: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2996: Mr. BOUSTANY and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3024: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3121: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 3153: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3333: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3465: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3490: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3505: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3611: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3680: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3717: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3747: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3761: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3775: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3850: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 3857: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3958: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3991: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3992: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4016: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4023: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4041: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4060: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 4156: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 4276: Mr. JOLLY and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4319: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4364: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4365: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4385: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4423: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4426: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4432: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4449: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 4510: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4511: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4576: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. OLSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4578: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4582: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4589: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4592: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4629: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4664: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4709: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4740: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4748: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4750: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4765: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4772: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4778: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4792: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 4793: Ms. MENG and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4818: Ms. MENG and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4833: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4837: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4851: Mr. NEAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4857: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 4872: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4878: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4906: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4917: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4930: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4960: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4962: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4969: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4978: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4979: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 4980: Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4988: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4995: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5007: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 5011: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 5014: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 5023: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 5049: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5050: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5053: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5059: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 5062: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5071: Mr. ENYART, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 5076: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5078: Mr. KLINE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HURT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 5081: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5088: Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 5089: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5094: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5104: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5110: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 5111: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5116: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5118: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 5122: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5135: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5139: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 5143: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 5160: Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Con, Res. 27: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 109: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 440: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 596: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 614: Mr. LATHAM.
H. Res. 621: Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 622: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H. Res. 623: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 652: Mr. BYRNE and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 665: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION REGARDING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this concurrent resolution supersedes the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 23, 2014*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, help us to follow Your commands so that we may experience abundant living. May our lawmakers' steps never stray from the path of integrity, nor waiver in following You. By Your mighty power, rescue our world from the challenges that overwhelm it. Protect those who love You as You would guard Your own eyes. Lord, hide us in the shadow of Your wings. Today, help our Senators to remember that their steps are directed by You. As You work for the good of those who love You, inspire them to stay within the circle of Your will. Give our legislators the reverential awe that brings life, prosperity, and protection.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, under a previous order, is now in leader time.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2569, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 11 a.m. there will be a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed regarding the Bringing Jobs Home Act, followed by voice votes on the following three nominations: confirmation of Julia Akins Clark to be general counsel for the Federal Labor Relations Authority; confirmation of Andrew Schapiro to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic; and confirmation of Madelyn Creedon to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

REPATRIATED INCOME

Mr. REID. I understand that Senator PAUL has an amendment that he wants to offer to this short-term funding bill. I'm talking about his amendment to permanently reduce the tax rate for repatriated income to 5 percent.

He has agreed not to offer that amendment here.

In exchange, we commit that when the Senate considers a long-term highway funding bill, Senator PAUL will be allowed to offer and get a vote on his amendment then.

Mrs. BOXER. I agree and also commit to providing Senator PAUL an opportunity to offer and get a vote on his repatriation amendment when the Senate considers a long-term highway bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My friend from Kentucky has been actively engaged on the issue of the highway funding mechanism for some time now, and I appreciate his work on this. This is one of the hardest issues that we face in Congress, and it has been helpful to have my colleague Senator PAUL working so hard on resolving it. He wanted an amendment on a repatriation proposal on the highway bill that we will soon be debating, and I want to thank him for setting it aside for the time being. We will, however, be addressing highway funding again later, and I promise to protect his right to offer his amendment and secure a vote on its adoption.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 5021

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader with the concurrence of the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 468, H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act; that the only amendments in order to the bill be the following: Wyden No. 3582; Carper-Corker-Boxer No. 3583; Lee No. 3584; Toomey No. 3585; further, that each amendment have 1 hour of debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that there be up to 2 hours of general debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to votes on the amendments in the order listed; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes; that no motions to commit the bill be in order; that upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the bill be read a third time, as amended, if amended, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; further, that the Secretary be authorized to make technical changes to amendments if necessary to allow for proper page and line number alignment; further, that the amendments and the votes on passage be subject to a 60-vote threshold; finally, if the bill is passed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 108, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 4719

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that we now proceed to H.R. 4719. It is my understanding it is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings on this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

INVERSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, more than a century ago, a small drugstore opened for business in Barrett's Hotel in Chicago, IL. The pharmacist, not yet 30 years old, and a veteran of the Spanish-American War, borrowed $6,000 to open this drugstore. His name was Charles Walgreen. This was his first store but certainly not his last. As his chain grew, the pharmacies became a fixture in American culture—you know, the vintage image of a soda fountain, milk shakes, a drugstore counter. They would mix their own drugs to give pain medication and other products to people who came in that drugstore. This is how Walgreen's started.

Now, 113 years later, the Walgreen family no longer heads the company. But there are over 8,200 Walgreen's drugstores around the country. They still bear the Walgreen name. That company Charles Walgreen started is reportedly strongly considering a renunciation of its American citizenship and a move to Switzerland. Why? To avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

Reestablished as a foreign corporation, Walgreen's would pay a smaller share of taxes. This practice is called ''inversion.'' It is a tax trick, a loophole. Of course, Walgreen's will not actually move to Switzerland. Instead, they plan to acquire a European company and officially make Switzerland home to their new headquarters, but in reality they will stay in Chicago right where they are now. That is because Walgreen's does not want to actually leave America. Why would they? Why would they want to leave America? We have the most sophisticated workforce in the world. Why would they give that up? America has the infrastructure that, although in need of updates, is still the most extensive in the world. It provides Walgreen's with the roads and transportation it needs to supply its stores. Why would Walgreen's give that up?

Why would they give up the fact that we have a legal system we can trust, that enforces business contracts and upholds intellectual property protections they need? They would not turn their heads and walk away from that. America has a Medicare system that pays for seniors to buy pharmaceuticals at Walgreen's. I am sure Walgreen's will not be turning away that cash; that is what it is, cash.

Let's not forget that Americans enjoy a law enforcement apparatus that protects the company's assets. Why would Walgreen's want to give that up? Our military, which is second to none, will continue to protect the country where all of those Walgreen's stores are located. I am sure Walgreen's would not want to give that up. Not to mention the fact that America is a pretty good place to live.

So why would Walgreen's executives ever want to move their families across the world? That would be foolish, would it not? Walgreen's leadership will probably stay right where they are now in their fancy homes in America. While they remain here, Walgreen's will still expect American tax credits, even as it dodges as much as $4 billion over the next 5 years in taxes. That is what inversion is all about.

Essentially what Walgreen's is saying is we love America. We love being in America. But we are not going to pay for it. The dictionary defines the word ''exploitation'' as ''the fact of making use of a situation to gain unfair advantage.'' What a perfect explanation of what Walgreen's is going to do. What the Walgreen's company is doing sure seems like exploitation to me. After all, this is a corporation that made $16.7 billion from Medicare and Medicaid last year—$16.7 billion—and they are going to move overseas.

But, sadly, Walgreen's is not the only corporation jumping ship. Major American companies such as Medtronic and others have already announced plans to give up their corporate citizenship. Who will be next? A decade ago, the senior Senator from Iowa warned of ''unpatriotic companies that dash stash their cash.'' Now we are seeing this dash-and-stash scheme become common practice for corporations that do not want to pay their fair share of taxes.

In fact, the two largest transactions to move American companies overseas in history have taken place within the last month. When these companies reincorporate overseas, it is, simply put, unfair. It is unfair to the American taxpayer, to the American Government, and to many companies that refuse to engage in this deceptive practice.

Why should other American pharmacy chains such as CVS Caremark and Rite Aid be disadvantaged because Walgreen's balks at paying its fair share of taxes? To uphold our free enterprise system and ensure that American businesses are competing on a level playing field, Congress must close this loophole.

We have a new chairman of the Finance Committee. The senior Senator from Oregon is known to be a man who is fair and will make sure that people do not take advantage of others. He has made a commitment to me and anyone who will listen to him that this must change. It is going to start with the Finance Committee and start very soon. I have been encouraged by his statements. He has indicated he will work to close this loophole for these runaway companies.

The chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the senior Senator from Michigan, has also been leading on this issue. He has been talking about it for a long time. Two strong leaders—the senior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from Oregon—have locked arms and are going to do something about this.

Senator LEVIN's legislation, the Stop Corporate Inversion Act, puts a 2-year moratorium on inversions by U.S. companies. This moratorium will give Congress time to thoroughly and thoughtfully consider the issue. I do not need a lot more thought on it. I am ready to roll on this one. We need to get this done, and quickly. I will settle for the 2 years. I am frankly, though, open to all ideas. What I am not open to is the idea that this corporate exploitation of the American taxpayer is somehow acceptable, because it is not.

Today we are considering legislation that would amend the U.S. Tax Code to fight outsourcing, protect American jobs, and create job creation within our borders. The Bring Jobs Home Act, which ends senseless tax breaks for outsourcers, will offer companies a 20-percent tax credit to help with the cost of moving jobs back to America. Much like the Bring Jobs Home Act, ending this corporate citizenship scam will encourage American companies to pay their fair share. It will also let corporations know that cheating the American people with their tax trick is not a viable business plan.

Benjamin Franklin said this: ''Tricks and treachery are the practice of fools, who have not wits enough to be honest.'' If corporations want to leave America, it is their right. But American taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill when U.S. companies want all the benefits of commerce in this country without having to pay their fair share.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Republicans control the time from 3:30 to 4:30 today, and the majority control the time from 4:30 to 5:30 today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SECURING THE BORDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. There is a lot we can get done in Washington when Democrats are willing to put the politics aside and work together for bipartisan results.

We saw an example of that yesterday when the President signed a bipartisan workforce training bill into law, legislation I and others proudly supported. Unfortunately, though, we have rarely seen such bipartisanship from Washington Democrats these days. Working

toward bipartisan solutions and helping the middle class, it always seems like such a chore for them. Just look at what President Obama and the majority leader have planned for the coming days.

The President is off campaigning for a workforce training bill he already signed. It makes no sense, but this is a man who just can't stop campaigning. And apparently the majority leader is suffering from a similar condition. He is busy turning the Senate into a campaign studio. He wants to spend more of the Senate's time on a designed-to-fail campaign bill that he loves to trot out before every national election. We have seen this proposal a couple of years ago before the election. Then, of course, for political purposes they pray that it will fail.

Look, this is time that would be a lot better spent helping the middle-class families who are struggling in our country. Instead of worrying about design-to-fail legislation, we could be addressing things like the highway bill, which already passed the Republican-led House with massive bipartisan support, or addressing the humanitarian crisis on the southern border. That is where our focus should be. That is what the American people expect.

The Border Patrol estimates that as many as 90,000 unaccompanied children will have crossed our border by fall. It is a dangerous journey to the border, and many have suffered heartbreaking treatment and abuse. That is why anyone who wants to help these children should be working overtime to spare them from this journey.

A few weeks ago the President made some modest policy recommendations that should be a part of any legislation that deals with this crisis. Unfortunately, the far left objected and the President has since wobbled.

That has led to top Democrats in Congress balking at even the most modest of reforms. They all seem to prefer a blank check that would preserve the status quo instead, and the President will barely lift a finger to encourage his own party to support these simple reforms.

Remember, now, this is the same President who keeps telling us about this mythical phone he plans to use. So what we are saying is use it. Call the Members of your own party who object to what you said you wanted and what we all know is needed.

Call the leadership of your party in the Senate who, despite the footage on the evening news, pronounced our southern border to be secure. Get them to support the policies that you told us would address this crisis. Frankly, it would be a much better use of your time than campaigning for a workforce bill you have already signed. Sending these children all over the country for indeterminate periods of time just isn't an answer.

We need to humanely return them to their homes as soon as possible, and President Obama needs to show some leadership to help us get a long-term credible plan in place to do just that. He owes the country at least that much.

Remember, news reports suggest the President could have intervened long ago to address this problem before it turned into a full-blown humanitarian crisis. But according to the Washington Post, he prioritized politics over helping these children.

The paper cited a Congresswoman who admitted that her fellow Democrats recognized the urgency of this crisis, but they kept mostly silent because they didn't want to cause problems for the administration's political priorities in Congress.

Democrats didn't want others to be able to point out that the President's policies had failed. It is really quite shameful. The Post also cited one source who said the administration staff was concerned about the growing number of children, but that they too were effectively overruled by White House political concerns.

Here is what the source said:

> Was the White House told there were huge flows of Central Americans coming? Of course they were told. A lot of times. . . . Was there a general lack of interest and focus on the legislation? Yes, that's where the focus was.

In short, it appears the Obama administration knew about this problem a long time ago, did almost nothing, and the country is now faced with this crisis.

So the President needs to get serious about this—not some other time—now.

What we are saying is cut out the campaigning, tell your party's leadership in the Senate to get serious and work with Members of both parties to get this addressed.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I listened carefully as the Republican leader came to the floor to talk about the Senate issues, and he failed to mention this issue, S. 2569, which we will be voting on in 1 hour and 10 minutes. In fact, we have listened carefully. There has not been a single Republican Senator who has come to the floor to literally debate this issue or to disagree with this bill. What is this measure that is the source of such a mystery on the floor of the Senate?

Well, it is an effort by Senator JOHN WALSH of Montana and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan to bring good-paying manufacturing and other jobs back home to America. Wouldn't you think that would be worth a comment from the Republican leader or perhaps from one of the Republican Senators? I hope it means they are going to join us in a bipartisan effort in a little over 1 hour to bring this measure to the floor.

What does it say? Simple. We will give a tax break to companies that bring jobs home from overseas. We will reduce the current tax incentives for companies to ship American jobs overseas. There it is—straightforward, clear—bring the jobs home.

I would think this would be so bipartisan it would get a unanimous vote at 11 o'clock. But the fact is, despite the support of all Democratic Senators, we are still struggling to find five Republicans who will join us so we can move to this measure and do something in the Tax Code to help bring American jobs back home instead of shipping them overseas.

Senator REID, our majority leader, spoke this morning about another aspect of this issue. Sadly, in my home State of Illinois, a major company, AbbVie, which was formerly part of Abbot Laboratories, the eighth largest pharmaceutical company, just announced last week they are going to relocate their corporate base of operations to an island off the U.K.

The U.K. is a beautiful country, but to think that American companies such as Abbot—now AbbVie—are prepared to desert America, is worth a little reflection.

Senator REID raised an important point. Pharmaceutical companies in America depend on tax-supported organizations and agencies. The National Institutes of Health, the leading biomedical research agency in the world, is supported by American tax dollars. Pharmaceutical companies like AbbVie, with blockbuster drugs such as Humira, which has earned them over $1 billion so far this year, rely on the NIH for research and then rely on the taxpayer-supported U.S. Patent Office to protect their legal rights.

They also count on the Food and Drug Administration, supported with U.S. tax dollars, to do the testing necessary to bring this drug to market. It is said the approval by the FDA of a

drug in the United States is really the gold standard—more than any other country.

So here is a pharmaceutical company which is very profitable, with over 4,000 employees, based in the United States, based in the State of Illinois for virtually its entire existence, now picking up and leaving. Why? They are leaving to avoid paying taxes in the United States.

What is the definition of a corporate ingrate? I think it would start with a company that has become immensely profitable because of the United States of America and the agencies of its government that support that company which is now turning its back on the United States.

Across the street the Supreme Court tells us with regularity we have to view corporations now as persons. They are no longer legal creations. They have some personhood under the Constitution, according to five of our Supreme Court justices—personhood that entitles them to freedom of speech under the Citizens United decision, personhood which entitles them under the Hobby Lobby decision to have religious freedom as a corporation.

So if we are going to give personhood to corporations, what can we say of this decision to renounce their American citizenship to get a tax break?

I think what we can say is these inverters are deserters, to quote Allan Sloan and others who have written about this issue in the past.

I am troubled by this, and I am troubled there isn't a sense of outrage on both sides of the aisle.

Senator REID has spoken about this issue, I have spoken to it, Senator LEVIN of Michigan has been a leader on this issue, and yet the Republicans are strangely silent. Do they believe it is in the best interests of the United States for our major corporations to pick up, cut and run, go to some foreign land, claim this is now their new headquarters, and avoid paying taxes in the United States?

This process, known as inversion, is a clever tax dodge. At the end of the day, who loses? Well, I can tell you. The taxpayers in this country lose because valuable revenue and resources are no longer there to sustain our great Nation, whether it is the defense of this country, the building of infrastructure, great agencies like the National Institutes of Health—the list goes on. There will be money lost.

Who are the winners? The winners are those investment bankers, folks who are buying up these corporations and coming up with these tax dodges and incentives to raise stock prices at any cost.

I often wonder, as I look at the list of members of the boards of directors of AbbVie and Walgreens, if there wasn't in their boardroom one person who held up their hand and said: Does anybody else feel a little sick about this—that we would give up on America, that AbbVie would renounce its American citizenship; that we would listen to those who say stock price is more important than loyalty to the country we live in, the country we have prospered in? Was there one hand in the air dissenting from this corporate desertion of the United States?

I think this is worth a debate. I think it is worth bringing this bill to the floor, S. 2569. In a little over 1 hour we will have a chance to decide whether it should come to the floor. There aren't many things that we do around here that have an impact on the lives of Americans. This one will. This bill will bring jobs home from overseas.

Senator REID has suggested we move into the inversion—a change in the Tax Code. I support that. I am a cosponsor of Senator LEVIN's bill. That, to me, is overdue. Last week Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew issued a statement about this warning us this was just the beginning; a dozen corporations are now working on this.

One of the corporate leaders on the street, Jamie Dimon of JPMorgan Chase, said in Fortune magazine: We shouldn't moralize about this decision.

He characterized it as largely a protest against the Tax Code—the unfair Tax Code.

I wish to remind Mr. Dimon and the CEOs and members of the boards of these corporations, this Tax Code, which certainly should be reformed, is the same Tax Code that has generated record-breaking corporate profits and record-breaking CEO salaries.

I didn't hear complaints about that so-called unfair Tax Code when these corporations were making record-breaking profits or getting compensation at record-breaking levels. It troubles me too that many of the corporations that are now rationalizing abandoning the United States not that long ago were counting on this government and taxpayers all across the United States to bail them out.

When the Wall Street banks were failing, when AIG was flat on its back, did they turn to Ireland or Switzerland for help? No. They turned to Washington and the United States of America and to the taxpayers who came through with billions of dollars to save them from their perfidy.

That is the reality of history, a reality which many of these corporate deserters are now ignoring. I have trouble with this—clearly, a great deal of trouble. I am going to offer an amendment, should we get on this bill, called the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act.

Very simply, here is what it says: If you have a corporation in the United States, headquartered in our country, and you have not moved jobs overseas; if you pay your employees at least $15 an hour, which means they don't qualify for most Federal benefits, just their paycheck; if you will give them quality health insurance as required by the Affordable Care Act; if you will provide at least 5 percent of their income as a contribution by the company toward their retirement; and if you will give a preference for the hiring of veterans, you will be entitled to the patriot employer tax credit, a credit for each of your employees. I think that is the proper incentive—incentivizing and rewarding companies that are making a positive difference in the lives of their employees, staying in the United States, committed to this country.

How would I pay for that? Well, I have an idea. It would end the deductions currently available for corporations that want to move their jobs overseas. To me, that makes perfect sense. Encourage the payment of Americans in good-paying companies and discourage sending jobs overseas.

Why won't the Republicans discuss this with us? Why isn't this a bipartisan issue? Do they honestly believe only Democrats object to shipping American jobs overseas? Everyone objects to it. We want to keep good-paying jobs at home. We want to be able to walk into stores and see the label ''Made in the U.S.A.'' more often. We want to encourage our companies to stay in America, to set the standard in America, to lead in the world. Let's have a tax code that helps us reach that goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the quorum call be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans for the remainder of the debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I rise in support of the Bring Jobs Home Act. There has been some discussion on the floor about this act already, but I wish to lend my voice to that. This is

a commonsense bill to bring good-paying middle-class jobs back to America.

When we look at the terrible recession this Nation went through a few years ago, we have seen that our recovery has been sluggish. One of the reasons it has been sluggish is because these good middle-class jobs in many cases just aren't here anymore. They have gone overseas. They have gone to China, Mexico, Vietnam, and other countries around the globe. They are not here.

We need to grow this economy from the middle. We have the statistics to see that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. That should concern everyone in this Chamber. I know it concerns economists and it concerns people all over the country. These are kitchen-table issues for people. We need to grow our economy from the middle. That is what this proposed act is all about.

My home State of Arkansas is a good example. We have seen good companies, such as Levi Strauss, Whirlpool, Fruit of the Loom—these are name-brand companies. Everybody knows these companies. We have seen them, one after the other, leave Arkansas, abandon our State and our Nation to go find cheap wages overseas.

To rub salt in the wounds, through their hard-earned tax dollars, these very same workers have helped pay for the companies to move their jobs overseas because the companies are able to write off the move overseas as a business expense. In effect, the U.S. taxpayer ends up helping to export jobs out of the United States. It is a policy that does not make sense. It is a policy we need to change. That is one part of the Bring Jobs Home Act that is critically important that we pass as quickly as possible. I think most of my colleagues will agree with me when they say this tax giveaway is counterproductive. In fact, it is outrageous that we continue to allow this to happen.

Fortunately, even though my State has lost some jobs, we have some very good job replacements as well. Last week I had the good pleasure and fortune of meeting with a man in Rogers, AR, named Bill Redman, the founder and CEO of a small toy company. This toy company has moved its operation from China to Rogers, AR, in the northwest corner of the State, because the economics of manufacturing now favor ''Made in the U.S.A.'' That is very positive.

We are seeing this with companies all over the country, and we would see even more of it if we passed the Bring Jobs Home Act.

A study shows that the $18.55-an-hour average wage created by this toy company I was talking about—created by his company in Arkansas—will pump $3 million back into the local economy. So if he pays his people $18.55, the stimulative effect of that is $3 million into the local economy. It also shows that each job he creates will support four other jobs that provide services to what he is doing. These may be truck-drivers, they may be people who print the boxes or the labels or make the containers or whatever it is, but for every job he creates, there are four other jobs that are created. So there is a huge multiplier effect in bringing jobs home to America.

If we see that in Rogers, AR, we know we see that in the other 50 States of the Union. So if we want to keep America as a nation of makers—and that is in our DNA as a nation. We make things in this country. We have always done it. We have always done it better than anybody else in the world. If we want to keep America a nation of makers, we need more companies like Redman & Associates in Arkansas, but this will only happen if we tip the scale in the right direction, and that is what this Bring Jobs Home Act is all about.

The policy that we make here in the Senate or that we don't make here in the Senate has a huge bearing on what the future of the Nation will look like. So let's do the right thing. Let's end this tax giveaway for the companies that ship their jobs overseas to places such as Mexico and China and many other countries. Let's instead provide meaningful tax incentives for those jobs to come back home, to create these good-paying middle-class jobs right here in the good old U.S.A.

From my standpoint, this is good commonsense policy, it is good commonsense economics, and I hope my colleagues will join me as well as many others of us here in this Chamber in supporting this Bring Jobs Home Act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to speak for a few minutes and start by talking about these court cases yesterday that create more complications particularly for the President's health care plan.

The idea that the law is specific, which is what the Washington, DC, Federal Court of Appeals said—the law specifically says, in the case they dealt with, that people can only get the taxpayer subsidy if they work through the State exchanges. There is no question that the law, in dealing with this issue, in clear language makes that case, and the judges agreed that was the case made.

What happened was that not only did many States decide not to set up the exchanges because of the expense involved and the problems involved and the complications of the law, but even the States that did set up the exchanges couldn't get them to work. I don't know that any State spent more money than Oregon did—certainly they spent a lot of money—and in the first 6 months did not sign up anybody—nobody. Not a single person was able to sign up through the exchange they set up.

Massachusetts—a State which actually had experience with its own law and which I would have thought would have been the easiest possible exchange to set up—also admitted they failed. Massachusetts has to go through the Federal exchange.

I think 36 States have either not set up the exchange or tried to and failed. So in 36 States the only option people have to get insurance in an exchange as an individual—many of their policies were previously canceled because of the law—is to go to the Federal exchange. Now, through a ruling in the DC court, they say you can go to the Federal exchange. We should understand this.

I have been on record saying I think people should try their best to have insurance. If the insurance people need is what the Federal Government prescribes people should have—and that is insurance people can afford—obviously the exchange can be a place to get it, and it is a place to get insurance whether it is subsidized or not. But many people will find that those new higher rates at the exchange, without taxpayer assistance, just don't work for them.

The law was poorly written. It was poorly structured. It was crammed down the throats of the minority in both the House and in the Senate and, in my view, the health care providers and people who want insurance in this country, in the way it was passed.

There are many lessons to be learned from the Affordable Care Act, and one is never pass a piece of legislation this way because the Richmond court said yesterday that there are other places in the law—even though they surely said it was clear where the law refers to subsidizing people to get insurance through the exchange, and they surely knew that was clear, they said there are other places in the law that indicate maybe that is not the way it was.

Why is that? Why wasn't that debated on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House? It wasn't debated because one side decided they were going to do this exactly the way they wanted to do it and they were going to do it by themselves. There was that brief moment where there were 60 Democrats in the Senate. They passed the current law that I fully believe nobody expected would be the health care law.

The way we used to pass laws in the Congress, through the entire constitutional history of the country, was that the Senate would pass a bill, the House would pass a bill, and then we would go to conference and figure out, No. 1, how the two bills came together and, No. 2, what didn't make as much sense—when we had time to step back and look at it—as it seemed to make in the heat of the floor debate.

That didn't happen with this law. Why didn't it happen with this law? Because by the time the Senate passed the bill and it was time for the House to deal with it, there were suddenly 59 Senators on the Democratic side in the majority of the Senate. We remember the Scott Brown election in Massachusetts. Everybody was surprised except maybe Scott Brown, but he was elected, so there were no longer 60 votes in the Senate, which is what it takes to do whatever the majority wants to do.

So apparently the message to the House of Representatives, controlled by the Democrats and Speaker PELOSI, was the only way we are going to pass a health care bill that goes anywhere near this floor is to pass the bill the Senate passed. There will be no conference. There will be no cleaning up this piece of legislation. There will be no discussion as to what we can do to actually make this work. We are going to pass this bill.

Not a single Republican in the Senate voted for it, and not a single Republican in the House would vote for it.

What is the unintended consequence of that? How do we go back and clean up the bill? People decided, if they participated in that process, that their momentary power was so important they were not going to involve anybody else's ideas in a way that would get a single vote from the other side.

One of the great lessons to learn is if we are going to mess with everybody's health care and we are going to impact 16 or 18 percent of the entire economy, they better have buy-in from more than just one group of Americans who represent one political party or one point of view.

So now we have this confusion that will go on until I assume the Supreme Court determines the difference in these two Federal courts of appeal decisions, but it will be months before that happens. We will see if taxpayers subsidize others getting their insurance. We will see what happens to people who got a subsidy if the subsidy turns out to be one that was inappropriately given. And we will see how we move forward.

Then there is also this discussion going on—some of which we had on the floor last week—about religious freedom as it relates to that law. There is a so-called accommodation for religious groups who don't believe they should have to pay for certain things. The Little Sisters of the Poor—who, by the way, were listed on one advocacy group for the law as it was being applied—the Little Sisters of the Poor were listed as one of the 100 dirty employers in America because they worked with 100 church groups and others who tried to take this idea to court that people could be forced to do things that violate their faith principles. If we have come to a point that the Little Sisters of the Poor are one of the evil employers in America, we better think about how we got to this point.

Actually, Justice Sotomayor gave, on her own—the Little Sisters of the Poor said: Not only do we not want to do that, we don't agree with the so-called accommodation that if we sign a paper saying we don't want to do this but our insurance company will—what did the Little Sisters of the Poor think was wrong with that? What could possibly be wrong with that? All they are asked to do is to sign a piece of paper that says they believe it is wrong but it is OK with them if somebody else pays for it. That is obviously not right. Justice Sotomayor, on her own, gave the relief the Little Sisters of the Poor asked for, but then only a few weeks later she is outraged when the rest of the Court gives the exact same relief to Wheaton College.

Wheaton College—a Christian college near Chicago and the President's home State—has a long-term commitment to their faith principles, and they basically said: We are just like the Little Sisters of the Poor. We don't believe this is right, and we don't want to sign a piece of paper that says we think it is wrong but it is OK with us if somebody else pays for it.

Then, in a story I just read today, there was the constant concern that the health care plan narrows one's ability to get health care because it restricts the network one can go to. In at least one State, half of the hospitals in the State don't participate in anything people could get access to through the Affordable Care Act as an individual or a family. So people have to drive by their old hospital, drive by their old doctor's office to get to a doctor or a hospital that may or may not see them. I think the hospital has to see you; I don't think the doctor does. But people have to drive by the old to get to the new.

We just had this big discussion. I had the great opportunity to speak at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on Monday, and obviously, as did everybody else there, I had on my mind what was happening with the Veterans' Administration. At the same time we are talking about how to give veterans more choices, we are talking about how to give everybody else fewer choices.

This is a great quote: Networks help to contain costs. Well, of course they do. If a person can't get to see the doctor or it is inconvenient to go to the hospital, of course it contains costs.

Then we have the bill on the floor this week about economic opportunity, economic advancement. One of the great attacks on economic opportunity has been the attack on the 40-hour workweek. What happened to the 40-hour workweek for many people working in this country? The Federal Government, for the first time ever, said employers have to provide insurance and this is what it has to look like. Whether you can afford it as an employer or not, whether your employees want to take it or not, you have to provide insurance. This is what it is supposed to look like for everybody who works 30 hours or more.

Actions have consequences. No matter what the administration might think about EPA rules on water, EPA rules on the utility bill, HHS rules on health care, actions have consequences, and a lot of people who used to work 40 hours now may be working 50 hours, but they are doing it at two different jobs, neither of which has benefits. The 40-hour job that in more cases than not had benefits that both the employer and the employee thought were good—and 85 percent of everybody who got health insurance at work thought it was good, thought it met their needs—85 percent. Most people had insurance at work, but now many people go to work without insurance, while the only people at the place they go to work who get insurance are the managers and the longtime employees or the people who work more than 30 hours.

The chances to advance if you are in a part-time job are a lot less than the chances to advance if you are in a full-time job. I suggest if we were really trying to get people to work here this week, instead of making political points, we would be talking about the 40-hour workweek, we would be talking about the advanced manufacturing bill the Senator from Ohio Mr. BROWN and I have that others are very interested in—and it is bipartisan interest—we would be talking about the BRIDGE Act that allows more infrastructure building that Senator WARNER and I have—another bipartisan piece of legislation—we would be talking about the Build America Act that helps State and local governments with infrastructure by allowing companies—the very companies, apparently, that are being talked about this week in a piece of legislation everybody knows cannot pass that has no bipartisan support—we would be talking about companies that would be allowed to bring profits they have made overseas—they pay taxes on it overseas—that they would be allowed to bring those profits here in a way that would encourage State and local governments to expand their infrastructure and maintain their infrastructure, making their sewer system, their water system, their road and bridge system all work better.

The unintended consequences of not thinking through what is the constitutional responsibility of the House and the Senate are significant. We need to understand the impact of what we do and the impact of what we fail to do. Failing to have a health care system that meets people's needs, failing to have a 40-hour workweek where we figure out how to encourage rather than discourage—failing to get people into that first job is a failure that lasts for a long time. If you do not advance in your twenties at work as you should, when you get to be 30, somebody else in a better economy in their twenties is likely to pass you because the opportunity you had was disrupted by circumstances that the government could not control or in many cases today circumstances the government could control and actually works in a way that makes those circumstances worse, not better.

I would like to see us do the kinds of things that get people to work, talk about the kind of legislation that is bipartisan, that could pass both Houses of Congress. There are plenty of them out there. I continue to hope we figure out how to get to it.

I yield the floor.

If nobody is prepared to speak, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, in a few minutes we are going to have the opportunity to make it clear to the American people that we get it, that we understand, that we need to be bringing jobs home to America, that it is not acceptable we have lost 2.4 million manufacturing jobs. In fact, as we see more companies coming back to the United States, we need to reward them. We need to say: We are open for business. Come on back. And we are going to make sure we have a Tax Code that supports those decisions.

The Bring Jobs Home Act, which Senator WALSH is leading—and I want to commend him. I know he has talked to me about how important it is to his State of Montana. It certainly is to my State of Michigan as well. We have this opportunity, through Senator WALSH's Bring Jobs Home Act, to show that we are going to begin the process of making our tax system work for American workers, American businesses, and communities.

So we have a vote in a few minutes on whether to proceed to this bill. It is not the final vote. The question is, is this an important enough topic that we would actually proceed to the bill? That is the question. Because there has been objection to just proceeding, as we know, we have to get 60 votes, a supermajority, to proceed. I would hope this is something we would see 100 people—everybody in the U.S. Senate—agree that, yes, we should be debating this issue of how we bring jobs home to America. I cannot imagine a more critical issue for everyone whom we represent.

This bill is very simple. First of all, if you are packing up and leaving this country, you should not be able to write off the cost. The worker who helps pack the equipment that is going to be going overseas should not be paying the bill through the Tax Code. The community that sees the factory empty once the business leaves should not be paying through the Tax Code for the costs of the move. So this bill says no more writeoffs if you are leaving the country.

On the other hand, if you want to bring jobs home, you can write off those costs that our Tax Code will allow you to take as a business expense and—because we think it is so important—we will add another 20-percent tax credit on top of it.

So, very simply, if you want to come home, we are all in. We want to support you doing that. We congratulate those businesses that are making the right business decision right now—for a lot of good reasons: low energy costs, a high-skilled workforce. There are a lot of reasons why folks are coming home. But if you want to leave, you are on your own. That is what the bill is all about. I hope everyone will vote to proceed to the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I rise today regarding an issue that is crucial to our country's economic future. In recent decades we have seen too many multinational corporations close factories in the United States while at the same time opening new plants in other countries, getting rid of American jobs and creating jobs overseas. It is wrong, and it strikes the heart of American competitiveness.

Too many big businesses are engaged in this harmful race to the bottom. They are moving their business operations out of America to countries with lower wages and fewer worker protections, and they are costing Americans jobs.

Businesses make decisions in order to make profits, which is usually good for jobs and growing our economy. But it is outrageous that American workers are forced to subsidize decisions that send American jobs overseas.

Under our current Tax Code, corporations can claim a deduction for expenses associated with closing operations in the United States and moving them overseas. This is a fundamentally wrong policy that encourages multinational corporations to send jobs abroad.

I believe that leveling the playing field for American workers should be a nonpartisan issue. That is why I have sponsored the Bring Jobs Home Act. I would like to thank my fellow sponsor, Senator STABENOW, for her tireless effort and work on behalf of American workers. I say to Senator STABENOW, you are respected around the country for your service and what you are doing.

The Bring Jobs Home Act is a straightforward bill. First, companies will no longer be able to claim a tax deduction for the costs of moving jobs overseas. This just makes sense. I imagine most Americans would be shocked to learn that multinational corporations are allowed to claim such a tax break. I am also sure that most small business owners, who cannot take advantage of this tax break, would also be outraged.

Taxpayers should not be asked to continue to foot the bill for the costs associated with shutting down factories in the United States in order to move jobs to countries such as China or Mexico.

Second, the Bring Jobs Home Act will create a new 20-percent tax credit for companies that bring jobs back to the United States.

It is time we set new priorities for American job creation. We should be doing everything we possibly can to encourage job growth and creation here in the United States.

In Montana, where I am from, Montanans believe in American workers and the power of American industry and innovation. We believe that American workers are essential to America's economy. But they need and deserve a level playing field.

Since the financial crisis of 2007 and 2008, many of our constituents have been trapped in a vicious cycle of instability and uncertainty that comes with long-term unemployment. We want to see more job opportunities for Americans. It is our responsibility as leaders to bring our jobs back home. So today I urge my colleagues to stand with American workers and vote for this bill.

There are companies out there right now that are considering bringing business activities back to the United States. We must do everything we possibly can to help those companies create jobs and grow our American economy right here at home.

In Montana people take pride in producing quality products here at home. I recently toured a company in Manhattan, MT—Blackhawk—that manufactures top-of-the-line outdoor gear and sporting goods for sportsmen and women, military, and law enforcement. It is an example of American ingenuity, putting Montanans to work on American soil.

It is time for Congress to show true leadership and put partisan politics aside. So today I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting bringing American jobs back to America.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Harry Reid, John E. Walsh, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Carl Levin, Christopher A. Coons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Ayotte	Franken	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hirono	Rubio
Brown	Hoeven	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schatz
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Levin	Toomey
Corker	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Markey	Udall (NM)
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McCaskill	Walsh
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—7

Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Graham	Lee	
Inhofe	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 93, the nays are 7. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

CLARK NOMINATION

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Julia Clark to a second term as general counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

The Federal Labor Relations Authority oversees the program in place at the Federal Government to maintain fair and efficient labor-management relations at agencies across the government. The general counsel fulfills key responsibilities in these efforts, including investigating and prosecuting allegations of unfair labor practices.

Ms. Clark has served in this position for almost five years, and has fulfilled her responsibilities effectively and with distinction.

However, her term expires on August 7—just 15 days from today. If the Senate allows her term to lapse without reconfirming her, the position will become vacant and, by law, no one else can fulfill the functions of her office. Our inaction will cause a backlog of complaints and appeals to form.

This has happened before, and Ms. Clark spent much of her first year as general counsel clearing a backlog that developed because of a previous vacancy.

Ms. Clark is highly qualified, and we must fulfill our constitutional duty and confirm Ms. Clark today in order to allow her to continue doing her job.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIA AKINS CLARK TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

NOMINATION OF ANDREW H. SCHAPIRO TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC

NOMINATION OF MADELYN R. CREEDON TO BE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Nominations of Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Andrew H. Schapiro, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czech Republic, and Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

VOTE ON CLARK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the Clark nomination.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Delaware.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SCHAPIRO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the Schapiro nomination.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Andrew H. Schapiro, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czech Republic?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CREEDON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the Creedon nomination.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent on the nomination of Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I am pleased that today we

were able to put aside the partisan politics and vote for what was right for the American people. I hope my colleagues will also vote for the final bill. We must protect American jobs and eliminate tax loopholes for corporations that move jobs overseas. Creating and supporting well-paying American jobs should be our top priority.

The debate about jobs in America and New Mexico is not about politics; it is about people. This past weekend I visited with some New Mexicans who are facing a very real and personal challenge as far as their future and their livelihood.

In Questa, NM, miners have worked for nearly a century. But that mine is now closing—less than 2 weeks from today—and 300 people will lose their jobs. For the workers, for their families, and for local businesses, it is a hard time, with tough questions and uncertain answers.

Just this past Sunday I met with the miners to talk with them and, most importantly, to listen about what has happened in Questa and the future of a great community.

This is about more than Chevron Corporation's decision to close the mine; it is about workers who feel they were kept in the dark, who worry that help will be too little and too late. My office is working closely with the community for trade adjustment assistance to get the training and help they will need.

Folks there are struggling, but they are committed to mapping out a new future for Questa, a post-mining economy, including ecotourism and renewable energy.

Families have lived and worked in Questa for generations. They know hard work, grit, and determination. No one needs to tell them about that. They helped build our country. They support their community, and they follow the rules. They ask for one thing in return: a fair chance—that is all, just a fair chance.

Let's be clear. For the Supreme Court, for those who seem to be confused on this point, these miners are people, their families are people. Corporations are not people. Super PACs buying our elections—they are not people. They are special interests with a lot of money and a lot of demands, such as special tax breaks—tax breaks that make no sense to real people with real problems who are looking for real jobs.

We need to be doing all we can to create jobs, to keep building our economy. The Bring Jobs Home Act would help—a tax policy that brings jobs home, not one that rewards sending them away. Almost 2.5 million jobs have gone over the past 10 years, shipped overseas and paid for by the American taxpayers, by families such as those in Questa footing the bill.

The Bring Jobs Home Act would do two important things: First, it would end the tax loophole for outsourcing jobs. If corporations want to send a job overseas, they can do so but at their own expense, not at the expense of the American taxpayers. Second, it would create the right incentives, giving a tax credit for companies that bring jobs back home. This is a pretty simple idea. Let's reward what helps and stop rewarding what doesn't.

The Bring Jobs Home Act will do something else too. For the middle class in this country, for workers and families, it will say: We hear you. Your voice matters too. And all the super PAC dollars can't change that.

We can create jobs right here at home. We can keep growing our economy and help communities with a tax policy that builds them up and invests in the future. That is something to fight for. That is the kind of fairness folks want and deserve in Questa, in my State and in our country.

The mine will close in Questa. We can't change that. We can't bring it back. Some folks say that it will feel like a death the day that door closes, that it almost feels like a funeral, as if a part of them dies with the mine. And I am sure it does. It has been the lifeblood of the community for so many years and for so many generations of families. But folks there said something else too: When bad things happen, friends and family show up to do what they can to help.

We need to start showing up for the American worker, for the middle class, for towns all across our Nation where the factory closed, where the jobs went away. The Bring Jobs Home Act is a start to create jobs, to build our economy here at home, and to help communities in a world that is changing awfully fast. It is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from New Mexico for his compelling remarks about the importance of passing the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I am here to echo the need to pass this critical legislation, and I am certainly pleased we had such a strong vote to end debate on this legislation. I hope we can now come to some agreement and get the same kind of support for moving the bill forward. I am an original cosponsor of this commonsense bill.

As Senator UDALL said, this legislation would end incentives for companies to send American jobs overseas, and it would instead encourage companies to move jobs back to the United States.

Believe it or not, when a company moves jobs offshore, it can write off those expenses on its taxes. That doesn't make sense. The Bring Jobs Home Act would stop forcing taxpayers to foot the bill for companies when they ship jobs overseas. In addition, to encourage companies to move production back to the United States, the bill provides a tax credit for the costs associated with bringing jobs back home.

Not only is this legislation the right thing to do, but it also comes at a critical time as our economy struggles to recover. In New Hampshire and across the country—as Senator UDALL pointed out, in New Mexico with the closing of the mine and in that community—we are still feeling the effects of the great recession. Millions of Americans lost their jobs, and too many middle-class families are still struggling to make ends meet.

But sadly, even before the recession hit, the American middle class was finding it hard to pay their bills, to pay their mortgage, to find the good jobs that allowed them to have opportunities. A big reason for that was the loss of so many good-paying American jobs that supported the middle class. Too many of those jobs were shipped overseas. Over the last decade, 2.4 million jobs were shipped overseas, and those 2.4 million families supported by those jobs had to find other ways to support themselves, and often they were in jobs that didn't pay as well.

Well, it doesn't have to be this way. In fact, many companies are now looking to move jobs back to the United States. As production costs rise overseas, these companies want the advantages provided by our American workers—the most productive workers in the world—and the ease of doing business in the United States.

I have heard from several companies that have already moved jobs back to the United States, and there are many more that are hoping to bring jobs back home if we have the right policies in place.

Let me give an example. Last year I met with Doug Clark, who is the CEO of a footwear manufacturing company, New England Footwear. When we think footwear manufacturing or shoe factory jobs, we don't think the United States anymore because while there are still some very good companies that manufacture footwear here, most of those jobs were sent offshore a long time ago.

I know that story very well because my father was in shoe manufacturing. The whole time I was growing up, I watched him struggle with the loss of those shoe manufacturing jobs that were being sent overseas and imports coming in to take the place of shoes made here in America and the jobs that workers here in America held.

Today about 99 percent of shoes sold in the United States are made abroad. But New England Footwear executives, who have years of experience in the shoe industry, are looking to bring those jobs back home—back to New

Hampshire. The company currently manufactures in China, but as costs rise there, Doug believes he can bring higher paying jobs to the United States thanks to innovative technology that reduces manufacturing costs.

New England Footwear isn't alone. A Boston Consulting Group survey from last September showed that more than half of large U.S.-based manufacturers are planning or considering right now bringing production lines back to the United States from China. That is up 17 percent from just 2 years ago—17 percent. That is a big increase, a lot of jobs. The Boston Consulting Group projected that production reshored from China and higher exports due to improved U.S. competitiveness in manufacturing could create 2.5 to 5 million American factory and related service jobs by 2020. So by 2020 we could replace more than the jobs we lost in the last decade. That is the kind of behavior we should be encouraging. That is exactly what the bill before us does.

We know it will work because a 2012 MIT forum on supply chain management found that providing tax credits for bringing American jobs back to the United States would be one of the most effective ways to accelerate that process, along with other commonsense measures such as enacting tax reform, which we all agree we have to do, providing research and development incentives, ensuring a highly educated workforce, and improving American infrastructure. Again, these are all challenges which I think the majority of us in this body understand have to be done.

I am very glad the Senate moved to this bill because our priority in Washington must be creating jobs and restoring the American middle class. Over the past few decades too many Americans have seen their jobs disappear or their incomes fall. The Bring Jobs Home Act is an opportunity to support those families by creating good-paying jobs in the United States and by helping our economy regain its competitive edge.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HUMANE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, in recent days I have come to the floor several times to talk about the humanitarian crisis on our southwestern border where a veritable flood of unaccompanied children, from Central America mainly, is appearing on our border and turning themselves in to the Border Patrol because they realize that ultimately they will be released to a relative in the United States with a notice to appear at a future court date. The vast majority of them will fail to appear for that court date and successfully end up staying in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that it does not comply with our law.

But in recent days a curious division has emerged from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on a fundamental issue that I want to highlight. On the one hand, more and more Democrats are calling on Congress to reform this 2008 law that inadvertently has become a magnet for illegal immigration by Central American minors. On the other hand, Senate Democratic leadership is refusing to consider any such reforms. They just want the cash. They wanted the money the President has asked for. So they are asking Congress to simply throw more money at the problem. The figure they have now settled on is $2.7 billion. The Associated Press has called this ''problematic.''

If you have a humanitarian crisis and you need more money to deal with it, we all understand that. But if you are unwilling to take the step to fix the basic problem that has created the crisis, that strikes me as problematic, as the Associated Press says.

What is President Obama's position? Well, I am afraid the President has shown a complete lack of leadership on something that he himself has called a humanitarian crisis. But there have been prominent members of his administration who have publicly expressed support for the type of reforms contained in the HUMANE Act, which is a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation I have introduced with my colleague HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, TX.

For example, you will see on this chart Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson has said the administration wants to change the 2008 law at the center of the crisis so that U.S. authorities can ''treat unaccompanied kids from Central America the same way as it does from a contiguous country''—in other words, from Mexico.

White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest, you can see on this next chart, has confirmed that the administration would support ''changing the 2008 law'' if it is necessary to resolve the crisis, as Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson says it is.

As tens of thousands of children continue to flood across our border, such changes are absolutely necessary. In fact, the cartels, the criminal organizations that are smuggling children into the United States, discovered this flaw and they have changed their business model to exploit it, because they are making money off of it.

The HUMANE Act, which we have offered as a solution is not the only solution. If other people have good ideas, we would love to hear them, but doing nothing is not an option.

The HUMANE Act would equalize the treatment of all unaccompanied minor children, regardless of where they come from. Treat them all the same. If it is good enough for children coming from Mexico unattended by parents, then it ought to be good enough for others.

All of our colleagues essentially voted for that proposition in 2008 with that law. This proposal we have would also expedite the removal process for those without a valid claim for legal status. In other words, there are claims for legal status in the United States that some of these children might qualify for. We do not touch any of those preexisting laws. In other words, if you are a victim of human trafficking, for example, you can qualify for something called a T visa while you cooperate with a law enforcement investigation.

If you have a credible fear of persecution in your home country based on certain other criteria, you could qualify for asylum or as a refugee. But finally, we would end the policy of catch and release by which these children or other immigrants are not detained pending a hearing in front of a judge. We know from experience, given the surge of Brazilians who came in 2005 and 2006, that additional detention and speedy hearings and reprocessing back to the home country are essential to deter people from coming in the first place.

The HUMANE ACT would bring order and clarity to a situation currently marked by chaos and confusion. You would think that Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, would want to bring some clarity and end the chaos and confusion. But so far we have not seen that sort of bipartisan desire to embrace a solution. So I am happy to note that a number of Democrats do agree with us about the need to reform the 2008 law and establish an expedited removal process.

For example, Senator MCCASKILL, the senior Senator from Missouri, has reportedly said: I think we should have the same law on the books for Central America as we have for Canada and Mexico.

That is precisely the point. She and I agree with each other 100 percent on that. That is what the HUMANE Act would do.

Meanwhile, the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER—the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, someone with a lot of knowledge about this, and somebody who I know has been in close consultation with Secretary Johnson—has argued that any supplemental funding should be paired with significant policy changes, saying, ''the two should go together.'' I agree with Senator CARPER.

So if the administration agrees with prominent Senate Democrats, as Jeh Johnson has said they do, and as Josh

Earnest has said they do, if the administration agrees with these prominent Senate Democrats about the urgency of passing something like the HUMANE Act, and if plenty of Senate Republicans agree as well, why are we not having a vote? What is the holdup?

Well, as usual, the majority leader seems to be more concerned about good politics than good policy. He, incredibly to most ears, certainly to mine, declared that the border was ''secure'' a couple of days ago. I was shocked to hear him say that. In the midst of a humanitarian crisis, he says the border is ''secure.'' With 414,000 detained coming across the border last year alone from 100 different countries, the majority leader says the border is ''secure.''

Here is what he said on Monday. He said: We need to get resources to our Border Patrol agents and others who are caring for these children.

This is at the same time he said the border is ''secure.'' I do not quite understand that tension between his positions. But this is what he said. He said: ''We need judges to hear those kids' cases and decide whether they need protection or need to be sent back home.'' So here is my confusion. The majority leader has said he understands what needs to happen. The press secretary for the President says he understands what needs to happen. Secretary Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, says he knows what needs to happen. Prominent Democrats such as the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Delaware say they understand what needs to happen. Yet nothing is happening.

The HUMANE Act, which would do everything the majority leader mentioned, is a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation that would alleviate a national emergency and a humanitarian crisis. It has received support across the political and ideological spectrum.

I would add that some on the left and some on the right have criticized it. Some have not bothered to read it or understand it. But if you are being criticized on both sides of the extremes, then you must be doing something that is actually doable and may be at least 80 percent part of the solution.

So I would urge the majority leader, the majority whip, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to heed the message conveyed by Secretary Johnson. I would urge all of us, particularly at a time of humanitarian crisis, to forget the politics and let's solve the problem. We have an opportunity to address a genuine crisis. I urge them to remember, as Mr. Charles Lane of the Washington Post has written recently:

> The rule of law is one of the benefits immigrants seek in the United States. Step one in dealing with the border crisis should be to reestablish it.

Those are wise words.

In contrast, if we simply write the administration a blank check for $2.7 billion without fixing the problem, we will find ourselves back here again and again as the numbers escalate from the 57,000 so far since October to the projected 90,000 the administration says could come across this year alone to the 145,000 who are projected to come next year.

I am, frankly, flabbergasted. Why can't we do this? Why can't we do it? Democrats agree with the need. Republicans agree there is a need. There is an escalating crisis on the border that is not going to go away with the change of the news cycle. We have the ability to deal with it so we should.

I actually agree with this statement by Senator REID: We need to get the resources to our Border Patrol agents and others who are caring for these children. We need judges to hear these kids' cases and decide whether they need protection or need to be sent back home.

I agree with the majority leader when he said that. So let's do it.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today because Democrats in Washington continue to put out misleading information about the President's health care law.

Last week the Senator from Connecticut came to the floor and said Republicans have, in his words, gone silent when it comes to talking about the health care law. He claimed there was a quiet acceptance that the law is working.

Well, I just want to correct the record and make it perfectly clear Republicans have not gone quiet because the health care law is not working.

The American people are not going quiet either. They are not going quiet when it comes to talking about the devastating side effects they are feeling from the health care law.

I hear it from people when I go home to Wyoming every weekend. I heard it last weekend. I heard it last night on a telephone townhall meeting, and when I travel I hear about it—even just passing through the airport in Denver on the way home, which I do each week.

As chairman of the Republican policy committee, one of my responsibilities is to study how policies that come out of Washington—like the President's health care law—affect people all across America, including States such as Colorado, where I change planes each week.

Last week the Denver Post had an op-ed written by Dr. Cyndi Tucker, an obstetrician/gynecologist who practices medicine in Thornton, CO, outside Denver. Her op-ed was published in the Denver Post, which is, of course, the statewide newspaper in Colorado.

The headline on the column in the Denver Post was: ''Red tape isn't health care reform.''

Now, remember the amount of regulations ObamaCare has created is a red-tape tower of paper over 7 feet tall. Dr. Cyndi Tucker, from one of the suburbs of Colorado, wants us to know about the health care law from her perspective as a practicing Colorado physician. What she has to say is that the prognosis isn't good. She writes:

> At my practice, I've found that the ACA disrupts the doctor-patient relationship by drowning us both in paperwork.
>
> ObamaCare authors—and the politicians . . . who voted for it—promised that it would provide quality, affordable health care to Coloradans. Yet it does exactly the opposite. For doctors, it makes health care more and more complex, more expensive, and increasingly more impersonal.

Not more personal, which is what we want as doctors, as somebody who practiced medicine for 25 years. She says it makes it more impersonal.

And for patients, it makes finding a cheap health plan or finding a doctor more difficult—not less difficult as the President promised, not cheaper, but more difficult, as the doctor points out. For me, that is a very damaging and maybe even life-threatening side effect of the President's health care law.

President Obama was in Colorado earlier this month. This week he is doing the same thing in Seattle and California. Instead of meeting with more campaign donors—which is what the President is doing—the President should meet with doctors and patients—and, specifically, doctors such as this obstetrician-gynecologist in Colorado. He should sit down with some of the women who are patients of this doctor. I think they would like to ask the President about these devastating side effects of his health care law and explain to him about how it is hurting them and hurting their families.

The disruptive impact the law is having on care is drowning patients and doctors in red tape. But that is not the only side effect of the law that is hurting American families. A recent Gallup poll earlier this month found that only 8 percent of Americans are spending less money on health care than they did a year ago.

President Obama promised the American people they would save $2,500 a year per family under his health care law. NANCY PELOSI, the former Speaker of the House, was on ''Meet the Press'' at one point and said that everyone's rates would go down.

Well, Democrats in the Senate who voted for the law promised the same

thing, and it just didn't happen. People are paying more all across America. People are paying more in Washington State and in California, where the President is visiting. Why is he there? He is meeting with campaign donors. He is collecting campaign money.

People are paying more all across the country. They are paying more for health care insurance in Wyoming. People are paying more in Colorado, where the doctor who wrote in the Denver Post is and where she sees patients.

There is a recent study that found health insurance premiums for an average 40-year-old woman in Colorado are 20 percent higher this year than last year. That was before she was forced on to the ObamaCare exchange.

President Obama says Democrats who voted for the law should ''forcefully defend and be proud'' of the health care law. When he was in Colorado a couple of weeks ago, did President Obama forcefully defend these premium increases because of the law? When he is traveling this week, is the President going to forcefully defend patients and doctors experiencing the exact opposite of what the Democrats promised? Are Democrats in the Senate proud that only 8 percent of Americans are spending less on health care this year than they did before? Costs are going up so fast that last month State regulators in Colorado decided to add another tax on every insurance policy in the State in order—get this—to bail out the State ObamaCare exchange. They added an extra tax on every insurance policy in the State in order to bail out the State ObamaCare exchange.

Now, that is not just on people buying the policy in the exchange. They are charging this new tax on every person in Colorado who buys health insurance just to cover those who buy it through the exchange. Well, that is a very expensive side effect for the families of Colorado as a result of the President's health care law.

So this health care law is bad for patients, bad for providers, the nurses, and the doctors who take care of those patients, and it is terrible for taxpayers. Every Democrat in the Senate voted for this health care law. Where are the Democrats willing to forcefully defend these costly and damaging side effects of their health care law?

People in Colorado and all across America received letters telling them their plans were being cancelled because of the law. People lost access to their doctors, like this OB/GYN physician who wrote her op-ed editorial for the Denver Post.

She says she has had to stop seeing Medicare patients because of the new redtape in the health care law. So people in Colorado lost their right to choose the health plan that works for them and their families.

Republicans are not going to quietly accept the terrible side effects of the President's health care law. We are going to keep coming to the floor. We are going to keep standing for American families who are being hurt by this law. We are going to keep offering new solutions—real solutions—for better health care without all of these tragic side effects.

That means patient-centered reforms that get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. It means giving people choices, not Washington mandates. It means allowing people to buy health insurance that works for them and their families because they know what is best for them.

Democrats who voted for this health care law have failed to answer the real concern of the American people, which was affordable quality care.

American families will not go quiet about the harm Democrats have done to them with this health care law.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 9/11 COMMISSION

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the final report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, also known as the 9/11 Commission Report.

As the chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—a committee on which I proudly serve with the Presiding Officer—I can tell my colleagues that this report has been and continues to be incredibly important to the work we do in the committee that Dr. COBURN and I are privileged to lead in this Congress.

Nearly 13 years ago, as we will recall, our Nation suffered the most devastating attack on U.S. soil since Pearl Harbor. Almost every American alive will remember where they were on the day the Twin Towers collapsed, when the Pentagon was hit, and when they saw the wreckage in the fields of Shanksville, PA.

We asked ourselves at that time, Why would anybody want to do this? How did this happen? What could have been done to prevent this tragedy?

In the months after this horrific attack, Congress and the President endeavored to answer these questions. Together they established an entity we call the 9/11 Commission.

Led by former New Jersey Gov. Tom Kean—our neighbor across the Delaware River—a Republican, and by former Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton, a Democrat—one of my mentors in the House of Representatives—the Commission was charged with preparing a full and complete accounting of the circumstances surrounding these horrific attacks and recommending ways to make our Nation more secure.

This proved to be no small task. The Commission interviewed more than 1,200 people in 10 countries, including every single relevant senior national security official from not one but two administrations, and reviewed more than 2.5 million pages of documents. Despite the political tensions and partisan climate that engulfed our Nation at the time, the Commission put aside their own political differences and issued their final report 10 years ago today.

The 592-page report contained a full accounting of what happened before and after the attacks and included no less than 41 recommendations on how we could prevent another tragedy such as the one visited upon us on September 11. The report went on to sell more than 1 million copies and it was at the top of the national best seller list—numerous national best seller lists. Imagine that, a report—a Federal report—a best seller. It was a remarkable achievement, not only because of the depth and breadth of the Commissioners' findings but because all 10 Commissioners—5 Democrats and 5 Republicans—came to agreement on every single word of this report. Around here some days we can't agree if it is Wednesday, much less agree on every single word of a 592-page report.

In the months and years following the report's release, Democrats and Republicans in Congress worked together with the Bush administration to enact not one but two major laws to implement the report's recommendations. These laws were championed in part by our good friends Joe Lieberman of Connecticut and SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, both of whom served as chair and as ranking member of the committee I now chair.

Among other things, these two historic bills created a new Director of National Intelligence to coordinate and oversee all information sharing and intelligence activities. These laws implemented a passenger prescreening system that has helped to ensure that terrorists aren't able to fly on aircraft, while also establishing a fully staffed Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

When we think about all of these accomplishments and more, I think it is safe to say that the 9/11 Commission report has proven to be one of the most important and influential efforts of its kind in recent history. We as a nation owe a real debt of gratitude to the Commissioners for their determined and clear-eyed approach to improving the security of our Nation.

We might ask ourselves: How did they do this? The Commission's leadership—Governor Kean and Congressman

Hamilton—wrote in their own words on the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks about why the Commission was so special and so effective. Here is what they had to say:

First, because of the great damage and trauma the 9/11 attacks produced, the American public demanded action and had high expectations for measures and reforms that would improve the nation's security.

Importantly, the statutory mandate for the Commission was limited, precise, and clear—the Commission was authorized to investigate the facts and circumstances surrounding the attacks and to make recommendations to keep our country safe;

The Commission had an extraordinary nonpartisan staff—

They truly did have an excellent staff—

the members of which possessed deep expertise and conducted their work with thoroughness and professionalism; the Commissioners—

Many of them I am privileged to know—

had deep experience in government and political credibility with different constituencies;

The final report was unanimous and bipartisan; families of the victims of 9/11 provided solid and sophisticated support throughout the life of the Commission and in the years since; and following the Commission, the Commissioners and staff continued to work closely with Congress and the executive branch to implement and monitor reform.

That is what they had to say.

In other words, they had the will to act. They had the authority and the responsibility to act. They had the support of great staff and of the Americans most directly affected by the tragedy; that is, the families who were affected. They had extraordinary leadership from Governor Kean and Congressman Hamilton, both of whom put aside partisan differences and built a trusting relationship for the betterment of our Nation.

Once, after having a hearing in Dirkson 342, where our committee meets now and where they were testifying before us, the Chair and Vice Chair, Governor Kean and Congressman Hamilton, and I asked them: In a day and age when it is hard for us to agree on much of anything around here, how were you able to agree, the two of you and your Commission, on the entire almost 600 pages of this report?

I will never forget what they both said.

They said: Well, we didn't really know each other, but we were thrust into this and asked to serve in this capacity, and we got to know each other.

They said: We got to know each other very well, and out of all the time we spent together grew a trust that was almost without bounds and a very strong friendship—a real bond.

Sometimes we think about why we are so dysfunctional here. That is, in my judgment, a very big part of what is missing—a lack of trust and understanding of one another and having those kinds of personal friendships that go across all kinds of boundaries.

After 10 years, I still marvel at the trust developed between the Commissioners, and especially the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Perhaps most importantly, no other large-scale, 9/11-type attack on U.S. soil has occurred over these past 13 years. The improvements made to our intelligence, our law enforcement, and our security agencies as a result of the 9/11 Commission's work have undoubtedly contributed to that good fortune.

The response to the Boston Marathon bombing on April 15, 2013—just last year—was a shining example of how the investments we have made as a nation in training and equipment for our first responders have made us more capable, more resilient, and more secure than ever. But that attack itself showed us we cannot grow complacent. We must maintain our resolve and our commitment to the security of our Nation.

The Boston bombing, new threats to aviation, foreign fighters in Syria coming home—these are all stark reminders that we continue to face persistent and evolving terrorist threats.

Of course, one of the biggest threats our country faces is in cyberspace. That is why Dr. COBURN, our staffs, members of our committee, and I worked so hard to move three bipartisan cyber bills out of the committee this year and they now await action by the full Senate in this Chamber. These are just a few of the challenges our Nation continues to face.

We know there is still work to be done to fully implement the Commission's recommendations. So today, as we commemorate the release of this report, I think we would be wise to revisit and attempt to recapture the spirit of unity that made this bipartisan achievement possible by the 9/11 Commission.

As we seek to confront and to overcome the challenges before us on this day, we would be wise to consider again the example set by Governor Kean, Congressman Lee Hamilton, and the other eight Commissioners, and we should be inspired by their example.

The people we are privileged to represent across the Nation are pleading with us to set aside what separates us—pleading with us—remembering what binds us together and do the hard work we need to do to keep our homeland secure in an evermore turbulent world.

Let me close by thanking once again the 9/11 Commissioners not only for their important work that they did all those years ago but for the enduring example they set for us a decade ago. Let's be inspired by them. Our country and its people are counting on us on so many different fronts. Let's not let them down.

I note the absence of a quorum. Thanks so much.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Utah because I got here late and I am intruding on his time, but he has been kind enough to patiently wait for me to make a few points. So I will try to be brief, but I think it is really important that we address this issue, which is a very serious problem happening in America.

We see increasing numbers of what we call corporate inversions—American corporations establishing their headquarters overseas—typically through the mechanism of purchasing a company overseas and establishing that as the headquarters.

First of all, I just hate to see any American company choosing to not be an American company. It is very offensive to me at a deep level, most especially if it were to be a Pennsylvania company—but any company. Secondly, whatever little shred of faith any Americans have in our tax system is further undermined by seeing this. And, most importantly over time, this dynamic that is happening, if unaddressed, I think poses a very serious risk that we are going to lose jobs, we are going to lose corporate headquarters and all of the very substantial and good-paying jobs that are always associated with an American corporate headquarters, from senior executives, to secretarial folks, to the janitorial staff, and everyone in between. There are a lot of jobs that go along with where people decide to establish their corporate headquarters, and I want it to be in America. That is my goal. That is my motivation.

So it is useful to start with posing the question: Why is this happening, that American companies that have subsidiaries overseas are deciding they had better be headquartered somewhere other than America?

I will tell you why it is happening. There is no mystery here. It is happening because we have a Tax Code that is driving them to do this. We have chosen to inflict on our workers and our businesses the highest marginalized tax rate in the industrial world, so we are systematically less competitive than any of our trading

partners, the nations against which we compete.

In addition to having such a high marginal rate, we have chosen, quite foolishly, in my view, to adopt a system of taxation with respect to overseas subsidiaries that no one else in the world—virtually no one else in the world—adopts.

Let me drill down a little bit into this. Specifically, the difference between a high marginal rate and a low rate is pretty obvious. We have the highest. Other countries have much lower rates. Increasingly, they are reducing their rates. We used to be in the middle of the pack. Twenty years ago the American business tax rate was about the same as most of our trading partners and competitors. Today it is much higher. We stand pretty much alone with a very high rate. That is obvious. That is pretty straightforward.

The other piece, though, is how we deal with the tax—with the income of subsidiaries. That is very different. Here is what happens. Basically imagine that an American company has a subsidiary in Ireland. That subsidiary makes some profits. The profits are taxed by the Irish Government. They happen to use a 12½-percent tax rate, because they want to attract business. It is working, by the way, for them.

But be that as it may, the first layer of tax an American subsidiary operating in Ireland pays is the tax to the Irish Government, 12½ percent. Then here is what we do in America: We say, now if you want to bring that money home to America and invest it in America and build a new factory in Pennsylvania or in Delaware and hire lots of workers, if you want to bring the money home to do that, well, we have a punishment in store for you. We are going to look at our rate, which is among the very highest in the world at 35 percent. We will give you credit for the 12½-percent that you paid to the Irish Government. We will soak you for another 23 percent. That is the price we will charge you for investing in America. That is what we do. That is what our current tax system does.

Now what if this Irish company, this subsidiary operating in Ireland, what if instead it was owned by a company that is headquartered in Sweden or Switzerland or any other number of European countries? Do you know what they do? What they do is say: Well, after you have paid your tax to the Irish Government, if you then want to bring it home to one of those countries, there is almost no additional charge. There is a very nominal toll, if you will, on bringing that money back to those countries.

What is the effect of this? The effect of this is that we put our multinational companies at a huge competitive disadvantage. It is an unsustainable competitive disadvantage. The other effect is that we end up trapping money overseas that would be invested in America but is not.

So what is the rational response of the corporate management and the board of directors of a business which has this Irish subsidiary that has made this money, it has paid its tax to the Irish Government? Unfortunately, the response typically is: Well, I cannot defend to my shareholders why I should bring that money home and get whacked another 23 percent. So instead, I would rather not do this, but I am forced to look at investing somewhere else in the world where I will not have to pay this tax. This is what I am being told—this is what is happening. The way to avoid all of this is to be headquartered somewhere other than America.

This is terrible. This is outrageous. We are doing this to ourselves. It is madness.

I have to say, I am very disappointed with how we are responding in this body. We know this is a problem. This is very real. It is growing. We are not taking it seriously. What we are going to vote on later this week, I think, or whenever the vote comes up, is not a serious attempt to solve this problem. It is a completely political show vote, the Walsh-Stabenow bill. It will do nothing to stop these ongoing inversions. It does nothing about the fundamental underlying cause that is driving these inversions. It does nothing to encourage the repatriation of all of this money.

By the way, it is attached to a vehicle that is unconstitutional. We cannot originate a tax bill in the Senate. The Constitution forbids that. So if you are even pretending to be serious about tax reform, you take up a House-passed vehicle so it is at least constitutionally possible. Our Democratic friends chose not to even bother with that formality, so blatant is the fact that this is not a serious discussion. That is a shame. We ought to be having a serious discussion about this.

There is a more serious alternative bill that some of our friends on the other side are advocates for. That is a bill that basically would make it harder for you to achieve the inversion a company is attempting to achieve. It would require the number of foreign shareholders be quite high at the end of the transaction in order to qualify for it. So it sounds on the surface like: Oh, that might work and make it harder to do this.

But the problem still goes to it does not deal with the underlying fundamental driver of this problem, which is a Tax Code that makes it uncompetitive to be American. So if the Levin bill, which is the one I am referring to, were to be adopted, which I certainly hope it would not be, it continues to make it untenable for shareholders of a business to justify being headquartered in America. We will continue to see increasing numbers of startups and spinoff and growth overseas where the governments choose not to punish their businesses the way we punish ours.

I think the answer is to deal with the underlying cause, not the reaction to that underlying cause. I do not want to see any more of these inversions.

We are going to do that by lowering the marginal corporate tax rates so there is not a huge advantage in being anywhere else other than America, and to adopt a territorial system, a system where once a company pays the tax it owes to the country in which it is located, we do not punish them for bringing that money home and investing it in America. That is the answer. That is the solution. This is no great mystery. The rest of the world has figured this out. They are ahead of us on this.

If we would get serious about this very real problem and we made these reforms, what would the net result be? Up to maybe over $1 trillion of money that is trapped overseas would be invested back in America. Can you imagine what that would do to our economic growth almost immediately—the surge in job creation, the surge in expansion of existing businesses.

You know, we have this tremendous renaissance in manufacturing that we are on the edge of, because we have such low-cost energy. It is an enormous advantage we have. We could release this pent-up demand and take advantage of this enormous opportunity if we had a Tax Code that made it rational.

I am standing here very frustrated, because I am watching us eke out this miserable sort of 1, maybe if we are lucky, 2-percent economic growth. Employment levels are way too low. Workforce participation is nowhere near where it should be. I know we could be booming. We could be growing at 4 percent. We could be creating many hundreds of thousands of new jobs every month. We could be bringing people back in the workforce. We could have the kind of strong economic expansion we have always had in the past after a severe recession.

But we are not getting there right now. It is partly because we have a Tax Code that is hampering us. It is driving up transactions that none of us want to see. So I hope after we get through the political exercise we are going to go through this week, we will get serious about solving the underlying problem: lowering the marginal rate so we do not stand out as the worst place in the world to establish a business, and moving to a territorial-based system so that we stop punishing businesses that want to invest in America. That is my hope. I hope we will get to this soon, because, unfortunately, we are seeing the unfortunate consequences of this bad policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be in the same Senate with this wonderful Senator from Pennsylvania who does a very good job on the Senate Finance Committee and is, frankly, one of the brighter lights in the Senate. I appreciate him. I appreciate his efforts. I appreciate his leadership. I appreciate what he just got through saying.

Mr. President, soon we will begin debate on the so-called Bring Jobs Home Act. There are a number of serious problems facing our country. For example, our national debt currently exceeds $17.5 trillion. That is trillion with a T. Our economy continues to struggle. In fact, the economy shrunk last quarter. We have an entitlement crisis that threatens to swallow our government and take the country down with it.

Of course, as has been widely discussed, we are seeing a parade of U.S. multinationals opting to move their legal domiciles to countries outside of our country, outside of the United States. During these difficult times what we are hearing from my friends on the other side of the aisle is not very good.

What are we hearing from these friends on the other side of the aisle? We are hearing talk about ''economic patriotism.'' I did not make up that term. It is the latest catchphrase coming from the Obama administration as they try to malign business models and investments they do not like during an election year.

Last week I received a letter from the Treasury Secretary calling for ''a new sense of economic patriotism'' as the administration pushed for legislation that would punitively and retroactively seek to limit corporate inversions. The President has repeated the line in some of his recent speeches. Of course, ''economic patriotism'' is not a new catchphrase. It was trotted out by the President during the 2012 election campaign. Now it appears to be making a comeback. Not surprisingly, this comeback is taking place in the midst of another election year. Apparently, as part of this recycled campaign, we are going to have to once again debate and vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act, the same bill the Senate rejected during the last election cycle.

If enacted, this legislation would deny the deduction for ordinary and necessary business expenses to the extent that such expenses were incurred for offshore outsourcing. That is, to the extent an employer incurred costs in relocating a business unit from somewhere inside the United States to somewhere outside the United States, the employer would be disallowed a deduction for any of the associated business expenses. Wow. How antibusiness can you be? There are other ways of solving this problem.

The bill would also create a new tax credit for insourcing. That is, if a company relocated a business unit from outside the United States to inside the United States, the business would be allowed a tax credit equal to 20 percent of the costs associated with that relocation. As I said, this is a recycled bill.

The political talking points surrounding the bill are also recycled. This bill and the related talking points are based on the oft-repeated lie that there are special incentives or loopholes in the Tax Code that encourage businesses to move jobs overseas. No such loopholes exist.

As the Joint Committee on Taxation noted in its recent analysis of this bill:

> Under present law, there are no targeted tax credits or disallowances of deductions related to relocating business units inside or outside the United States. Deductions generally are allowed for all ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business. These ordinary and necessary expenses may include expenditures for the relocation of a business unit.

The truth could not be plainer. Yet the supporters of this bill still talk as though this legislation will end some kind of special tax treatment or deduction for companies that outsource. There is no special treatment. Under our Tax Code, relocation expenses are treated the same whether a company is relocating from a high-tax State in the United States to a lower tax State or if a company relocates some operations offshore.

As the nonpartisan congressional scorekeeper has made clear, there are no targeted tax benefits related to relocating business units outside of the United States. No credits. None. Zero.

As the Joint Committee on Taxation said:

> There has always been a deduction allowed for a business's ordinary and necessary expenses. Expenses associated with moving have always been regarded as deductible business expenses.

That being the case, allowing a deduction for these expenses is not all that remarkable. It is the general rule. Disallowing or putting exceptions on this deduction, on the other hand, would be an extraordinary deviation from long-standing tax policy and would needlessly add yet another level of complexity to our already overly complex Tax Code.

Still, let's pretend for a moment this deviation is, in terms of tax policy, justified. It is not, but there is no harm in pretending, I guess. Even if we were justified, in terms of policy, the revenue generated by this proposal is minuscule.

According to JCT, the Joint Committee on Taxation, preventing businesses from deducting expenses relating to outsourcing would raise about $140 million over 10 years. That is about $14 million a year—not $14 billion with a ''b,'' but $14 million with an ''m.''

To put the puny amount of this proposal in context, we should compare this revenue number against the volume of business U.S. companies conduct overseas.

According to the latest available IRS statistics of income, in 2010 U.S. companies conducted about $1.085 trillion in business abroad, and that is probably low, given the sluggishness of the economy at that time. On an annualized basis, the Bring Jobs Home Act would curtail deductions representing about $40 million in expenses.

That represents four-thousandths of 1 percent of all overseas business conducted by American companies. Let me repeat that, four-thousandths of 1 percent—hardly perceptible.

As I said, we are talking about minuscule sums here. We are also talking about politics as usual in the Senate. Instead of facing these problems and facing them realistically, some prefer to play politics with it, and it is total BS.

Yet over the last few years we have heard countless claims from my friends on the other side of the aisle that ''closing loopholes for businesses that move jobs overseas'' will pay for all kinds of things.

Earlier this month, for example, President Obama claimed that part of his infrastructure plan could be paid for by making sure corporations shipping jobs overseas ''pay their fair share of taxes.''

Well, if this bill is representative of this particular effort, the President doesn't plan on paying for very much. I would bet the $14 million wouldn't even be enough to pay for a single high-speed rail car or a round of IRS bonuses. It is amazing to me what people will do for political advantage that is shameless. They should be ashamed.

Of course, all of this discussion only focuses on one section of the bill. When you add in the other part of the bill—the 20 percent credit for expenses associated with insourcing—the Bring Jobs Home Act actually loses revenue—loses revenue—adding $214 million to the deficit over 10 years.

So why are we debating this bill? It is obviously not about raising revenue to pay for anything. It is clearly not about impacting business economic decisionmaking, and it is not about improving or simplifying our Tax Code.

Instead, this bill is about politics, pure and simple. It was all about politics the last time we debated this bill in 2012, and it is about politics this time around.

I, for one, am getting sick of it. I am so sick of this body not doing its job.

The Democrats, both in the Senate and the White House, think they gain some traction by talking about ''economic patriotism'' and trying to paint Republicans as the party of outsourcing. Give me a break. The bill is yet another election-year gimmick, pure and simple, and they ought to be ashamed.

Quite frankly, the American people are tired of gimmicks.

What they want are serious solutions to the problems ailing our country. Sadly, they are not getting that from the Senate majority leadership these days.

If we are serious about bringing jobs home, we should try working on legislation that will actually make the United States a better place to do business. Let's make our country more attractive to do business.

We should try working on legislation that will actually grow our economy. But we don't do much of that in the Senate these days. In fact, we don't do much of anything in the Senate these days other than to continue to overbalance the Federal courts with this administration's suggestions.

Yes, we don't do much of that in the Senate these days. Instead, what we are seeing is an endless series of showboats designed to highlight whatever Democratic campaign theme is popular that week.

We have seen votes designed to highlight the supposed ''war on women.'' We have seen votes designed to make it appear the Republicans are indifferent to the plight of the middle class. Give me a break. Now we are seeing votes designed to demonize Republicans for their supposed lack of ''economic patriotism.''

What a fraud. When does it end? From the looks of things, not any time soon.

I suspect as we debate the so-called Bring Jobs Home Act, the Republicans will offer a number of amendments that, unlike this bill, will actually create jobs in the United States. I plan to offer some amendments along those lines, and I am sure many of my colleagues will do the same.

This will be an opportunity to show whether the Senate Democratic leadership is serious about creating jobs and helping American workers and businesses as they claim to be. If, in fact, that is the aim of this legislation, then we should have a full and fair debate on it, including an open amendment process that will allow the Senate to explore alternative approaches and to discuss different ideas and how best to create jobs in this country. But I wouldn't hold my breath, watching how this Senate is being run these days.

Let's talk about actually fixing our Tax Code. Let's talk about growing our economy. Let's talk about real solutions to the real problems facing our Nation.

I hope that is the kind of conversation we will have on this bill. Of course, I am not naive. I know how the Senate operates these days. I have come to the floor numerous times—only yesterday, in fact—to lament the deterioration of this body under the current leadership. I am not under any illusions that things are simply going to change overnight.

I might add that the Senate leadership—these are friends of mine. I am just disappointed in the way they are running the place, and I think my disappointments are correct and accurate. But make no mistake, things need to change. For the good of our country, things need to be done differently around here.

Like I said, the American people are tired of political gimmicks. They are tired of the endless campaign. They want to see the Senate act in a way that will produce results.

Sadly, with this legislation before us this week, it looks as if we are in for yet another round of partisan gamesmanship.

We can do things differently and, once again, I hope we will. But as I have said many times before, I am not going to hold my breath. I just wish we could get together and work in the best interests of not only this body but our country.

I don't see the leadership at the White House either, nor do I think Secretary Lew's letter on this issue was a justifiable letter. In fact, I think it was pathetic, and I am very disappointed in him as a person and as a leader in this country for that letter.

Of course, I wrote one back to him, certainly, expressing my viewpoint.

U.N. DISABILITY TREATY

Yesterday the Foreign Relations Committee voted 12 to 6 again to report the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

This was similar to the committee vote 2 years ago. On December 4, 2012, the Senate voted 61 to 38 on the treaty, less than the two-thirds the Constitution requires for ratification.

I expect a similar result if the Senate takes up the treaty again. Yesterday afternoon the senior Senator from Iowa—a friend of mine, and a person for whom I have a lot of regard—spoke on the floor about the treaty, and as he has done many times, urged its ratification. I don't doubt his sincerity at all, and I admire him personally for the long service he has given to this country.

He called the concern that this treaty would undermine American sovereignty and self-government imaginary, hypothetical, and unreal. In fact he said:

> Anyone who is hiding behind that issue does not want to vote for this treaty for some other reason. But it can't be the reason of sovereignty.

I will not speculate about what the Senator from Iowa meant by some other reason. He and I have worked hard together to promote the rights and opportunities of all persons with disabilities. I feel deeply about that issue. I feel as deeply as he does.

We were partners in the development and passage of both the original Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 and the ADA Amendments Act in 2008.

I take a back seat to no one when it comes to legislation to help persons with disabilities.

But since I gave a speech on the floor 1 year ago explaining my concerns about this treaty's effect on American sovereignty and self-government, I have to respond to the charges by my friend from Iowa. I can only speak for myself, of course, but I am not hiding behind anything, including the sovereignty issue.

That issue is neither imaginary nor hypothetical, and it is certainly not cover for some hidden, unexpressed reason for opposing this treaty.

As I explained on July 10, 2013, this is a treaty not with other nations but instead with the United Nations itself. Ratifying it would create obligations across at least 25 different areas of social, economic, cultural and even political life. Article 8, for example, would even regulate the United States to ''raise awareness throughout society, including at the family level, regarding persons with disabilities.''

If this is all the treaty did, if it simply stated obligations, I might support it. It would then be generally similar to the treaty regarding child labor the Senate ratified in 1999. That treaty states that ratifying nations shall ''take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor.''

But these two treaties are radically different and the difference is the very reason why the disability treaty threatens American sovereignty and self-government and the child labor treaty does not.

The difference between these treaties is who has authority to determine whether ratifying nations are in compliance. The child labor treaty leaves that up to the ratifying nations themselves.

The disability treaty, however, gives authority to determine whether ratifying nations were meeting their treaty obligations to the United Nations. That is considerably different and very dangerous. Each nation must submit compliance reports to a U.N. committee of experts which uses its own criteria and standards to determine compliance and makes whatever recommendations it chooses.

Treaty advocates say this U.N. committee will not have actual legal authority to require changes to domestic laws and that even if it did, we would not have to change a thing.

I have three responses to that. First, as I explained in my speech last year, American sovereignty and self-government are not so narrow they can only be undermined by the United Nations literally assuming legal and political control of our country. America is a republic under a written constitution,

and in this system of government the people must have the last word on everything because the people are sovereign over everything.

The American people and their elected representatives, not a U.N. committee, must have the last word not only on our laws and regulations but also on our priorities, our values, and our standards.

Ratifying this treaty would endorse a formal, ongoing role for the United Nations in evaluating virtually every aspect of American life. It would say that the U.N.—not the American people—has the last word about whether the United States is meeting its obligations in these many areas.

That undermines American sovereignty and self-government. The United Nations hardly needs a legally binding treaty to opine on aspects of American life and public policy. It does so all the time. Ratifying this treaty, however, would formally endorse the right of the United Nations to do so and, even worse, subject ourselves to their evaluation. That is serious. We should think twice before we allow something like that to happen.

Second, we may already have the world's most expansive disability laws and regulations—and I know because I helped bring them about—but this treaty goes far beyond that.

The U.N. Web site says this treaty legally binds any nation ratifying it to adhere to its principles, and the treaty spells out what that adherence will require. Ratifying nations agree to enact, modify, or abolish laws and regulations at all levels of government—federal, state, and local—that are inconsistent with the treaty's principles, but the treaty also requires evaluating and changing any social customs and cultural practices that are inconsistent with those principles. Anyone who has followed the United Nations knows that a U.N. committee is not likely to look as favorably on American customs and practices as it might on our laws and regulations.

Third, even though the U.N. disability treaty appears to have been modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act, it utilizes a very different concept of disability.

For more than four decades, American laws in this area have defined a disability as an impairment that substantially limits a major life activity. The disability treaty, however, states that ''disability is an evolving concept'' involving barriers that hinder ''full and effective participation on an equal basis with others.'' In other words, the U.N. committee would use a subjective fluid concept of disability to evaluate compliance with the treaty of U.S. laws that utilize an objective, functional definition of ''disability.''

I am pleased to note that, even without U.S. ratification, no less than 34 nations have ratified the U.N. disability treaty since it was sent to the Senate on May 17, 2012—15 of them since I last spoke here on the treaty a year ago.

Yesterday the senior Senator from Iowa asked for someone to explain to him why the disability treaty before us today raises concerns about sovereignty but the 1999 child labor treaty did not. Well, I think I have done that here today. The disability treaty gives the last word on whether a nation is in compliance to the U.N.; the child labor treaty leaves that entirely up to each nation.

I understand Senators have different understandings or concepts about such things as American sovereignty and self-government, but it is wrong to say that if I take a different view on that than the senior Senator from Iowa, I must somehow be hiding my real reason for opposing this treaty. In our system of government, legislation and treaties are profoundly different ways of addressing public policy issues with profoundly different effects on sovereignty and self-government.

I will continue to be a champion for disability legislation, but I cannot support this disability treaty. I will support those who have disabilities, who have difficult times, as I did back then.

Frankly, I still remember my great friend from Iowa and myself walking off the floor to a whole reception room filled with persons with disabilities, all of whom were crying and happy that we had done this in America.

America leads the world in our quest toward disabilities issues. In all honesty, I don't want to lose our sovereignty in this issue, nor do I want to turn over our rights and our own self-interests to the United Nations, as good as it may be from time to time. But I have also seen where it hasn't been so good from time to time as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Bring Jobs Home Act, which is the bill that would stop big corporations from getting a tax break for sending jobs overseas while rewarding businesses that invest in bringing jobs here, back home.

I thank my colleagues Senator WALSH and Senator STABENOW for leading the way on this important legislation, and I am glad we now have the opportunity to debate it. I hope our Republican colleagues will take a serious look at the Bring Jobs Home Act and work with us in the coming weeks and months on other efforts to create jobs and long-term economic growth.

Our economy has changed a lot over the last few decades. Prices have risen for everything from college tuition to health care, and the shifting realities of the global economy have really made it harder to find the kinds of jobs on which workers used to raise their families.

As we all remember, for far too many families the financial crisis and the recession that began in December of 2007 was the last straw. It pulled the rug out from under workers and small businesses across the country. We have come a long way since then, but it is clear there is much more we need to do to create jobs and broad-based economic growth so that hard-working families in our country get a fair shot.

At a time when too many families are still struggling to make ends meet, there is absolutely no reason taxpayer dollars should go toward helping big corporations send jobs overseas. That is why I was very proud today to vote in support of the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I think most Americans would agree they don't want their taxpayer dollars spent on helping corporations outsource jobs. It really should be a no-brainer.

Unfortunately, over the last few years we have spent far too much time avoiding crises rather than legislation like the Bring Jobs Home Act that would help our workers and businesses. Government shutdowns, default threats, and last-minute deals took up a lot of oxygen here in Washington, DC, and made workers and families really question whether their government could get anything done.

So when Chairman RYAN and I were able to reach a 2-year bipartisan budget agreement, I was hopeful we would be able to move beyond the cycle of governing by crisis, and I hoped we could build on that bipartisan foundation established in that 2-year budget deal and work across the aisle to create jobs and grow our economy. The Bring Jobs Home Act is exactly the kind of legislation I wanted to see us debate and work together on.

While we all know Republicans and Democrats have very different views on the best ways to encourage economic growth, we have taken some bipartisan steps that show we should be able to work together on this and other job-creating legislation. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which Senator ISAKSON from Georgia and I were able to work together to finish, is a great example. That bipartisan legislation shows what is possible when Members from different parties and different States and different Chambers come together to get things done for the American economy. I have heard from countless businesses and families in my home State of Washington who have told me how much they rely on effective workforce programs. So I was really thrilled yesterday to stand next to President Obama as he signed more than a decade of hard work and negotiation into law when he signed that legislation.

I am glad we were able to go beyond governing by crisis and reach a bipartisan agreement to thoroughly and responsibly improve our workforce development system. We need to do the same thing—go beyond simply avoiding crises when it comes to commonsense steps such as the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I would also note that this is true for the highway trust fund. I hope we will be able to not only avoid a construction shutdown short-term but that we will work together to strengthen our transportation infrastructure in a comprehensive way.

Construction workers and businesses absolutely deserve the certainty of knowing we are going to avoid the shortfall in the highway trust fund and keep our critical transportation projects moving forward. But they actually deserve more than that. They, along with every other American family and business that uses our roads and bridges, deserve a long-term solution—one that not only shores up the highway trust fund but also provides a plan for smart investments throughout our entire transportation system.

My colleagues Senator WYDEN and Senator BOXER have been leading the way on avoiding this unnecessary crisis and addressing our transportation infrastructure challenges not just for next year but for years to come, and I thank both of them for their efforts.

I know conventional wisdom is that Congress will not be able to get anything done from now until November, but I don't see any reason at all why that ought to be the case. Families and communities rightly want us to solve problems. Just avoiding crises isn't enough.

I am very hopeful that in the coming weeks and months we can not only avoid a construction shutdown but also lay the groundwork for smart investments in our country's roads and bridges and waterways.

I am glad my Republican colleagues are making it clear that they don't want another fight over keeping the government open. I think we should build on that by working together to replace more of the harmful sequestration cuts we are going to face in 2016.

Instead of simply avoiding self-inflicted wounds to jobs and the economy, we should be taking important steps, such as the Bring Jobs Home Act, that encourage our companies to invest and hire right here at home.

Of course, there is much more to do as well, and I never meant to suggest that any of this would be easy. As we all know, compromise is not easy. But legislation such as the bipartisan Budget Act and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act show us that when both sides are ready to come to the table and make tough choices, we can make real progress.

We have a lot of work to do over the next weeks and into the fall, and I hope we will take the bipartisan path that leads us to real solutions and goes beyond just simply avoiding the next crisis. That is what our constituents rightly expect, it is what they deserve, and it is what I hope we can all work together on to deliver.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to take a few minutes to update Members of the Senate as to where we are on some very important issues that impact veterans all over this country.

The first point I want to make is some good news. The committee had a hearing yesterday to hear testimony regarding the confirmation of Robert McDonald to be the new Secretary of the VA. I think I can speak for the whole committee in saying we were very impressed by what we heard from Mr. McDonald both in terms of his passion for the needs of veterans and also his administrative knowledge, his management skills, as the former head of one of the large corporations in America. I think he left us with a very strong impression. The result was that today, a few hours ago, by a unanimous vote, the Senate committee voted to confirm Robert McDonald as our new Secretary of the VA, and I hope very much his nomination will get to the floor as soon as possible. I think that is good news because the VA needs stable leadership. Sloan Gibson, who has been Acting Secretary, is doing an excellent job. He has already accomplished a lot. But it is important that we have a new permanent Secretary on board, and I hope the Members here see fit to confirm him as soon as we possibly can.

On an additional issue, I think as all Members of the Senate know, about a month or so ago we voted by a vote of 93 to 3, almost unanimously, to make sure the veterans of our country get quality health care in a timely manner, that we bring a new level of accountability to the VA, and I am very proud of the support that legislation, which was introduced by me and Senator JOHN MCCAIN, received. I thank again Senator MCCAIN for his very strong efforts to make that happen and for his continued support of the veterans community.

Senator MCCAIN made a statement the other day—I think it was yesterday—published in CQ, which I personally could not agree with more. He spoke in terms of the conference committee that we are in right now trying to merge the Senate bill and the House bill and come up with something that can pass in both bodies. He said and I quote: ''We've got to sit down and get this done, because we cannot go out for recess in August without having acted on this bill.''

I think he is exactly right.

Let me, picking up on that theme, relay to my colleagues what the VFW, which is having their annual convention in St. Louis, said:

> The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is demanding that Congress immediately pass a compromise bill to help fix the Department of Veterans Affairs before they adjourn for five weeks at the end of the month. ''Pass a bill or don't come back from recess,'' said VFW National Commander William A. Thien of Georgetown, IN. ''America's veterans are tired of waiting—on secret waiting lists at the VA and on their elected officials to do their jobs.''

I could not agree with the VFW more on that issue.

There was a bill a month ago that passed here. The CBO said that bill would cost $35 billion, and we voted for that for emergency funding because the Members here understood that taking care of veterans is a cost of war as much as spending money on tanks and guns and missiles—$35 billion in emergency funding. The House passed its bill which was later assessed by the CBO at $44 billion. But here is the good news—and without divulging the kinds of negotiations we are having with Chairman MILLER in the House—and Chairman MILLER is a serious man. I think he wants to get a bill passed. I don't want to go into all the details here, but I think it is fair to say the cost of that bill will be significantly less than what the CBO originally estimated.

A few minutes ago I and others received a letter from the major veterans organizations on an issue of important consequence. Again, without going into great detail about the nature of the negotiations which the House and Senate are having on the veterans bill, I think it is fair to say one of the stumbling blocks is that I agree and the House agrees it is imperative we pass funding to make sure that veterans who are in long waiting lines right now get the quality care they need now, and that means if the VA cannot accommodate them in a timely manner, they will go out to private doctors, community health centers, or whatever, and the VA will pay that bill. That is what we have to do because it is unacceptable that veterans remain on long waiting periods and not get health care. There is a general agreement on that. There is debate about how much that is going to cost over a 2-year period, but I think we can reach some resolution.

Here is where the difference of opinion lies—without divulging anything,

and this has been in the newspapers—Sloan Gibson, the Acting Secretary, came before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee last week and he made it very clear that while we have to deal with the emergency of long waiting periods and get people the contracted care they need, simultaneously, we must make sure the VA has the doctors, the nurses, the medical personnel, the IT, and the space they need in order to deal with this crisis so that 2 years from now we are not back in the same position we are, and he came forward with a proposal that, in fact, costs $17.6 billion. I think we can lower that amount of money, because some of that request is not going to be spent this year or even next year.

But the issue here is we have to strengthen the VA, their capacity, so that veterans do not remain on long waiting periods and that we can get them the quality and timely care they need.

Now, what I wanted to mention was an hour or so ago I received and Chairman MILLER, who is chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, got the letter, RICHARD BURR, who is the ranking member on the Senate committee, MIKE MICHAUD, the ranking member at the House—we received a letter from a variety of veterans organizations, virtually every major veterans organization, and they are the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the VFW, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Military Officers Association of America, the U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association, and many other organizations.

I want to take a moment to read what they say, because this is terribly important. What they are saying in essence is yes, we need emergency funding to make sure that veterans tomorrow get the health care they need from the private sector or anyplace else, but we also need to strengthen the VA so that over the years they can provide the quality and timely care veterans are entitled to. I am going to read this letter because it is important that Members of the Senate and the House understand where the major veterans organizations are coming from.

Last week Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson appeared before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to discuss the progress made by the Department of Veterans Affairs over the past two months to address the health care access crisis for thousands of veterans. Secretary Gibson testified that after re-examining VA's resource needs in light of the revelations about secret waiting lists and hidden demand, VA required supplemental resources totaling $17.6 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year through the end of FY 2017.

As the leaders of organizations representing millions of veterans, we agree with Secretary Gibson that there is a need to provide VA with additional resources now to ensure that veterans can access the health care they have earned either from VA providers or through non-VA purchased care. We urge Congress to expeditiously approve supplemental funding that fully addresses the critical needs outlined by Secretary Gibson either prior to, or at the same time as, any compromise legislation that may be reported out of the House-Senate Conference Committee. Whether it costs $17 billion or $50 billion over the next three years, Congress has a sacred obligation to provide VA with the funds it requires to meet both immediate needs through non-VA care and future needs by expanding VA's internal capacity.

And I continue. Again, this is a letter from almost every major veterans organization:

Last month, we wrote to you—

They wrote to the chairmen of the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees—

we wrote to you to outline the principles and priorities essential to addressing the access crisis, a copy of which is attached. The first priority ''must be to ensure that all veterans currently waiting for treatment must be provided access to timely, convenient health care as quickly as medically indicated.'' Second, when VA is unable to provide that care directly, ''VA must be involved in the timely coordination of and fully responsible for prompt payment for all authorized non-VA care.'' Third, Congress must provide supplemental funding for this year and additional funding for next year to pay for the temporary expansion of non-VA purchased care. Finally, whatever actions VA or Congress takes to address the current access crisis must also ''protect, preserve and strengthen the VA health care system so that it remains capable of providing a full continuum of high-quality, timely health care to all enrolled veterans.''

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 23, 2014.

Chairman BERNIE SANDERS,
Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member RICHARD BURR,
Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Chairman JEFF MILLER,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member MIKE MICHAUD,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN SANDERS, CHAIRMAN MILLER, RANKING MEMBER BURR, RANKING MEMBER MICHAUD: Last week, Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson appeared before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to discuss the progress made by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) over the past two months to address the health care access crisis for thousands of veterans. Secretary Gibson testified that after re-examining VA's resource needs in light of the revelations about secret waiting lists and hidden demand, VA required supplemental resources totaling $17.6 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year through the end of FY 2017.

As the leaders of organizations representing millions of veterans, we agree with Secretary Gibson that there is a need to provide VA with additional resources now to ensure that veterans can access the health care they have earned, either from VA providers or through non-VA purchased care. We urge Congress to expeditiously approve supplemental funding that fully addresses the critical needs outlined by Secretary Gibson either prior to, or at the same time as, any compromise legislation that may be reported out of the House-Senate Conference Committee. Whether it costs $17 billion or $50 billion over the next three years, Congress has a sacred obligation to provide VA with the funds it requires to meet both immediate needs through non-VA care and future needs by expanding VA's internal capacity.

Last month, we wrote to you to outlining the principles and priorities essential to addressing the access crisis, a copy of which is attached. The first priority ''. . . must be to ensure that all veterans currently waiting for treatment must be provided access to timely, convenient health care as quickly as medically indicated.'' Second, when VA is unable to provide that care directly, ''. . . VA must be involved in the timely coordination of and fully responsible for prompt payment for all authorized non-VA care.'' Third, Congress must provide supplemental funding for this year and additional funding for next year to pay for the temporary expansion of non-VA purchased care. Finally, whatever actions VA or Congress takes to address the current access crisis must also ''. . . protect, preserve and strengthen the VA health care system so that it remains capable of providing a full continuum of high-quality, timely health care to all enrolled veterans.''

In his testimony to the Senate, Secretary Gibson stated that the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) has already reached out to over 160,000 veterans to get them off wait lists and into clinics. He said that VHA accomplished this by adding more clinic hours, aggressively recruiting to fill physician vacancies, deploying mobile medical units, using temporary staffing resources, and expanding the use of private sector care. Gibson also testified that VHA made over 543,000 referrals for veterans to receive non-VA care in the private sector—91,000 more than in the comparable period a year ago. In a subsequent press release, VA stated that it had reduced the New Enrollee Appointment Report (NEAR) from its peak of 46,000 on June 1, 2014 to 2,000 as of July 1, 2014, and that there was also a reduction of over 17,000 veterans on the Electronic Waiting List since May 15, 2014. We appreciate this progress, but more must be done to ensure that every enrolled veteran has access to timely care.

The majority of the supplemental funding required by VA, approximately $8.1 billion, would be used to expand access to VA health care over the next three fiscal years by hiring up to 10,000 new clinical staff, including 1,500 new doctors, nurses and other direct care providers. That funding would also be used to cover the cost of expanded non-VA purchased care, with the focus shifting over the three years from non-VA purchased care to VA-provided care as internal capacity increased. The next biggest portion would be $6 billion for VA's physical infrastructure, which according to Secretary Gibson would include 77 lease projects for outpatient clinics that would add about two million square feet, as well as eight major construction projects and 700 minor construction and nonrecurring maintenance projects that together could add roughly four million appointment slots at VA facilities. The remainder of the funding would go to IT enhancements, including scheduling, purchased care and project coordination systems, as well as a modest increase of $400 million for additional VBA staff to address the claims and appeals backlogs.

In reviewing the additional resource requirements identified by Secretary Gibson, the undersigned find them to be commensurate with the historical funding shortfalls identified in recent years by many of our organizations, including The Independent Budget (IB), which is authored and endorsed by many of our organizations. For example, in the prior ten VA budgets, the amount of funding for medical care requested by the Administration and ultimately provided to VA by Congress was more than $7.8 billion less than what was recommended by the IB. Over just the past five years, the IB recommended $4 billion more than VA requested or Congress approved and for next year, FY 2015, the IB has recommended over $2 billion more than VA requested. Further corroboration of the shortfall in VA's medical care funding came two weeks ago from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), which issued a revised report on H.R. 3230 estimating that, ''. . . under current law for 2015 and CBO's baseline projections for 2016, VA's appropriations for health care are not projected to keep pace with growth in the patient population or growth in per capita spending for health care—meaning that waiting times will tend to increase . . .''

Similarly, over the past decade the amount of funding requested by VA for major and minor construction, and the final amount appropriated by Congress, has been more than $9 billion less than what the IB estimated was needed to allow VA sufficient space to deliver timely, high-quality care. Over the past five years alone, that shortfall is more than $6.6 billion and for next year the VA budget request is more than $2.5 billion less than the IB recommendation. Funding for nonrecurring maintenance (NRM) has also been woefully inadequate. Importantly, the IB recommendations closely mirror VA's Strategic Capital Investment Plan (SCIP), which VA uses to determine infrastructure needs. According to SCIP, VA should invest between $56 to $69 billion in facility improvements over the next ten years, which would require somewhere between $5 to $7 billion annually. However, the Administration's budget requests over the past four years have averaged less than $2 billion annually for major and minor construction and for NRM, and Congress has not significantly increased those funding requests in the final appropriations.

Taking into account the progress achieved by VA over the past two months, and considering the funding shortfalls our organizations have identified over the past decade and in next year's budget, the undersigned believe that Congress must quickly approve supplemental funding that fully meets the critical needs identified by Secretary Gibson, and which fulfills the principles and priorities we laid out a month ago. Such an approach would be a reasonable and practical way to expand access now, while building internal capacity to avoid future access crises in the future. In contrast to the legislative proposals in the Conference Committee which would require months to promulgate new regulations, establish new procedures and set up new offices, the VA proposal could have an immediate impact on increasing access to care for veterans today by building upon VA's ongoing expanded access initiatives and sustaining them over the next three years. Furthermore, by investing in new staff and treatment space, VA would be able to continue providing this expanded level of care, even while increasing its use of purchased care when and where it is needed.

In our jointly signed letter last month, we applauded both the House and Senate for working expeditiously and in a bipartisan manner to move legislation designed to address the access crisis, and we understand you are continuing to work towards a compromise bill. As leaders of the nation's major veterans organization, we now ask that you work in the same bipartisan spirit to provide VA supplemental funding addressing the needs outlined by Secretary Gibson to the floor as quickly as feasible, approve it and send it to the President so that he can enact it to help ensure that no veteran waits too long to get the care they earned through their service. We look forward to your response.

Respectfully,

Garry J. Augustine, Executive Director, Washington Headquarters, DAV (Disabled American Veterans); Homer S. Townsend, Jr., Executive Director, Paralyzed Veterans of America; Tom Tarantino, Chief Policy Officer, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America; Robert E. Wallace, Executive Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Rick Weidman, Executive Director for Policy and Government Affairs, Vietnam Veterans of America; VADM Norbert R. Ryan, Jr., USN (Ret.), President, Military Officers Association of America; Randy Reid, Executive Director, U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association; James T. Currie, Ph.D., Colonel, USA (Ret.), Executive Director, Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Service; Robert L. Frank, Chief Executive Officer, Air Force Sergeants Association; VADM John Totushek, USN (Ret.), Executive Director, Association of the U.S. Navy (AUSN); Herb Rosenbleeth, National Executive Director, Jewish War Veterans of the USA; Heather L. Ansley, Esq., MSW, Vice President, VetsFirst, a Program of United Spinal Association; CW4 (Ret.) Jack Du Teil, Executive Director, United States Army Warrant Officers Association; John R. Davis, Director, Legislative Programs, Fleet Reserve Association; Robert Certain, Executive Director, Military Chaplain Association of the United States; Michael A. Blum, National Executive Director, Marine Corps League.

Mr. SANDERS. Essentially what the letter goes on to talk about is that many of these organizations have been looking at this issue for years, and in their independent budget have noted that the VA needs more space, because you have many hospitals where there are not enough examination rooms and that slows down the ability of doctors and nurses to treat patients, and we need more doctors and nurses. So for many of these organizations this is not new news. They have known it for years.

Here is where we are. The good news is that I think we can bring forth a bill which deals with emergency contracted-out care for veterans today on long waiting periods. I think we can deal with the issue that Senator MCCAIN feels very strongly about and that is making sure that veterans who live 40 miles or more away from a VA facility will be able to go to the private physician of their choice, and I think we can also strengthen the VA in terms of doctors and nurses and information technology and space so that we don't keep running into this problem year after year. It is going to take the VA time in order to bring in the doctors and nurses and do the construction. I don't want to get into the details of the discussions we are having with the House, but I did want to make veterans, and, in fact, Members of Congress aware of where I believe we are at this moment.

With that, I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address the legislation we are debating, the Bring Jobs Home Act, but before I do so, I wish to note how much I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Vermont in fighting for quality care and quality programs for our U.S. veterans. This is incredibly important. Our sons and daughters and husbands and wives are coming home from Iraq and now from Afghanistan. They have stood for us and we need to stand for them. BERNIE SANDERS is leading that effort, and I appreciate him for doing so.

I wish to address the legislation we are debating, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Earlier today the Senate voted on whether to debate this legislation to help bring manufacturing jobs back to America—to onshore these jobs. I was very heartened to see a 93-to-7 overwhelming bipartisan majority say: Yes, let's turn to this bill and work on increasing manufacturing jobs in America. This is a much better result than we had just 2 years ago when some of my colleagues combined to thwart the ability to close debate on the motion to proceed and we were unable to get on to this bill.

We are in an economy where jobs have been returning, but quality living-wage jobs remain elusive. Indeed, 60 percent of the jobs we lost in 2008 and 2009 were living-wage jobs, and of the jobs we are getting back, only 40 percent of those are living-wage jobs. The difference between those two numbers means that millions of families who had a strong foundation just a few years ago, while they may have employment today, do not have a strong foundation because they are chasing part-time jobs, minimum-wage jobs, near-minimum-wage jobs, and jobs with low to no benefits, and that is not a foundation on which a family can thrive.

This bill is important. The Bring Jobs Home Act does two simple things: It closes tax loopholes that ask the American people—currently—to subsidize the costs for corporations to ship jobs overseas; second, it creates a new tax incentive to encourage companies to bring jobs home with a tax credit that covers 20 percent of the costs of relocating those jobs back to the United States.

I am an original cosponsor of this legislation because this is an item of huge importance to my home State of Oregon. Manufacturing is a tremendous driver of Oregon's economy. In fact, if we look across the Nation and we look at what share of the State economy is driven by manufacturing, Oregon is often first or second. Manufacturing matters a great deal. When manufacturing thrives, the Oregon economy is going to do well, and when it dies, the Oregon economy is not going to do well.

If we look at this from yet another perspective, we can see that States have been losing manufacturing jobs over the last 10-plus years in sizeable numbers. In the period of about 2001 to 2011, that 10-year period, we lost approximately 5 million manufacturing jobs. To put it differently, we lost 50,000 factories. Well, what would we do today to have those 5 million living-wage, family-wage, good-paying jobs? One is we should pass this bill and to quit subsidizing the export of our jobs overseas.

These tax breaks, which were put through by powerful special interests for the benefit of a few multinationals, have done enormous damage to the United States of America and to our families, and this is our chance to reverse that.

One study—the Economic Policy Institute study of 2012—looked at the number of jobs that were created in this dynamic between additional sales overseas versus additional imports. Those additional imports, of course, reflected jobs lost. In their estimate, Oregon gained about 9,100 jobs from additional exports and we lost about 59,000 jobs. That differential of 50,000 jobs has an enormous impact on the State of Oregon. We can put it this way: It is about 2 to 3 percent of the number of jobs in our State economy, so it is an issue which really hits home.

I know Oregon is not alone. For every single State—West and East, urban and rural, and, yes, Democrat and Republican—this has been the story in which jobs lost have exceeded jobs gained. That is why I strongly hope this body of folks—representing the West and East and North and South and urban and rural, the blue and red—can come together to get this job done for the American people.

Think about it this way for a moment. Under our current Tax Code, we are asking working families who are paying income taxes to subsidize the exportation of their own jobs. That makes no sense. If you went out on the street in Eugene or Pendleton or Medford—cities across my State—and asked people what they think about that, you would probably hear a common theme. One person might say: That is absurd. Another person might say: That goes against our own economic self-interest. A third person might simply say: That is wrong and it hurts families. All of them would be right. Let's right this wrong, this inflicted wound on living-wage jobs and on our families.

Over the last few years we have started to see a bit of improvement in that manufacturing jobs have started to grow. But we need to nurture that trend. We need to encourage that direction. I know that for the Oregon families who are at the heart of the manufacturing economy, whether or not their jobs stay here in the United States of America means everything. It will affect the quality of life they will have as adults, and it also affects the quality they will bring to their jobs as parents and raising their children to seize opportunities of the future.

Let's continue to work together to keep jobs here in Oregon and here in America. Let's take on this issue of offshoring that has deeply affected millions of Americans. This is a problem that is within our power to fix, and we are now on the bill that starts us down the path of fixing it. Let's not get stalled. Let's make sure we have the majority to close debate, to get to a final vote.

If anyone has anything to say and you don't feel you have had time to say it, come and say it tonight, say it tomorrow, say it tomorrow evening, but get down here and make your notions known so that you don't have to say that you need more time when it comes time to shut down debate and actually vote on this bill.

Paralysis has been the practice that has so hurt this Chamber's ability to address major issues affecting America, and that is not right.

I encourage my colleagues, whatever you have to say, come down here and say it. Don't once again obstruct the ability of this Chamber to take on a major issue affecting families across this land.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time and opportunity to speak on this bill. I know the Presiding Officer has been championing a whole collection of bills designed to nurture manufacturing. That collection of bills could do great work and would be a logical additional step as we take on these provisions to stop offshoring and increase onshoring.

We should turn to some of the other bills the Senator from Delaware has put together. One of the bills he has put together is a bill I sponsored. It is called the Build Act. I have gone on a manufacturing tour in my State of Oregon and visited a large number of manufacturers, and the common issue I hear from those who are managing the factory floor or from the CEOs is this: We need more folks coming out of high schools and community colleges who have both the aptitude for using tools and the desire to use tools.

It used to be, when I was growing up—this simply came because we had a habit of building things in our garages. Our garages were full of tools in a working-class community. My garage is still full of tools, but I can tell you that my children are not likely to find themselves out in the garage making things because that is not the culture today. If they are going to learn the joy of making things, they are going to have to have the opportunity of shop classes. It has a fancy name now—''career technical education.'' I think ''shop classes'' gives a better visual impression—metal shop and woodshop and bringing items home where you can say, hey, I made this dustpan or this carving or this mask.

I have been to some shop classes in Oregon where the students are not making the simple things that I made. They are making some of the most incredibly gorgeous furniture you have ever seen, with sophisticated skills in using tools. We need more of those shop classes to help feed and nurture the manufacturing economy. It is a win-win for our children, it is a win-win for our economy, and it is a win-win in terms of creating living-wage jobs that are a strong foundation for families to thrive.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Under the previous order, the time until 4:30 p.m. will be controlled by the Republicans.

LNG EXPORT APPROVAL

Mr. HOEVEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I come to the floor to offer a compromise on the LNG export issue. I will put up my first chart. I think this is both a solution and a compromise to LNG exporting.

The reality is we need to be able to construct LNG export facilities. There has been debate in this body as to how that approval process should work. Some want to take the Department of Energy completely out of the process and just allow companies to build LNG facilities—let the market work—and that is actually an approach I advocate and I have joined with others on that type of legislation. That legislation has bipartisan support. I think we could get it to the floor and we would have more than the 60 votes it needs to pass. Others have advocated a more cautious approach, which is essentially continuing the current state of play wherein DOE can take years before they make a decision on these LNG export terminals. So what I offer today is

the LNG Certainty Act, which I believe is a compromise between those two points of view. It would provide for an expedited process but would do it in a way where we keep the Department of Energy in the equation.

Why is it so important that we act now? This is a bill that is very much about jobs. Right now we are on a motion to go to a bill that purportedly would create jobs. I don't think that bill will create jobs; I think it will create more regulation and more costs for companies that are trying to create jobs. So instead why don't we bring up some of these energy bills that will not only create jobs but accomplish much more as well, such as economic growth—economic growth that will generate revenues to reduce the deficit and the debt without raising taxes or increasing regulatory burdens? Why not pass some of these energy bills that will provide better environmental stewardship? LNG production certainly would provide job growth, economic growth but also better environmental stewardship, and it will also help provide national security—national security for us and for our allies. That is a very big reason it is so important that we act now.

We have a President who is talking about what Vladimir Putin and Russia should do and what they shouldn't do. He is talking about it, but we need to go beyond talk to action. What is that action? We need to impose stronger sanctions on Russia. I think there is broad bipartisan support in this Senate to impose stronger sanctions on Russia, but for those sanctions to be truly effective, we need the European Union to join with us in imposing those sanctions. We can have a meaningful impact on what Putin and Russia do, but we have to act and we have to get the European Union to act with us.

So why aren't they acting with us? The reality is Vladimir Putin has them over a barrel—literally. European countries are dependent on Russia for their energy. So they are very reluctant to impose sanctions when they have to get their energy from Russia.

Here is a graph that shows how much all of these different European countries get in terms of their energy, their natural gas from Europe. We can see in some cases it is 100 percent, 60 percent, 50 percent. For some obviously it is less. But for many European countries, they are dependent on Russia for this natural gas.

Here is the pipeline network coming in from Russia. Here we see Russia and all of these pipelines coming into Europe through the Ukraine supplying natural gas. Obviously, these countries are very worried about imposing sanctions which, of course, would create difficulty for them from an economic perspective as well as Russia, but they are very concerned about energy supply. That is why we have to act and we have to act now to make sure they have another supply of energy so they can join with us in meaningful sanctions against Russia.

So how does the LNG Certainty Act work? Quite simply, it provides that the Department of Energy must make a decision on whether to approve an LNG export application within 45 days of that company completing its preliminary application to the FERC—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. So understand, right now companies have to apply to both the Department of Energy and to the FERC—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. They have to apply to both in order to get approval to build an LNG facility.

When we talk to these companies we learn that the FERC has a fairly rational process that they know they can step through in an orderly fashion. It is pretty dependable, pretty certain. It takes a certain amount of time, covers all the bases, but they know they can get through it. The DOE—the Department of Energy—on the other hand, doesn't have any specific timeframes or criteria on how or whether they will give approval to these companies, so it creates uncertainty and it creates real delay.

As I said, some people want to take the Department of Energy out of the equation completely; others want to continue just as it is. That is why this act truly is a compromise in that we keep the Department of Energy in the mix, but we require that within 45 days after the preliminary application to the FERC is approved, which takes about 6 months, up to as much as 1 year—within 45 days after that preliminary application is filed with the FERC, the DOE then has 45 days to make a decision. So we still have whatever safeguards some people feel need to be in there, as far as the DOE. The DOE is still in there. They still have that safeguard, but we have a reasonably expedited process and a reasonably certain process for these companies that are applying to try to get approval.

Right now we have on the order of 13 different companies—1 has conditional approval but 13 different companies—seeking approval to build LNG facilities. Many of these companies have been waiting for over 1 year—some 1 to 2 years—and they are not even through the Department of Energy process yet. So while we need to start moving natural gas to Europe, since Europe needs that source of supply so they can stand with us in sanctions against Russia, these applications continue to sit in limbo. How does that possibly make sense? Why aren't we acting? Why is it adequate or satisfactory for the President to just talk about what should be done instead of doing something? This is action we can and must take.

I will give my colleagues an example of a project showing what we are talking about. I am showing my colleagues 13 different projects that are in limbo.

Here is one right here where we take a specific example. This is the Golden Pass project. It is a project ExxonMobil wants to build. They are ready to invest $10 billion—$10 billion—today and save these taxes to build an export facility that will move liquefied natural gas from this country to Europe. Why would we want to sit and hold them up?

Here you see a timeline. They have been in this process already for more than 1 year. It looks to me as though they do not even figure they are halfway done yet, and there is no certainty from the Department of Energy when they will be done. Yet here is a $10 billion project that is sponsored by a company—ExxonMobil—that certainly has the ability to build it, that will take LNG, liquefied natural gas, to Europe.

What is the rationale for holding them up, for just making them wait? Aren't we moving to a so-called jobs bill? How many jobs do you think will be created in building a $10 billion facility? A lot of jobs.

This is just 1 example of the more than 13 I just showed that are sitting in limbo.

That is exactly why I have joined with Senator MCCAIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator BARRASSO and we proposed the North Atlantic Energy Security Act. The whole focus of this act was to streamline oil and gas production, to build the gathering systems we need, move it to these LNG facilities, and give companies the approval and the authority to build those LNG facilities so they can move that gas to our allies.

All of these steps create jobs. They all create jobs. We create jobs in all of these steps: producing more gas, building the gathering systems, and building the LNG facilities. But instead of doing this—in this picture we have an oil well, which is flaring off gas, meaning burning it off. This picture is an example in my State of North Dakota where we are flaring off $1.5 million worth of gas a day. So instead of just burning up that gas, we would actually have a market for it, so we can capture it, move it to the LNG facilities, and export it to our allies, not only strengthening our national security and their national security but creating a market for our gas.

Right now we produce 30 trillion cubic feet of gas a year in this country, and we use 26 trillion. So gas is flared off instead of captured and sent to market.

If we want to talk about job creation, if we want to talk about economic growth, if we want to talk about environmental stewardship, if we want to talk about working with our allies to actually do something in response to Russian aggression, do we want to actually do something or just keep talking about it?

So while we are considering jobs bills, why don't we consider this jobs bill? Why don't we consider the LNG Certainty Act. The reason I have introduced this compromise bill is so we can do this: move natural gas from the United States, through facilities, to our allies to deter Russian aggression. It is that simple. That is what it is all about.

That is why, again, I joined with Senators MCCAIN, MURKOWSKI, and BARRASSO to introduce the North Atlantic Energy Security Act. But if that is too heavy a lift—if that is too heavy a lift—then let's take up the LNG Certainty Act and just approve the ability to build these facilities. Let's at least take that first step.

There are other bills we can take up as well that are true job creators, real job creators, where we empower companies across this great Nation, large and small, to create jobs, to create more energy, to create better environmental stewardship, and to strengthen national security—energy bills that myself and others have introduced: the LNG Certainty Act which I am talking about right now, the North Atlantic Energy Security Act which I have referenced as well, Keystone—the Keystone XL Pipeline. Why aren't we building that right now to make sure, with Canada, we produce more oil than we consume so we can tell the Middle East we do not need any oil, we have it covered or the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, which is a whole series of bills that have been passed in the House that I have introduced in the Senate that would cut the regulatory burden, increase the amount of energy we produce in this country both onshore and offshore or the Empower States Act, where we give States the ability to take a primary role in regulating hydraulic fracturing so we have the certainty to continue the investment that is producing an energy renaissance in this country.

All of these acts have been filed. All of these acts create jobs. Why are they being held up so we can consider a bill that increases regulation, increases taxes on companies in the country, and will have the impact of reducing jobs and reducing economic growth rather than accomplishing all of the things we are talking about—not just jobs, not just economic growth but national security and actually working with our allies to accomplish something instead of just talking about it, making Putin tow the line rather than just telling him he should.

With that, I know my colleagues are here to propose additional job-creating ideas as well, and at this time I yield for the outstanding Senator from the State of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the Dakotas for yielding the floor to me. Before he leaves, I wish to say something about what the Senator just said. In fact, I was sitting here listening to him. I am going to prove I was actually listening to his speech. I don't think we always do—sometimes I think we don't—but I did that because he was right on target.

But my thought process went back to the 1970s. In the 1970s, OPEC and the Arab oil embargo basically held the United States of America hostage. I remember lines where we would wait for an hour and a half to get $10 worth of gasoline because we had a limited supply.

Now we sit here in a country, some 40 years later, that has unlimited resources available to us if we will just take the political moves and the regulatory moves and the practical moves to exhibit our power and extract those resources.

For example, the Keystone Pipeline that the Senator talked about—not a single molecule of carbon will be generated by bringing that petroleum underground through a pipeline from Canada to Houston. We will refine it more soundly and more environmentally than the Chinese would or anybody else would, and then we will have an almost infinite supply to take care of our own country internally and also use it as a part of our soft power around the world.

The Senator is absolutely correct about Germany and about the Ukraine and about Russia. If we become the surrogate and we replace Russia in terms of supply of natural gas to that part of the world, we take away the only asset Russia has. As Senator MCCAIN has so often said, Russia has relegated itself to being a gas station with a flag. If we become the competitive gas station down the line, we can lower our price by nine-tenths of a cent, we can sell more gas than they can, and we can use the soft power of our natural resources to bring back what we need in terms of peace and stability in that part of the world. The byproduct of doing that is not just energy security, it is not just better diplomatic and international policy, but it is jobs for Americans—jobs to build the pipeline, jobs to operate the pipeline, jobs to extract or frack the natural gas out of Haynesville and Marcellus.

We are sitting on a ham sandwich, starving to death as a country with our assets because governmental policy will not let us do some of what we ought to do.

So I came to the floor to talk a little bit about job creating and bringing jobs home. The bringing jobs home bill is a $214 million bill, which is a rounding error in terms of the way we do business around here, and will do nothing except penalize companies for doing what they have to do and offer a reward that is not a carrot at all to bring jobs back.

I thank the Senator from the Dakotas for his speech and for his continuing and persistent emphasis on our energy and our energy power and our energy independence. It is voices such as his that need to be heard more and more in this Chamber so we can create jobs for the American people and solve the economic problems we have.

I commend the Senator from South Dakota—thank you—from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ISAKSON. I apologize. I am a southerner, so I slipped up on that.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the good Senator and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise to talk for a minute about the issue of the day that is before us, the bring jobs home bill. I appreciate any effort to bring jobs home and to create new jobs at home, but I want to talk about how we are making a false promise and giving idle hope to people about bringing jobs back because we are not doing the things we should be doing.

If you ask me to make my choice, what should we do in the Senate, on the floor of the Senate, in this body as legislators to create as many jobs as we can as fast as we can, a tax credit for bringing jobs home will not do it and a tax penalty for taking jobs overseas will not do it, but approving the Keystone Pipeline will do it and giving the President of the United States trade promotion authority will do it. Both of those are pending on the floor of the Senate right now before us. We could take them up tomorrow. If we did, we could make a massive impact on job creation in America and further empower our economy.

I happen to be the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee's subcommittee on trade. We have two major trade agreements pending in the United States of America that we are a part of current negotiations—one of them is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, one is the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, called TTIP.

Those two trade agreements are free-trade agreements with our biggest trading partners—Asia and Europe and Scandinavia—but the Asians and the Scandinavians both ask me, when I talk to them in meetings discussing trade: When are you going to give your President trade promotion authority? Because we know until the U.S. Congress gives the President that authority, you are not serious about negotiating trade deals.

I first came to the Congress of the United States in 1999, 1 year after we gave President Bill Clinton trade promotion authority. Then we had a plethora of free-trade agreements that passed at that time because of the negotiation power we gave the President. Trade promotion authority just means we give the President the authority to negotiate the trade agreement, and

then the Senate gets an up-or-down vote on the agreement. But we do not get to vote on amendment after amendment after amendment, we get a vote on the totality of the agreement. In other words, we give sincerity to our foreign trading partners that what we say is what we mean and that we are going to give our President the authority to negotiate those deals, and we will make them subject to our ratification in the Senate. Trade promotion authority is important for America, for jobs, for our economy, and it is, quite frankly, important for bringing jobs home to the United States of America.

The Keystone Pipeline, which I mentioned a minute ago in talking about Senator HOEVEN's remarks, is a job creator. The unions are for it. Business is for it. Most Americans are for it. It only takes the signature of the President to let it go. The State Department has signed off on it. There is only one reason, I suppose, we are not building the Keystone Pipeline; that is, because of environmental fear of the Keystone Pipeline generating some kind of an environmental problem.

Think about it for a second. If we do not put it in a pipe and bring it underground, we can put it on a truck that burns gasoline or diesel fuel and bring it to Texas and create a whole lot of carbon molecules. We are trying to reduce carbon in the air, so building a pipeline is environmentally friendly. It is safer than putting it on the roads or railcars or trucks or tractors. It is the way to do it. I do not understand why the President will not do it. But I think we need to continue to talk about it because the energy independence Senator HOEVEN talked about is exactly what America is on the cusp of having. We suffered when we were energy dependent in the 1970s and 1980s. We paid a big price for it. We paid the price of inflation, reduced authority around the world, and we lost our position and stature in business. We now have a chance to secure it not just for this decade but for this century in the United States of America, and I hope the President will reconsider his unwillingness to sign the Keystone Pipeline and do so.

On the jobs issue and on the inversion issue, which has brought about this entire discussion—and for those who might be listening and watching, inversion is where American corporations decide to acquire a foreign company and invert to where their headquarters are in the foreign country rather than in the United States of America to take advantage of a better corporate tax rate.

We have now the highest corporate tax rate in the world—the highest in the world. Japan, which used to be up there above us or right with us, has now lowered theirs. Canada has lowered theirs. Ireland has lowered theirs.

Jobs are going offshore because the cost of taxes is lower, because it is a tax code that promotes growth, promotes business, and promotes development.

We need a progrowth tax policy in the United States. We need a simpler tax code. We need a fairer rate of taxation. We need to get rid of corporate welfare. A lot of my friends on the other side are always talking about corporate welfare. They are right. We did it on ethanol subsidies when we were subsidizing people to make ethanol. That was an intent, through a tax incentive, to cause something we thought would be the right thing to happen for the environment, which did not work. Those are the types of things we ought to stop doing—those types of corporate welfare. But what we should do is give a progrowth tax code to the American businesspeople, whether they are C corps or S corps—and I am going to talk about that for a second—so they know what kind of tax rate they can count on, they know it is simple, they know it is fair, and they know it is predictable for the future.

I find it interesting, when the old Soviet Union fell, when the Soviet satellite states such as Estonia and Latvia became independent countries, if you go back and study that—and that was not too long ago—if you go back and study what they did to separate themselves from the Soviet Union—take Estonia, for example. The new President of Estonia, after they became independent, did three things. He gave the state-owned apartments to each person who rented them and let them own them as a home and then created a housing market instantaneously.

That was No. 1. No. 2, they cut the tax rate from 50 percent to 25 percent and revenues went up and not down, because people thought 25 percent was a fair rate and they did not cheat—because there was a lot of cheating going on under the 50-percent rate. Then on the corporate taxes in Estonia, they went to businesses and said: We are not going to tax your profits as long as you reinvest those profits in jobs or in research and development. The rest of it will be taxes. So they incentivized research and development. They incentivized employment. They made corporate Estonia feel as though they had a fair tax system.

What happened? If you fly into a town in Estonia today, it is similar to flying into Dallas or Atlanta. There are cranes everywhere. There is economic development and improvement everywhere. Why? Because they have what people perceive to be a fair code. They do not have a junk code. They have a good tax code, and they incentivize people to do business and make money.

You raise revenue in America by raising prosperity, not by raising rates of taxation. We have proved that every time we have lowered the capital gains tax. Every year following the lowering of the capital gains tax, revenues from capital gains went up and not down.

Why? Because people who had a mature investment were incentivized to pay the lower tax rate, sell the investment, and reinvest in a maturing, developing investment rather than just hold onto it because they did not want to pay what they considered was a confiscatory tax. Tax policy drives economic decisions. There is not one of us in this room who does not make decisions every single day on our own personal finances where we do not consider—in some part or in whole—the tax consequence of it.

That is why you have a tax code. But we all look at fair and equitable corporate tax relief. We ought to do it for S corporations and for C corporations. I want to talk about that part for just a minute. C corporations are the major corporations and dividend-paying companies in America. Their tax rate is 35 percent. S corporations are corporations where they file as partners. The profits of the company flow through on what is known as a K–1 statement. It flows through as ordinary income.

Today the ordinary income tax rates for people making more than $450,000 can go up to 39 percent. It is already higher than the 35 percent C corporations have. If we lower the C corporation rate from 35 to 28 percent through comprehensive tax reform, then there will be a big disparity between the S corporations and the C corporations. The S corporations employ a lot of Americans. They are the mom and pop Main Street businesses. They are 72 percent of the jobs that are created in America. So we ought to take the whole enchilada. We ought to reform both the corporate tax rate, the C corporation rate, the S corporation rate, and the individual tax rate and modernize them together and make them fair, equitable, less complex, and more productive.

If we incentivized American business to invest and to grow, we will raise revenues, we will raise prosperity, and we will raise hope. If we continue to pass bills that say: If you doing something, we are going to tax you or if you do something, we are going to give you a benefit—if we think that is going to cause people to bring jobs back to the United States of America, we are dead wrong.

What would cause them to bring jobs back to America is a fair tax code and to take our strong investments and our strong assets, such as petroleum and liquid natural gas, which we were talking about, and use them to our advantage through the soft power of economic power. So my message today is very simple. If you want to create jobs, build the Keystone Pipeline and give the President Trade Promotion Authority and do it now.

If you want to really stop corporate inversions, just modernize the American Tax Code like every other country in the world has done. There are a lot

of people who are talking about offshore profits who are stranded in the Cayman Islands in these secret bank accounts because they do not come back to America. We created the Cayman Islands secret bank accounts when we passed a tax code that was confiscatory in nature.

When it is better off for your company and your stockholders to keep the money you make offshore—somewhere else offshore—so it is not subject the second time to taxes, we created those Cayman Islands tax havens. We will do it again if we do not get our Tax Code fixed. So my message is simple: Build Keystone, explore our natural resources, give the President Trade Promotion Authority, and make a fair equitable change in S corporations, our C corporations, and our individual rate. Let's incentivize prosperity and hope and not penalize and punish Americans for doing business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

LAWFUL IVORY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Georgia on his remarks. As usual, they are eloquent and elucidate the issue beautifully. I am glad I had a chance to hear them.

I come to the floor to speak about an effort to expand regulations that will have a damaging effect on thousands of Americans. For those who are concerned this administration is trying to take away our guns, this regulation could actually do that. If this regulation is approved, when you decide to sell a gun, to sell a guitar or anything else that contains African elephant ivory, the government would actually take them away, even if you inherited the item or bought the item at a time when the sale of ivory was not illegal.

In February the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced a plan to prohibit the interstate commerce of African elephant ivory. This was part of President Obama's National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trade. The plan is intended to stop the poaching of African elephants and to help preserve that species. But the impact will be something very different.

The impact of this plan will be to change a policy that has been in place since 1990, which prevents the importation of ivory for commercial purposes, with the exception of antiques. But it did not restrict interstate or intrastate commerce of legal ivory.

Now, let me be clear. I support stopping poachers. I support the preservation of these magnificent, regal animals, the elephant. I strongly support stopping the trade of illegal ivory. But what I do not support is treating Tennessee musicians, Tennessee antique shops, and Tennessee firearms sellers like illegal ivory smugglers for selling legal ivory products, many of which are decades old, if not over 100 years old.

Banning the buying and selling of products with ivory found in legally produced guitars, legally produced pianos, legally produced firearms, could prohibit musicians from buying or selling instruments that contain ivory, prevent firearms and family heirlooms containing ivory from being sold, and pose a significant threat to antique businesses.

Even though the ban has not yet gone into effect, the confusion and uncertainty created by the Fish and Wildlife Service's action to ban the interstate commerce of ivory and any item that contains ivory are already having a significant impact on businesses and families alike. Let me give you the example of John Case, who owns and operates a small antique family business with four employees in Knoxville, TN, near my home. He says he could see his business devastated by this proposed regulation. This is what John Case says:

The impact of President Obama's Executive Order expanding the buying and selling of antique ivory and other endangered species has been significant on our auction and appraisal business. If one looks at the number of antique objects we have sold and are selling at auction just for 2014, the total exceeds $156,000. This amount is more than 11 percent of our revenues for 2013 and does not include the number of antique objects we turned away from selling because of these new regulations and the loss of appraisals of those objects.

John Case continues:

This would easily total an additional $25,000 in revenues. This total loss in revenues of $181,000 equates to one full time salaried employee in addition to hours for part time employees.

Here is one more example of a new regulation, which on a small business will equate to the loss of a job of one full-time salaried employee, in addition to hours for part-time employees. We wonder why the economic recovery has been worse than the great recession? You cannot be pro-jobs if you are antibusiness and if you keep dumping this big wet blanket of regulations on every effort an entrepreneur has to create a new job. Americans who create jobs—one told me the other day in Tennessee: I'm sorry to say that I'm beginning to look at a new employee as a liability instead of an asset. He said: I hate that. I want the employee to be an asset. But when I look at the employee, I think about what new costs does that employee bring to my business because of government regulations, because of ObamaCare, because of this or that. Now, in John Case's case, it is about legal ivory.

Mr. Case goes on to say:

Further, the loss of revenues for our business is significant, as it encompasses a wide range of antique objects, including 18th and 19th century American portraits on ivory, music boxes and furniture with ivory inlay, silver tea services with ivory insulators, weapons with ivory grips and inlay. If these new regulations go into full effect, I anticipate the reduction of staff and intern programs.

That is fewer jobs.

The impact of these new regulations has a significant impact on our customers as well.

According to Mr. Case:

I just fielded calls this past week of two local consignors who had holdings of antique ivory with values exceeding $200,000. For one of those consignors, his antique ivory was by far the most available personal property he owned. It had been inherited from his grandfather. For many of my consignors such as these gentlemen, they will see a complete devaluing of one of their greatest personal assets.

Mr. Case is not alone. The music industry—and we have a lot of that in Tennessee, in Nashville and in Memphis and East Tennessee as well—is concerned. The National Association of Music Manufacturers, whose mission is to promote the pleasures and benefits of making music, says, of the proposed regulation:

[The] Problem with the Fish and Wildlife Service's plan is many post-1914 instruments containing ivory are still in use. Many famous artists perform with vintage guitars, violin bows or pianos which contain small amounts of ivory. It is worth noting that the music products industry had generally stopped using ivory by the mid-1970s. A ban on the interstate sale of items containing ivory would prohibit musicians from buying or selling instruments. Replacing ivory with other materials could adversely affect the total quality of those instruments.

Instruments are not bought because they contain ivory but because of their playing characteristics. The proposed ban has already resulted in anecdotal reports of Fish and Wildlife Service agents investigating piano transportation companies to see if any instruments are containing ivory—even though these companies do not own the instruments.

Here is another example from the National Rifle Association about the proposed ban of legal ivory:

The effects of the ivory ban would be disastrous for American firearms owners and sportsmen, as well as anyone else who currently owns ivory. This means that shotguns that have an ivory bead or inlay, handguns with ivory grips, or even cleaning tools containing ivory, would be illegal to sell.

My office has heard from businesses and individuals from all different sectors of our economy. The examples go on and on about this misguided policy. Let me repeat. I support stopping poachers. I support preserving these magnificent, regal animals, the elephant. I strongly support stopping the trade of illegal ivory. What I do not support is treating Tennessee musicians, antique owners, and gun owners like illegal ivory smugglers if they sell products that contain legal ivory.

I call on the Fish and Wildlife Service to abandon their current efforts and take a more commonsense approach, an approach that will preserve elephants, while not turning law-abiding

citizens and businesses into criminals. In the absence of a more commonsense approach, I have introduced legislation, S. 2587, the Lawful Ivory Protection Act of 2014, to stop this misguided policy from going forward. My bill simply stops the Fish and Wildlife Service from continuing down this unwise path.

It keeps in place the same regulation that prohibited the illegal ivory trade regulation before February 25, which is the date the Fish and Wildlife Service began rolling out new regulations to ban the interstate commerce of ivory and any item that contains ivory. I urge my colleagues to take a look at this issue, and cosponsor my bill, S. 2587, the Lawful Ivory Protection Act of 2014, to stop the administration from taking away our legal guns, from taking away our legal guitars, and from taking away our legal items which contain legal ivory if we try to sell them.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, when Congress unanimously passed the bipartisan William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act back in 2008 to strengthen Federal trafficking laws and ensure that unaccompanied and undocumented children receive humane treatment, it was welcomed by the Bush administration as a priority issue in preventing the trafficking of persons around the world.

At the time Southern Baptist Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission president Richard Land said that:

> It shows a broad coalition all the way from the left to the right and in between when it comes to significant human rights issues.

The law itself was named for William Wilberforce, an evangelical Christian who led the effort in Britain's Parliament to end the slave trade in Britain in the 19th century. But now, 6 years later, too many of my Republican colleagues are calling to roll back the very protections that just a few years ago were rightfully lauded as a tremendous victory for human rights.

Many of us believe the current Central American refugee crisis requires an immediate and compassionate response. Yet the proposals put forth by Senate Republicans have been to reverse critical child refugee protections, and deport DREAMers who have absolutely nothing to do with this current crisis.

The proposal introduced by my colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, and similar proposals from my Republican colleagues would weaken the 2008 trafficking law and implement expedited deportation that denies children the chance to go through an orderly process to determine if they need protection—and it applies to all unaccompanied children who cross the border. I believe we are a better nation than that.

My Republican colleagues keep saying they want a humane process, but these proposals would trade the safety of children for expediency and eliminate the very protections unanimously set forth by Congress back in 2008.

As a father, I have to say I believe this debate can't just be about the efficiency with which we can deport refugees. It should take into account the situation these boys and girls are seeking to escape in the first place.

Both the United Nations High Commission on Refugees and the Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services in two separate reviews recently found that approximately 60 percent of unaccompanied children from Central America suffered or faced harms that indicated a potential or actual need for international protection.

To understand how these proposals could adversely harm the children involved, one can read a recent article in the New York Times by Julia Preston. It tells the story of Andrea, a young woman from Honduras who was forced by her own family—associates with the Mexican drug cartel—into prostitution at age 13, if you can imagine that. After 2 years she ran away, hoping to seek safety in the United States. She tried twice to flee abuse, crossing the Rio Grande, and was apprehended by the Border Patrol in both attempts.

When agents questioned her, Andrea did not tell them why she fled. She said:

> I was just trying to protect myself . . . I was just afraid of everything, after all those things those guys had been doing to my body.

Andrea, a victim of sex trafficking, was sent back into harm's way to live with relatives in Mexico.

Andrea is not alone. Many more children could also be sent back into a dangerous environment if proposals to overturn the 2008 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act are passed.

Unaccompanied children such as Andrea need a safe place to talk about violence and abuse. A Border Patrol station holding cell is no place for an interview that literally will impact the rest of their lives, especially while they are still recovering from a dangerous journey. Subjecting Central American children to this screening process would be a retreat from our Nation's commitment as a humanitarian leader, and, frankly, undercuts our American values of putting children ahead of politics.

A coalition of more than 100 nongovernmental organizations—such as First Focus, Women's Refugee Commission, and the American Immigration Lawyers Association—all wrote a letter to President Obama earlier this month to share their thoughts on this humanitarian crisis. They wrote:

> Congress gave consideration to the unique circumstances of children when it enacted the [Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act].

Undermining due process and protection under the law is not the right answer, and certainly will not appease the criticisms of those who have been calling for more punitive and aggressive enforcement.

Yesterday, in an open letter to Congress, the Evangelical Immigration Table warned against weakening the protections afforded by the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, stating that the law:

> . . . ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice.

I have also heard from the Southern Baptist Convention, the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, anti-trafficking groups, and children's lawyers who have all sent the same message to us: Don't weaken this anti-trafficking law. Congress should focus on strengthening safeguards for children rather than weakening their protections.

Last week one of my colleagues from Texas proposed that the only way to stop the rise of unaccompanied children is to punish DREAMers and introduce legislation to defund the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program—or DACA, as it is called. DACA has helped more than 550,000 undocumented students across the country who came to the United States as children to have an opportunity to pursue a higher education. DREAMers in the DACA Program are not the cause of the current Central American refugee crisis. And the notion that any legislation to address this issue must also end DACA is, frankly, out of touch. DREAMers are bright, they are hard-working, and most of them don't know how to be anything but an American.

I have met many DREAMers from New Mexico. I have heard their stories. I have read their letters. They have never given up on this country, and, frankly, I am not giving up on them.

Last year I had the pleasure of meeting a young woman named Laura in Las Cruces, NM. She arrived in the United States from Mexico when she was 7 years old. She learned English. She earned good grades in school. It wasn't actually until she was 13 years old that she even found out she was undocumented.

She said:

> I couldn't believe it. All my dreams, all my hard work, it felt like it was all for nothing. . . . Don't leave anyone behind on the American dream.

Laura wants to be a doctor.

There is the story from a young woman named Yuri. Her family immigrated to the United States from Mexico when she was 2 years old back in 1996. While in high school in Albuquerque, NM, Yuri volunteered in her community, graduated in the top 10 percent of her class. She even received the 2013 Sandia Laboratory scholarship. Recently, she was approved for DACA and is currently a student at the University of New Mexico.

There are literally countless stories just like these of young people who love this country and have only known it as their home. We are not going to let Republicans use this current humanitarian crisis as an opportunity to punish DREAMers.

I am happy to end President Obama's deferred action program, but we will only do that by passing the DREAM Act as part of comprehensive immigration reform.

If we really want to help solve this crisis and make our policies crystal clear, it is all the more reason to pass the Senate's bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill.

The reality is, our Nation is facing a refugee crisis at our southern border. Children from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala have fled to the United States and to other neighboring Central American countries to escape unimaginable violence, corruption, extreme poverty, and instability in their home countries. In some cases, these children are literally fleeing for their lives. Many of these children are turning themselves in to Border Patrol agents.

This little boy's name is Alejandro. He is 8 years old. He traveled alone from Honduras, with nothing but his birth certificate in his pocket. I thought about that. I can't imagine my 7-year-old traveling across Washington, DC, or Albuquerque, NM, or any major metropolitan city in the United States by himself.

It took him 3 weeks to make that dangerous journey from Central America to the banks of the Rio Grande. After being asked where his parents were, Alejandro said they were in San Antonio. He came to the United States because he wanted to reunite with his family. He didn't run, he didn't hide when an agent approached him. Alejandro wanted to turn himself in—just as many mothers and children have done over the course of the last year. Yet we have heard this week calls from some who would militarize our border and send in the National Guard.

I would say we need more resources for our Border Patrol agents. They have been taxed. They have certainly been putting in long hours since these numbers started to crest. But I don't think sending soldiers to meet people like Alejandro is the right solution to this crisis. The notion that lax border policies are somehow responsible for this latest crisis is not just a myth, it is a willful misrepresentation driven by politicians who would rather create a political issue than solve a real problem.

In a recent interview when asked to discuss whether sending in the National Guard would be an appropriate response to these problems at the core of the current crisis, Steven Blum—who was the former Chief of the National Guard Bureau under President George W. Bush—told the Washington Post:

> There may be many other organizations that might more appropriately be called upon. If you're talking about search and rescue, maintaining the rule of law or restoring conditions back to normal after a natural disaster or catastrophe, the Guard is superbly suited to that. I'm not so sure that what we're dealing with in scope and causation right now would make it the ideal choice.

That is a very polite statement. The fact is there are more Border Patrol agents today and more technology and resources at the border than any time in our Nation's entire history, and our Border Patrol is better prepared to deal with this issue than the National Guard.

Border Patrol apprehensions are today less than one-third of what they were at their peak, and this is because we have worked so hard and so effectively to secure the border. Those of us who represent border communities understand the challenges we face, but there are solutions before us that are pragmatic and bipartisan; that uphold our American values; that don't compromise them. Republican leaders should demand that their colleagues in the House of Representatives act to fix our broken immigration system. The Senate passed a bipartisan bill more than a year ago now, and passing that bill would make our immigration policies crystal clear to the world.

Additionally, passing the Senate's supplemental funding bill to address this crisis sends a clear signal that we are aggressively stemming the flow of children and families from Central America while continuing to treat those refugee children humanely under the law. This situation is an emergency and frankly we need emergency funding.

Passing the emergency supplemental would allow the Departments Of Homeland Security and Justice to deploy additional enforcement resources, including immigration judges, Immigration and Customs Enforcement attorneys, asylum officers, as well as expand the use of the alternatives to detention program. We are not arguing that every child should stay. Many, in fact, will be returned, but it will be after a Department of Justice judge has evaluated his or her case for asylum.

The supplemental would also help governments in Central America better control their borders and address the root causes of migration, including criminal gangs causing and profiting from this refugee crisis. A number of us today met with the Ambassadors from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, and it was very clear what was driving these issues. Without getting to those root causes, we won't be able to solve this crisis permanently.

The supplemental would provide much needed resources for U.S. Health and Human Services to ensure that these children receive medical screenings, housing, and counseling. Yet, instead of supporting this funding which seeks to meet these challenges head-on and protects these children, Republicans want to use the crisis to eliminate crucial child protection, punish some of our Nation's brightest students, and promote their border-enforcement-only agenda.

Before I close and hand the floor off to some of my colleagues, I would like to highlight some of the humanitarian work that is being done in my home State of New Mexico to address this crisis by telling the story of Project Oak Tree volunteer Orlando Antonio Jimenez.

Project Oak Tree is a short-term-stay shelter for Central American undocumented immigrants in Las Cruces run by the Catholic Diocese of Las Cruces. The shelter opened earlier this month after DHS established a temporary facility for undocumented parents and their children at FLETC—the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center campus—in Artesia, NM.

Orlando signed up to volunteer for Project Oak Tree on day one. He said he saw the immediate need to assist families facing this humanitarian crisis and he didn't think twice. He said his Christian values and belief in doing the right thing drove him to volunteer.

Orlando gets the opportunity to speak to almost every single person who arrives at Project Oak Tree and said that almost all of the stories he hears from mothers have some element of fear for their safety if they were to go back home. Orlando said he will never again say the words ''I am starving'' when he is hungry because he knows now what starving really means. He says that this experience has changed his life forever and that he will continue to help as much as he can.

I am grateful for Orlando's work in our community and for the many others in New Mexico who have stepped in and shown compassion and done all they can to help. Now it is Congress's turn to help. It is our turn to be part of the solution to this refugee crisis.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise on the floor together with my colleagues from New Mexico and Florida

to talk about the refugee crisis at our Nation's border. I appreciate Senator HEINRICH's leadership on this issue and his comments, and I am looking forward to hearing from Senator NELSON as well.

I would like to share a little bit of a personal story and amplify a few comments I made on the floor last Thursday about this challenge. I feel very personally connected to this issue and to the children who are coming to the border, children such as Alejandro, whose picture was such a stark reminder that we are dealing with little kids.

In 1980 and 1981, I was a student in law school, and I decided that I didn't know what I wanted to do with my life and I needed to figure it out. So what I did was I took a year off from law school and went to work with Jesuit missionaries in the town of El Progreso, Honduras. El Progreso, Honduras, was at that point a small community at the edge of banana plantations in a large agricultural valley in that country. I worked there as the principal of a school that taught kids to be plumbers and carpenters. I was dealing with youngsters in that neighborhood. Well, today El Progreso is in the epicenter of this problem. There have been many hundreds of kids from El Progreso who have come to the border this year.

San Pedro Sula—a nearby large city—is thought to be the murder capital of Honduras, which is now the murder capital of the world.

When I was in Honduras in 1980 and 1981, it was not an overly violent place. It was under military dictatorship. There were problems and challenges, and there was poverty, but refugees were coming into Honduras back then from El Salvador and Guatemala. They weren't leaving because there wasn't the everyday violence we see today. Honduras was a great ally of the United States, a great partner. Honduras was one of the original countries to which we sent Peace Corps volunteers, and I could see their influence all around the country.

But Honduras is a very different nation today. Honduras is now the murder capital of the world, has the highest homicide rate, which is about 40 times the homicide rate of the United States. This area, El Progreso and San Pedro Sula, is the epicenter of that. The United States had to pull Peace Corps volunteers out of the country a few years ago because it got too violent. The friends I have stayed in touch with over the years have informed me about what has been happening in their neighborhoods as the violence has increased.

We had a hearing last week where we had witnesses before us in the Foreign Relations Committee. We asked: Why are the kids leaving Honduras? Is it because their parents don't love them?

I mean, you think about family members. What would it take for a family to let a child take a trip of the kind Alejandro took? I can tell you from living in Honduras that parents love their kids just as much as people love their kids here in the United States. They are no different. To send your child thousands of miles—you would only do it for the most extreme reasons, and living in the murder capital of the world is that extreme reason. These kids are fleeing to the border because they are not safe.

What is the cause of the violence? I talked about this a little bit last week. The violence in Honduras, which is the murder capital of the world; El Salvador, which has the fourth highest homicide rate in the world; and Guatemala, which has the fifth highest homicide rate in the world—the violence is overwhelmingly driven by the drug trade. That was the evidence from our hearing last week as well.

Drug cartels have moved into Honduras and into these Central American countries. They get drugs from South America. They are shipping them to the United States because of the U.S. demand for illegal drugs, especially cocaine. The drug rate in Honduras is not about Hondurans using drugs. Hondurans don't use drugs to any significant degree at all. It is the illegal demand for drugs by people in the United States, largely, and the dollars we are sending down to buy drugs that have turned Honduras—that have turned San Pedro Sula and El Progreso into a massive drug cartel area where the combination of dollars and violence and fights between drug cartels puts little kids in harm's way. And then the gangs want them to join—we want to be the most powerful gangs because we want the money, and the way we do that is we recruit more kids.

So the root of this problem—the root of these refugees—is violence in their neighborhoods that is created by a drug trade that is driven by, sadly, U.S. demand for illegal drugs. That is what is happening. That is what is happening.

It has been heartbreaking to see a country that I care about and love and people whom I care about and love live in what is now the murder capital of the world largely because of the demand for illegal drugs coming from this Nation. So we are going to blame these kids? We are going to call them names or stand out in protest against them? Why? Because they live in a violent neighborhood? Because they want a better future? Because they look at the United States and think we may be a better and safer place for them? We shouldn't be blaming them. We shouldn't be blaming them because they are doing what any of us would do if we lived in a neighborhood where the violence was this extreme. If you have no other way to protect yourself, you are going to leave. We leave neighborhoods and we leave situations that are this bad.

The good news is—and Senator HEINRICH has laid this out—we don't have to stand by and say there is nothing we can do. There are solutions. We had a meeting with the three Ambassadors today, and the Foreign Relations Committee is going to have a meeting with the three Presidents of these Nations tomorrow, and we are going to talk about solutions. Let me run through six things we can do, and I will talk briefly about some of them. My colleagues have already dealt with some of them, and Senator NELSON will, but first let's start off with, how about not blaming the kids, No. 1. Let's not blame the kids. Let's not pretend they are crooks or criminals. Might there be some who are coming across the border who have criminal records? Sure. We can do a criminal record check and we can figure that out, and if that is the case, then we can deal with that. But these kids are leaving to stay alive.

My wife is a juvenile court judge. She used to say: I sometimes put a kid in jail to keep him alive.

The need to remain alive sometimes leads you to do extreme things, even to travel thousands of miles to come to a country where you think you might be more safe.

Let's begin by not blaming these kids. That is No. 1.

No. 2, we do need to implement the law. Senator HEINRICH talked about this law which was passed by a unanimous Congress, which was signed by President Bush, which was named after William Wilberforce. Do you know who William Wilberforce was? William Wilberforce was a great abolitionist English preacher who had interaction with the slave trade when he was in England and then came to realize that the slave trade was wrong and that religions had promoted the slave trade. He turned his life around and became a crusader against human trafficking, a crusader against the slave trade. That is what this law is that was put in place.

Let's not willy-nilly change the law. Let's implement the law. The law was a good law. In order to implement the law, we do need funding. Senator HEINRICH talked about the supplemental request that would be before the Senate. We have had some good discussions about it. I think we have put it in a place where it is now solid. We do need to support that supplemental request so that there will be ample services where these children can be evaluated. If they qualify for asylum, they should be able to stay, just as other refugees stay. If they have committed criminal activities, they can be sent back in order to enforce the law. It seems that is what folks are always saying around here—we should enforce the immigration laws. Let's enforce the William

Wilberforce law and make sure there are funds in place to do it.

The third thing we should do is get our priorities right about how we spend money. We are spending the money the wrong way in Central America. It is kind of amazing what we are doing. You would think we ought to be investing a little bit in the security of Central America just as we invest in rebuilding infrastructure in Afghanistan, just as we invest in things all around the world, and we should especially be doing it in Central America because it is the U.S. demand for illegal drugs that is creating the conditions of violence there. Doesn't that create some obligation to take a little bit of responsibility for helping Central American nations with security?

Well, we do spend money on the security in Central American nations, but the money has been dwindling every year—dropping, dropping, dropping. For 2015 the President's budget submission for the Central American Regional Security Initiative was $130 million, which is about $40 million each for the three countries. Compare that to what we will spend on border security in 2015, which is $17 billion. So $130 million for regional security in the nations these refugees are coming from and we are spending $17 billion on the border.

Instead of having to catch all these kids as they are coming across the border and spend time and expense on the legal processes, wouldn't it be a little better to try to take some of that money and spend more in Central America to help these three nations have stronger police forces, stronger judiciary systems? If we could deal with and reduce violence in the neighborhoods—and we have to do it in partnership with these nations. They have responsibilities as well. If we could do that, we could dramatically reduce the number of kids who are coming to the border. We are spending money the wrong way.

I am happy this supplemental has some significant funding to increase our security efforts in Central America. That is very critical. We have to work with the Central American governments to prosecute the coyotes. The coyotes are the smugglers who bring these kids to the border, and they often perpetrate violence and tell these kids: Hey, look, we can get you to the border, and you can stay forever. They will spin false messages about American law, and they do it because they are making money off these poor families.

Honduras is one of the poorest countries in the Western Hemisphere. For a parent to pay $4,000 or $5,000 to one of these smugglers for their kids to come here—that is usually more than their combined assets. They have to gather up money from all kinds of places to be able to do it. We need to prosecute the coyotes and these smugglers in Central America, and our effort is going to help these countries do that.

We need to make sure these countries spread the message that once the kids get here, they are not going to come and stay automatically. That work is being done, but more can be done.

I think probably the most important thing we can do here is to spend more money helping to solve the cause of the violence and the drug cartels in Central America. If we do that, we will see the number of kids who are fleeing neighborhoods such as the ones I lived in dramatically reduced.

The fourth thing we can do—and Senator NELSON is going to talk about this, so I will not get into it—is interdict more drugs. If you want to do something tough, why send the National Guard to the border? These kids are not sneaking across the border. They are turning themselves in to the first person they see. They know if they see someone with a U.S. uniform on, they won't be killed. They feel safe. We don't need more National Guard at the border because the kids are already turning themselves in. But if you want to be tough, how about more funds for the American military so they can interdict more drugs before they get to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador? Senator NELSON will go over that.

Fifth, we need to do immigration reform, and Senator HEINRICH mentioned that. We passed immigration reform in this Chamber 13 months ago. There were all kinds of stories about it. There has been no action in the House—not even bills out of committee, much less from the House floor—on immigration reform.

This morning the ambassadors told us the uncertain status of whether there is going to be immigration reform is an issue. What is going to happen? Something passed, but maybe it won't pass in the other House. When there is uncertainty, it enables these coyotes to go in and kind of market and say something is going to happen. They will say: We can get you to the United States, and you can stay.

The faster we pass immigration reform and create certainty, the easier it will be to deliver a message that everybody in Central America will understand about what our rules are and what they are not and who is allowed to come in and who is not.

Finally—and this is the hardest one of all—we have to figure out better strategies to reduce the illegal use of drugs, especially cocaine, in the United States. As long as there is this massive demand for illegal drugs such as cocaine in countries such as Honduras that have poor budgets, there will be powerful drug cartels that will use them as staging grounds to try to supply the United States drug demand.

We sometimes hear people talk about drug and cocaine use as a victimless crime. They say: It is a victimless crime; I am not hurting anybody. I may use drugs, but I am not hurting anybody.

This is not a victimless crime. The ones who are using recreational, illegal drugs transited through the Americas are the ones who are creating victims. They are creating the murder capital of the world, and they are the reason kids are fleeing their homes and trying to find safety in the arms of a Border Patrol agent on the border of the United States.

We need new strategies to tackle a huge and overwhelming demand for illegal drugs in the United States. Two weeks ago the President's drug control policy key administrator, Michael Botticelli, went to Roanoke, VA, to roll out the national drug control strategy. He chose Roanoke because Virginia, like a lot of States, has had significant problems—whether it is heroin or prescription drugs. He also chose Roanoke because it has been a place where there have been strong efforts to come together to tackle illegal drug use.

Last Friday I went to Roanoke and spoke at a drug court graduation—people who were addicted to drugs but worked with social workers and folks from local courts to break the bonds of that addiction, the bonds that, just as they are addicted to them, also put people in chains in countries such as Honduras by turning their neighborhoods into violent drug-controlled shooting galleries.

We have to be creative and strategic in dealing with the demands for illegal drugs. It is sad that these kids are fleeing their country because of the violence that in some ways has its roots here. The drug demand in this country is at the origin of the violence that is chasing these kids out of their neighborhoods, and that gives us a moral responsibility to try and tackle this problem and solve it.

I thank my colleagues for their strong support for the supplemental appropriation we will take up. I look forward to working with them. We can solve this problem. We can solve it if we do the right things.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that this is a very substantive discussion. This Senator is enormously impressed with the quality of the commentary from the two who have preceded me and those who will follow. We are addressing the treatment of this issue in a comprehensive way.

I was so glad the Senator from Virginia mentioned the initial legislation from years ago protecting children once they reached the border is named after William Wilberforce, a Parliamentarian in England in the late 1700s

and early 1800s whose sole mission—it took him 20 years as a politician and a member of Parliament—changed the course of history because he singlehandedly, through his legislative efforts, abolished the English slave trade, and it changed the course of the history of the world.

When we think of that kind of quality of parliamentary endeavor, it is time for the Senate to rise to this occasion in what is considered a humanitarian crisis but is so complicated as to the reason it is causing hundreds and thousands of children to appear at our border.

Right off the bat this law says we are going to treat these children in a humanitarian way. They are going to get medical treatment and a safe place to stay.

When Senator HEINRICH showed the picture of the little boy named Alejandro—doesn't your heart go out to him? Taking care of a little boy like that is at the heart of America. We don't want all of these children coming to our border, begging for entrance.

Listen to these Senators as they dissect the problem of what we should do to eliminate the problem in the first place.

I want to take one snippet of what Senator KAINE said. Why is Honduras the murder capital of the world? Why are the other two Central American countries—El Salvador and Guatemala—ranked so high as murder capitals of the world? Why is it that next door in Nicaragua and Belize their children are not coming to our border in great numbers? The same thing is true with Costa Rica and Panama. Why those three countries? Because the drug lords producing the drugs in South America are sending huge shipments by boat—2 and 3 tons of cocaine per boat—through the Caribbean to the East or the Pacific to the West. Where are they going? They are going to those three countries.

Basically, most of those drug shipments are getting through. Once they get to those Central American countries—since the economic power is among the drug dealers and the drug lords—they can buy off everybody else. If you don't do what they say, you are dead.

When a young man gets close to becoming a teenager, his parents are confronted with a situation of either joining one of these criminal gangs, which is interrelated with the drug lords, or they have to accept the fact that they are going to be attending their child's funeral because he will be killed if he doesn't join them.

The third choice they have comes from what they hear from these coyotes when they say: You are going to have free entrance into the United States.

What do you think a parent is going to do? Because the big shipments of drugs—primarily by boat to the east and the west—has corrupted the whole system in those three Central American countries, what should the United States be doing?

We have had very successful drug interdiction programs in the past. We have been very successful at it. We now have a four-star Marine general—General Kelly, who is the head of the United States Southern Command—who has a task force in Key West, the Joint Interagency Task Force South, watching their radar and aerial surveillance but doesn't have the assets to go after 75 percent of those drug shipments. If we would give General Kelly and the joint task force the additional Navy assets—that is Navy boats with helicopters or Coast Guard cutters with helicopters—to interdict those shipments instead of letting 75 percent of them go, we would get to the root cause of the whole problem of why the children are showing up on our border.

The big shipments of drugs have completely corrupted the societies of those three countries, leading to all of the ramifications of the children and others going north.

Once those big shipments of 2 or 3 tons of cocaine in a boat land in one of those Central American countries, they break them up into small packages. It is then transported by individuals, and it is very hard to interdict those drug shipments as they go north through the rest of Central America, Mexico, and to the border. The place to get them is when they are the large shipments. There are many more of these shipments coming by boat than on airplanes. As a result, what we see is this crisis.

I will close by saying my wife Grace and I have been involved through a Christian charity in trying to help some of the poor villagers have hope, particularly in Honduras in this case. I am not going to say the name of the village because I don't want to alert the bad guys that this is a little village where they are getting attention, an education, nourishment, and some health care. More than that, they are getting the love of Americans. So it is a painful personal picture for us to see what has happened to that little country.

Finally, the President's request of over $3 billion does not include, as we learned in an all-Senators meeting last week with three or four cabinet secretaries and other agencies represented, funds for additional Coast Guard cutters or Navy ships or the movement of those Coast Guard cutters or Navy ships with their helicopters from other places. I hope, by the effort Senator HEINRICH has exerted today, with many of us coming here and speaking about this, that we are going to start to get this message through as to what needs to be done to address this crisis.

Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to share my heart, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues sitting here before me, especially Senator HEINRICH, who invited us to partner in this dialogue today. I wish right now just to express my frustration. We see on our television sets and we hear throughout the American landscape rhetoric, posturing, and demagoguery that does not reflect the truth of who we are as a nation, and it obscures the facts of what is happening on our southern border right now as a country. We have thousands upon thousands of children in the most vulnerable and innocent stage of their lives showing up at our border. I hear ugly rhetoric about just turning them around and sending them back—rhetoric that does not reflect who we are as a nation, the history of our communities or the laws of this land.

If I may, for a brief time I wish to speak just to reflect on the fact of why these children are showing up. Why are they coming to our borders? As the senior Senator from New Jersey has said clearly: This is not a case of ordinary people seeking better economic opportunities. If this was just about poverty, then we would see people coming from all the nations in that area. To be specific, El Salvador's poverty rate is 34.5 percent. Belize's poverty rate is actually higher at 41.3 percent. To make a journey from a country with a lower poverty rate to a country with a higher poverty rate, because that is where many of these refugees are going—to Belize—begs a closer examination of the true drivers of this migration, because it is not poverty. It is not people simplistically looking for economic opportunity. We are seeing countries in addition to America facing the same problem: Children from these three nations escaping severe persecution, sexual assault, rape, violence, and murder are not just coming to the borders of the United States to escape this persecution but going to other nations in that area.

For example, combined, Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize documented a 435-percent increase in the number of asylum applications logged by individuals from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. In this area of our globe, where there is such violence and persecution in these three countries, it is driving people out not just to the United States, as some people allege because of the policy of the Obama administration; these are people escaping persecution to countries all throughout the region. This is about violence. This is about heinous crimes. This is about a drug war. This is about cartels carrying out the most egregious of human acts, evidencing the depravity and the evil that so cuts

at the conscience of humanity, so that people are escaping to wherever they can go.

We in the United States have a long and noble history that when there are places on our globe that face this level of crisis, we respond, and we are a part of an international community where our peer nations have shown that history as well. Here in North America, we know allies such as Canada have done incredible deeds when there is crisis, violence, war, and persecution—mass rapes going on. There have been responses from our northern neighbor.

In 1972 when Uganda's President Idi Amin announced the Ugandan Asians were to be expelled, Canada set up a refugee office and, by the end of 1973, more than 7,000 Uganda Asians arrived in Canada.

Germany, for example, right now currently is accepting 20,000 Syrian refugees. As I speak right now, Jordan and Lebanon are host to over 2 million Syrian refugees, and we as a nation are encouraging our allies in the Middle East to be there for those refugees when they come to those borders. That is the international community. In America, we set the standard. We are the leaders globally for compassion, for humanity, for charity. I am proud that this tradition, which is two centuries old in America, can continue under Democrats and Republicans. It has not been a partisan football.

In 2008, under the Bush administration, in the face of Burma's humanitarian crisis, this country, with the courage of its compassion, resettled thousands of Burmese refugees, admitting as many as 18,000 of them. President Bush signed the legislation to ease the restrictions that prevented ethnic minorities involved in that struggle against the Burmese regime—eased restrictions for them entering the United States. President Bush spoke eloquently during that time about American compassion. He spoke about American heritage and American tradition. He said, quite poignantly, I thank those of you Americans and those around the country—all of us—who have opened up our arms and said: ''Welcome to America. How can we help you settle in?''

This is who we are as a nation. And when we have children—innocents—escaping violence and terror and crimes against humanity, where we as a nation are not even fully relieved of culpability for what is going on and when our Nation's drug consumption is helping to drive that violence, we have a responsibility. That is who we are. That is our truth. We know this. We are a nation of people who came from persecution, who came from famine, who came from religious war. We are a nation settled by those who were yearning to be free.

Now, I know the Statue of Liberty well because New Jersey has its back. When I travel around the State, I often get a great view of her noble torch. I know it is not down along our southern border, but the ideals of the Statue of Liberty still hold true:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

I am grateful and support Senator MIKULSKI's leadership and the push to address this crisis by stepping up as a nation, by following the letter of the law and providing due process for these young people who have come to our borders, so that we can evaluate them and see those who have a justifiable claim for asylum and to see that we honor our tradition and our law and give them a place in our country that is safe and secure from the terror and the violence that is going on in those three countries. It cannot be acceptable that we use our resources now simply to expedite the return of thousands of children into that conflict zone, which is more dangerous now than at the height of civilian dangers during the Iraq war.

We must as Americans follow that great tradition. We must as Americans now do the right thing by innocent children: evaluate them with our resources, expedite the judicial process to understand clearly who is meritorious of asylum. And we should invest our resources in making sure the conflicts in those nations are abated so this crisis ends.

I say clearly: In America we stand for something now as we have time and time again. We must garner our resources and, most importantly, our compassion, which is the truth of who we say we are, and make sure we take care of these vulnerable children and make sure we don't turn them around into a dangerous situation. It is time we show internationally that when there is crisis, America stands and shows leadership and does the right thing.

With that, I yield the floor for the senior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, first of all, let me say I am really moved by Senator BOOKER's passion, Senator NELSON's clarity of thought, and by my other colleagues who have joined us. I am compelled to join them because we do have a crisis, but we also have, in my mind, a clear moral and legal compass we need to follow.

We have a refugee crisis on our southern border, which I argue requires an emergency response domestically and the urgent recalibration of our foreign policy. Why do I say that? Because, as I have argued for several years in the Foreign Relations Committee, the continuous cuts we have had in the programs that are in our national interests, in our national security, were going to bring us a day in which we would rue the consequences of those cuts.

So here we are with Honduras having the No. 1 murder rate per capita in the world, and the other two Central American countries from which these children are fleeing in the top five in the world. As Senator NELSON spoke so eloquently, there is the whole question of the narcotics trafficking taking place, using this as a via to the United States where the demand is, and the total inability of these countries to deal with entities that have more money and very often have more firepower than any of the national governments that are engaged. Then add to that the dynamic and explosive growth of gangs. I am talking about gangs armed and fueled with money in a symbiotic relationship with the drug traffickers. That creates a challenge. In one of these countries it went from 600 to 40,000 members of a gang. This isn't about some far-off place; this is right here in our own front yard, in our hemisphere, a very relatively short distance. Unless we deal with the root causes of these problems, there will be no resources or any change in law that is going to ultimately meet the challenge of those who flee because to stay is to die.

So that is the challenge we have before us. We have to deal with that challenge on our southern border, and our distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee has fashioned a package I think is balanced and seeks to do that. But as we deal with this refugee crisis, in my view, it is equally important that we not rush to change our laws in a way that strips children of the very rights for which we have been known as a country. I am not even talking about the 2008 law; I am talking about the very essence of our immigration law for decades that has asylum as a fundamental pillar.

It is imperative to understand this is a desperate effort by desperate parents to do what any parent would do to protect their child from violence and the threat of death. Imagine the circumstances a parent must be in to send an 8-year-old on a treacherous journey of 2,000 miles where all things can happen to them in the hope—in the hope—they can arrive and make a claim for asylum, but not knowing whether their child will actually be able to arrive alive. That is some dramatic choice, but those are choices facing these parents.

These children are facing tremendous threats: towns and schools controlled by narcotic traffickers, gangs threatening to kill them, rapes and manufacturers.

In the Foreign Relations Committee recently, we held a hearing and I noted

a piece that was written in the New York Times by Pulitzer Prize-winning author Sonia Nazario, who testified before the committee. This was to give the Senate the sense of what we are talking about.

A young boy named Christian Omar Reyes, a sixth grader—his father was murdered by gangs while working as a security guard. Three people he knows have been murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a corner near his house in the first 2 weeks of this year. A girl his age was beaten, had a hole cut in her throat, her body left in a ravine across from his house. Christian said: It is time to flee.

Carlos Baquedana, a 14-year-old who worked in a dump picking scrap metal when he was a boy, making a dollar or two a day, when he was 9 years old, barely escaped two drug traffickers who were trying to rape him. When he was 10, the drug traffickers pressured him to try drugs and join a gang or die. He has known eight people who were murdered—three killed in front of him. In one case he watched as two hit-men brazenly shot two young brothers execution style. Going to school is even too dangerous for him now.

These stories are, unfortunately, not unique. They are tragic stories of life-changing experiences that too many children face in Central America every day—children such as Christian and Carlos whose stories are unknown but no less tragic.

Let me take a moment to repeat that I strongly oppose changing existing law. The answer is not to repeal the law that keeps these children safe and gives them an opportunity—that is all the law gives them, an opportunity—to determine whether their status here can be adjusted under asylum. The answer is not to deny these children their day in court and send them back to very probable death. But those who want to repeal the 2008 law would be doing exactly that.

If we provide the funding the government needs, the administration has the authority to deal with the crisis in a safe and humane way without turning our back on the rule of law that we take pride in as a nation.

Antitrafficking organizations have explained to me that this trafficking law was designed by both Republicans and Democrats in broad bipartisan efforts to give special protections to children who cannot adequately represent themselves and who often do not self-identify as victims of abuse, crime or human trafficking.

Congress sought to provide special protections for those who have fled thousands of miles in recognition of the fact that a larger percentage of these children may have very compelling and legitimate claims.

Unfortunately, the Border Patrol's cursory review of Mexican children's claims often results in a failure to identify children who are at risk of persecution or trafficking, according to the U.N. Commissioner for Refugees. Extending this type of superficial screening to Central American children would certainly mean serious abuse or death upon their return.

We can keep this important antitrafficking law and at the same time address the situation on the border. Let me explain how the administration already—already—has the authority to control this crisis.

Critics have complained that the 2008 trafficking law requires children to be released into the community, but what the law actually says is that children need to be held in the manner that is in the ''best interests of the child.'' In this situation, where we are dealing with an influx of thousands of children, it is clearly in the best interests of these children to hold them in a safe and clean shelter rather than returning them to face possible death or quickly releasing them into the hands of a sponsor who may not be properly vetted. Failure to properly screen these children could result in children being returned to their very traffickers.

Critics have also complained that deportation hearings do not take place for years after the children arrive and that this creates an incentive for children to come to the United States. But the law allows the Justice Department to hold hearings much more quickly—without denying due process—by moving recently arriving children and families to the front of the line for hearings before a judge.

As the Justice Department testified last week before the Appropriations Committee hearing, that is exactly what they are doing—surging resources and expediting full hearings.

This expedited process that still protects due process would send a signal to the parents in Central America that children without valid claims—and there will be a significant universe that will not have a valid claim and will be deported—will not be able to stay in the United States. But at the same time we protect the rights of legitimate refugees and trafficking victims.

So while not every single child apprehended at the border will have a valid claim to stay in the country, and many will be deported, we have a moral and a legal obligation to keep them safe until their status is resolved.

The answer is not to repeal the law that protects them but to enforce it and to provide the administration with the resources it requested to address both the domestic and international aspects of this crisis.

This problem was not created overnight, and it will not be solved overnight. But the solution is not to abandon our values and the rule of law that we uphold as an example to other nations so every child will be safe wherever they may live. If we do this now, I can tell you, I do not know how we will have any authority to look at any other country in the world and say to them: You must accept refugees from Syria, you must accept refugees from Congo, the Dominican Republic, you must accept refugees from Haiti. The list goes on and on.

There is a reason this law was passed. It was passed to say if you are fleeing 2,000 miles to try to come to the United States, there may be a greater probability that you have a real case to be made for asylum because you have a credible fear for the loss of your life.

As I hear those who advocate for the rule of law, I say you are right. The rule of law means you do not undermine the law or change it when you do not want to ultimately live under it. You obey it. You obey it.

If you flee 2,000 miles because you were told by the gangs to join or die or if you were raped and you flee 2,000 miles never to experience that tragic and traumatic set of circumstances again, you have a very compelling case.

So let me close by saying the fact is there are some who are exploiting this issue for political gain, some who could not even see their way to cast a vote or to allow a vote on the type of comprehensive immigration reform the Senate passed on a broad, bipartisan basis in which both border control and human trafficking and all of these other issues we are now facing would have had the resources and would be addressed.

I also find it incredible to see the Governor of Texas saying he is going to send the National Guard to the border. What is the National Guard going to do in what is otherwise a Federal law enforcement obligation with Border Patrol agents who ultimately are obviously interdicting these young people but they are actually turning themselves over to them. What is the National Guard, with rifles, going to do at the Texas border that the Border Patrol cannot do themselves?

This supplemental bill is almost entirely for enforcement of the law. I know Republicans have been saying for years they want more money for enforcement of immigration law. Well, folks, here it is. Here it is. I cannot believe with the resources that are going to the very States that say they face a challenge, there will be those who will vote against it. I cannot believe that just because the President is proposing it, they cannot ultimately find their way to vote for the money that is going to go largely to the States that face the most critical challenge at this time.

So that is what our immigration debate has come to. We began this Congress with an overwhelming bipartisan vote in favor of commonsense immigration reform, and here we are unwilling to even provide something I have never

voted for but will—strictly enforcement funding. We have Republicans calling for DREAMers to be deported as part of this bill in the House of Representatives and a rollback of legislation to protect small children from human trafficking. That is what we have come to.

Rolling back this law, which passed with broad bipartisan support in both Houses of the Congress and was signed by a Republican President, is not something I can personally accept, and I will use the procedures of the Senate—I hope with others who feel the same—if that is the choice that has to come before us, not to permit that to happen.

The President has the authority to control this crisis already. Let's give him the resources to do the job, and let us, in the process of doing that, not create a dark day in our Nation's history which we will regret for years to come.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise as the chair of the Appropriations Committee that will be proposing the emergency supplemental bill. This bill will be introduced tonight, and I want to briefly describe it.

First of all, what does the emergency supplemental bill do? It deals with three crises; one, it will fight wildfires with additional resources as to what is going on in our own country; second, it will help Israel be able to continue to man its Iron Dome antiballistic missile system, as has been under siege by Hamas rockets; and, third, it will help be a downpayment on resolving the crisis of the children arriving at the border.

To be specific, it will fight wildfires to the tune of $615 million. Right now there are 127 wildfires burning in our Western States, covering four or more States.

Second, it will strengthen Israel's Iron Dome and add $225 million to replenish the antimissile defense system, saving lives by shooting down Hamas rockets, helping our essential ally Israel.

Third, it will deal with the crisis of our children arriving at the border, and that will be $2.7 billion—$1 billion less than what the President asked for. It will care for the children. It will provide food, shelter, and other needs. It will resolve children's asylum status, and it will have enforcement money to break up organized crime cartels, the traffickers, and the smugglers.

The total for all three of those will be $3.57 billion.

I agree with President Obama. This is an emergency supplemental. These funds are designated as emergency spending because they meet the criteria set in the Budget Control Act of 2011 that the needs must be urgent, temporary, unforeseen, and prevent loss of life. That is exactly what we are facing.

What does it mean to designate the funds as emergency spending? It means no offsets. So we do not take existing funds where we are either defending the Nation or helping America's families to pay for the spending in this bill.

The needs are urgent.

Firefighting needs are needed now. The Forest Service will run out of money in August. Fires are burning Oregon, Washington, and other States. We need to be able to provide the support to fight those fires and help our neighbors in our Western States.

Iron Dome. The funding is needed now to replenish a key part of the missile defense system, replace Iron Dome artillery. Israel has already used a great deal of its assets dealing with the more than 2,000 Hamas rockets aimed at Israel. Israel has the right to self-defense. We are helping them have what they need to intercept 90 percent of the rockets.

Funds to deal with unaccompanied children crossing our border are needed now. If we do not do this, the Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement will run out of money in August, and the Department of Homeland Security Border Patrol will run out in early September. It does not mean that our Border Patrol agents or ICE agents will stop working, but it will mean the Department of Homeland Security will have to take money from other Homeland Security needs to keep these agencies doing their jobs.

Also, Health and Human Services will run out of money to house children in August. It means that children will stay longer at the border. They will be in inappropriate holding cells. It also means Border Patrol agents will be taking care of them, rather than child welfare social workers. If you want to use Border Patrol agents to take care of children, that is one thing. I think they should be defending our border and we should have social workers taking care of the children.

Our approach is sensible. It meets human needs. While we acknowledge a tight budget situation, we fund only that which is needed in calendar year 2014. This is very important. It funds only what is needed in calendar year 2014. It defers $1 billion of the President's request until 2015, subject to Congressional action that the need be validated. We hope by 2015 the surge will have diminished because of the prevention and intervention issues we are dealing with. But make no mistake, the funds we say we need we really do need.

This bill defers funds until next year, because I am deeply concerned if we do not follow the Senate number, the House will make draconian cuts that impact the care of the children, and also being penny wise and pound foolish, they are going to stop our ability to go after the smugglers and the coyotes. So we do not want to go after the children, we want to go after those people who are exploiting the children and trying to recruit them into despicable activities.

We also do not want radical riders that will weaken our refugee and human trafficking laws or accelerate deportation of children without due process under existing law. We do not want a backdoor version of bad immigration reform.

This bill is only a money bill. It does not include immigration legislation. How that will be addressed on the Senate floor will be decided by the leadership on both sides. The challenges to this request are many. We have made changes to the President's request. We have included more money for immigration judges and more money for additional legal representation for children so we can determine their legal status and determine whether they have the right to seek asylum status.

We also have robust enforcement against gangs and organized crime. Seven organized crime syndicates are operating in these three Central American countries now. We are talking about more guns at the border. We need more law enforcement and the help of the United States going after the real bums and scums, which is these drug dealers who recruit these children, murder children before other children's eyes.

You know what. We also know that when we work in a crisis and we do urgent supplemental efforts, we sometimes waste money. We can only look at some of the other agencies where we have done this. This bill includes strong oversight from the inspectors general to make sure the taxpayers' money is well spent, to protect our border, protect the children, and go after smugglers, coyotes, and human traffickers.

The best way to make sure the surge of children is slowed is not by rewriting refugee and human trafficking laws, it is by making it harder on these crooks and criminals.

I am going to conclude by saying this: We already have 60,000 children at the border. This crisis is not at our border, however. The crisis is in their home countries: Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala.

These children are truly fleeing violence. I have been down to the border. I have talked to these children, listened to children who faced sexual assault, the recruitment into human trafficking, gang intimidation, persecution, threats of grisly physical actions directed against them.

What is happening in these countries? When you listen to the cries of the children, I can tell you, in these countries there is a war on children. We cannot turn our backs on these

children who are seeking refuge. We need to pass this supplemental and we need to deal with the violence that is coming out of Central America; that if we do not deal with it there, it is not that the children will come to our borders, it is that the violence and the gangs will come to our borders.

I hope when the leader introduces the bill later on this evening we can proceed and debate this with due diligence. I look forward to chairing the committee as we go through this process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a presentation and colloquy with my fellow Republican colleagues for up to 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. CORKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2650 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. CORKER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2262

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a number of my colleagues to ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2262, which is the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill; that the motion to commit be withdrawn; that amendments Nos. 3023 and 3025 be withdrawn; that the pending substitute amendment be agreed to; that there be no other amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that if the bill is passed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 371, S. 2282, which is the passage of the Keystone Pipeline, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, but no later than Thursday, July 31, 2014; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; finally, that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

What I am basically asking is that we get a vote on Shaheen-Portman and if that moves, that we then get a vote on the Keystone Pipeline—something our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been talking about for months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would propose to the Senator from New Hampshire an alternative. Before I do that, I would say the biggest problem we have is the inability of the Senate to process amendments in the normal order. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire is sympathetic to that.

If we could just have an opportunity to offer and vote on amendments, I have every confidence this piece of legislation would have been long passed. But somehow we are stuck. And it is not just the minority party that is limited on opportunities to offer ideas to help improve legislation and to get votes. It is even our friends who are in the majority. I can only imagine what it is like to feel like: I am in the majority, and I can't even get votes on my amendments or my legislation passed.

So I ask unanimous consent that the only amendments in order to S. 2262 be five amendments from the Republican side related to energy policy, each with a 60-vote threshold on adoption of each amendment. I further ask that following the disposition of these five amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection of the Senator from Rhode Island is heard.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to speak on these two commonsense pieces of legislation.

My dear friends Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN—Democrat and Republican—have worked so hard in a bipartisan way, which we don't always see anymore on the floor here or over on the House side. It is a shame. People tell me about how things used to be. I have been here not quite 4 years, and I haven't seen it yet. I am still waiting for it to happen. But we have a bill, the Shaheen-Portman bill. It is basically a bill that creates jobs, saves money, makes significant strides toward a more energy-efficient nation, which we should be.

I am from an energy-producing State, the great State of West Virginia. My dear friend Senator HEITKAMP is from the great State of North Dakota, which is a tremendous energy-producing State. We believe in energy policies. We believe we should be using everything we have to make sure we have the economic engine so we can compete globally and in a very competitive way.

With that being said, this is the low-hanging fruit. This is truly low-hanging fruit. And we all agree—why shouldn't we pass a piece of legislation that basically we all benefit—all 50 States will benefit. The bill will put us on a path toward a more sustainable future. It has broad support, as we can see. And our colleague Senator CORNYN from Texas will tell you that if it got voted on, it would pass overwhelmingly. Now, that is hard for me, coming from West Virginia where there is a lot of common sense.

People say: Well, if it would pass, why don't you just vote on it and pass it?

That is what I am saying. It is a shame that politics has trumped good policy in this body and in this city, and we have to get back to some order of common sense.

I am a tremendous supporter of this piece of legislation. I thank Senator SHAHEEN for all the hard work she has done. She has not given up. She will not give up. And that is what it takes—the tenacity to make sure a good piece of legislation which not only helps the great people of New Hampshire, it helps all of us. That is what I am looking forward to.

Then we look at the Keystone Pipeline. I have never seen a piece of legislation that makes more sense than this piece of legislation, the Keystone Pipeline. When I first heard about this, people said: Senator MANCHIN, what do you think about this?

The only thing I can say is that in West Virginia we would rather buy from our friends than our enemies. So we are going to buy the oil. The oil is going to be sold somewhere in the world. Why shouldn't we have access to that? Why shouldn't we have control of that? Why shouldn't we benefit from the jobs? We are talking 20,000 direct jobs during construction, 118,000 indirect and spinoff jobs after construction, contributing $20 billion of economic stimulus to the United States. Every State, including my State of West Virginia—New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island—we are all going to benefit.

It is something we find almost reprehensible, for us not to be able to vote on legislation. And I understand the amendment process. I understand all of that. But when we have very clearly defined pieces of legislation that really create good policy for all of America, that is something for which sometimes maybe we push the politics aside, we vote on the policies and the contents of these other pieces of legislation, which I know West Virginia would be happy

for me to vote on, and I will be in very much support of these two pieces.

With that, I thank Senator SHAHEEN for her hard work. I thank her for her not-give-up attitude, that New Hampshire commitment she has. She is going to work and fight. We are going to be right behind her and work with our bipartisan friends on the other side. Senator PORTMAN has committed the same way. So we hope we can get something reasonably done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am standing with my good friend from the great State of West Virginia, certainly a tremendous legislator and former Governor and someone who knows how to get things done, Senator SHAHEEN.

I know what is happening. I think I have learned at least that much since I have been here, about the rules and how things work. But I also see this body through the eyes of an American citizen.

I see two pieces of legislation—one the Keystone Pipeline. The vast majority of people in this country support moving forward with the Keystone Pipeline. It is a critical piece of North American infrastructure. It was critical in the last discussion we had about the disruption and about the horrible conditions in the Middle East. If we haven't learned the lesson, we need to build out our resources right here among our friendly allies in the form of Canada and use our own resources here and then have the ability to use that new energy development for soft power, to actually begin to have a meaningful geopolitical discussion that doesn't involve an addiction to foreign oil.

So we think about Keystone Pipeline, and we think about the relationship we have with Canada and the jobs that could be created, but mainly we think about developing the infrastructure that is absolutely essential to the development of our country and the development of our energy resources.

We can talk about fuel sources—and that is what my great friend from West Virginia just talked about, having a policy that truly includes all of the above—all of the above, not picking and choosing. Let the market decide. Let's make sure that it is diverse, that we have every opportunity to develop everything we are going to develop. But we have to move that energy, and the Keystone Pipeline is example 1.

A lot of the disagreement about the Keystone Pipeline has nothing to do with the pipeline itself. It has to do with the oil sands development up in Canada.

When we pick and choose winners and decide we are not going to vote on something, the American people just shake their head and say this makes so much sense, so why isn't the Congress voting.

Then let's take the second part of a solid energy policy—''all of the above'' but also conservation, also energy efficiency, also making the best use in a great American tradition, a conservative American tradition of making sure we have the best energy efficiency in the world and having a piece of legislation that guarantees that and creates jobs as a result and saves money for schools and saves money for businesses.

All of this makes so much sense, and the American public knows it makes sense. Yet this body cannot find a way forward to take a vote. How frustrating is that?

It is frustrating for us here in this body, but it is more frustrating for the American public that watches this display of inability to move forward on critical pieces of public policy that would make a difference not only for our future but the future of the young people here whom I see every day, the future of the young people in my State, knowing that we need to absolutely have an energy policy that works for the future, that is diverse, that recognizes the importance of energy efficiency, and that moves energy.

We know we have a huge number of people in this body who support the Keystone Pipeline. Do we have 60 votes? We will find out. Let's take a vote. We know there is tremendous bipartisan support not only for Keystone but for energy efficiency, for the Shaheen-Portman bill. Let's take a vote. Let's actually demonstrate to the American public that we can move forward on what are literally no-brainers, things that absolutely make sense. And those of us who support the Keystone Pipeline, we will find out. We will find out if we can pass it.

Think about this: We have a bill here that mandates we approve that little bit of crossing into the United States of America, which is the only way the Federal Government really gets involved in it, is because it is coming from a foreign country—approves that. Maybe we win, maybe we lose, but we will know where we are. The administration has taken 6 years to evaluate the Keystone Pipeline—longer than it took us to fight World War II. There is something dramatically wrong with that. So frustration builds. We know we need to move on the Keystone Pipeline. We need to have a strong vote. Let's take that vote. Let's take the vote on Shaheen-Portman.

It is a critical piece of legislation—well-thought-out—and comes right out of committee where lots of amendments were offered, where there was the ability to have a dialogue. It comes about the right way with the bill sponsors standing on the floor answering questions and debating what the bill does. Yet because of this impasse—because of whatever happens behind closed doors that the American public doesn't see—they only look at what they see happening in the debate here and wonder why.

I support Senator SHAHEEN in her efforts to promote this bill. This will not be the first time we have come and asked this. We will continue to do everything we can to move a vote forward on Shaheen-Portman, to move a vote forward on the Keystone Pipeline, and start getting the work done for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Before my colleague leaves I wish to thank Senator HEITKAMP for her support, not just for Shaheen-Portman but for a resolution to getting a vote on our energy efficiency legislation that I have worked on for 3½ years with our colleague Senator ROB PORTMAN from Ohio but also for the impasse that would break around the vote for the Keystone Pipeline as well. Pairing the two would allow us to see where we stand on both of these issues.

I appreciate my colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, coming to the floor because he and Senator HEITKAMP have talked about the fact that we have to look at a variety of areas of energy if we are going to address our future energy needs in this country. There is new urgency to energy efficiency right now. A recent study just came out that shows the United States ranks 13th out of the world's largest 16 economies in energy efficiency. So that study analyzed the world's largest economies that cover more than 81 percent of the global gross domestic product and posts 71 percent of the global electricity. What it found is we are severely lagging behind other countries in our use of energy efficiency. This legislation, the Energy Efficiency and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman, is a way for us to address the deficit we currently have in this country.

We have heard from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy that by 2030 this legislation would create 192,000 domestic jobs. That is nothing to sneeze at, at a time when our economy is still recovering from the recession. It would save consumers and businesses $16 billion a year—again, real savings in a way that is important to consumers and businesses. It would reduce carbon pollution at a time when we know pollution is affecting our environment and we are seeing a record number of disasters. It would be the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road. Our legislation does this without any mandates, without raising the deficit. In fact, we see a very small savings of about $12 million in the legislation.

It addresses the building sector where we use about 40 percent of our

energy. It addresses the industrial manufacturing sector that consumes more energy than any other sector of our domestic economy, and it addresses the Federal Government where we use more energy than any other entity in our economy; 93 percent of the energy is used by our military. Clearly, energy efficiency is something that would benefit all of us.

There are 10 bipartisan amendments that have been incorporated into this legislation. It is the product of 3½ years of work. It has been endorsed by hundreds—literally hundreds and hundreds of business groups, of businesses, organizations, everything from the Natural Resources Defense Council to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers, the International Union of Painters.

This is legislation that makes sense. We just heard Senator CORNYN on the floor saying he thought there was support to get this legislation done. I think we need to figure out how we can come together. We don't have much time left before we go out in August to go back to our home States. This would be a great bipartisan effort to go out on at the end of July, to be able to go home and say to people across this country that we worked out a deal that passed this energy efficiency legislation, that we got a vote on the Keystone Pipeline—let the chips fall where they may—that we addressed one of the biggest challenges facing this country, which is energy, and what we are going to do about our energy future.

I certainly hope that in the remaining time between now and the beginning of August we can come together, find some sort of resolution to address this issue and get this legislation done. We know the House has said they are willing to take it up. They are interested in seeing some action on energy efficiency. Now is an opportune time to do that.

I am disappointed by today's objections, but as Senator HEITKAMP said so well, we are not going to give up. We are going to continue to try and move this issue and do what is in the best interests of the people of this country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to ask unanimous consent, first of all, to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to highlight an important piece of legislation that was just voted out of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—known by the acronym HELP. We voted out of committee today S. 2539, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014. Senator HATCH and I introduced S. 2539 to reauthorize existing programs to support States' efforts to help individuals live with traumatic brain injury and of course to help their families.

TBIs range from mild concussions to devastating life-altering injuries that collectively represent a significant public health challenge. It is the signature injury, unfortunately, of the conflicts of the last decade, whether it is Iraq or Afghanistan.

It is also an injury that occurs approximately 2.5 million times in the United States each year. Over 50,000 people die of traumatic brain injuries every year. Traumatic brain injury is implicated in nearly one-third of all injury-related deaths.

Children—just imagine this number—ages 0 to 4 and teens ages 15 to 19 are at the greatest risk for traumatic brain injury. Among all children in an average year, 62,000 will sustain brain injuries that require hospitalization and 564,000 will be seen in hospital emergency rooms. Clearly, we must continue to improve our response to traumatic brain injury, which includes prevention, timely and accurate diagnosis, and treatment.

The bill passed today out of the HELP Committee would make modest but important improvements to the TBI Act that is in place already. We ask that the Department of Health and Human Services develop a traumatic brain injury coordination plan to ensure that Federal activities at HHS and other Federal agencies are being coordinated for maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

We also ask for a review of the scientific evidence on brain injury and in particular brain injury management in children, with a special emphasis on evaluating scientific evidence behind the ''return to school'' and ''return to play'' policies. This of course is very important.

As public awareness of the seriousness of traumatic brain injuries increases, parents, schools, and coaches are struggling to develop appropriate responses. A lot of attention thus far has been focused on the ''return to play'' policies, trying to ensure that children don't return to sports until they have healed from a previous concussion, but there is much less attention on the so-called return to school policies and how we can take steps to ensure that children with a concussion or a more serious brain injury can return to the classroom and continue learning safely and effectively.

It is my hope that this bill, S. 2539, will help focus future research efforts and guide Federal and State agencies looking to develop policies in this area. Along with a lot of the members of the HELP Committee, I am pleased the committee voted today to move forward S. 2539, and I hope the rest of the Senate will join Senator HATCH and me in passing this legislation as quickly as possible.

In conclusion, it has been a great honor to work with Senator HATCH on this legislation as it is when we work together on a whole series of important matters in the Senate.

2014 KIDS COUNT DATA BOOK

Mr. President, I have brief comments on an important set of data that has just been released. I will highlight very briefly the 2014 Kids Count Data Book, something a lot of child advocates and families are aware of. This is an annual report, and I want to highlight the fact that the 2014 report is now on the record.

This Kids Count Data Book was just published by the Annie E. Casey Foundation for this year. The Kids Count Data Book looks at every State to measure child well-being in States and across the country considering factors such as economic well-being, health, education, family, and community. Within each of these categories the report highlights four important metrics and notes whether we have improved from the year 2008 to 2012.

Nationally, 10 of the 16 metrics showed improvement. That is good news. Five metrics worsened. Of course we don't like hearing that, but it is important to measure when we are going in the wrong direction. And one of the metrics remained unchanged. So we are happy the improvement number is 16 metrics and the worsening metric number is 5, but we still have a long way to go to improve in each of these areas.

The report also ranks States based upon their overall results. Pennsylvania is ranked 16th in the Nation. I wish we were in the top 10. I wish we were in the top five and even No. 1. So we have some work to do in Pennsylvania. In some areas Pennsylvania is doing well compared to the national average. For example, we have a lower rate of children without health insurance. That is certainly good news, with still more to do on that. Teen birth rates in Pennsylvania continue to be below the national average. Pennsylvania has a slightly higher percentage of children attending preschool. That is good news. We have a lot more to do on that, both in Pennsylvania and across the Nation. Finally, Pennsylvania students continue to have higher proficiency rates in reading and math skills when compared to the national rate, but there is still more work to do there as well.

The report also highlights areas where we need to improve both in Pennsylvania and nationally. Far too many children in the United States of America are living in poverty with parents who often lack secure employment. Too many teens are not in school and also not working, which dramatically worsens their ability to grow into economically self-sufficient adults.

I would encourage my colleagues to review the 2014 Kids Count Data Book which is available on the Web site of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We should all consider what we can do in the Senate and in the other body to improve our children's lives and our future.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak about amendments I have filed to the Bring Jobs Home Act.

My first amendment, the United States Job Creation and International Tax Reform Act, would truly incentivize American companies to create jobs in the United States, while at the same time leveling the playing field for U.S. companies in the global marketplace. We can do this by reforming the rules for taxing the global operations of American companies and making America a more attractive location to base a business that serves customers around the world.

Our current Tax Code does just the opposite, but the base bill we are debating today wouldn't change that. Instead, it would discourage global businesses from locating their headquarters in the United States and make it harder for U.S.-based companies to expand.

Instead of messaging that we should bring jobs home, we need to reform our outdated international Tax Code. Let's just do it. Many of the United States' major trading partners have moved to what are called territorial tax systems. Those types of tax systems tax the income generated within their borders and exempt foreign earnings from tax. The United States, on the other hand, taxes the worldwide income of U.S. companies and provides deferral of U.S. tax until the foreign earnings are brought home. Deferring these taxes incentivizes companies to leave their money abroad. Because the United States has one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world, companies don't bring those earnings back home and instead reinvest outside of the United States.

This is having a real impact on jobs. Thirty-six percent of the Fortune Global 500 companies were headquartered in the United States in 2000; in 2009 that number dropped to 28 percent. Clearly, America is losing ground, but the base bill we are considering won't change that.

My amendment would help to right the ship by pulling our international tax rules into the 21st century. This bill would give U.S. companies real incentives to create jobs in the United States in order to win globally. I hope as we talk about jobs this week, we will have a chance to consider the amendment.

My second amendment, the Small Business Fairness in Health Care Act, would remove the ObamaCare disincentive for small businesses to add jobs. Small businesses are the drivers of the economy in Wyoming and across the Nation, but the bill before us is not focused on removing the burdens that current laws have placed on our Main Street businesses.

A recent survey by the National Small Business Association found that because of the President's health care law 34 percent of small businesses report holding off on hiring a new employee and another 12 percent report they had to lay off an employee in the last year.

My amendment is a great step to help address those issues. It would remove the ObamaCare mandate that businesses with 50 employees provide health insurance. This would allow small companies with 49 employees to add jobs without the fear of the employer mandate. My amendment would also clarify that 40 hours, not 30 hours, is full-time so that folks who have jobs aren't limited to 29 hours of work per week.

These aren't the only ideas we should debate when we talk about creating jobs in the United States. We should be fighting the administration's war on coal, an industry that supported over 700,000 good-paying jobs in 2010. The EPA recently issued new regulations that try to force a backdoor cap and tax proposal on Americans that Congress has already rejected. We need to reject that idea again. Instead of running from coal, America needs to run on coal.

We should debate the merits of the Keystone Pipeline and insist that the President approve this project which has been pending for more than 5 years and would create more than 40,000 jobs. The State Department has done five reviews of the project and determined that the pipeline would cause no significant environmental impacts. So let's create those jobs. What are we waiting for?

Mr. CASEY. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND GREGG W. ANDERSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an upstanding citizen from my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The Reverend Gregg W. Anderson is an accomplished news reporter and dedicated prison chaplain, ministering to inmates in the Commonwealth.

Though he has traveled the world, and worked as a reporter at radio and television stations across the Midwest, Reverend Anderson is honored to call Bardstown in Nelson County, KY, his home, where he hosts ''Talk of the Town'' Monday through Friday evenings on WBRT, Bardstown's hometown radio station on 97.1 FM and 1320 AM. This year, WBRT celebrates its 60th anniversary informing and cultivating a special relationship with the Bardstown community.

During his nearly four decades as a news reporter, Reverend Anderson has enjoyed a varied and successful career covering everything from Super Bowls to bank robberies. However, he has found no assignment more rewarding than that of ''a good news reporter,'' bringing the good news of Christ to others.

His conversion experience began after he covered the horrific 1988 Carrollton school bus crash. Killing 27 people, including 24 children, the Carrollton crash remains the worst drunk-driving accident in our Nation's history.

The gruesomeness and heartache Reverend Anderson witnessed following that crash inspired him to begin bringing the light of Christ to others. On May 15, 1988, the day after the accident, Reverend Anderson felt called by God to be a ''good news reporter.'' One year later he founded 70x7 Evangelistic Ministry. Continuing as a news reporter by day, Reverend Anderson began his ministry career by preaching at church services and revivals at night.

His ministry eventually brought him to the prisons of Kentucky and Ohio, where he became a devoted and beloved prison chaplain. Reverend Anderson worked with the prisoners, bringing many hardened criminals the message of Christ. Reverend Anderson eventually took his prison chaplaincy overseas, ministering to inmates in Estonia and Latvia, before returning to the United States.

The Reverend Gregg W. Anderson's dedication seems to know no bounds. His devotion and commitment to his work, whether in news reporting or in his Christian ministry, is an inspiration for us all, and I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring him today.

TRIBUTE TO GREGORY SCOTT SALYER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a veteran from my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky. As a member of

the Army National Guard, Gregory Scott Salyer served his country with honor on a tour of duty in Afghanistan.

Service to this country is something that runs deep in Salyer's family. His father, uncle, and grandfather are all military veterans, and Salyer followed suit when he enlisted in 2006.

In Afghanistan, Salyer and his team performed the treacherous, yet indispensable, task of tracking, unearthing, and disposing of improvised explosive devices, IEDs. IEDs were, and still remain, one of the most serious and unnerving threats to our troops abroad. Salyer's work in diffusing that threat undoubtedly increased the safety of our servicemen and women.

Returning to Kentucky following his service in the Guard, Salyer brought with him the National Defense Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the ARCOM Medal of Valor.

For his honorable service to this country, Salyer is deserving of our praise here in the Senate.

Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Gregory Scott Salyer.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Salyer's service in Afghanistan. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

JOINS GUARD FOR WORK, SENT TO AFGHANISTAN

(By Heather Oney)

Gregory Scott Salyer joined the Army National Guard in Prestonsburg in 2006, serving until 2011.

The former Magoffin County High School student said he was having a hard time finding a job, so at the age of 24 he decided to enlist, following in his dad's, uncles' and grandfathers' footsteps.

Salyer served one tour in Afghanistan, working in route clearance. His crew, which included five other men from Magoffin, tracked, dug up and disposed of improvised explosive devices (IEDs). While he said he was hit once, he came home without any injuries.

''I would rather go back than sit here,'' Salyer said. ''Everything was simple. You trained for a job, then you went out and did your job. You would get up the next day and do it all, again.''

Salyer said growing up around guns helped him get ready for his time overseas.

''I had been around guns my whole life and been shot at while corning,'' Salyer laughed. ''You could tell these boys from California with stricter gun laws were not used to it, but us country people were used to doing hard work every now and then.''

Salyer received the National Defense Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, ARCOM Medal of Valor, and Whitelist recognition.

He has one son, Hunter Salyer.

TRIBUTE TO BARRY E. OWENS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Kentucky's proud military veterans—Barry E. Owens. Owens hails from Magoffin County, and served his country with honor in the Vietnam war.

Although millions of young Americans were drafted into service during this time, Barry decided to leave nothing to chance and volunteer. He served in the U.S. Army from 1968 until 1970, achieving the rank of specialist 4.

In 1969, he was deployed to Vietnam with the 2nd and 35th Regiments of the 4th Infantry Division. In a time when the war became increasingly unpopular, Owens always retained his sense of duty. ''I served my country with pride and honor,'' he said.

Owens is a member of Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Salyersville chapter of the Disabled American Veterans. His commitment to this country is worthy of praise from this body. Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Barry Owens.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Specialist Owens's service in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

OWENS VOLUNTEERS FOR DRAFT, GOES TO VIETNAM

(By Heather Oney)

Barry E. Owens, born and raised in Royalton, Magoffin County, volunteered for the draft during the Vietnam War in 1968 with the U.S. Army, climbing to the rank of Specialist 4 by the time he was discharged in 1970.

He attended basic training at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, then advanced training for supply specialist and armory school at Fort Lee, Virginia.

From 1969 until discharged, Owens served in Vietnam with the 2nd and 35th Regiment 4th Infantry Division.

After a few days upon reporting, Owens's company commander decided that for the next year he would be a better fit as an 11 Bravo Infantry soldier, working ''out in the boonies,'' as opposed to sitting around an office in a base camp.

Owens said he can remember the soldiers lining up in a field to get their hair cut by Vietnamese civilians. Since there was no electricity, they had to use the hand clippers where you have to squeeze them to make them work. His sergeant was in line and getting impatient.

''I told him I was a barber before going into the military,'' Owens laughed. ''So I started at the back of his head and came out with a half moon, and that's where I stopped. I threw the clippers and ran. The next time I saw him his head was shaven, I think that's when they started shaving heads.''

Owens was stationed in the Central Highlands of Vietnam, including areas around Pleiku, Kon Tum City, Buon Me Thuot, and many firebases in this region, including VC Valley and areas on the border of Cambodia and Laos.

''The Vietnam veterans returning home from this country were not greeted and welcomed home with parades or such fanfare,'' Owens remembers. ''Many of us were met at airports with degrading slurs, cursed and spat upon.''

It would be another 20 years before the Veterans Administration would acknowledge Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other disabilities and afford medical care to this era of veterans. Many Vietnam veterans fell into drug and alcohol abuse, often even resulting in homelessness, with many committing suicide and dying at an early age.

''I served my country with pride and honor,'' Owens said.

He is a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), and the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) Chapter 15 Salyersville. He has been married to his wife, Shirley, for over 20 years and has three daughters, Melissa, Misty, and Jennifer.

CONGRATULATING REVEREND SAMUEL C. TOLBERT

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Rev. Samuel Tolbert, pastor of the Greater St. Mary's Missionary Baptist Church in Lake Charles, LA, on his recent election as the 15th president of the National Baptist Convention of America, Inc.

Rev. Samuel C. Tolbert, Jr. was born August 1, 1958 in Lake Charles, LA and graduated from Washington High school in 1976. A graduate of Bishop College in Dallas, he earned his bachelors of arts in religion and philosophy with a minor in speech education. He has also received an honorary doctorate of divinity from Union Baptist College and Theological Seminary and a masters from Payne Theological Seminary. He is currently pursuing a doctorate in ministry at Stephen Olford Center at Union University in Memphis, TN.

Reverend Tolbert is a recognized civic leader. He served as a commissioner for the Lake Charles Housing Authority, a representative of District ''A'' on Lake Charles City Council, and as a member of the board of the Louisiana Economic Development Corporation. Currently, Reverend Tolbert serves on the board of supervisors for the Southern University System.

A devout man of faith, Reverend Tolbert has dedicated himself to a life of religious servitude. He has presided over Greater Saint Mary Missionary Baptist Church since 1984. Reverend Tolbert has held a number of positions in the faith community including serving as first vice president of the Southwest Missionary Baptist Association, president of the Louisiana Home & Foreign Missions Baptist State Convention, and general secretary National Baptist Convention of America Inc. Reverend Tolbert currently serves as president of Greater St. Mary Community Development Foundation, the president & CEO Strategic Faith Leadership Ministries, and as the coordinator of disaster relief North America

for Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Mission Convention.

Reverend Tolbert's accomplishments reflect his dedication to his faith, education and service. On June 25, 2014, he was elected the president of the National Baptist Convention of America. With over 3.5 million members worldwide, the National Baptist Convention of America is an organization that seeks to ''positively impact and influence the spiritual, educational, social, and economic conditions of all humankind''.

It is with the greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Rev. Samuel Tolbert Jr. for his accomplishments as an incredible reverend, father, and mentor. His wife Matilda, and their two daughters Candace and Kayla must be extremely proud and I know that he will serve the National Baptist Convention well.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE JOHN P. DION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute Army PVT John P. Dion. Private Dion and two other soldiers died January 3, 2010 when insurgents attacked their unit with improvised explosive devices and small arms fire in Ashoque, Afghanistan.

John was born February 4, 1990 in Tarzana, CA and moved to Oklahoma during his sophomore year in high school. He joined the Army in June 2009 after graduating from high school in Shattuck, OK where he was on the baseball and football teams.

Upon graduating from basic training at Fort Benning, GA, John was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO. He was deployed to Afghanistan in November 2009.

He is survived by his parents Mark and Patricia Elsner, of Reynolds, GA, two sisters: Kelsey Dion, Reynolds, GA, and Jackie Boals of Cedar Grove, TN, two brothers: Justin Werve of Shattuck, OK, and Mark Elsner of Paris, TN, grandmothers: Jane Elsner of Reynolds, GA and Carol Willoughby of Las Vegas, NV.

Dion's half-brother, Justin Werve, who was deployed to Iraq twice with the Air Force, said he tried talking Dion out of joining the Army, but he couldn't be dissuaded. ''He wanted to serve his country,'' Werve said. ''He did it for the same reason I did it: to make sure his family stayed safe.''

The family held a funeral service for Private Dion on January 16, 2010 and he was laid to rest with full military honors in Andersonville National Cemetery, Andersonville, GA.

Today we remember Army PVT John P. Dion, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

STAFF SERGEANT JACK M. MARTIN III

Mr. President, I also would like to honor Army SSG Jack M. Martin III. Sergeant Martin and another soldier died September 29, 2009 when a bomb buried beneath a road detonated while they were helping to resupply a school construction project in the Jolo Islands, Philippines.

Jack, the youngest of five children, was born April 5, 1983 in Maquoketa, IA and later moved to Oklahoma where he played football and was an honors student at Bethany High School, graduating in 2001.

He started out in the Army Reserve where he volunteered to go to Iraq, but when that deployment was canceled he met with a recruiter looking for special forces volunteers. After enlisting and completing the special forces qualification course in 2004, Jack earned his Green Beret and was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 1st Special Forces Group, Fort Lewis, WA.

''Both of his grandfathers served in the Army during World War II. My father was a medic in World War II. I think that influenced him. Jack wanted to serve his country,'' his father said.

He is survived by his wife Ashley, his parents Jack and Cheryl Martin, his brother Abe, and three sisters: Mandi, Amber and Abi.

Today we remember Army SSG Jack M. Martin III, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

FIRST LIEUTENANT DAVID T. WRIGHT II

Mr. President, I would also like to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army 1LT David T. Wright II. First Lieutenant Wright and another soldier died September 14, 2009 of wounds sustained after enemy forces attacked their vehicle with improvised explosive devices in southern Afghanistan.

Born July 7, 1983 in Norman, OK, David did not let his football and track talent go to waste after graduating from Moore High School in 2002. He went to the University of Oklahoma on a track scholarship and earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice in 2006.

After completing basic training and officer training, he was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Infantry Regiment, 5th Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, WA. On July 21, 2009 he was deployed to Afghanistan as part of II Platoon Bravo Company, 5th Brigade, II Infantry Division; Striker Brigade/Combat Team.

While deployed he wrote home about the honor he felt for his country and his fellow soldiers as they protected a village. He said he had no hard feelings toward the villagers, although some were angry with the soldiers.

''These people deserve a better existence,'' he wrote, ''and hopefully my efforts will help, in a small way, provide that to them.''

That letter was waiting for his parents Tim and Michele, when they returned to Oklahoma after receiving his body.

The family held a funeral service on September 22, 2009, in Norman, OK. He was laid to rest with full military honors in I.O.O.F. Cemetery.

''It was 9/11 that did it for David,'' the Rev. Randy Nail said at his memorial. ''He wanted to do something about it, and he did.''

David is survived by his parents Michele and Tim, of Moore, OK, his uncle Mitchell Scott, and his wife Angie, of Farmington, MN, and cousins, Hunter and Hailey Scott. He is preceded in death by his grandparents Betty and Junior Scott, and his uncle Michael Scott.

Today we remember Army 1LT David T. Wright II, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL MICHAEL T. FLYNN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTG Michael T. Flynn will retire in August after more than 33 years of distinguished service to the Army and the Nation.

Throughout his career, General Flynn has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, and selfless service across the many missions to which he has contributed.

A native Rhode Islander, General Flynn graduated from the University of Rhode Island and was commissioned as a second lieutenant through the university's ROTC program. He was assigned to the ''All-American'' 82nd Airborne Division, and since then, has served in a variety of command and staff assignments, leading men and women during times of peace and war. Over the course of almost four decades of service, he has commanded at the platoon, company, battalion, and brigade levels.

As an intelligence officer, General Flynn was often deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, serving as the director of intelligence for Joint Special Operations Command, U.S. Central Command, the Joint Staff, and the International Security Assistance Force-Afghanistan and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan.

For the past 2 years, General Flynn has served as the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA, focusing on strengthening integration and collaboration with the Combatant Commands and making the agency more flexible and responsive to intelligence requirements. He has overseen DIA's rapid tactical, operational, and strategic intelligence support to U.S. warfighters as they confront a variety of threats—from militancy in North Africa and the crisis in Ukraine, to tracking terrorists and weapons proliferation.

In all of his assignments, General Flynn has provided outstanding leadership with integrity and has offered sound advice on numerous issues of importance to the Army and our Nation.

I know that he is looking forward to spending more time with his family in Rhode Island, and I wish Mike and his wife Lori the very best. On behalf of the citizens of Rhode Island and a grateful Nation, I thank General Flynn and his family for their many years of commitment, sacrifices, and service to our Nation.

BAY NOMINATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to voice my concern over the nomination of Mr. Norman Bay to be a Commissioner on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—and eventually Chairman of the entire FERC.

I have serious concerns with Mr. Bay's qualifications to serve as a Commissioner, let alone lead the entire agency, particularly at such a critical time for the Commission and the many issues it must address such as energy grid infrastructure, safety and reliability.

Mr. Bay has at best limited experience in the energy sector and, unlike many of the recent FERC Chairmen, has never served on the Commission. Mr. Bay's inexperience is only further illuminated when compared to the lengthy and significant energy sector experience of current FERC Acting Chairman, Ms. Cheryl LaFleur.

While I may not agree with Ms. LaFleur's various policy positions, there is no denying the fact that she has spent nearly her entire career learning the intricacies of a very complicated electricity grid.

We must have the very best people on FERC, and the Chair must be the best qualified for leading the agency. Mismanagement in this critical agency could have serious consequences for American families, small businesses, national security and energy infrastructure reliability. I do not believe in on-the-job training for such an important position. It appears there has been an undefined deal—some would say a backroom deal—struck with the administration to give Mr. Bay a FERC apprenticeship, while the qualified Ms. LeFleur is forced out of her current role as FERC Chairman.

Certainly, the Obama administration knows enough regulators to have nominated one that would be ready to serve once confirmed. This presents the question: if he is not ready to serve, why was Mr. Bay nominated in the first place?

I am afraid that President Obama and his Senate cohorts want to use Mr. Bay and the FERC to carry out their radical energy agenda that uses the government to pick winners and losers in the energy marketplace, which will only cause prices to increase on those who can least afford more expensive energy.

I also think serious questions have yet to be answered by Mr. Bay about his time as FERC's Enforcement Director. His answers to questions by various members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee were vague at best and evasive at worst.

Some suggested that actions taken by Mr. Bay as Enforcement Director have had a chilling effect on wholesale electric markets and have already caused electricity prices to increase in certain parts of the country.

There is simply too much at stake for me to support a nominee we know so little about and who knows so little about the job for which he was nominated.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING JESSICA BISIAR

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jessica Bisiar for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jessica is a native of Casper, WY and a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends Casper College, where she is studying political science and international studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Jessica for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MARIDI CHOMA

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Maridi Choma for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Maridi is a native of Casper, WY and a graduate of Kelly Walsh High School. She will be a freshman at the University of Wyoming this fall, where she plans to study French and international studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Maridi for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING DYLAN CROUSE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Dylan Crouse for his hard work as an intern in my Republican Policy Committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Dylan is a native of Basin, WY and a graduate of Riverside High School. He currently attends Colgate University where he is studying history and Spanish. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Dylan for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CAROLINE DANIELSON

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Caroline Danielson for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Caroline is a native of Casper, WY and a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends Casper College and the University of Wyoming where she is studying distributed social sciences with an emphasis in political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Caroline for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING AMBER FRANKLAND

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Amber Frankland for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Amber is a native of Casper, WY and a graduate of Natrona County High

School. She currently attends the University of Chicago where she is studying Russian. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Amber for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CAMERON FRY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Cameron Fry for his hard work as an intern in my Republican Policy Committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Cameron is from Laramie, WY and a graduate of Laramie High School. He recently earned a degree from the University of Wyoming where he studied finance and economics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Cameron for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING LEEANN GRAPES

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to LeeAnn Grapes for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

LeeAnn is a native of Casper, WY and a graduate of Kelly Walsh High School. She recently earned a degree from the University of Wyoming where she studied international studies and Spanish. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank LeeAnn for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CHANDLER HARRIS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Chandler Harris for his hard work as an intern in my Indian Affairs Committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Chandler is a native of Cokeville, WY and a graduate of Cokeville High School. He currently attends the University of Wyoming where he is studying history. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Chandler for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING JR KANE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to JR Kane for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

JR is a native of Big Horn, WY and a graduate of Big Horn High School. He currently attends the University of Montana where he is studying human biology. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank JR for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KATHRYN KEMPEMA

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kathryn Kempema for her hard work as an intern in my Indian Affairs Committee office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kathryn is a native of Laramie, WY and a graduate of Laramie Senior High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is studying mechanical engineering and mathematics. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Kathryn for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING ERIN SIMS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Erin Sims for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Erin is a native of Cheyenne, WY and a graduate of Cheyenne Central High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is studying zoology. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Erin for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING HARRISON SUTTLE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Harrison Suttle for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Harrison is a native of Newport News, VA and a graduate of Hampton Roads Academy. He currently attends the College of Wooster where he is studying history. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Harrison for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CAMILLE ZENT

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Camille Zent for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Camille is a native of Shoshoni, WY and a graduate of Shoshoni High School. She recently earned a degree from Utah State University where she studied constitutional law. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset

to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last few months.

I want to thank Camille for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING DIEGO ZEPEDA

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Diego Zepeda for his hard work as an intern in my Sheridan office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Diego is from Gillette, WY and a graduate of Campbell County High School. He currently attends Northern Wyoming Community College where he is studying business management. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Diego for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

REMEMBERING ROBERT C. BROOMFIELD

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn recently of the passing of Judge Robert C. Broomfield, who served on the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona for nearly 30 years, including as chief judge on that court from 1994 to 1999. During his impressive tenure on the Federal bench, Judge Broomfield was known for his outstanding work improving the administration of our Nation's court system. He was instrumental in bringing the Sandra Day O'Connor Courthouse to Phoenix, where a special memorial service will be held today in the Special Proceedings Courtroom named in his honor. Judge Broomfield was an outstanding public servant and a well-respected jurist, and his work will continue to have a lasting impact on our State for years to come. He will be greatly missed by his family, friends, and all those who had the pleasure of working with him.●

TRIBUTE TO MATT STIGLBAUER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Matt Stiglbauer, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Matt is a senior at the University of North Florida in Jacksonville, FL. Currently, he is majoring in English. Matt is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Matt for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BRITTANY ROBERTS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Brittany Roberts, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Brittany is a graduate of American University, Washington College of Law, having specialized in law, politics, and legislation. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Brittany for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO OLIVIA VOSLOW

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Olivia Voslow, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Olivia is a rising junior at Middlebury College in Great Falls, VA. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Olivia for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MALLIE WOODFIN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Mallie Woodfin, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Mallie is a graduate of the University of Alabama, having majored in Public Relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Mallie for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

At 3:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2430. An act to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3716. An act to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3802. An act to extend the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4411. An act to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4450. An act to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4508. An act to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services.

H.R. 4562. An act to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska.

H.R. 4572. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4802. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4803. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4812. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration

to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5035. An act to reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5120. An act to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2430. An act to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3802. An act to extend the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4411. An act to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4508. An act to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4562. An act to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4802. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4803. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4812. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5035. An act to reauthorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5120. An act to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4719. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3716. An act to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2648. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6591. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tobacco Products, User Fees, Requirements for the Submission of Data Needed To Calculate User Fees for Domestic Manufacturers and Importers of Tobacco Products'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–0920) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6592. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Federal Multiagency Collaboration on Unconventional Oil and Gas Research: A Strategy for Research and Development''; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6593. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael J. Basla, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6594. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral Bruce W. Clingan, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6595. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133P–5.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6596. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Current Good Manufacturing Practices, Quality Control Procedures, Quality Factors, Notification Requirements, and Records and Reports, for Infant Formula; Correction'' ((RIN0910–AF27) (Docket No. FDA–1995–N–0063, Formerly Docket No. 95N–0309)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6597. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–369, ''Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6598. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6599. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010; Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Clips'' ((MB Docket No. 11–154) (FCC 14–97)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 675. A bill to prohibit contracting with the enemy (Rept. No. 113–216).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1820. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of official portraits of Members of Congress, heads of executive agencies, and heads of agencies and offices of the legislative branch (Rept. No. 113–217).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 1233. A bill to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–218).

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 315. A bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 531. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2154. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 2405. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2406. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SANDERS for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Robert Alan McDonald, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2644. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2645. A bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2646. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2647. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system for private security officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 2648. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 2649. A bill to provide certain legal relief from politically motivated charges by the Government of Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 2650. A bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 512. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Environmental Protection Agency and the proposed rules and guidelines relating to carbon dioxide emissions from power plants; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 513. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 514. A resolution designating the week of August 10 through August 16, 2014, as ''National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 515. A resolution designating July 24, 2014, as ''International Self-Care Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 516. A resolution to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in State of North Dakota v. Beatrice Quill; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 487

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that over-the-road bus drivers are covered under the maximum hours requirements.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 760

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1898

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1898, a bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 1999

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1999, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to require the consent of parties to contracts for the use of arbitration to resolve controversies arising under the contracts and subject to provisions of such Act and to preserve the rights of servicemembers to bring class actions under such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2094

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2094, a bill to provide for

the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2118

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2118, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

S. 2199

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2202, a bill to provide for revenue sharing of qualified revenues from leases in the South Atlantic planning area, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2405

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2405, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2406

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2406, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2591

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2591, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 37, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2646. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to introduce the Leahy-Collins Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. The prevalence of homelessness among young people in America is deplorable. There are 1.6 million homeless teens in the United States. This problem is not limited to large cities. Its impact is felt strongly in smaller communities and rural areas, including in my home State of Vermont. It affects our young people directly and reverberates throughout our families and communities.

The Runaway Youth Act, first signed into law in 1974, has proven essential to providing the services and resources that runaway and homeless youth need, and our continued support is vital. Thirty-nine percent of the homeless population is under the age of 18, and the average age at which a teen becomes homeless is 14.7 years old. These numbers are stark reminders of our duty as a nation to protect the most vulnerable among us.

This bill reauthorizes funding for key elements of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs, including the Basic Center Program, which provides short-term emergency shelter and family reunification services to runaway and homeless youth. The Transitional Living Program provides longer term residential services, life skills, education, and employment support to older homeless youth. This bill reauthorizes the Street Outreach Program, which is staffed by workers who go out into the community to provide crisis intervention and services referrals to runaway and homeless youth on the street and at drop-in centers. It also supports funding for national support activities like the national runaway youth crisis line, and access to evaluation tools to help grantees track the success of their efforts and ensure that Federal funding is supporting only the most effective programs.

This reauthorization includes new and important provisions to combat human trafficking. Victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons and runaway and homeless youth—two of our most vulnerable populations—are intersecting populations. Runaway and homeless youth service providers are uniquely situated to identify victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons. These youth have specific needs and this bill ensures that victims of trafficking will be identified as such, and receive the appropriate services.

Another improvement made by this reauthorization is a provision to improve support for family reunification and intervention. Service providers

will be able to use grant funds to encourage the resolution of family problems through counseling and other services. Family support is critical to providing stability for homeless youth, and this new provision will help boost positive outcomes.

I am proud that this bill contains a new nondiscrimination clause to prohibit any grantee from discriminating against a child based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. It is estimated that 40 percent of the runaway and homeless youth population identifies as LGBT. It is clear that this community needs the services authorized under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. No young person should be turned away from these essential services.

Supporting our youth when they are most in need and helping to get them back on their feet benefits us all. Homeless children are less likely to finish school, more likely to enter our juvenile justice system, and are ill-equipped to find a job. The services authorized by this bill are designed to intervene early and encourage the development of successful, productive young adults.

I have heard from dozens of service providers urging swift passage of this legislation. These are the people who are there on the frontlines when youth have nowhere else to turn. Without the programs funded through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, hundreds of thousands of children would be left on the street.

I thank Senator COLLINS for working with me on this legislation and for joining me as an original cosponsor. I hope all Senators will join us in supporting the prompt passage of the Leahy-Collins Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act on the Senate floor.

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

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

S. 2646

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Section 302 (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and'' before ''linguistically appropriate'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''outside the welfare system and the law enforcement system'' and inserting '', in collaboration with public assistance systems, the law enforcement system, and the child welfare system'';

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting ''a safe place to live and'' after ''youth need''; and

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

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) runaway and homeless youth are at a high risk of becoming victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons.''.

SEC. 4. BASIC CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.—Section 311(a) (42 U.S.C. 5711(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''services'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''safe shelter and services, including trauma-informed services, for runaway and homeless youth and, if appropriate, services for the families of such youth, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''mental health,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''21 days; and'' and inserting ''30 days;''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate'' before ''individual'';

(II) by inserting '', as appropriate,'' after ''group''; and

(III) by striking ''as appropriate'' and inserting ''including (if appropriate) counseling for individuals identified by such youth as family''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) suicide prevention services; and''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (ii), by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate'' before ''home-based services'';

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking ''diseases.'' and inserting ''infections;''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) trauma-informed and gender-responsive services for runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

''(vi) an assessment of family engagement in support and reunification (if reunification is appropriate), interventions, and services for parents or legal guardians of such youth, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY; PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 312 (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by inserting '', or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family,'' after ''parents or legal guardians'';

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking ''cultural minority and persons with limited ability to speak English'' and inserting ''cultural minority, persons with limited ability to speak English, and runaway or homeless youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation'';

(C) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the youth and family members of such youth whom the applicant serves, including demographic information on and the number of—

''(A) such youth who are not referred to out-of-home shelter services;

''(B) such youth who are members of vulnerable or underserved populations;

''(C) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

''(i) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

''(ii) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

''(iii) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

''(D) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

''(E) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

''(F) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system;'';

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (14);

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) shall ensure that—

''(A) the records described in paragraph (7), on an individual runaway or homeless youth, shall not be disclosed without the consent of the individual youth and parent or legal guardian of such youth, or (if appropriate) an individual identified by such youth as family, to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway or homeless youth; and

''(B) reports or other documents based on the statistics described in paragraph (7) shall not disclose the identity of any individual runaway or homeless youth;'';

(F) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated, by striking ''statistical summaries'' and inserting ''statistics'';

(G) in paragraph (13)(C), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking clause (i) and inserting:

''(i) the number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project, including such information on—

''(I) such youth (including both types of such participating youth) who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

''(aa) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

''(bb) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

''(cc) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

''(II) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

''(III) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

''(IV) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system; and''; and

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

(H) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''for natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies;''; and

(I) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) shall provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(16) shall assist youth in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090).''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate'' after ''provide'';

(ii) by striking ''families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth'' and inserting ''families of such youth (including unrelated individuals in the family households of such youth and, if appropriate, individuals identified by such youth as family)''; and

(iii) by inserting ''suicide prevention,'' after ''physical health care,''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', including training on trauma-informed and youth-centered care'' after ''home-based services''.

(c) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 313(b) (42 U.S.C. 5713(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''priority to'' and all that follows through ''who'' and inserting ''priority to eligible applicants who'';

(2) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

SEC. 5. TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 322(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714–2(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate'' before ''information and counseling services''; and

(B) by striking ''job attainment skills, and mental and physical health care'' and inserting ''job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, and suicide prevention services''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) and (9) through (16) as paragraphs (5) through (10) and (12) through (19), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) to provide counseling to homeless youth and to encourage, if appropriate, the involvement in such counseling of their parents or legal guardians, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family;

''(4) to provide aftercare services, if possible, to homeless youth who have received shelter and services from a transitional living youth project, including (to the extent practicable) such youth who, after receiving such shelter and services, relocate to a State other than the State in which such project is located;'';

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting ''age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate'' after ''referral of homeless youth to'';

(B) by striking ''and health care programs'' and inserting ''mental health service and health care programs, including programs providing comprehensive services to victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation,''; and

(C) by striking ''such services for youths;'' and inserting ''such programs described in this paragraph;'';

(5) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

''(11) to develop a plan to provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services that address the needs of homeless and street youth;'';

(6) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking ''the applicant and statistical'' through ''who participate in such project,'' and inserting ''the applicant, statistical summaries describing the number, the characteristics, and the demographic information of the homeless youth who participate in such project, including the prevalence of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of such youth,''; and

(7) in paragraph (19), as so redesignated, by inserting ''regarding responses to natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies'' after ''management plan''.

SEC. 6. COORDINATING, TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) COORDINATION.—Section 341 (42 U.S.C. 5714–21) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''safety, well-being,'' after ''health,''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''other Federal entities'' and inserting ''the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice''.

(b) GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 342 (42 U.S.C. 5714–22) is amended by inserting '', including onsite and web-based techniques, such as on-demand and online learning,'' before ''to public and private entities''.

(c) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 (42 U.S.C. 5714–23) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''violence, trauma, and'' before ''sexual abuse and assault'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''sexual abuse and assault; and'' and inserting ''sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation;''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''who have been sexually victimized'' and inserting ''who are victims of sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) best practices for identifying and providing age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to—

''(i) vulnerable and underserved youth populations; and

''(ii) youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

''(E) verifying youth as runaway or homeless to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090);'';

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at end the following:

''(11) examining the intersection between the runaway and homeless youth populations and trafficking in persons, including noting whether such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons were previously involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by inserting '', including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation'' after ''runaway or homeless youth''.

(d) PERIODIC ESTIMATE OF INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF YOUTH HOMELESSNESS.—Section 345 (42 U.S.C. 5714–25) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''13'' and inserting ''12''; and

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

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) that includes demographic information about and characteristics of runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

''(4) that does not disclose the identity of any runaway or homeless youth.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''13'' and inserting ''12'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) incidences, if any, of—

''(i) such individuals who are victims of trafficking in persons; or

''(ii) such individuals who are victims of sexual exploitation; and''; and

(E) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', including mental health services;''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) access to education and job training; and''.

SEC. 7. SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.

Section 351 (42 U.S.C. 5714–41) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''public and'' before ''nonprofit''; and

(B) by striking ''prostitution, or sexual exploitation.'' and inserting ''violence, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall certify to the Secretary that such applicant has systems in place to ensure that such applicant can provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to all youth described in subsection (a).''.

SEC. 8. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) REPORTS.—Section 382(a) (42 U.S.C. 5715(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively; and

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

''(B) collecting data on trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of runaway and homeless youth;''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects, including—

''(i) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation;

''(ii) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

''(iii) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

''(iv) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''intrafamily problems'' and inserting ''problems within the family, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family,''.

(b) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Part F is amended by inserting after section 386A (42 U.S.C. 5732–1) the following:

''SEC. 386B. NONDISCRIMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity (as defined in section

249(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code), sexual orientation, or disability, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with amounts appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, or other assistance administered by the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services.

''(b) DISQUALIFICATION.—Any State, locality, organization, agency, or entity that violates the requirements of subsection (a) shall not be eligible to receive any grant, assistance, or funding provided under this title.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 387 (42 U.S.C. 5732a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B)(v)—

(A) by redesignating subclauses (II) through (IV) as subclauses (III) through (V), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subclause (I), the following:

''(II) trafficking in persons;'';

(C) in subclause (IV), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''diseases'' and inserting ''infections''; and

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

(D) in subclause (V), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(VI) suicide.'';

(3) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking ''prostitution,'' and inserting ''trafficking in persons,'';

(4) by inserting after paragraph (6), the following:

''(7) TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term 'trafficking in persons' has the meaning given the term 'severe forms of trafficking in persons' in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).'';

(5) in paragraph (8), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting ''to homeless youth'' after ''provides''; and

(B) by inserting '', to establish a stable family or community supports,'' after ''self-sufficient living''; and

(6) in paragraph (9)(B), as so redesignated—

(A) in clause (ii)—

(i) by inserting ''or able'' after ''willing''; and

(ii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) who is involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, but who is not receiving government-funded housing.''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) (42 U.S.C. 5751(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''for fiscal year 2009,'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.'';

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.'' and inserting ''$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act with Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman LEAHY. This bill would reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, which expired last September. The programs supported by this Act have provided life-saving services and housing for America's homeless and human trafficked youth for forty years and are a vital tool in addressing the problem of homelessness among young people in our country.

Homelessness is affecting youth in unprecedented numbers. According to the Health Resources and Services Administration, there are approximately 1.6 million homeless teens in the United States. Some advocacy groups estimate that 39 percent of the homeless population is under the age of 18. Some of these youth may stay away from home for only one or two nights, while others have been living on the street for years.

Of the 1.6 million homeless youth, the National Alliance to End Homelessness estimates that, in any given year, there are approximately 550,000 unaccompanied, single youth and young adults up to age 24 who experience a homelessness episode of longer than one week. Approximately 200,000 youth each year live permanently on the street—a life that is extremely difficult, often dangerous, and unhealthy. Sadly, 5,000 teenagers are buried each year in unmarked graves either because they are unidentified or unclaimed.

Teens run away and become homeless for many reasons. A study conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found that 46 percent of homeless youth left home because of physical abuse and 17 percent because of sexual abuse. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile justice system.

As the Ranking Member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations, I have made addressing homelessness a priority. Since 2010, we have seen a 16 percent drop in chronic homelessness. We must build on this success and ensure our nation's homeless youth have opportunities to succeed just as other youth. The Administration has set a goal, which I fully support, to prevent and end youth homelessness by 2020.

The programs reauthorized by this bill serve homeless youth by meeting their immediate needs and providing long-term residential services for youth who cannot be safely reunified with family. In 2013, 94 percent of the minors who entered Basic Center Programs exited these programs safely and appropriately, and 72 percent were reunited with their families. Similarly, 88 percent of youth in Transitional Living Programs made safe and appropriate exits.

In Portland, Maine, the Preble Street Resource Center has used Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resources to connect with youth who need food, a safe place to sleep, health services, and education support. Over 200 individual youth were served at the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter last year, and dozens received the support they needed to return home, find independent living options, and deal with trauma, substance abuse, and mental health challenges. The Street Outreach Program allows Preble Street to operate a Drop-In center and helps caseworkers and social workers connect with youth who appear homeless or in distress. This support often translates into powerful success stories. In fact, Preble Street has seen some of its youth go on to become physicians, attorneys, film makers, and social workers.

Mr. President, homeless youth are at high risk of victimization, abuse, targeting by human traffickers, criminal activity, and death. Research shows that 40 to 60 percent of homeless youth have experienced physical abuse. Without a safe place to stay, young people suffer and remain disconnected from education, the workforce, and community involvement, and they struggle to enter adulthood successfully.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support the critically needed services for young people who run away, are thrown out, or are disconnected from families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, and develop is critical for all young people, and the programs reauthorized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator LEAHY and me in supporting this bill.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 2650. A bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, in order to set the context, I am going to say a few words on the opening, and then enter into a discussion with Senator GRAHAM, Senator RUBIO, and Senator MCCAIN. But let me say that all of us—I know certainly myself—want to start by saying I strongly support the negotiations regarding Iran's nuclear program. I also strongly support the President's stated goal that we must prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Congress, in fact, has led the way on this point—Senator GRAHAM, Senator MENENDEZ, and many others, Senator KIRK—by building a broad multilateral sanctions regime that has forced Iran

to the negotiating table. That is why today we are introducing the bill, the Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act, with a simple message: Allow Congress to weigh in on behalf of the American people on what is one of the most important national security issues facing our Nation.

We hope the administration reaches a good agreement over the next 4 months that will prevent a nuclear-armed Iran from becoming a reality. But if and when they reach an agreement, let's bring all the details out in the open. Let's examine the agreement in its entirety, and let's determine if it is in our national security interests.

To help ensure that that is the case, Senators GRAHAM, MCCAIN, RUBIO, and myself are offering this bill that will do three things: First of all, have a Congressional review. First, it allows Congress to weigh in on any final deal the President reaches with Iran. The bill requires the President to submit any final deal to Congress for review, and then allows Congress to introduce a joint resolution of disapproval should it choose to do so.

Second, it ensures Iran does not cheat on any final agreement. The bill requires the Director of National Intelligence to report on any violation by Iran to Congress. If determined there is credible and accurate evidence that Iran violated the agreement, all sanctions that have been temporarily lifted should be reimposed.

Thirdly, in order to ensure the interim deal does not become the final deal, the bill puts a clock on negotiations. This clock is consistent with the timeline the administration itself has outlined. If the President does not submit a comprehensive final agreement to Congress, all sanctions lifted under the interim agreement would be restored immediately on November 28, 2014, 4 days after the end of the extension period.

Let me be clear: Nothing in this bill talks about imposing new sanctions of any kind. Nothing in this bill would prohibit Congress from seeking further sanctions if it chooses to do so. This bill does not dictate the terms of what a final deal should look like. Rather, it helps to ensure the Iranians do not use the negotiations as a delaying tactic or cover for advancing their program. This bill is all about transparency.

The administration can go out and try to get the best deal possible. They simply have to show Congress and the American people the results, letting the deal fail or succeed on its own merits. This should be an area of broad support and broad bipartisan agreement. Even Secretary Kerry, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that any final deal would have to pass muster with Congress.

I want to stop here. I have some additional comments I might make. I know there are numbers of people here who wish to speak. I want to close with this. This bill represents a constructive, responsible role for Congress to play on this important national security issue to try to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, in the hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will agree, as Secretary Kerry has stated, that any final deal should have to pass muster with Congress and the American people.

I know Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina—no one has played a bigger role in trying to ensure that Iran does not become a nuclear-armed country. With that, I would love to hear his thoughts and his reason for wanting to be a part, with five Senators, in creating this piece of legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator very much.

Senators MCCAIN, RUBIO, and CORKER on the Foreign Relations Committee, all have I think revived the committee, along with Senator MENENDEZ. The committee is probably the most effective it has been in a very long time. The committee is doing a lot of work in a bipartisan fashion. I hope one day this becomes a bipartisan piece of legislation. But credit to the three of you all for coming up with this idea. I am glad to be part of it.

I wish to hear from Senator RUBIO about his view of why this legislation is necessary.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few moments. I thank both the Senators from Tennessee, South Carolina, and Arizona for allowing me this opportunity to join them in this effort.

For those who are watching at home, I know so many other issues are going on around the world—we see the things going on with regard to Israel over the last few days; certainly the shootdown of that airplane by Ukrainian separatists, being armed by the Russians, is of great concern.

But what should not be lost in all of this is there is another urgent matter before the Nation and the world; that is, the ambitions of a rogue, radical regime in Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon that they will use to hold the world hostage and establish dominance in the region and in their stated goal, to destroy Israel and wipe it off the face of the Earth.

What has happened here over the last few months, for those who have been following this, is the White House has engaged in negotiations, along with some other countries, with Iran to get them to walk away from this. These negotiations have been ongoing. I have never been very optimistic about it, although we all hope to wake up one day to the news that the Ayatollah and the Supreme Leader in Iran and those who surround him have somehow decided to walk away from this ambition and change their direction.

These negotiations are not going very well. That is why they have now been extended for another 4 months. The administration claims there has been great progress being made, although it is not clear what that progress is toward. For example, Iran's right to enrich, which they do not have one, but this right to enrich uranium has essentially been recognized as part of these negotiations, meaning there will be no guarantee that Iran cannot at some time in the future come back and exploit this agreement to develop nuclear weapons. If they keep the machines, and if they keep the process in place to enrich uranium, if they decide at some point in the future to go from a symbolic nuclear program, or a nascent one, into a full-fledged weapons one, they can do that rather quickly.

That is what they have agreed to do, already allowed them to retain a right to enrich. That, in and of itself, should be reason, in my opinion—perhaps it is not shared by others but in my opinion—to pull the plug on these negotiations. But it is not even clear in this instance that the administration is still insisting that Iran dismantle all of its nuclear-related facilities. In fact, according to some press reports, the Iranians want to keep all of their current centrifuges and the United States is supposedly open to allowing Iran to retain thousands of them. Iran's Supreme Leader even said recently that they need a larger enrichment capability than the one they currently have.

Another thing that has happened as part of this extension is that the P5+1 countries are going to allow Iran to access another $2.8 billion in sanctions relief. Basically what they have done here is they have forced the hand of this extension, and they get even more relief as a result of it.

I am also worried that the administration seems willing to allow Iran to have even more than 4 months to provide simply answers about its past work on nuclear weapons.

If they are not even willing to come clean on what they have done in the past, how can we possibly treat them as a reliable, responsible actor. Beyond that, there seems to be no attention whatsoever paid to the need to address Iran's ballistic missile program, its ICBMs. There is only one reason why you have ICBMs and that is these are long-range rockets capable of one day reaching the United States as they continue to develop them. The only reason they would even have one of those is to put a nuclear warhead on it. Just imagine a world where Iran has nuclear weapons capable of reaching this very city or New York or any part of the continental United States.

It would be all-out chaos. They would now have to be treated very differently, and they would basically be able to act with impunity anywhere in

the world. And that reaches my last point. Absent in this whole conversation and in all these negotiations is any discussion about Iran's ongoing sponsorship of terrorism and their ongoing human rights violations, including a pastor—an American, with strong links to this country—being held unjustly in that country.

All of this is to say this is the reason why this bill is so important. Any final agreement on a matter of this consequence should be reviewed by this body, should come before Congress, and Congress should have the ability to provide oversight. The absence of that, I believe, unfortunately, leaves us vulnerable, not only to a terrible deal but to a dangerous one that could potentially endanger the future of our allies and even of our own country.

I am grateful to join these Senators. I don't know who would want to speak next. I know all of my colleagues—I know the Senator from Arizona has spent a tremendous amount of time sounding the alarm on the danger—not just of this deal—that Iran poses in this region.

I would be interested in hearing from the Senator from Arizona on his views about this extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Florida and I thank him for his advocacy for freedom and democracy throughout the world. Frankly, I have been incredibly impressed with his knowledge and depth, including in our own hemisphere, which I think he and I would agree has been very much ignored. There are enormous challenges ahead there as well.

I would ask a couple of questions of my friend from Tennessee and my friend from South Carolina.

Isn't it true that in order to have a true nuclear capability you have to have a warhead and you have to have a delivery system, and the Iranians are proceeding apace forward in acquiring those capabilities? Would anybody believe that if they were truly interested in not going to nuclear weapons, they would not be spending time and effort on that capability?

Doesn't that destroy any credibility they might have about a commitment to not continue the development of nuclear weapons?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I would say that if there was a group of people in the world to be suspicious of, I would put Iran very close to the top of that list.

The international intelligence community believes they have tried to militarize their nuclear program in the past. Senator RUBIO made a good point. They deny this, but before you go forward, you would want to answer that question: Were they engaged in militarization of what was claimed to be a peaceful nuclear power program?

Second, why would you go through all of this upheaval, build a nuclear powerplant secretly at the bottom of a mountain, if all you wanted to do was have peaceful nuclear power? None of this really adds up. Why do you need an ICBM if all you want to do is produce peaceful nuclear power?

Having said that, suspicion is warranted here. But more than anything else, the final deal that may be reached should come to this body because I would suggest that of all the problems in the world today, this is the top of the list for me.

If they did break out as did North Korea, if a bad deal turned into a dangerous deal just as with North Korea, Sunni Arabs would respond in kind and we are on the road to Armageddon. I cannot think of a much worse scenario for our national security than the ayatollahs with nukes. I cannot think of a much more direct threat to the survival of the State of Israel than ayatollahs in Iran with nukes. I can't believe the Sunni Arabs would allow the Shia Persians to have a nuclear capability unanswered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would ask my friend from Tennessee, was he surprised and shocked that there would be an extension of these negotiations? Was he shocked and surprised that the end date is now after the midterm elections that we have in the United States of America?

Was he shocked that even though there has not been ''sufficient progress,'' there was still more relaxation of the sanctions, which then gives the Iranians billions of dollars worth of a boost to their economy? Was he surprised and shocked that this extension took place?

Mr. CORKER. Obviously, just the way the Senator asks the question—and obviously nobody in this Senate has spent more time on these issues than the Senator from Arizona—and I thank the Senator so much for his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and also on the Foreign Relations Committee and on all of these issues—absolutely not.

When you have a deal that is aimed, that says there is a built-in extension, you know that people aren't going to focus until the very end. So we expected there to be an extension. I was very disappointed, though, to know that we were giving additional sanctions relief.

I am very concerned because of the way this has happened. In March the administration agreed to allow them to enrich uranium, which was a big setback. I mean, we don't allow our best friends. We approved one, two, three agreements. The Senator and I just did one the other day in the committee with Senator RUBIO. Senator RISCH is also a part of this bill. But with our closest friends and allies we do not approve enrichment.

So here we are really doing something that will undo many of the agreements that we have and certainly have—as Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina mentioned—a tremendous impact on the region. There is no question people in the Arabian Peninsula right across the strait are looking at a country that has been their foe—and looking at potentially their having the capability to enrich uranium. Yes, this agreement started in a very bad place, but I think we all want to see a diplomatic solution. We want this to be successful.

I would add that Rouhani has the Supreme Leader whom he has to go back and talk to. He can always use that. The Supreme Leader, as Senator GRAHAM mentioned, wants 100,000 centrifuges—not the 19,000 centrifuges they have.

I would say to our administration to have us as a backstop—where Congress has to approve this. That would actually be an aid to them as they move down this negotiating path. I look at this as an asset to them, and I look at our fulfilling our responsibilities if this bill becomes law. I thank the Senator for asking.

Mr. MCCAIN. Finally, could I ask the Senator from Florida, we judge nations by their behavior, I believe. In fact, we don't view them in a vacuum. For example, the President of the United States said that if Syria crossed the red line in the use of chemical weapons, we would have to respond, and obviously we didn't.

Meanwhile, 170,000 people have been slaughtered—men, women, and children. So isn't it appropriate for us to not look at the Iranians in a very narrow spectrum but to look at overall behavior going all the way back to the bombing of the barracks in Beirut, the USS Cole, and a plot to kill the Saudi Ambassador here? And maybe the worst, most of all, is the Revolutionary Guard that has gone into Syria and the incredible flow of weapons and training on the part of the Iranians which has turned the tide in favor of Bashar al-Assad.

What about the Iranian missiles, some of which are threatening and raining down on Israel. Shouldn't we understand better? Shouldn't the American people and the world understand better what we are dealing with—a country with leaders who are dedicated to the extinction of everything we stand for and believe in? Therefore, wouldn't that impact our calculations as to their sincerity about a nuclear weapons program?

Mr. RUBIO. I think the Senator from Arizona touches on the exact point.

First, we have to understand Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. No nation on Earth uses terrorism as an active form of tradecraft as they do. They use terrorism the way we use military forces when necessary. They view it as a very active part of their agenda.

The Senator is correct. Virtually every major terrorist organization in the Middle East, absent a couple, they provide extraordinary assistance to. I think the Senator touched on another point: What is their goal? That is important to understand.

What is the Iranians' goal in these negotiations? In my mind those goals are quite clear. In fact, it is shocking to me because I know the administration knows this as well.

The goal of Iran is pretty simple. They want relief from as many sanctions as possible without agreeing to any irreversible concessions on their nuclear program.

Let's go through what they want to achieve. They want to be able to achieve or obtain an internationally recognized right to enrich—check.

They want the capability to enrich, process in the future, and keep that much in place as possible. They have already gotten that—check.

They want to continue to develop their long-range rockets and missile capabilities so that one day they can be in that position where, when we negotiate with them in the future on anything else, they are untouchable because they can launch a nuclear attack against the United States and certainly against our allies. They continue to do that—check.

The Iranians in this whole negotiation view themselves to be in a position of strength. To be quite frank, they believe that our President wants this deal more than they do. They believe he wants this deal more than they do, and that is what puts them in this tremendous position of strength.

The result is that these negotiations are not going to, in my view—I hope that I am wrong. I hope that tomorrow when we open the paper and read: You know what. They have changed their mind. They don't want to do any more terrorism—no more rockets and no nuclear weapons program—and they have become just a normal government in a normal country. Don't hold your hopes out for that because that is not what they have shown in the past. That is not what they are doing now, and they are negotiating from a position of strength because they know the President wants a deal much more than they want or need a deal.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would ask again, going full circle with the Senator from South Carolina, wouldn't we actually be helping the administration at the negotiating table to say wait a minute, we have a Congress full of people who have spent a lot of time on this issue, are very skeptical and, one, are going to have to be convinced of this deal?

Wouldn't we actually be strengthening the United States' hand at the bargaining table, in the Senator's view, if it were something of this magnitude that Congress would have to be involved in, as we have been in other major treaties that have been made, some of them much less significant than this agreement?

Mr. GRAHAM. The answer, unequivocally to me would be yes, assuming one thing: that those of us in this body would handle this in a mature fashion, assuming that Republicans would not vote no because this is the Obama deal and Democrats would not be tempted to vote yes because their President did this, a Democratic President.

I have confidence in the body that they would not do that. Let me tell you why. There are a lot of treaties out there that affect our national security. I can't think of an event in my life that is going to affect our national security one way or the other greater than the Iranian nuclear deal that I think is coming.

If a Republican scuttled the deal that was good, you would have a very unique place in history because you would have done a disservice to our country and the world at large.

Is it possible to know that it is a good deal? Yes, because the Israelis would comment on it. The Sunni Arab world would comment on it. If it is truly a deal unlike North Korea, which led to a bad outcome, I think you would have a score of people, including me, that would acknowledge that the President did the world a great service.

If it is a bad deal, if Senator RUBIO is right that they want to check the box and get a deal for the sake of getting a deal, I hope my Democratic colleagues would stand and say: This will come back to bite us as a nation.

I have confidence the body can do this because I can't think of anything more serious we will vote on other than going to war.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. As the Senator from South Carolina noted, the relationship that exists between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Jersey, I believe, has reinvigorated the Foreign Relations Committee in a very incredible way. What has taken place, thanks to that bipartisanship and hard work, has really been some remarkable results.

Frankly, thanks to the Senator's leadership and under the chairman, we have been able to have a significant impact on the conduct of national security in what I would argue is probably the greatest turmoil in my lifetime.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his great work.

Mr. CORKER. If I could, since the Senator and I have worked together on the committee, the administration came to us when they didn't have to. They came to us on the authorization for the use of force in Syria. We came together over a very short amount of time, Democrats and Republicans, and crafted something of which I am very proud. It didn't end up coming to the floor because a different course of action was taken, but the fact is that the administration sought our input on something that, as the Senator from South Carolina just mentioned, may pale compared to the impact of this Iranian negotiation relative to nuclear arms.

So this is something that is very important. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina—I believe that if something is presented, we would act very much in the same manner. It would be a sober discussion. People would understand the importance of it. And I think, from the administration's standpoint, the Senate saying grace over it and approving it gives him additional buy-in from the American people that we are behind him if they negotiate a good deal. On the other hand, if they don't, obviously we should have the right to weigh in and keep the sanctions that have been put in place by us.

Everybody says: Well, the administration still has to come back and talk with you all about sanctions.

That is not true. There is a waiver provision in there. They can't be undone permanently. But I think it gives us the appropriate say-so.

I thank the Senator so much for his leadership and for everybody's time on the floor and for working on this issue. Hopefully, as the Senator mentioned, this will become something that is very bipartisan.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 512—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND THE PROPOSED RULES AND GUIDELINES RELATING TO CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS FROM POWER PLANTS

Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 512

Whereas the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this preamble as the ''EPA'') proposed rules entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units'' (79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014)), and ''Carbon Pollution Standards for Modified and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units'' (79 Fed. Reg. 34960 (June 18, 2014)), in furtherance of the President's Climate Action Plan of June 2013;

Whereas the proposed rules would result in a Federal takeover of the electricity system of the United States leading to significant increases in electricity rates and additional energy costs for consumers and elimination of access to abundant, affordable power, putting the manufacturing of the United States at a competitive disadvantage, threatening the diversity and reliability of the electricity supply, and undermining energy security;

Whereas increased energy costs will, as always, fall most heavily on the elderly, the poor, and individuals on fixed incomes;

Whereas increased energy costs also result in job losses and damage families, businesses, and local institutions such as hospitals and schools;

Whereas in the haste of the Administration to drive coal and eventually natural gas from the energy generation portfolio, the Administration has gone beyond the plain reading of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), disregarding whether the EPA has the legal authority to propose and finalize rules and guidelines that include elements from the cap-and-trade program rejected by the United States Senate in June 2008;

Whereas including emissions sources beyond the power plant fence as opposed to only emissions sources inside the power plant fence creates a cap-and-trade program;

Whereas the President noted in the wake of the initial failure of the proposed cap-and-trade program, ''There are many ways to skin a cat'', demonstrating that the Administration seems determined to accomplish administratively what fails to be achieved through the legislative process;

Whereas at a time when manufacturers are shifting production from overseas to the United States and investing billions of dollars in the process, an Administration with a poor management record decided to embark on a plan that will result in energy rationing, pitting power plants against refineries, chemical plants, and paper mills for the ability to operate under the emissions requirements of the EPA;

Whereas after adopting similar carbon constraints, European countries experienced skyrocketing energy costs, economic decline, and a lower standard of living;

Whereas, on July 17, 2014, Australia repealed a carbon tax because Australia found that the carbon tax eliminated jobs, increased the cost of living for families, and did not benefit the environment;

Whereas the proposed rules mandate renewable energy use and initiate demand destruction to shrink energy production and usage, which will result in reduced economic opportunity at the State level, forcing States to pick winners and losers and choose between economic growth and energy affordability;

Whereas history demonstrates that at the end of the rulemaking process, the EPA will use its authority to constrain State preferences on program design, potentially even dictating policies that restrict when families of the United States can do laundry or run the air-conditioning;

Whereas impositions by the EPA almost guarantee that costs will be maximized and passed along to ratepayers, the size and scope of the Federal government will expand, and the role of the States in the system of cooperative federalism will continue to diminish;

Whereas the EPA failed to provide a complete assessment of the economic costs imposed by the proposed rules or the benefits that may result;

Whereas benefits from the proposed rules (as measured by reductions in global average temperature, reductions in the rate of sea level rise, increases in sea ice, or any other measurement related to climate change) will be essentially zero;

Whereas, in 2009, former EPA Administrator, Lisa Jackson testified that ''U.S. action alone would not impact world CO_2 levels.'';

Whereas on June 18, 2014, former EPA Administrator William Reilly testified that ''Absent action by China, Brazil, India and other fast-growing economies, what we do alone will not suffice.'';

Whereas China remains the largest emitter of carbon dioxide in the world with increasing emissions rates;

Whereas China continues to pursue aggressive economic growth, and estimates indicate that China will pass the United States as the largest economy in the world by 2016; and

Whereas while the Junior Senator from Massachusetts, now Secretary of State John Kerry, said ''[W]e need to have an agreement that does not leave enormous components of the world's contributors and future contributors of this problem out of the solution'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the proposed rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units'' (79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014)), should be withdrawn; and

(2) the proposed rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Carbon Pollution Standards for Modified and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units'' (79 Fed. Reg. 34960 (June 18, 2014)), should be withdrawn.

SENATE RESOLUTION 513—HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 513

Whereas August 1, 2014, marks the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising, a heroic event during World War II during which citizens of Poland, against all odds, fought against the Nazi occupation of Warsaw;

Whereas, on August 1, 1944, the Polish Home Army, with limited supplies and armed with mostly homemade weapons, rose up against the Nazis to fight the nationwide occupation of Poland by Nazi Germany;

Whereas the Polish resistance fought German forces for 63 days, suffering extreme hardship, retribution, and personal sacrifice, and during which approximately 250,000 Poles were killed, wounded, or went missing;

Whereas Adolf Hilter ordered the destruction of Warsaw as punishment for the uprising, leaving 85 percent of the city of Warsaw in ruins, including many historical buildings and monuments;

Whereas the actions of the Polish resistance inspire people throughout the world who fight for freedom and democracy; and

Whereas the actions of the Polish people during the Warsaw Uprising were a significant contribution to Allied war efforts during World War II and those actions continue to be respected and remembered throughout Poland: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising, which occurred during World War II and serves as a symbol of heroism and the power of the human spirit.

SENATE RESOLUTION 514—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF AUGUST 10 THROUGH AUGUST 16, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL NURSE-MANAGED HEALTH CLINIC WEEK''

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 514

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics are nonprofit, community-based health care sites that offer primary care and wellness services based on the nursing model;

Whereas the nursing model emphasizes the protection, promotion, and optimization of health, the prevention of illness, the alleviation of suffering, and the diagnosis and treatment of illness;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics are led by advanced practice nurses and staffed by an interdisciplinary team of highly qualified health care professionals;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics offer a broad scope of services, including treatment for acute and chronic illnesses, routine physical exams, immunizations for adults and children, disease screenings, health education, prenatal care, dental care, and drug and alcohol treatment;

Whereas, as of March 2014, approximately 500 nurse-managed health clinics provided care across the United States and recorded more than 2,500,000 patient encounters annually;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics serve a unique dual role as both health care safety net access points and health workforce development sites, given that the majority of nurse-managed health clinics are affiliated with schools of nursing and serve as clinical education sites for students entering the health profession;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics strengthen the health care safety net by expanding access to primary care and chronic disease management services for vulnerable and medically underserved populations in diverse rural, urban, and suburban communities;

Whereas research has shown that nurse-managed health clinics experience high patient retention and patient satisfaction rates and nurse-managed health clinic patients experience higher rates of generic medication fills and lower hospitalization rates when compared to similar safety net providers;

Whereas the 2010 report of the Institute of Medicine entitled ''The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health,'' highlights the work nurse-managed health clinics are doing to reduce health disparities by bringing evidence-based care to individuals who may not otherwise receive needed services; and

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics offering both primary care and wellness services provide quality care in a cost-effective manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of August 10 through August 16, 2014, as ''National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week'';

(2) supports the ideals and goals of National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week; and

(3) encourages the continued support of nurse-managed health clinics so that nurse-managed health clinics may continue to serve as health care workforce development sites for the next generation of primary care providers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 515—DESIGNATING JULY 24, 2014, AS ''INTERNATIONAL SELF-CARE DAY''

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 515

Whereas chronic diseases impose high costs in the United States in the forms of human capital, medical expenditures, and economic productivity;

Whereas chronic diseases are the leading cause of disability and death in the United States, and chronic diseases account for 7 out of 10 deaths in the United States;

Whereas approximately 25 percent of individuals with a chronic disease have some limitation on daily living activities and may be restricted from working or attending school;

Whereas chronic diseases account for $3 of every $4 spent on health care in the United States, including—

(1) $432,000,000,000 spent annually on heart disease and stroke;

(2) $174,000,000,000 spent annually on diabetes;

(3) $154,000,000,000 spent annually on lung disease; and

(4) $148,000,000,000 spent annually on Alzheimer's Disease;

Whereas the adoption of proactive healthy behaviors and lifestyles by individuals will materially reduce the burden of chronic diseases in the United States;

Whereas it is not possible to meet the enormous challenges presented by chronic diseases, the aging of the population, and other demographic changes without engaging individuals to be active participants in maintaining their health and well-being;

Whereas self-care can reduce the human and economic costs of chronic diseases, help individuals achieve better overall health, and prevent or delay many diseases;

Whereas self-care includes simple actions that individuals can take for themselves and their families to stay healthy, treat minor illnesses, and prevent or manage long-term conditions;

Whereas self-care entails a lifelong habit and culture of—

(1) making healthy lifestyle choices on a daily basis;

(2) practicing good hygiene to prevent infection and illness;

(3) avoiding unhealthy and risky actions;

(4) monitoring for signs and symptoms of changes in health;

(5) taking care of minor ailments; and

(6) knowing when to consult a doctor, pharmacist, or other health care professional;

Whereas individuals need greater access to tools that enable better self-care, including those that improve health literacy, promote good nutrition and overall wellness, facilitate physical activity, and prevent and manage chronic diseases;

Whereas over-the-counter medicines (commonly known as ''self-care medicines'' in other regions of the world) are some of the most important self-care tools, and help individuals improve wellness, treat everyday ailments, and prevent chronic diseases;

Whereas every $1 spent on over-the-counter medicines in the United States each year saves the health care system in the United States $6 to $7, accounting for $102,000,000,000 in annual savings relative to treatment alternatives;

Whereas self-care and the responsible use of over-the-counter medicines can help individuals avoid unnecessary visits to health care professionals, easing the burden on those health care professionals;

Whereas self-care empowers individuals with higher self-esteem, improves wellness, and reduces the use of health care services;

Whereas individuals in the United States have not sufficiently taken advantage of the potential of self-care to improve health, reduce the burden of chronic disease, and strengthen the sustainability of the health care system in the United States; and

Whereas achieving the full potential of self-care is the shared responsibility of consumers, policymakers, regulators, and health care professionals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 24, 2014, as ''International Self-Care Day'';

(2) recognizes the importance of improving awareness of self-care and the value self-care represents for the people of the United States;

(3) encourages patients, government officials, health care professionals, manufacturers and providers of medical products, and the media to use ''International Self-Care Day'' to highlight the benefits of self-care; and

(4) acknowledges that ''International Self-Care Day'' is recognized by health care organizations and parties with an interest in health care around the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 516—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA V. BEATRICE QUILL

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 516

Whereas, in the case of *State of North Dakota v. Beatrice Quill*, Crim. No. 08–2014–CR–01545, pending in South Central Judicial District Court in Bismarck, North Dakota, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony from two employees in the Bismarck, North Dakota office of Senator Heidi Heitkamp, and a video recording from that office;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current or former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Megan Carranza and Jane Opdahl, employees in the Office of Senator Heidi Heitkamp, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to produce documents and provide testimony in the case of *State of North Dakota v. Beatrice Quill*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent employees of Senator Heitkamp's office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3582. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3583. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3584. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3585. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3586. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3587. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3588. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3589. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3590. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3591. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3592. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3593. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3594. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3595. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3596. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3597. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3598. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3599. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3600. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3601. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3602. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3603. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3604. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3605. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3606. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3607. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3608. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3609. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3610. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3611. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3612. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3613. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3614. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3615. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3616. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3617. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3618. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3619. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3620. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3621. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3622. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3623. Mr. CASEY (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 489, supporting the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week''.

SA 3624. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3625. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3582. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title II and insert the following:

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Preserving America's Transit and Highways Act of 2014''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Subtitle A—Extension of Trust Fund Expenditure Authority

SEC. 2011. EXTENSION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 is amended—

(1) by striking ''before October 1, 2014,'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3), and

(2) by striking ''MAP-21'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 is amended—

(1) by striking ''MAP-21'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''before October 1, 2014,'' in subsection (d)(2).

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) is amended by striking ''before October 1, 2014,''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2012. FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS TO TRUST FUND.

Subsection (f) of section 9503 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS TO TRUST FUND.—For fiscal year 2014, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated, in addition to any amounts under paragraph (4), to—

''(A) the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund, $7,824,000,000, and

''(B) the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund, $2,000,000,000.''.

Subtitle B—Other Revenue Provisions

SEC. 2021. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RETURNS RELATING TO MORTGAGE INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6050H(b) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (I), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) the unpaid balance with respect to such mortgage at the close of the calendar year,

''(E) the address of the property securing such mortgage,

''(F) information with respect to whether the mortgage is a refinancing that occurred in such calendar year,

''(G) the amount of real estate taxes paid from an escrow account with respect to the property securing such mortgage,

''(H) the date of the origination of such mortgage, and''.

(b) PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 6050H is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) the information required to be included on the return under subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), (G) and (H) of subsection (b)(2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns and statements the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2022. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6501(e)(1) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and'',

(2) by inserting ''(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)'' in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after ''In determining the amount omitted from gross income'', and

(3) by inserting ''AMOUNT OMITTED FROM'' after ''DETERMINATION OF'' in the heading thereof.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2023. ADDITIONAL TRANSFER FROM THE LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 9508 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Out of amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund there is hereby appropriated $1,000,000,000 to be transferred under section 9503(f)(3) to the Highway Account (as defined in section 9503(e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund.''.

(b) TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (3) of section 9503(f) is amended by striking ''section 9508(c)(2).'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 9508(c).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2024. EQUALIZATION OF EXCISE TAX ON LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS AND LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.

(a) LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, 18.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline, and''.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline' means, with respect to a liquefied petroleum gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 115,400 (lower heating value).''.

(b) LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2), as amended by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting '', and'' and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

''(iv) in the case of liquefied natural gas, 24.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel.''.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a), as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel' means, with respect to a liquefied natural gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 128,700 (lower heating value).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iv), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) and paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by striking ''liquefied natural gas,'', and

(B) by striking ''peat), and'' and inserting ''peat) and''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any sale or use of fuel after September 30, 2014.

SEC. 2025. CLARIFICATION OF THE NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Section 204 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

''(k) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE FOR CERTAIN EXISTING DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3(24), an applicable plan shall not be treated as failing to meet any requirement of this title, or as failing to have a uniform normal retirement age for purposes of this title, solely because the plan provides for a normal retirement age described in paragraph (2).

''(2) APPLICABLE PLAN.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'applicable plan' means a defined benefit plan the terms of which, on or before June 25, 2014, provided for a normal retirement age which is the earlier of—

''(i) an age otherwise permitted under section 3(24), or

''(ii) the age at which a participant completes the number of years (not less than 30 years) of benefit accrual service specified by the plan.

A plan shall not fail to be treated as an applicable plan solely because the normal retirement age described in the preceding sentence only applied to certain participants or only applied to employees of certain employers in the case of a plan maintained by more than 1 employer.

''(B) EXPANDED APPLICATION.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if, after June 25, 2014, an applicable plan is amended to expand the application of the normal retirement age described in subparagraph (A) to additional participants or to employees of additional employers maintaining the plan, such plan shall also be treated as an applicable plan with respect to such participants or employees.

''(C) LIMITATION ON EXPANDED APPLICATION.—A defined benefit plan shall be an applicable plan only with respect to an individual who—

''(i) is a participant in the plan on or before January 1, 2017, or

''(ii) is an employee at any time on or before January 1, 2017, of any employer maintaining the plan, and who becomes a participant in such plan after such date.''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Section 411 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE FOR CERTAIN EXISTING DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(8), an applicable plan shall not be treated as failing to meet any requirement of this subchapter, or as failing to have a uniform normal retirement age for purposes of this subchapter, solely because the plan provides for a normal retirement age described in paragraph (2).

''(2) APPLICABLE PLAN.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'applicable plan' means a defined benefit plan the terms of which, on or before June 25, 2014, provided for a normal retirement age which is the earlier of—

''(i) an age otherwise permitted under subsection (a)(8), or

''(ii) the age at which a participant completes the number of years (not less than 30 years) of benefit accrual service specified by the plan.

A plan shall not fail to be treated as an applicable plan solely because the normal retirement age described in the preceding sentence only applied to certain participants or only applied to employees of certain employers in the case of a plan maintained by more than 1 employer.

''(B) EXPANDED APPLICATION.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if, after June 25, 2014, an applicable plan is amended to expand the application of the normal retirement age described in subparagraph (A) to additional participants or to employees of additional employers maintaining the plan, such plan shall also be treated as an applicable plan with respect to such participants or employees.

''(C) LIMITATION ON EXPANDED APPLICATION.—A defined benefit plan shall be an applicable plan only with respect to an individual who—

''(i) is a participant in the plan on or before January 1, 2017, or

''(ii) is an employee at any time on or before January 1, 2017, of any employer maintaining the plan, and who becomes a participant in such plan after such date.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to all periods before, on, and after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2026. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MEET DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6695 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) FAILURE TO BE DILIGENT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Any person who is a tax return preparer with respect to any return or claim for refund who fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary by regulations with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, the credit allowable by section 24 shall pay a penalty of $500 for each such failure.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 2027. FUNDING STABILIZATION.

(a) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The table in subclause (II) of section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv) is amended to read as follows:

''If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, or 2015	90%	110%
2016	85%	115%
2017	80%	120%
2018	75%	125%
After 2018	70%	130%''.

(b) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The table in subclause (II) of section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(C)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

''If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, or 2015	90%	110%
2016	85%	115%
2017	80%	120%
2018	75%	125%
After 2018	70%	130%''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(f)(2)(D) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1021(f)(2)(D)) is amended—

(i) in clause (i) by inserting ''and Preserving America's Transit and Highways Act of 2014'' after ''MAP-21'' both places it appears, and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2018''.

(B) STATEMENTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall modify the statements required under subclauses (I) and (II) of section 101(f)(2)(D)(i) of such Act to conform to the amendments made by this section.

(c) STABILIZATION NOT TO APPLY FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ACCELERATED BENEFIT DISTRIBUTION RULES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 436(d) is amended by striking ''of such plan'' and inserting ''of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv))''.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—The second sentence of subparagraph (B) of section 206(g)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''of such plan'' and inserting ''of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv))''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(B) COLLECTIVELY BARGAINED PLANS.—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(4) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If this paragraph applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(I) pursuant to the amendments made by this subsection, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Labor under any provision as so amended, and

(II) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2016, or such later date as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(ii) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless, during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that the amendments made by this subsection or the regulation described in clause (i)(I) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by such amendments or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in clause (i)(II) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted),

the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

(C) ANTI-CUTBACK RELIEF.—A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U. S. C. 1054(g)) and section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 solely by reason of a plan amendment to which this paragraph applies.

(d) MODIFICATION OF FUNDING TARGET DETERMINATION PERIODS.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Clause (i) of section 430(h)(2)(B) is amended by striking ''the first day of the plan year'' and inserting ''the valuation date for the plan year''.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Clause (i) of section 303(h)(2)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''the first day of the plan year'' and inserting ''the valuation date for the plan year''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) ELECTIONS.—A plan sponsor may elect not to have the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) apply to any plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, either (as specified in the election)—

(A) for all purposes for which such amendments apply, or

(B) solely for purposes of determining the adjusted funding target attainment percentage under sections 436 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and 206(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 for such plan year.

A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of such Act (29 U. S. C. 1054(g)) and section 411(d)(6) of such Code solely by reason of an election under this paragraph.

SEC. 2028. MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.

(a) RATE INCREASE.—For the period beginning on July 1, 2021, and ending on September 30, 2024, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered by substituting ''0.3464'' for ''0.21'' each place it appears.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''January 7, 2024''.

SEC. 2029. 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2030. MODIFICATION OF TAX EXEMPTION REQUIREMENTS FOR MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (12) of section 501(c) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) TREATMENT OF MUTUAL DITCH IRRIGATION COMPANIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued—

''(I) from the sale, lease, or exchange of fee or other interests in real property, including interests in water,

''(II) from the sale or exchange of stock in a mutual ditch or irrigation company (or in a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company) or contract rights for the delivery or use of water, or

''(III) from the investment of proceeds from sales, leases, or exchanges under subclauses (I) and (II),

except that any income received under subclause (I), (II), or (III) which is distributed or expended for expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company (as the case may be) shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended. For purposes of the preceding sentence, expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) include expenses for the construction of conveyances designed to deliver water outside of

the system of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, where State law provides that such a company or organization may be organized in a manner that permits voting on a basis which is pro rata to share ownership on corporate governance matters, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account whether its member shareholders have one vote on corporate governance matters per share held in the corporation. Nothing in this clause shall be construed to create any inference about the requirements of this subsection for companies or organizations not included in this clause.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2031. SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE NEED FOR LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION FUNDING BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Highway Trust Fund is projected to become insolvent before the end of fiscal year 2014.

(2) The user-fee principle upon which the Highway Trust Fund was established is eroding as demonstrated by the fact that since 2008 Congress has transferred $54,000,000,000 from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund.

(3) The gas tax and diesel tax, which are the primary funding mechanisms for the Highway Trust Fund, have not been increased since 1993 and are not indexed for inflation.

(4) Highway Trust Fund revenues have not kept pace with the infrastructure needs of the United States, in significant part due to a decline in miles driven, a decline in the purchasing power of highway excise taxes, and increased fuel efficiency.

(5) In 2013, according to the World Economic Forum Report on Global Competitiveness, the United States was ranked 25th globally in overall infrastructure quality.

(6) Short-term surface transportation extensions increase costs of transportation projects, limit the ability of State and local governments to plan infrastructure improvement, and ultimately have resulted in the degradation of infrastructure of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) any long-term transportation reauthorization bill should at a minimum fund infrastructure spending levels established in Senate authorizing legislation through fiscal year 2020; and

(2) the Committee on Finance of the Senate and other relevant committees of jurisdiction should work diligently to produce long-term surface transportation reauthorization legislation expeditiously.

Subtitle C—Budgetary Provisions

SEC. 2041. UNUSED EARMARKS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''earmark'' means—

(A) a congressionally directed spending item, as defined in rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate; and

(B) a congressional earmark, as defined in rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term ''unused DOT earmark'' means an earmark of funds for the Department of Transportation for a Federal-aid highway or highway safety construction program provided in an Act other than an appropriation Act for which—

(A) funds were first made available for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2005;

(B) as of September 30, 2014, more than 90 percent of the dollar amount of the earmark of funds remains available for obligation; and

(C) no amounts from the earmark of funds were expended during fiscal year 2013 or 2014.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNUSED DOT EARMARKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), effective on September 30, 2014, all unobligated amounts made available under an unused DOT earmark are rescinded.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) DELAY BY SECRETARY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may delay the rescission of amounts made available under an unused DOT earmark under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an additional obligation of amounts from the earmark of funds is likely to occur during fiscal year 2015.

(ii) EARMARK FUNDS NOT USED.—For an unused DOT earmark for which the Secretary of Transportation delayed rescission under clause (i), if no amounts from the earmark of funds are obligated during fiscal year 2015, effective on October 1, 2015, all unobligated amounts made available under the unused DOT earmark are rescinded.

(B) WRITTEN REQUEST BY RECIPIENTS.—Amounts made available under an unused DOT earmark shall not be rescinded under paragraph (1) if, before September 30, 2014, the recipient of the unused DOT earmark notifies the Secretary of Transportation in writing that—

(i) the project to be carried out using the unused DOT earmark is a priority project for the recipient; and

(ii) the recipient intends to spend the amounts made available for the project to be carried out using the unused DOT earmark.

(c) DOT EARMARK IDENTIFICATION AND REPORT.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall identify and submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget an annual report regarding every Federal-aid highway or highway safety construction program of the Department of Transportation for which—

(A) amounts are made available under an earmark provided in an Act other than an appropriation Act; and

(B) as of the end of a fiscal year, unobligated balances remain available.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and publically post on the website of the Office of Management and Budget an annual report that includes a listing and accounting for earmarks for a Federal-aid highway or highway safety construction program of the Department of Transportation provided in an Act other than an appropriation Act for which unobligated balances remain available, which shall include, for each earmark—

(A) the amount of funds made available under the original earmark;

(B) the amount of the unobligated balances that remain available;

(C) the fiscal year through which the funds are made available, if applicable; and

(D) recommendations and justifications for whether the earmark should be rescinded or retained in the next fiscal year.

SEC. 2042. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SA 3583. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act and the amendments made by this Act:

(1) MAP-21.—The term ''MAP-21'' means the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 405).

(2) PART-YEAR EXTENSION PERIOD.—The term ''Part-Year Extension Period'' means the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date.

(3) PART-YEAR FUNDING DATE.—The term ''Part-Year Funding Date'' means December 19, 2014.

(4) PART-YEAR RATIO.—The term ''Part-Year Ratio'' means the ratio calculated by dividing—

(A) the number of days included in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date; by

(B) 365.

(5) SAFETEA-LU.—The term ''SAFETEA-LU'' means the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1144).

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–244), titles I, V, and VI of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title), that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Part-Year Extension Period a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under divisions A and E of MAP-21 and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title); multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) for the Part-Year Extension Period shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and in the same amounts (as calculated using the Part-Year Ratio) as the funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under—

(A) MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141);

(B) the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–244);

(C) SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59);

(D) the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178);

(E) the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–59);

(F) the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240); and

(G) title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) under this section shall be—

(A) available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) for the Part-Year Extension Period, except as provided in paragraph (3)(B), subject to the limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2015 in paragraph (3)(A) or an Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 or a portion of that fiscal year.

(3) OBLIGATION CEILING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the absence of an Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 or a portion of that fiscal year—

(i) the annual limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2015 shall be equal to that of fiscal year 2014; and

(ii) the limitation on obligations shall be distributed and funding shall be exempt from the limitation on obligations in the same manner as for fiscal year 2014

(B) APPLICATION DURING PART-YEAR EXTENSION PERIOD.—

(i) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—During the Part-Year Extension Period, obligations subject to the limitation described in paragraph (2)(B) shall not exceed—

(I) the annual limitation on obligations imposed under that paragraph; multiplied by

(II) the Part-Year Ratio.

(ii) EXEMPT NHPP FUNDS.—During the Part-Year Extension Period, the amount of funds under section 119 of title 23, United States Code, that is exempt from the limitation on obligations imposed under paragraph (2)(B) shall be—

(I) $639,000,000; multiplied by

(II) the Part-Year Ratio.

(C) CALCULATIONS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall, as necessary for purposes of making the calculations for the distribution of any obligation limitation during the Part-Year Extension Period—

(i) annualize the amount of contract authority provided under this Act for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs; and

(ii) multiply the resulting distribution of obligation limitation by either the Part-Year Ratio or the pro rata for the period of an Act making appropriations for a portion of fiscal year 2015, whichever is applicable.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, and other provisions authorized under subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109–59), and chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Part-Year Extension Period a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109–59), and chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to appropriated or made available for obligation under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects and activities under—

(1) subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141);

(2) section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109–59); and

(3) chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 31101(c) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2013 and 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015''.

(e) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109–59) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2013 and 2014'' each place it appears and inserting ''fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015''.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59), and part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59), and part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated under this section shall be available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if the funds were authorized by section 4101 of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59) and amendments made by that section, as amended by section 32603 of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141), or authorized by section 31104 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same

rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under—

(1) title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141);

(2) title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109–59); and

(3) part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) in the first sentence by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS CONTINUATION.

(a) EXTENSION FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141) and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund for the Part-Year Extension Period, a sum equal to—

(A) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 authorized under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141) and under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(B) the Part-Year Ratio.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, a sum equal to—

(A) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under division B of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141) and under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(B) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds made available under this section from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available for obligation in the same manner as set forth in section 5338(j)(1) of title 49, United States Code.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under division B of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141) and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code.

(e) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER DIVISION B OF MAP-21.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for programs continued under this section shall be distributed to those programs in the same proportion as funds were allocated for those programs for fiscal year 2014.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. EXTENSION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under title III of division C of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i) of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, an amount equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under title III of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112–141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under title III of division C of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''October 1, 2014'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''December 20, 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''MAP–21'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''MAP–21'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''October 1, 2014'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''December 20, 2014''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''October 1, 2014'' and inserting ''December 20, 2014''.

SEC. 2002. FUNDING OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(A) $5,633,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund; and

''(B) $1,500,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.

''(6) ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE.—There is hereby transferred to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund amounts appropriated from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund under section 9508(c)(3).''.

(b) APPROPRIATION FROM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Out of amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund there is hereby appropriated $1,000,000,000 to be transferred under section 9503(f)(6) to the Highway Account (as defined in section 9503(e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9508(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''.

SEC. 2003. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RETURNS RELATING TO MORTGAGE INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6050H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (I), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) the unpaid balance with respect to such mortgage at the close of the calendar year,

''(E) the address of the property securing such mortgage,

''(F) information with respect to whether the mortgage is a refinancing that occurred in such calendar year,

''(G) the amount of real estate taxes paid from an escrow account with respect to the property securing such mortgage,

''(H) the date of the origination of such mortgage, and''.

(b) PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 6050H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) the information required to be included on the return under subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), (G) and (H) of subsection (b)(2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns and statements the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2004. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MEET DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6695 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) FAILURE TO BE DILIGENT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Any person who is a tax return preparer with respect to any return or claim for refund who fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary by regulations with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, the credit allowable by section 24 shall pay a penalty of $500 for each such failure.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 2005. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and'',

(2) by inserting ''(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)'' in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after ''In determining the amount omitted from gross income'', and

(3) by inserting ''AMOUNT OMITTED FROM'' after ''DETERMINATION OF'' in the heading thereof.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2006. 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2007. MODIFICATION OF TAX EXEMPTION REQUIREMENTS FOR MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (12) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) TREATMENT OF MUTUAL DITCH IRRIGATION COMPANIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued—

''(I) from the sale, lease, or exchange of fee or other interests in real property, including interests in water,

''(II) from the sale or exchange of stock in a mutual ditch or irrigation company (or in a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company) or contract rights for the delivery or use of water, or

''(III) from the investment of proceeds from sales, leases, or exchanges under subclauses (I) and (II),

except that any income received under subclause (I), (II), or (III) which is distributed or expended for expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company (as the case may be) shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended. For purposes of the preceding sentence, expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) include expenses for the construction of conveyances designed to deliver water outside of the system of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, where State law provides that such a company or organization may be organized in a manner that permits voting on a basis which is pro rata to share ownership on corporate governance matters, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account whether its member shareholders have one vote on corporate governance matters per share held in the corporation. Nothing in this clause shall be construed to create any inference about the requirements of this subsection for companies or organizations not included in this clause.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2008. EQUALIZATION OF EXCISE TAX ON LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS AND LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.

(a) LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, 18.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline, and''.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline' means, with respect to a liquefied petroleum gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 115,400 (lower heating value).''.

(b) LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting '', and'' and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

''(iv) in the case of liquefied natural gas, 24.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel.''.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel' means, with respect to a liquefied natural gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 128,700 (lower heating value).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) and paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by striking ''liquefied natural gas,'', and

(B) by striking ''peat), and'' and inserting ''peat) and''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any sale or use of fuel after September 30, 2014.

SEC. 2009. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''January 7, 2024'', and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''January 7, 2024''.

TITLE III—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SA 3584. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE _____—TRANSPORTATION EMPOWERMENT

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Transportation Empowerment Act''.

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the objective of the Federal highway program has been to facilitate the construction of a modern freeway system that promotes efficient interstate commerce by connecting all States;

(2) the objective described in paragraph (1) has been attained, and the Interstate System connecting all States is near completion;

(3) each State has the responsibility of providing an efficient transportation network for the residents of the State;

(4) each State has the means to build and operate a network of transportation systems, including highways, that best serves the needs of the State;

(5) each State is best capable of determining the needs of the State and acting on those needs;

(6) the Federal role in highway transportation has, over time, usurped the role of the States by taxing motor fuels used in the States and then distributing the proceeds to the States based on the perceptions of the Federal Government on what is best for the States;

(7) the Federal Government has used the Federal motor fuels tax revenues to force all States to take actions that are not necessarily appropriate for individual States;

(8) the Federal distribution, review, and enforcement process wastes billions of dollars on unproductive activities;

(9) Federal mandates that apply uniformly to all 50 States, regardless of the different circumstances of the States, cause the States to waste billions of hard-earned tax dollars on projects, programs, and activities that the States would not otherwise undertake; and

(10) Congress has expressed a strong interest in reducing the role of the Federal Government by allowing each State to manage its own affairs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to return to the individual States maximum discretionary authority and fiscal responsibility for all elements of the national surface transportation systems that are not within the direct purview of the Federal Government;

(2) to preserve Federal responsibility for the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways;

(3) to preserve the responsibility of the Department of Transportation for—

(A) design, construction, and preservation of transportation facilities on Federal public land;

(B) national programs of transportation research and development and transportation safety; and

(C) emergency assistance to the States in response to natural disasters;

(4) to eliminate to the maximum extent practicable Federal obstacles to the ability of each State to apply innovative solutions to the financing, design, construction, operation, and preservation of Federal and State transportation facilities; and

(5) with respect to transportation activities carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector, to encourage—

(A) competition among States, local governments, and the private sector; and

(B) innovation, energy efficiency, private sector participation, and productivity.

SEC. ___03. FUNDING LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Transportation determines for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 that the aggregate amount required to carry out transportation programs and projects under this title and amendments made by this title exceeds the estimated aggregate amount in the Highway Trust Fund available for those programs and projects for the fiscal year, each amount made available for that program or project shall be reduced by the pro rata percentage required to reduce the aggregate amount required to carry out those programs and projects to an amount equal to that available for those programs and projects in the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year.

SEC. ___04. FUNDING FOR CORE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The following sums are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account):

(A) FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM.—For the national highway performance program under section 119 of title 23, United States Code, the surface transportation program under section 133 of that title, the metropolitan transportation planning program under section 134 of that title, the highway safety improvement program under section 148 of that title, and the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program under section 149 of that title—

(i) $37,592,576,000 for fiscal year 2016;

(ii) $19,720,696,000 for fiscal year 2017;

(iii) $13,147,130,000 for fiscal year 2018;

(iv) $10,271,196,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

(v) $7,600,685,000 for fiscal year 2020.

(B) EMERGENCY RELIEF.—For emergency relief under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

(C) FEDERAL LANDS PROGRAMS.—

(i) FEDERAL LANDS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands transportation program under section 203 of title 23, United States Code, $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, of which $240,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the National Park Service and $30,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(ii) FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands access program under section 204 of title 23, United States Code, $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

(D) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to be made available to the Secretary for administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration—

''(A) $437,600,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(B) $229,565,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(C) $153,043,000 for fiscal year 2018;

''(D) $119,565,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

''(E) $88,478,000 for fiscal year 2020.''.

(2) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that a State determines that funds made available under this title to the State for a purpose are in excess of the needs of the State for that purpose, the State may transfer the excess funds to, and use the excess funds for, any surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purpose in the State.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has transferred funds under paragraph (1) to a purpose that is not a surface transportation purpose as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the improperly transferred funds shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year that begins after the date of the determination.''.

(3) FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the National Highway System, which includes''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 103 by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

''§ 103. Federal-aid system'';

and

(ii) in the analysis by striking the item relating to section 103 and inserting the following:

''103. Federal-aid system.''.

(4) CALCULATION OF STATE AMOUNTS.—Section 104(c)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking ''FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014'' and inserting ''SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''fiscal year 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016 and each subsequent fiscal year''.

(5) NATIONAL BRIDGE AND TUNNEL INVENTORY AND INSPECTION STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (e)(1) by inserting ''on the Federal-aid system'' after ''any bridge''; and

(ii) in subsection (f)(1) by inserting ''on the Federal-aid system'' after ''construct any bridge''.

(B) REPEAL OF HISTORIC BRIDGES PROVISIONS.—Section 144(g) of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

(6) REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—The following provisions are repealed:

(A) Section 213 of title 23, United States Code.

(B) The item relating to section 213 in the analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

(7) NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS.—Section 311 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''under subsection (a) of section 104 of this title'' and inserting ''to carry out this section''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

(8) FEDERALIZATION AND DEFEDERALIZATION OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on October 1, 2015—

(A) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project unless and until a State expends Federal funds for the construction portion of the project;

(B) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project solely by reason of the expenditure of Federal funds by a State before the construction phase of the project to pay expenses relating to the project, including for any environmental document or design work required for the project; and

(C)(i) a State may, after having used Federal funds to pay all or a portion of the costs of a highway construction or improvement project, reimburse the Federal Government in an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds so expended; and

(ii) after completion of a reimbursement described in clause (i), a highway construction or improvement project described in that clause shall no longer be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project.

(9) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—No reporting requirement, other than a reporting requirement in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall apply on or after October 1, 2016, to the use of Federal funds for highway projects by a public-private partnership.

(b) EXPENDITURES FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) EXPENDITURES FOR CORE PROGRAMS.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''October 1, 2014'' and inserting ''October 1, 2021''; and

(ii) by striking ''MAP–21'' and inserting ''Transportation Empowerment Act'';

(B) in paragraphs (3)(A)(i), (4)(A), and (5), by striking ''October 1, 2016'' each place it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2023''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ''July 1, 2017'' and inserting ''July 1, 2024''.

(2) AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR CORE PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CORE PROGRAMS FINANCING RATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

''(A) in the case of gasoline and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(i), the core programs financing rate is—

''(i) after September 30, 2015, and before October 1, 2016, 18.3 cents per gallon,

''(ii) after September 30, 2016, and before October 1, 2017, 9.6 cents per gallon,

''(iii) after September 30, 2017, and before October 1, 2018, 6.4 cents per gallon,

''(iv) after September 30, 2018, and before October 1, 2019, 5.0 cents per gallon, and

''(v) after September 30, 2019, 3.7 cents per gallon, and

''(B) in the case of kerosene, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iii), the core programs financing rate is—

''(i) after September 30, 2015, and before October 1, 2016, 24.3 cents per gallon,

''(ii) after September 30, 2016, and before October 1, 2017, 12.7 cents per gallon,

''(iii) after September 30, 2017, and before October 1, 2018, 8.5 cents per gallon,

''(iv) after September 30, 2018, and before October 1, 2019, 6.6 cents per gallon, and

''(v) after September 30, 2019 5.0 cents per gallon.

''(2) APPLICATION OF RATE.—In the case of fuels used as described in paragraphs (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), the core programs financing rate is zero.''.

(c) TERMINATION OF MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—Section 9503(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting '', and before October 1, 2015'' after ''March 31, 1983''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY ACCOUNT.—On October 1, 2016, the Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the Mass Transit Account to the Highway Account.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments and repeals made by this section take effect on October 1, 2015.

SEC. ___05. FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out section 503(b) of title 23, United States Code, $115,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) shall—

(1) be available for obligation in the same manner as if those funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that the Federal share of the cost of a project or activity carried out using those funds shall be 80 percent, unless otherwise expressly provided by this title (including the amendments by this title) or otherwise determined by the Secretary; and

(2) remain available until expended and not be transferable.

SEC. ___06. RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—On the first day of each of fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall—

''(i) determine the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the amounts appropriated in such fiscal year to the Highway Trust Fund under subsection (b) which are attributable to the taxes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof (after the application of paragraph (4) thereof) over the sum of—

''(II) the amounts so appropriated which are equivalent to—

''(aa) such amounts attributable to the core programs financing rate for such year, plus

''(bb) the taxes described in paragraphs (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), and

''(ii) allocate the amount determined under clause (i) among the States (as defined in section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code) for surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purposes so that—

''(I) the percentage of that amount allocated to each State, is equal to

''(II) the percentage of the amount determined under clause (i)(I) paid into the Highway Trust Fund in the latest fiscal year for which such data are available which is attributable to highway users in the State.

''(B) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has used amounts under subparagraph (A) for a purpose which is not a surface transportation purpose as described in subparagraph (A), the improperly used amounts shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year which begins after the date of the determination.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section takes effect on October 1, 2015.

SEC. ___07. REDUCTION IN TAXES ON GASOLINE, DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AND SPECIAL FUELS FUNDING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) REDUCTION IN TAX RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4081(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''18.3 cents'' and inserting ''3.7 cents''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4081(a)(2)(D) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''19.7 cents'' and inserting ''4.1 cents'', and

(ii) by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(B) Section 6427(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''7.4 cents'' and inserting ''1.5 cents''.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''7.3 cents per gallon (4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2016)'' and inserting ''1.4 cents per gallon (zero after September 30, 2022)''.

(2) Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(3) Section 4041(a)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''18.3 cents'' and inserting ''3.7 cents''.

(4) Section 4041(m)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2022,'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''9.15 cents'' and inserting ''1.8 cents'';

(C) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11.3 cents'' and inserting ''2.3 cents''; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) zero after September 30, 2022.''.

(5) Section 4081(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2016'' and inserting ''zero after September 30, 2022''.

(6) Section 9503(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking ''October 1, 2016'' both places it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2022'';

(B) in the heading of paragraph (2), by striking ''OCTOBER 1, 2016'' and inserting ''OCTOBER 1, 2022'';

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ''after September 30, 2016, and before July 1, 2017'' and inserting ''after September 30, 2021, and before July 1, 2023''; and

(D) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking ''October 1, 2014'' and inserting ''October 1, 2020''.

(c) FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

(A) before October 1, 2020, tax has been imposed under section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on any liquid; and

(B) on such date such liquid is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale;

there shall be credited or refunded (without interest) to the person who paid such tax (in this subsection referred to as the ''taxpayer'') an amount equal to the excess of the tax paid by the taxpayer over the amount of such tax which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on such date.

(2) TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed or made under this subsection unless—

(A) claim therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury before April 1, 2021; and

(B) in any case where liquid is held by a dealer (other than the taxpayer) on October 1, 2020—

(i) the dealer submits a request for refund or credit to the taxpayer before January 1, 2021; and

(ii) the taxpayer has repaid or agreed to repay the amount so claimed to such dealer or has obtained the written consent of such dealer to the allowance of the credit or the making of the refund.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR FUEL HELD IN RETAIL STOCKS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any liquid in retail stocks held at the place where intended to be sold at retail.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''dealer'' and ''held by a dealer'' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 6412 of such Code; except that the term ''dealer'' includes a producer.

(5) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b) and (c) of section 6412 and sections 6206 and 6675 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel removed after September 30, 2020.

(2) CERTAIN CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subsections (b)(4) and (b)(6) shall apply to fuel removed after September 30, 2017.

SEC. ___08. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to Congress describing such technical and conforming amendments to titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and such technical and conforming amendments to other laws, as are necessary to bring those

titles and other laws into conformity with the policy embodied in this title and the amendments made by this title.

SEC. ___09. EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENT ON CERTIFICATION OF DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that—

(1) this title will become effective only if the Director of the Office of Management and Budget certifies that this title is deficit neutral;

(2) discretionary spending limits are reduced to capture the savings realized in devolving transportation functions to the State level pursuant to this title; and

(3) the tax reduction made by this title is not scored under pay-as-you-go and does not inadvertently trigger a sequestration.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect only if—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') submits the report as required in subsection (c); and

(2) the report contains a certification by the Director that, based on the required estimates, the reduction in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2021.

(c) OMB ESTIMATES AND REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall—

(A) estimate the net change in revenues resulting from this title for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2020;

(B) estimate the net change in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority under this title for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2020;

(C) determine, based on those estimates, whether the reduction in discretionary outlays is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2021; and

(D) submit to Congress a report setting forth the estimates and determination.

(2) APPLICABLE ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—

(A) REVENUE ESTIMATES.—The revenue estimates required under paragraph (1)(A) shall be predicated on the same economic and technical assumptions and score keeping guidelines that would be used for estimates made pursuant to section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

(B) OUTLAY ESTIMATES.—The outlay estimates required under paragraph (1)(B) shall be determined by comparing the level of discretionary outlays resulting from this title with the corresponding level of discretionary outlays projected in the baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907).

(d) CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—On compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), the Director shall adjust the adjusted discretionary spending limits for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019 under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 665(a)(2)) by the estimated reductions in discretionary outlays under subsection (c)(1)(B).

(e) PAYGO INTERACTION.—On compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), no changes in revenues estimated to result from the enactment of this Act shall be counted for the purposes of section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

SA 3585. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10___. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, railway, bridge, or transit facility that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

SA 3586. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

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

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.—'';

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''and congressional staff with'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with''; and

(B) by striking ''or congressional staff shall'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after ''Congress,'' the following: ''of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who—

''(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

''(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointees for coverage under this paragraph.

''(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

''(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.''.

SA 3587. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act''.

SEC. 2. ALLOWANCE OF TEMPORARY DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED FROM A CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATION.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ELECTION; ELECTION YEAR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The taxpayer may elect to apply this section to—

''(A) the taxpayer's last taxable year which begins before the date of the enactment of the Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act, or

''(B) the taxpayer's first taxable year which begins during the 1-year period beginning on such date.

Such election may be made for a taxable year only if made on or before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(C) ELECTION YEAR.—For purposes of this section, the term 'election year' means the taxable year—

''(i) which begins after the date that is one year before the date of the enactment of the Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act, and

''(ii) to which the taxpayer elects under paragraph (1) to apply this section.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) EXTRAORDINARY DIVIDENDS.—Section 965(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''June 30, 2003'' and inserting ''June 30, 2014'', and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The amounts described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) shall not include any amounts which were taken into account in determining the deduction under subsection (a) for any prior taxable year.''.

(B) DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO RELATED PARTY INDEBTEDNESS.—Section 965(b)(3)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''October 3, 2004'' and inserting ''June 30, 2014''.

(C) DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO BASE PERIOD.—Section 965(c)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''June 30, 2003'' and inserting ''June 30, 2014''.

(b) DEDUCTION INCLUDES CURRENT AND ACCUMULATED FOREIGN EARNINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 965(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of dividends taken into account under subsection (a) shall not exceed the sum of the current and accumulated earnings and profits described in section 959(c)(3) for the year a deduction is claimed under subsection (a), without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the election year, for all controlled foreign corporations of the United States shareholder.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 965(c) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 965(c) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), is amended to read as follows:

''(4) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—All United States shareholders which are members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return under section 1501 shall be treated as one United States shareholder.''.

(c) AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 965(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''75 percent''.

(2) BONUS DEDUCTION IN SUBSEQUENT TAXABLE YEAR FOR INCREASING JOBS.—Section 965 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) BONUS DEDUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxpayer who makes an election to apply this section, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the first taxable year following the election year an amount equal to the applicable percentage of the cash dividends which are taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to such taxpayer for the election year.

''(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percentage is the amount which bears the same ratio (not greater than 1) to 10 percent as—

''(A) the excess (if any) of—

''(i) the qualified payroll of the taxpayer for the calendar year which begins with or within the first taxable year following the election year, over

''(ii) the qualified payroll of the taxpayer for calendar year 2013, bears to

''(B) 10 percent of the qualified payroll of the taxpayer for calendar year 2013.

''(3) QUALIFIED PAYROLL.—For purposes of this paragraph:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified payroll' means, with respect to a taxpayer for any calendar year, the aggregate wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by the corporation during such calendar year.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP OF TRADES OR BUSINESSES.—

''(i) ACQUISITIONS.—If, after December 31, 2012, and before the close of the first taxable year following the election year, a taxpayer acquires the trade or business of a predecessor, then the qualified payroll of such taxpayer for any calendar year shall be increased by so much of the qualified payroll of the predecessor for such calendar year as was attributable to the trade or business acquired by the taxpayer.

''(ii) DISPOSITIONS.—If, after December 31, 2012, and before the close of the first taxable year following the election year, a taxpayer disposes of a trade or business, then—

''(I) the qualified payroll of such taxpayer for calendar year 2013 shall be decreased by the amount of wages for such calendar year as were attributable to the trade or business which was disposed of by the taxpayer, and

''(II) if the disposition occurs after the beginning of the first taxable year following the election year, the qualified payroll of such taxpayer for the calendar year which begins with or within such taxable year shall be decreased by the amount of wages for such calendar year as were attributable to the trade or business which was disposed of by the taxpayer.

''(C) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of determining qualified payroll for any calendar year after calendar year 2014, such term shall not include wages paid to any individual if such individual received compensation from the taxpayer for services performed—

''(i) after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and

''(ii) at a time when such individual was not an employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) REDUCTION FOR FAILURE TO MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT LEVELS.—Paragraph (4) of section 965(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(4) REDUCTION IN BENEFITS FOR FAILURE TO MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT LEVELS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, during the period consisting of the calendar month in which the taxpayer first receives a distribution described in subsection (a)(1) and the succeeding 23 calendar months, the taxpayer does not maintain an average employment level at least equal to the taxpayer's prior average employment, an additional amount equal to $75,000 multiplied by the number of employees by which the taxpayer's average employment level during such period falls below the prior average employment (but not exceeding the aggregate amount allowed as a deduction pursuant to subsection (a)(1)) shall be taken into income by the taxpayer during the taxable year that includes the final day of such period.

''(B) AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT LEVEL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the taxpayer's average employment level for a period shall be the average number of full-time United States employees of the taxpayer, measured at the end of each month during the period.

''(C) PRIOR AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the taxpayer's 'prior average employment' shall be the average number of full-time United States employees of the taxpayer during the period consisting of the 24 calendar months immediately preceding the calendar month in which the taxpayer first receives a distribution described in subsection (a)(1).

''(D) FULL-TIME UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'full-time United States employee' means an individual who provides services in the United States as a full-time employee, based on the employer's standards and practices; except that regardless of the employer's classification of the employee, an employee whose normal schedule is 40 hours or more per week is considered a full-time employee.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP OF TRADES OR BUSINESSES.—Such term does not include—

''(I) any individual who was an employee, on the date of acquisition, of any trade or business acquired by the taxpayer during the 24-month period referred to in subparagraph (A), and

''(II) any individual who was an employee of any trade or business disposed of by the taxpayer during the 24-month period referred to in subparagraph (A) or the 24-month period referred to in subparagraph (C).

''(E) AGGREGATION RULES.—In determining the taxpayer's average employment level and prior average employment, all domestic members of a controlled group shall be treated as a single taxpayer.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3588. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. AUTHORIZATION OF MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS FOR C-130 AIRCRAFT.

The Air Force may use programs in addition to the avionics modernization program for C-130 aircraft to modernize such aircraft.

SA 3589. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. __. PATRIOT EMPLOYER TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 45T. PATRIOT EMPLOYER TAX CREDIT.

''(a) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the Patriot employer credit determined under this section with respect to any taxpayer who is a Patriot employer for any taxable year shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified wages paid or incurred by the Patriot employer.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account under paragraph (1) with respect to any employee for any taxable year shall not exceed $15,000.

''(b) PATRIOT EMPLOYER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'Patriot employer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer—

''(A) which—

''(i) maintains its headquarters in the United States if the taxpayer (or any predecessor) has ever been headquartered in the United States, and

''(ii) is not (and no predecessor of which is) an expatriated entity (as defined in section 7874(a)(2)) for the taxable year or any preceding taxable year ending after March 4, 2003,

''(B) with respect to which no assessable payment has been imposed under section 4980H with respect to any month occurring during the taxable year, and

''(C) in the case of—

''(i) a taxpayer which employs an average of more than 50 employees on business days during the taxable year, which—

''(I) provides compensation for at least 90 percent of its employees for services provided by such employees during the taxable year at an hourly rate (or equivalent thereof) not less than an amount equal to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level for a family of three for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins divided by 2,080,

''(II) meets the retirement plan requirements of subsection (c) with respect to at least 90 percent of its employees providing services during the taxable year who are not highly compensated employees, and

''(III) meets the additional requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2), or

''(ii) any other taxpayer, which meets the requirements of either subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) for the taxable year.

''(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LARGE EMPLOYERS.—

''(A) UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met for any taxable year if—

''(i) in any case in which the taxpayer increases the number of employees performing substantially all of their services for the taxable year outside the United States, the taxpayer either—

''(I) increases the number of employees performing substantially all of their services inside the United States by an amount not less than the increase in such number for employees outside the United States, or

''(II) has a percentage increase in such employees inside the United States which is not less than the percentage increase in such employees outside the United States,

''(ii) in any case in which the taxpayer decreases the number of employees performing substantially all of their services for the taxable year inside the United States, the taxpayer either—

''(I) decreases the number of employees performing substantially all of their services outside the United States by an amount not less than the decrease in such number for employees inside the United States, or

''(II) has a percentage decrease in employees outside the United States which is not less than the percentage decrease in such employees inside the United States, and

''(iii) there is not a decrease in the number of employees performing substantially all of their services for the taxable year inside the United States by reason of the taxpayer contracting out such services to persons who are not employees of the taxpayer.

''(B) TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND THE DISABLED.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met for any taxable year if—

''(i) the taxpayer provides differential wage payments (as defined in section 3401(h)(2)) to each employee described in section 3401(h)(2)(A) for any period during the taxable year in an amount not less than the difference between the wages which would have been received from the employer during such period and the amount of pay and allowances which the employee receives for service in the uniformed services during such period, and

''(ii) the taxpayer has in place at all times during the taxable year a written policy for the recruitment of employees who have served in the uniformed services or who are disabled.

''(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLYING THE MINIMUM WAGE AND RETIREMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) MINIMUM WAGE.—In determining whether the minimum wage requirements of paragraph (1)(C)(i)(I) are met with respect to 90 percent of a taxpayer's employees for any taxable year—

''(i) a taxpayer may elect to exclude from such determination apprentices or learners that an employer may exclude under the regulations under section 14(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and

''(ii) if a taxpayer meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(B)(i) with respect to providing differential wage payments to any employee for any period (without regard to whether such requirements apply to the taxpayer), the hourly rate (or equivalent thereof) for such payments shall be determined on the basis of the wages which would have been paid by the employer during such period if the employee had not been providing service in the uniformed services.

''(B) RETIREMENT PLAN.—In determining whether the retirement plan requirements of paragraph (1)(C)(i)(II) are met with respect to 90 percent of a taxpayer's employees for any taxable year, a taxpayer may elect to exclude from such determination—

''(i) employees not meeting the age or service requirements under section 410(a)(1) (or such lower age or service requirements as the employer provides), and

''(ii) employees described in section 410(b)(3).

''(c) RETIREMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of this subsection are met for any taxable year with respect to an employee of the taxpayer who is not a highly compensated employee if the employee is eligible to participate in 1 or more applicable eligible retirement plans maintained by the employer for a plan year ending with or within the taxable year.

''(2) APPLICABLE ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'applicable eligible retirement plan' means an eligible retirement plan which, with respect to the plan year described in paragraph (1), is either—

''(A) a defined contribution plan which—

''(i) requires the employer to make nonelective contributions of at least 5 percent of the compensation of the employee, or

''(ii) both—

''(I) includes an eligible automatic contribution arrangement (as defined in section 414(w)(3)) under which the uniform percentage described in section 414(w)(3)(B) is at least 5 percent, and

''(II) requires the employer to make matching contributions of 100 percent of the elective deferrals (as defined in section 414(u)(2)(C)) of the employee to the extent such deferrals do not exceed the percentage specified by the plan (not less than 5 percent) of the employee's compensation, or

''(B) a defined benefit plan—

''(i) with respect to which the accrued benefit of the employee derived from employer contributions, when expressed as an annual retirement benefit, is not less than the product of—

''(I) the lesser of 2 percent multiplied by the employee's years of service (determined under the rules of paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 411(a)) with the employer or 20 percent, multiplied by

''(II) the employee's final average pay, or

''(ii) which is an applicable defined benefit plan (as defined in section 411(a)(13)(B))—

''(I) which meets the interest credit requirements of section 411(b)(5)(B)(i) with respect to the plan year, and

''(II) under which the employee receives a pay credit for the plan year which is not less than 5 percent of compensation.

''(3) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The term 'eligible retirement plan' has the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(8)(B), except that in the case of an account or annuity described in clause (i) or (ii) thereof, such term shall only include an account or annuity which is a simplified employee pension (as defined in section 408(k)).

''(B) FINAL AVERAGE PAY.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II), final average pay shall be determined using the period of consecutive years (not exceeding 5) during which the employee had the greatest compensation from the taxpayer.

''(C) ALTERNATIVE PLAN DESIGNS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations for a taxpayer to meet the requirements of this subsection through a combination of defined contribution plans or defined benefit plans described in paragraph (1) or through a combination of both such types of plans.

''(D) PLANS MUST MEET REQUIREMENTS WITHOUT TAKING INTO ACCOUNT SOCIAL SECURITY AND SIMILAR CONTRIBUTIONS AND BENEFITS.—A rule similar to the rule of section 416(e) shall apply.

''(d) QUALIFIED WAGES AND COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified wages' means wages (as defined in section 51(c), determined without regard to paragraph (4) thereof) paid or incurred by the Patriot employer during the taxable year to employees—

''(A) who perform substantially all of their services for such Patriot employer inside the United States, and

''(B) with respect to whom—

''(i) in the case of a Patriot employer which employs an average of more than 50 employees on business days during the taxable year, the requirements of subclauses (I) and (II) of subsection (b)(1)(C)(i) are met, and

''(ii) in the case of any other Patriot employer, the requirements of either subclause (I) or (II) of subsection (b)(1)(C)(i) are met.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOR AND RAILWAY LABOR.—Rules similar to the rules of section 51(h) shall apply.

''(3) COMPENSATION.—For purposes of subsections (b)(1)(C)(i)(I) and (c), the term 'compensation' has the same meaning as qualified wages, except that section 51(c)(2) shall be disregarded in determining the amount of such wages.

''(e) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 shall be treated as a single taxpayer.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of applying paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (b)—

''(A) the determination under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 for purposes of paragraph (1) shall be made without regard to section 1563(b)(2)(C) (relating to exclusion of foreign corporations), and

''(B) if any person treated as a single taxpayer under this subsection (after application of subparagraph (A)), or any predecessor of such person, was an expatriated entity (as defined in section 7874(a)(2)) for any taxable year ending after March 4, 2003, then all persons treated as a single taxpayer with such person shall be treated as expatriated entities.

''(f) ELECTION TO HAVE CREDIT NOT APPLY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may elect to have this section not apply for any taxable year.

''(2) TIME FOR MAKING ELECTION.—An election under paragraph (1) for any taxable year may be made (or revoked) at any time before the expiration of the 3-year period beginning on the last date prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year (determined without regard to extensions).

''(3) MANNER OF MAKING ELECTION.—An election under paragraph (1) (or revocation thereof) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.''.

(b) ALLOWANCE AS GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (36), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (37) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(38) in the case of a Patriot employer (as defined in section 45T(b)) for any taxable year, the Patriot employer credit determined under section 45T(a).''.

(c) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Subsection (a) of section 280C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''45T(a),'' after ''45P(a)''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45T. Patriot employer tax credit.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. _. DEFER DEDUCTION OF INTEREST EXPENSE RELATED TO DEFERRED INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to deductions for interest expense) is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) DEFERRAL OF DEDUCTION FOR INTEREST EXPENSE RELATED TO DEFERRED INCOME.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—The amount of foreign-related interest expense of any taxpayer allowed as a deduction under this chapter for any taxable year shall not exceed an amount equal to the applicable percentage of the sum of—

''(A) the taxpayer's foreign-related interest expense for the taxable year, plus

''(B) the taxpayer's deferred foreign-related interest expense.

For purposes of the paragraph, the applicable percentage is the percentage equal to the current inclusion ratio.

''(2) TREATMENT OF DEFERRED DEDUCTIONS.—If, for any taxable year, the amount of the limitation determined under paragraph (1) exceeds the taxpayer's foreign-related interest expense for the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(A) such excess, or

''(B) the taxpayer's deferred foreign-related interest expense.

''(3) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) FOREIGN-RELATED INTEREST EXPENSE.—The term 'foreign-related interest expense' means, with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year, the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of interest expense for such taxable year allocated and apportioned under sections 861, 864(e), and 864(f) to income from sources outside the United States as—

''(i) the value of all stock held by the taxpayer in all section 902 corporations with respect to which the taxpayer meets the ownership requirements of subsection (a) or (b) of section 902, bears to

''(ii) the value of all assets of the taxpayer which generate gross income from sources outside the United States.

''(B) DEFERRED FOREIGN-RELATED INTEREST EXPENSE.—The term 'deferred foreign-related interest expense' means the excess, if any, of the aggregate foreign-related interest expense for all prior taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014, over the aggregate amount allowed as a deduction under paragraphs (1) and (2) for all such prior taxable years.

''(C) VALUE OF ASSETS.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the value of any asset shall be the amount with respect to such asset determined for purposes of allocating and apportioning interest expense under sections 861, 864(e), and 864(f).

''(D) CURRENT INCLUSION RATIO.—The term 'current inclusion ratio' means, with respect to any domestic corporation which meets the ownership requirements of subsection (a) or (b) of section 902 with respect to one or more section 902 corporations for any taxable year, the ratio (expressed as a percentage) of—

''(i) the sum of all dividends received by the domestic corporation from all such section 902 corporations during the taxable year plus amounts includible in gross income under section 951(a) from all such section 902 corporations, in each case computed without regard to section 78, divided by

''(ii) the aggregate amount of post-1986 undistributed earnings.

''(E) AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF POST-1986 UNDISTRIBUTED EARNINGS.—The term 'aggregate amount of post-1986 undistributed earnings' means, with respect to any domestic corporation which meets the ownership requirements of subsection (a) or (b) of section 902 with respect to one or more section 902 corporations, the domestic corporation's pro rata share of the post-1986 undistributed earnings (as defined in section 902(c)(1)) of all such section 902 corporations.

''(F) FOREIGN CURRENCY CONVERSION.—For purposes of determining the current inclusion ratio, and except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the aggregate amount of post-1986 undistributed earnings for the taxable year shall be determined by translating each section 902 corporation's post-1986 undistributed earnings into dollars using the average exchange rate for such year.

''(G) SECTION 902 CORPORATION.—The term 'section 902 corporation' has the meaning given to such term by section 909(d)(5).

''(4) TREATMENT OF AFFILIATED GROUPS.—The current inclusion ratio of each member of an affiliated group (as defined in section 864(e)(5)(A)) shall be determined as if all members of such group were a single corporation.

''(5) APPLICATION TO SEPARATE CATEGORIES OF INCOME.—This subsection shall be applied separately with respect to the categories of income specified in section 904(d)(1).

''(6) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations or other guidance as is necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including regulations or other guidance providing—

''(A) for the proper application of this subsection with respect to changes in ownership of a section 902 corporation,

''(B) that certain corporations that otherwise would not be members of the affiliated group will be treated as members of the affiliated group for purposes of this subsection,

''(C) for the proper application of this subsection with respect to the taxpayer's share of a deficit in earnings and profits of a section 902 corporation,

''(D) for appropriate adjustments to the determination of the value of stock in any section 902 corporation for purposes of this subsection or to the foreign-related interest expense to account for income that is subject to tax under section 882(a)(1), and

''(E) for the proper application of this subsection with respect to interest expense that is directly allocable to income with respect to certain assets.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 3590. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—LYON COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. LAND CONVEYANCE TO YERINGTON, NEVADA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Yerington, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the land located in Lyon County and Mineral County, Nevada, that is identified on the map as ''City of Yerington Sustainable Development Conveyance Lands''.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Yerington Land Conveyance'' and dated December 19, 2012.

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

(b) CONVEYANCES OF LAND TO CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary and notwithstanding

the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City, subject to the agreement of the City, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(2) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(A) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(B) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) APPLICABLE LAW.—Beginning on the date on which the Federal land is conveyed to the City, the development of and conduct of activities on the Federal land shall be subject to all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

(5) COSTS.—As a condition of the conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the City shall pay—

(A) an amount equal to the appraised value determined in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(B) all costs related to the conveyance, including all surveys, appraisals, and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land to the City under paragraph (1).

SEC. 202. WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the area designated as the Wovoka Wilderness by this section contains unique and spectacular natural resources, including—

(A) priceless habitat for numerous species of plants and wildlife;

(B) thousands of acres of land that remain in a natural state; and

(C) habitat important to the continued survival of the population of the greater sage grouse of western Nevada and eastern California (referred to in this section as the ''Bi-State population of greater sage-grouse'');

(2) continued preservation of those areas would benefit the County and all of the United States by—

(A) ensuring the conservation of ecologically diverse habitat;

(B) protecting prehistoric cultural resources;

(C) conserving primitive recreational resources;

(D) protecting air and water quality; and

(E) protecting and strengthening the Bi-State population of greater sage-grouse; and

(3) the Secretary of Agriculture should collaborate with the Lyon County Commission and the local community on wildfire and forest management planning and implementation with the goal of preventing catastrophic wildfire and resource damage.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Lyon County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Wovoka Wilderness Area'' and dated December 18, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(5) WILDERNESS.—The term ''Wilderness'' means the Wovoka Wilderness designated by subsection (c)(1).

(c) ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land managed by the Forest Service, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the ''Wovoka Wilderness''.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 150 feet from the centerline of the road.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(B) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary, in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405).

(3) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interest in land within the boundary of the Wilderness that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Wilderness.

(4) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(5) OVERFLIGHTS.—

(A) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this title restricts or precludes—

(i) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can been seen or heard within the Wilderness;

(ii) flight testing and evaluation; or

(iii) the designation or creation of new units of special airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(B) EXISTING AIRSTRIPS.—Nothing in this title restricts or precludes low-level overflights by aircraft originating from airstrips in existence on the date of enactment of this Act that are located within 5 miles of the proposed boundary of the Wilderness.

(6) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take any measures in the Wilderness that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency.

(7) WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(i) the Wilderness is located—

(I) in the semiarid region of the Great Basin; and

(II) at the headwaters of the streams and rivers on land with respect to which there are few—

(aa) actual or proposed water resource facilities located upstream; and

(bb) opportunities for diversion, storage, or other uses of water occurring outside the land that would adversely affect the wilderness values of the land;

(ii) the Wilderness is generally not suitable for use or development of new water resource facilities; and

(iii) because of the unique nature of the Wilderness, it is possible to provide for proper management and protection of the wilderness and other values of land in ways different from those used in other laws.

(B) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this paragraph is to protect the wilderness values of the Wilderness by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(C) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph—

(i) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(ii) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(iii) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(iv) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(v) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(D) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(E) NEW PROJECTS.—

(i) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In this subparagraph, the term ''water resource facility'' means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary

facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(II) EXCLUSION.—In this subparagraph, the term ''water resource facility'' does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(ii) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, no officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

(II) EXCEPTION.—If a permittee within the Bald Mountain grazing allotment submits an application for the development of water resources for the purpose of livestock watering by the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a water development permit within the non-wilderness boundaries of the Bald Mountain grazing allotment for the purposes of carrying out activities under paragraph (2).

(8) NONWILDERNESS ROADS.—Nothing in this title prevents the Secretary from implementing or amending a final travel management plan.

(e) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations, if the activities are carried out—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles and aircraft, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks.

(3) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101–405, the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations in the Wilderness.

(4) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the Wilderness.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency and notify the public before making any designation under paragraph (1).

(5) AGREEMENT.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding: Intermountain Region USDA Forest Service and the Nevada Department of Wildlife State of Nevada'' and signed by the designee of the State on February 6, 1984, and by the designee of the Secretary on January 24, 1984, including any amendments, appendices, or additions to the agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State or a designee; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(f) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects (including guzzlers) in the Wilderness if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the Wilderness can reasonably be minimized.

SEC. 203. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) DEFINITION OF WITHDRAWAL AREA.—In this section, the term ''Withdrawal Area'' means the land administered by the Forest Service and identified as ''Withdrawal Area'' on the map described in section 202(b)(2).

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Withdrawal Area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral materials laws.

(c) MOTORIZED AND MECHANICAL VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), use of motorized and mechanical vehicles in the Withdrawal Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for the use of those vehicles, unless the use of those vehicles is needed—

(A) for administrative purposes; or

(B) to respond to an emergency.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to aircraft (including helicopters).

SEC. 204. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

SA 3591. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. REVIEW OF CERTAIN FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES.

If, by the date that is 45 days after the date on which a State Bureau of Land Management office has submitted a Federal Register notice to the Washington, DC, office of the Bureau of Land Management for Department of the Interior review, the review has not been completed—

(1) the notice shall consider to be approved; and

(2) the State Bureau of Land Management office shall immediately forward the notice to the Federal Register for publication.

SA 3592. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 4. EMERGENCY FUEL REDUCTION.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to expedite wildfire prevention projects to reduce the chances of wildfire on certain high-risk Federal land adjacent to communities, private property, and critical infrastructure;

(2) to improve forest and wildland health; and

(3) to promote the recovery of threatened and endangered species, or other species under consideration for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), including sage-grouse, whose habitat is negatively impacted by wildland fire.

(b) EXPEDITED REVIEW OF PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Section 104 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6514) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (f) through (i), respectively;

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(C)(i), by striking ''subsection (f)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF ADJACENT FEDERAL LAND.—In this subsection, the term 'adjacent Federal land' means an area of Federal land—

''(A) that, while not located in the wildland-urban interface, is located within not more than 5 miles of non-Federal land; and

''(B) on which the Secretary determines that conditions, such as the risk of wildfire, an insect or disease epidemic, or the presence of invasive species, pose a risk to the adjacent non-Federal land.

''(2) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An authorized hazardous fuel reduction project shall be categorically excluded from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if the project—

''(i) involves the removal of insect-infected trees, dead or dying trees, trees presenting a threat to public safety or electrical reliability, or the removal of other hazardous fuels within 500 feet of utility or communications infrastructure, a municipal water supply system, campground, roadside, heritage site, recreation site, school, or other infrastructure;

''(ii) is intended to treat 10,000 acres or less of public land or National Forest System land that—

''(I) contains threatened and endangered species habitat; or

''(II) provides conservation benefits to species that are not listed as endangered or threatened under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) but are a State-listed species, a special concern species, or candidates for a listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

''(iii) is proposed to be conducted on adjacent Federal land or is recommended in a community wildfire protection plan if—

''(I) the Secretary determines that the project is consistent with the applicable resource management plan; and

''(II) the decision to categorically exclude the project is made in accordance with applicable extraordinary circumstances procedures established pursuant to section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

''(B) CONSULTATION.—In determining whether an area contains trees or other hazardous fuels described in clause (i), the Secretary shall consult with any utility or other entity that manages the area.

''(C) PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—In providing categorical exclusions under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects and other projects recommended in a community wildfire protection plan.

''(D) EXCLUSIONS.—National Forest System land or public land eligible for treatment under this subsection shall not include land—

''(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

''(ii) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal law; or

''(iii) that is within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act.''.

SA 3593. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC LAND RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Subtitle A—Geothermal Energy

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 234(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15873(a)) is amended by striking ''in the first 5 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''through fiscal year 2020''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 234(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15873(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Amounts'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—Effective for fiscal year [2015] and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts deposited under subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure, subject to appropriation and without fiscal year limitation, to implement the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) and this Act.''.

SEC. 202. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR GEOTHERMAL DRILLING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a new categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for geothermal drilling activities on any National Forest System land or public land (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)) that were reviewed under the programmatic environmental impact statement relating to the authorization of geothermal leasing completed in October 2008.

Subtitle B—Development of Wind and Solar Energy on Certain Federal Land

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED LAND.—The term ''covered land'' means land that is—

(A)(i) public land administered by the Secretary; or

(ii) National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) not excluded from the development of solar or wind energy under—

(i) a final land use plan established under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) a final land and resource management plan established under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); or

(iii) other Federal law.

(2) FUND.—The term ''Fund'' means the Renewable Energy Resource Conservation Fund established by section 214(b)(1).

(3) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term ''pilot program'' means the wind and solar leasing pilot program established under section 212(a)(1).

(4) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(5) SECRETARIES.—The term ''Secretaries'' means—

(A) in the case of public land administered by the Secretary, the Secretary; and

(B) in the case of National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

SEC. 212. DEVELOPMENT OF SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY ON COVERED LAND.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries each shall establish a wind and solar leasing pilot program under which the Secretaries shall conduct lease sales of certain sites located on covered land for purposes of carrying out wind and solar energy projects.

(2) SELECTION OF SITES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date the pilot program is established under paragraph (1), the Secretaries shall each select from covered land—

(i) 1 site for the development of a solar energy project; and

(ii) 1 site for the development of a wind energy project.

(B) SITE SELECTION.—In selecting sites under subparagraph (A), the Secretaries shall—

(i) give a preference to sites that the Secretaries determine—

(I) are likely to attract a high level of wind and solar energy industry interest;

(II) have a comparatively low value for resources, other than wind and solar energy; and

(III) would serve as models for the expansion of the pilot program to other locations, if the program is expanded under subsection (c);

(ii) take into consideration the value of the multiple resources of the covered land on which the sites are located; and

(iii) not select any site for which a right-of-way or special use permit for site testing or construction has been issued under—

(I) title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.); or

(II) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

(3) LEASE SALES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (4)(B)(i), not later than 180 days after the date on which sites are selected under paragraph (2), the Secretaries shall offer each site for competitive leasing to bidders that the Secretaries determine to be qualified under subparagraph (C) under such terms and conditions as are required by the Secretaries.

(B) BIDDING SYSTEMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In offering the sites for lease, the Secretaries may vary the bidding system selected by the Secretaries, including—

(I) cash bonus bids with a requirement for payment of the royalty established under this subtitle;

(II) variable royalty bids based on a percentage of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity produced from the lease, except that the royalty shall not be less than the royalty required under this subtitle, together with a fixed cash bonus; or

(III) such other bidding system as the Secretaries determine will ensure a fair return to the public, consistent with the royalty established under this subtitle.

(ii) ROUND.—The Secretaries shall limit bidding to 1 round in any lease sale.

(C) BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS.—Before conducting a lease sale under this section, the Secretaries shall—

(i) establish qualifications for bidders that ensure the bidders—

(I) are able to expeditiously develop a wind or solar energy project on the site for lease;

(II) possess—

(aa) the financial resources necessary to complete a project;

(bb) knowledge of the technology needed to complete a project; and

(cc) such other qualifications as the Secretaries determine to be necessary; and

(III) meet eligibility requirements that are substantially similar to the eligibility requirements for leasing that apply under the first section of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181); and

(ii) using the requirements established under clause (i), determine whether a person is qualified to be a bidder on a site offered for lease under this subsection.

(D) CREDIT FOR BID PREPARATION EXPENDITURES.—If more than 1 bid is submitted with respect to a site offered for lease under this subsection on the date of the lease sale, the Secretaries shall give credit to each person who submitted a bid with respect to the site for expenditures the person incurred in the preparation of the bid.

(4) LEASE TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries may establish such lease terms and conditions with respect to any site offered for lease under this subsection as the Secretaries consider appropriate, including the duration of the lease.

(B) DATA COLLECTION.—As part of the pilot program, the Secretaries shall—

(i) offer on a noncompetitive basis a short-term lease with respect to at least 1 site for data collection; and

(ii) on the expiration of the short-term lease described in clause (i), offer on a competitive basis a long-term lease, giving credit toward the bonus bid to the holder of the short-term lease for any qualified expenditures to collect data or to develop the site during the short-term lease.

(5) REVENUES.—Subject to section 213, the Secretaries may collect bonus bids, royalties, fees, or other payments (except rental payments) with respect to sites offered for lease under this subsection.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretaries conduct the final lease sale under this subsection, the Secretaries shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that describes the results of the pilot program, including—

(A) the level of competitive interest;

(B) a summary of bids and revenues received; and

(C) any other factors that may have impacted the lease sale process.

(7) OTHER LAWS.—

(A) COMPLIANCE WITH LAND MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—In offering sites for lease under this subsection, the Secretary concerned shall comply with—

(i) all Federal laws applicable to public land or National Forest System land;

(ii) applicable Federal and State environmental laws; and

(iii) any other relevant laws.

(B) APPLICABILITY TO WIND AND SOLAR ENERGY PROJECTS UNDER OTHER FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretaries from issuing rights-of-way or special use permits with respect to wind and solar energy projects in compliance with other Federal laws (including regulations) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(8) ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Sections 302(c) and 303 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1732(c), 1733) shall apply to activities conducted on sites on covered land offered for lease under this subsection.

(B) EFFECT ON ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY UNDER OTHER FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in this subsection reduces or limits the enforcement authority vested in the Secretaries or the Attorney General on covered land under any other Federal law.

(b) TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Until the date on which final regulations are promulgated under subsection (c)(4), the Secretaries—

(1) shall continue to carry out the pilot program on the sites offered for lease under subsection (a); and

(2) as the Secretaries determine to be necessary, may extend any lease issued under subsection (a) under the same terms and conditions applicable to the lease on the date of the lease sale.

(c) EXPANSION OF PILOT PROGRAM TO ALL COVERED LAND.—

(1) JOINT DETERMINATION REQUIRED; EXPANSION.—The Secretaries shall—

(A) not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, jointly determine whether to expand the pilot program to all covered land, including sites with respect to which leases were issued under subsection (a); and

(B) if the Secretaries determine to expand the pilot program under subparagraph (A), expand the pilot program.

(2) CONSIDERATION; CONSULTATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretaries shall—

(A) take into consideration the results of the pilot program;

(B) consult with—

(i) the heads of Federal agencies and relevant State agencies (including State fish and wildlife agencies);

(ii) interested States, Indian tribes, and local governments;

(iii) representatives of the solar and wind energy industries;

(iv) representatives of the environment, conservation, and outdoor sporting communities; and

(v) the public; and

(C) consider whether the expansion of the pilot program—

(i) provides an effective means of developing wind or solar energy; and

(ii) is in the public interest.

(3) REPORT ON JOINT DETERMINATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretaries make a determination under paragraph (1)(A) to expand the pilot program, the Secretaries jointly shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report describing the basis and findings for the determination.

(4) REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT EXPANSION.—Not later than 1 year after making a determination to expand the pilot program under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretaries jointly shall promulgate final regulations to implement this subtitle.

(5) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS OF PILOT PROGRAM TO EXPANDED PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraphs (3), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall apply to covered land offered for lease under this subsection in the same manner as those paragraphs apply to sites offered for lease under subsection (a).

(B) COMPETITIVE LEASING NOT REQUIRED UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The requirement under subsection (a)(3) that a lease be sold on a competitive basis shall not apply to a lease issued under this subsection if the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, determines that—

(i) no competitive interest exists for the covered land offered for lease;

(ii) the public interest would not be served by the competitive issuance of a lease with respect to the covered land; or

(iii) the lease is for a purpose described in paragraph (7)(A)(ii).

(6) PAYMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 213, the Secretaries jointly shall establish fees, bonuses, or other payments (except rental payments) to ensure a fair return to the United States for any lease issued under this subsection.

(B) BONUS BIDS.—The Secretary concerned may grant credit toward any bonus bid for a qualified expenditure by the holder of a lease described in paragraph (7)(A)(ii) in any competitive lease sale held for a long-term lease of the covered land that is the subject of the lease described in that paragraph.

(7) LEASE DURATION, ADMINISTRATION, AND READJUSTMENT.—

(A) DURATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a lease issued under this subsection shall be for—

(I) an initial term of 30 years; and

(II) any additional period after the initial 25-year term during which electricity is being produced annually in commercial quantities from the lease.

(ii) DATA COLLECTION LEASES.—In the case of a lease issued under this subsection for the placement and operation of a meteorological or data collection facility or for the development or demonstration of a new wind or solar technology, the lease shall have a term of not more than 5 years.

(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretaries jointly shall establish terms and conditions for the issuance, transfer, renewal, suspension, and cancellation of a lease issued under this subsection.

(C) READJUSTMENT PROVISION REQUIRED.—Each lease issued under this subsection shall provide for readjustment in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(8) SURFACE-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES.—The Secretaries jointly shall promulgate regulations regarding surface-disturbing activities conducted under any lease issued under this subsection, including any reclamation and other actions necessary to conserve and offset impacts to surface resources.

(9) SECURITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries shall require that the holder of a lease issued under this subsection shall—

(i) furnish a surety bond or other form of security, as prescribed by the Secretaries;

(ii) provide for the reclamation and restoration of the covered land that is the subject of the lease; and

(iii) comply with such other requirements as the Secretaries consider to be necessary to protect the interests of the public and the United States.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not less frequently than once every 5 years, the Secretaries shall conduct a review of the adequacy of a surety bond or other form of security provided by the holder of a lease issued under this subsection.

SEC. 213. ROYALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries shall—

(1) require as a term and condition of any lease issued under section 212, the payment of a royalty; and

(2) pursuant to a joint rulemaking, establish those royalties as a percentage of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity produced on covered land that is the subject of the lease at a rate that—

(A) encourages production of solar or wind energy;

(B) ensures a fair return to the public comparable to the return that would be obtained on State or private land; and

(C) encourages the maximum energy generation while disturbing the least quantity of covered land and other natural resources, including water.

(b) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the royalties under subsection (a), the Secretaries shall take into consideration the relative capacity factors of wind and solar energy projects.

(c) EXCLUSIVE PAYMENT ON SALE OF ELECTRICITY.—The royalty under subsection (a) shall be the only rent, royalty, or similar payment to the Federal Government required with respect to the sale of electricity produced under a lease issued under section 212.

(d) ROYALTY RELIEF.—The Secretaries may reduce the royalty rate established under subsection (a) if the holder of a lease issued under this subtitle demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretaries by clear and convincing evidence that—

(1) collection of the full royalty would unreasonably burden energy generation on covered land that is the subject of the lease; and

(2) the royalty reduction is in the public interest.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) AUDITING SYSTEM.—The Secretaries jointly shall establish a comprehensive inspection, collection, fiscal, and production accounting and auditing system—

(A) to accurately determine royalties, interest, fines, penalties, fees, deposits, and other payments owed under this subtitle; and

(B) to collect and account for the payments in a timely manner.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL OIL AND GAS ROYALTY MANAGEMENT ACT.—The Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (including the civil and criminal enforcement provisions of that Act) shall apply to leases issued under this subtitle with respect to wind and solar energy projects in the same manner as that Act applies to oil and gas leases.

(f) REPORT ON ROYALTIES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that includes a review of the collections and impacts of the royalties and fees collected under this subtitle, including—

(1) the total revenues received (expressed by category) on an annual basis as royalties from wind, solar, and geothermal development and production, specified by energy source, on covered land;

(2) whether the revenues received for the development of wind, solar, and geothermal development are comparable to the revenues received for similar development on State or private land;

(3) any impact on the development of wind, solar, or geothermal development and production on covered land as a result of the royalties; and

(4) any recommendations with respect to changes in Federal law (including regulations) relating to the amount or method of collection (including auditing, compliance, and enforcement) of the royalties.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries jointly shall promulgate final regulations to carry out this section.

SEC. 214. DISPOSITION OF ROYALTY REVENUES.

(a) ALLOCATION OF REVENUE.—Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, all amounts collected by the Secretaries as royalties or bonuses under subsection (a)(5) or (c)(6) of section 212 shall be distributed as follows:

(1) 25 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to States within the boundaries of which the royalties or bonuses are derived, to be allocated among those States based on the percentage of covered land from which the royalties or bonuses are derived in each State.

(2) 25 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the counties within the boundaries of which the royalties or bonuses are derived, to be allocated among those counties based on the percentage of covered land from which the royalties or bonuses are derived in each county.

(3) 25 percent shall be deposited in the Fund.

(4) For the 15-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, 15 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury directly to the State offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the regional office of the Forest Service with jurisdiction over the areas from which the royalties or bonuses are derived for purposes of reducing the number of renewable energy permits that have not been processed before the date of enactment of this Act, to be allocated among those offices based on the percentage of covered land from which the royalties or bonuses are derived in each State.

(5) The remainder shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury for purposes of reducing the annual Federal budget deficit.

(b) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE CONSERVATION FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ''Renewable Energy Resource Conservation Fund'', to be administered by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, for use in regions impacted by the development of wind or solar energy on public land.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use amounts in the Fund to carry out activities and make payments to State agencies, Federal agencies, or other interested persons in regions described in paragraph (1) for—

(A) protecting and restoring important fish and wildlife habitat in the regions, including corridors, water resources, and other sensitive land; and

(B) ensuring and improving access to Federal land and water in the regions for hunting, fishing, and other forms of outdoor recreation in a manner consistent with the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for expenditure, in accordance with this subsection, without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation.

(4) INVESTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall earn interest in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

(B) USE.—Any interest earned under subparagraph (A) may be expended in accordance with this subsection.

(5) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The expenditure of amounts under this subsection shall be separate and distinct from any mitigation requirement imposed pursuant to any law, regulation, or term or condition of any lease, right-of-way, or other authorization.

(c) ALLOCATION FOR PERMITTING AFTER EXPIRATION OF 15-YEAR PERIOD.—

(1) CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—At the end of the 15-year period described in paragraph (4) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall certify whether the State offices referred to in that paragraph have adequately reduced the renewable energy permitting backlog referred to in that paragraph.

(2) ALLOCATION AFTER CERTIFICATION.—If the Secretary certifies under paragraph (1) that—

(A) the State offices referred to in that paragraph have not adequately reduced the backlog referred to in that paragraph—

(i) the 15-year period described in subsection (a)(4) shall be extended by an additional 15-year period; and

(ii) payments shall continue to be made during that period as described in subsection (a)(4); or

(B) the State offices referred to in that paragraph have adequately reduced the backlog, of the amount otherwise required to be paid under subsection (a)(4)—

(i) ⅔ shall be added to the amount deposited in the Fund; and

(ii) ⅓ shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury for purposes of reducing the annual Federal budget deficit.

(d) PAYMENTS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts paid to States and counties under this section shall be used in a manner that is consistent with section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191).

(2) IMPACTS.—Not less than 35 percent of the amounts paid to a State under this section for each fiscal year shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2) .

(3) ADDITION TO PILT PAYMENTS.—A payment to a county under this section shall be in addition to a payment received in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 215. STUDY AND REPORT ON MITIGATION BANKING.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall carry out a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a mitigation banking program on Federal land administered by the Secretaries for purposes of fully offsetting the impacts of wind or solar energy on that Federal land.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify areas in which—

(i) privately owned land is not available to fully offset the impacts of wind or solar energy development on Federal land administered by the Secretaries; or

(ii) mitigation investments on that Federal land are likely to provide greater conservation value for the impacts of wind or solar energy development on the Federal land; and

(B) examine—

(i) the effectiveness of laws (including regulations) and policies in effect on the date of enactment of this Act in facilitating the development and effective operation of mitigation banks;

(ii) the advantages and disadvantages of using mitigation banks on Federal land administered by the Secretaries to mitigate impacts to natural resources on private, State, and tribal land; and

(iii) any changes in Federal law (including regulations) or policy necessary to advance development of a Federal mitigation banking program.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries jointly shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the recommendations of the Secretaries relating to—

(A) the most effective system for Federal land administered by the Secretaries to meet the goals of facilitating the development of a mitigation banking program on Federal land administered by the Secretaries; and

(B) any change to Federal law (including regulations) or policy necessary to address more effectively the siting, development, and management of mitigation banking programs on that Federal land to mitigate impacts to natural resources on private, State, and tribal land; and

(2) a description of any administrative action to be taken by the Secretaries in response to the recommendations.

(c) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the report is submitted to Congress under subsection (b), the Secretaries shall make the report available to the public.

SEC. 216. RENEWABLE ENERGY POTENTIAL AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary, shall conduct, and prepare for States that have not completed a comparable analysis a report describing the results of, a study that—

(1) identifies locations on land withdrawn from the public domain and reserved for military purposes that—

(A) exhibit a high potential for solar, wind, geothermal, or other renewable energy production;

(B) are disturbed or otherwise have comparatively low value for other resources; and

(C) could be developed for renewable energy production in a manner consistent with all present and reasonably foreseeable military training and operational missions and research, development, testing, and evaluation requirements; and

(2) describes the administration of public land withdrawn for military purposes for the development of commercial-scale renewable energy projects, including the legal authorities governing authorization for that use.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary, shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact analysis document to support a program to develop renewable energy on withdrawn military land identified in the study under subsection (a) as suitable for the production.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the report under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense jointly shall submit the report to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Armed Services of the House Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

SA 3594. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. RELIEF FOR ENERGY CONSUMERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) COVERED ENERGY-RELATED RULE.—The term ''covered energy-related rule'' means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A)(i) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy; or

(ii) provides for the regulation described in clause (i) by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than $1,000,000,000.

(3) DIRECT COSTS.—The term ''direct costs'' has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses'' and dated December 17, 2010.

(4) INDIRECT COSTS.—The term ''indirect costs'' has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses'' and dated December 17, 2010.

(5) RULE.—The term ''rule'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall not promulgate as final any covered energy-related rule if the Secretary determines under subsection (c)(4) that the covered energy-related rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy.

(c) REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before promulgating as final any covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall carry out the activities described in paragraphs (3) and (4).

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—For each covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall submit to Congress and Secretary a report containing—

(A) a copy of the covered energy-related rule;

(B) a concise general statement relating to the covered energy-related rule;

(C) an estimate of the total costs of the covered energy-related rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the covered energy-related rule;

(D) an estimate of—

(i) the total benefits of the covered energy-related rule; and

(ii) when those benefits are expected to be realized;

(E) a description of the modeling, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under subparagraph (D);

(F) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the covered energy-related rule; and

(G) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the covered energy-related rule.

(3) INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the covered energy-related rule will cause—

(A) any increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(B) any impact on fuel diversity of the electricity generation portfolio of the United States or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(C) any adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the covered energy-related rule; or

(D) any other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use (including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies).

(4) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.—If the Secretary determines, under paragraph (3), that the covered energy-related rule will result in an increase, impact, or effect described in that subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(A) determine whether the covered energy-related rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(i) the costs and benefits of the covered energy-related rule and limitations in calculating those costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(ii) the positive and negative impacts of the covered energy-related rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(B) publish the results of that determination in the Federal Register.

SA 3595. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. SUPPORTING NEW BUSINESSES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Startup Act 3.0''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Achieving economic recovery will require the formation and growth of new companies.

(2) Between 1980 and 2005, companies less than 5 years old accounted for nearly all net job creation in the United States.

(3) New firms in the United States create an average of 3,000,000 jobs per year.

(4) To get Americans back to work, entrepreneurs must be free to innovate, create new companies, and hire employees.

(c) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR IMMIGRANTS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 216A the following:

''SEC. 216B. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALIENS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of not more than 50,000 aliens who have earned a master's degree or a doctorate degree at an institution of higher education in a STEM field to that of an alien conditionally admitted for permanent residence and authorize each alien granted such adjustment of status to remain in the United States—

''(1) for up to 1 year after the expiration of the alien's student visa under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) if the alien is diligently searching for an opportunity to become actively engaged in a STEM field; and

''(2) indefinitely if the alien remains actively engaged in a STEM field.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional permanent resident status under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security before the expiration of the alien's student visa in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall not be eligible, while in such status, for—

''(1) any unemployment compensation (as defined in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

''(2) any Federal means-tested public benefit (as that term is used in section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613)).

''(d) EFFECT ON NATURALIZATION RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of meeting the 5-year residency requirement set forth in section 316(a)(1).

''(e) REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's conditional permanent resident status under this section on the date that is 5 years after the date such status was granted if the alien maintained his or her eligibility for such status during the entire 5-year period.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A STEM FIELD.—The term 'actively engaged in a STEM field'—

''(A) means—

''(i) gainfully employed in a for-profit business or nonprofit organization in the United States in a STEM field;

''(ii) teaching 1 or more STEM field courses at an institution of higher education; or

''(iii) employed by a Federal, State, or local government entity; and

''(B) includes any period of up to 6 months during which the alien does not meet the requirement under subparagraph (A) if such period was immediately preceded by a 1-year period during which the alien met the requirement under subparagraph (A).

''(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

''(3) STEM FIELD.—The term 'STEM field' means any field of study or occupation included on the most recent STEM-Designated Degree Program List published in the Federal Register by the Department of Homeland Security (as described in section 214.2(f)(11)(i)(C)(2) of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 216A the following:

''Sec. 216B. Conditional permanent resident status for aliens with an advanced degree in a STEM field.''.

(d) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ''institution of higher education'' and ''STEM field'' have the meanings given such terms in section 216B(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the alien college graduates granted immigrant status under section 216B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(3) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (2) shall include—

(A) the number of aliens described in paragraph (2) who have earned a master's degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(B) the number of aliens described in paragraph (2) who have earned a doctorate degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(C) the number of aliens described in paragraph (2) who have founded a business in the United States in a STEM field;

(D) the number of aliens described in paragraph (2) who are employed in the United States in a STEM field, broken down by employment sector (for profit, nonprofit, or government); and

(E) the number of aliens described in paragraph (2) who are employed by an institution of higher education.

(e) IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS.—

(1) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.—

(A) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 210A. QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.

''(a) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in accordance with the provisions of this section and section 216B, may issue a conditional immigrant visa to not more than 75,000 qualified alien entrepreneurs.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional immigrant visa under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) REVOCATION.—If, during the 4-year period beginning on the date that an alien is granted a visa under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such alien is no longer a qualified alien entrepreneur, the Secretary shall—

''(1) revoke such visa; and

''(2) notify the alien that the alien—

''(A) may voluntarily depart from the United States in accordance to section 240B; or

''(B) will be subject to removal proceedings under section 240 if the alien does not depart from the United States not later than 6 months after receiving such notification.

''(d) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of the status of an alien issued an immigrant visa under this section on that date that is 4 years after the date on which such visa was issued if such visa was not revoked pursuant to subsection (c).

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.—The term 'full-time employee' means a United States citizen or legal permanent resident who is paid by the new business entity registered by a qualified alien entrepreneur at a rate that is comparable to the median income of employees in the region.

''(2) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEUR.—The term 'qualified alien entrepreneur' means an alien who—

''(A) at the time the alien applies for an immigrant visa under this section—

''(i) is lawfully present in the United States; and

''(ii)(I) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b); or

''(II) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(F)(i);

''(B) during the 1-year period beginning on the date the alien is granted a visa under this section—

''(i) registers at least 1 new business entity in a State;

''(ii) employs, at such business entity in the United States, at least 2 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien; and

''(iii) invests, or raises capital investment of, not less than $100,000 in such business entity; and

''(C) during the 3-year period beginning on the last day of the 1-year period described in paragraph (2), employs, at such business entity in the United States, an average of at least 5 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien.''.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 210 the following:

''Sec. 210A. Qualified alien entrepreneurs.''.

(2) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 216A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186b) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking ''203(b)(5),'' and inserting ''203(b)(5) or 210A, as appropriate,'';

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''alien entrepreneur must'' each place such term appears and inserting ''alien entrepreneur shall'';

(D) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A, as appropriate.''; and

(E) in subsection (f)(1), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A.''.

(f) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the qualified alien entrepreneurs granted immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (e).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include information regarding—

(A) the number of qualified alien entrepreneurs who have received immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, listed by country of origin;

(B) the localities in which such qualified alien entrepreneurs have initially settled;

(C) whether such qualified alien entrepreneurs generally remain in the localities in which they initially settle;

(D) the types of commercial enterprises that such qualified alien entrepreneurs have established; and

(E) the types and number of jobs created by such qualified alien entrepreneurs.

(g) ELIMINATION OF THE PER-COUNTRY NUMERICAL LIMITATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED VISAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED'';

(B) by striking ''(3), (4), and (5),'' and inserting ''(3) and (4),'';

(C) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)'';

(D) by striking ''7'' and inserting ''15''; and

(E) by striking ''such subsections'' and inserting ''such section''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ''both subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)''; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES AT CEILING.—If it is determined that the total number of immigrant visas made available under section 203(a) to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area will exceed the numerical limitation specified in subsection (a)(2) in any fiscal year, in determining the allotment of immigrant visa numbers to natives under section 203(a), visa numbers with respect to natives of that state or area shall be allocated (to the extent practicable and otherwise consistent with this section and section 203) in a manner so that, except as provided in subsection (a)(4), the proportion of the visa numbers made available under each of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a) is equal to the ratio of the total number of visas made available under the respective paragraph to the total number of visas made available under section 203(a).''.

(3) COUNTRY-SPECIFIC OFFSET.—Section 2 of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsection (e))'' and inserting ''subsection (d))''; and

(B) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(h) TRANSITION RULES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), and notwithstanding title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), the following rules shall apply:

(A) For fiscal year 2014, 15 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not 1 of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.

(B) For fiscal year 2015, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not 1 of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2013 under such paragraphs.

(C) For fiscal year 2016, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not 1 of the 2 states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2014 under such paragraphs.

(2) PER-COUNTRY LEVELS.—

(A) RESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the visas reserved under each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the number of such visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area in the appropriate fiscal year may not exceed 25 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas.

(B) UNRESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) and not reserved under paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015, not more than 85 percent shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of any single foreign state.

(3) SPECIAL RULE TO PREVENT UNUSED VISAS.—If, with respect to fiscal year 2014, 2015, or 2016, the operation of paragraphs (1) and (2) would prevent the total number of immigrant visas made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) from being issued, such visas may be issued during the remainder of such fiscal year without regard to paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) RULES FOR CHARGEABILITY.—Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) shall apply in determining the foreign state to which an alien is chargeable for purposes of this subsection.

(i) CAPITAL GAINS TAX EXEMPTION FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) PERMANENT FULL EXCLUSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1202(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) EXCLUSION.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, gross income shall not include 100 percent of any gain from the sale or exchange of qualified small business stock held for more than 5 years.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) The heading for section 1202 of such Code is amended by striking ''**PARTIAL**''.

(ii) The item relating to section 1202 in the table of sections for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking ''Partial exclusion'' and inserting ''Exclusion''.

(iii) Section 1223(13) of such Code is amended by striking ''1202(a)(2),''.

(2) REPEAL OF MINIMUM TAX PREFERENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 57(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(B) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 53(d)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of such Code is amended by striking '', (5), and (7)'' and inserting ''and (5)''.

(3) REPEAL OF 28 PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE ON QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(h)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) collectibles gain, over''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 1(h) of such Code is amended—

(I) by striking paragraph (7); and

(II) by redesignating paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), respectively.

(ii) Sections 163(d)(4)(B), 854(b)(5), 857(c)(2)(D) of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 1(h)(11)(B)'' and inserting ''section 1(h)(10)(B)''.

(iii) The following sections of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 1(h)(11)'' and inserting ''section 1(h)(10)'':

(I) Section 301(f)(4).

(II) Section 306(a)(1)(D).

(III) Section 584(c).

(IV) Section 702(a)(5).

(V) Section 854(a).

(VI) Section 854(b)(2).

(iv) The heading of section 857(c)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''1(h)(11)'' and inserting ''1(h)(10)''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to stock acquired after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(j) RESEARCH CREDIT FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) TREATMENT OF CREDIT TO QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the election of a qualified small business, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a) shall be treated as a credit allowed under section 3111(f) (and not under this section).

''(2) PAYROLL TAX CREDIT PORTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a) for any taxable year is so much of such credit as does not exceed $250,000.

''(3) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small business' means, with respect to any taxable year—

''(i) a corporation, partnership, or S corporation if—

''(I) the gross receipts (as determined under subsection (c)(7)) of such entity for the taxable year is less than $5,000,000, and

''(II) such entity did not have gross receipts (as so determined) for any period preceding the 5-taxable-year period ending with such taxable year, and

''(ii) any person not described in subparagraph (A) if clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) applied to such person, determined—

''(I) by substituting 'person' for 'entity' each place it appears, and

''(II) in the case of an individual, by only taking into account the aggregate gross receipts received by such individual in carrying on trades or businesses of such individual.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Such term shall not include an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501.

''(4) ELECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership or S corporation, an election under this subsection shall be made at the entity level.

''(B) REVOCATION.—An election under this subsection may not be revoked without the consent of the Secretary.

''(C) LIMITATION.—A taxpayer may not make an election under this subsection if such taxpayer has made an election under this subsection for 5 or more preceding taxable years.

''(5) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of determining the $250,000 limitation under paragraph (2) and determining gross receipts under paragraph (3), all members of the same controlled group of corporations (within the meaning of section 267(f)) and all persons under common control (within the meaning of section 52(b) but determined by treating an interest of more than 50 percent as a controlling interest) shall be treated as 1 person.

''(6) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including—

''(A) regulations to prevent the avoidance of the purposes of paragraph (3) through the use of successor companies or other means,

''(B) regulations to minimize compliance and recordkeeping burdens under this subsection for start-up companies, and

''(C) regulations for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under section 3111(f) in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a), including requiring amended returns in the cases where there is such an adjustment.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 280C(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT.—For purposes of determining the amount of any credit under section 41(a) under this subsection, any election under section 41(i) shall be disregarded.''.

(2) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST FICA TAXES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified small business which has made an election under section 41(i), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subsection (a) on wages paid with respect to the employment of all employees of the qualified small business for days in an applicable calendar quarter an amount equal to the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a).

''(2) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—In any case in which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a) exceeds the tax imposed under subsection (a) for an applicable calendar quarter—

''(A) the succeeding calendar quarter shall be treated as an applicable calendar quarter, and

''(B) the amount of credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the amount of credit allowed under such paragraph for all preceding applicable calendar quarters.

''(3) ALLOCATION OF CREDIT FOR CONTROLLED GROUPS, ETC.—In determining the amount of the credit under this subsection—

''(A) all persons treated as a single taxpayer under section 41 shall be treated as a single taxpayer under this section, and

''(B) the credit (if any) allowable by this section to each such member shall be its proportionate share of the qualified research expenses, basic research payments, and amounts paid or incurred to energy research consortiums, giving rise to the credit allowable under section 41.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) APPLICABLE CALENDAR QUARTER.—The term 'applicable calendar quarter' means—

''(i) the first calendar quarter following the date on which the qualified small business files a return under section 6012 for the taxable year for which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit under section 41(a) is determined, and

''(ii) any succeeding calendar quarter treated as an applicable calendar quarter under paragraph (2)(A).

''For purposes of determining the date on which a return is filed, rules similar to the rules of section 6513 shall apply.

''(B) OTHER TERMS.—Any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 41 shall have the meaning given such term under section 41.''.

(B) TRANSFERS TO FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by paragraph (1). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund had such amendments not been enacted.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(k) ACCELERATED COMMERCIALIZATION OF TAXPAYER-FUNDED RESEARCH.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship of the Department of Commerce established pursuant to section 25(c) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3720(c)).

(B) EXTRAMURAL BUDGET.—The term ''extramural budget'' means the sum of the total obligations minus amounts obligated for such activities by employees of the agency in or through Government-owned, Government-operated facilities, except that for the Department of Energy it shall not include amounts obligated for atomic energy defense programs solely for weapons activities or for naval reactor programs, and except that for the Agency for International Development it shall not include amounts obligated solely for general institutional support of international research centers or for grants to foreign countries.

(C) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(D) RESEARCH OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The term ''research'' or ''research and development'' means any activity that is—

(i) a systematic, intensive study directed toward greater knowledge or understanding of the subject studied;

(ii) a systematic study directed specifically toward applying new knowledge to meet a recognized need; or

(iii) a systematic application of knowledge toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements.

(E) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency that has an extramural budget for research or research and development that is in excess of $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019, shall transfer 0.15 percent of such extramural budget for each of such fiscal years to the Secretary to enable the Secretary to carry out a grant program in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) GRANTS.—

(i) AWARDING OF GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—From amounts transferred under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the criteria developed by the Council to award grants to institutions of higher education, including consortia of institutions of higher education, for initiatives to improve commercialization and transfer of technology.

(II) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—Not later than 30 days after the Council submits the recommendations for criteria to the Secretary under paragraph (3)(B)(i), and annually thereafter for each fiscal year for which the grant program is authorized, the Secretary shall release a request for proposals.

(III) APPLICATIONS.—Each institution of higher education that desires to receive a grant under this paragraph shall submit an application to the Secretary not later than 90 days after the Secretary releases the request for proposals under subclause (II).

(IV) COUNCIL REVIEW.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit each application received under subclause (III) to the Council for Council review.

(bb) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Council shall review each application received under item (aa) and submit recommendations for grant awards to the Secretary, including funding recommendations for each proposal.

(cc) PUBLIC RELEASE.—The Council shall publicly release any recommendations made under item (bb).

(dd) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—In awarding grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Council under item (bb)).

(ii) COMMERCIALIZATION CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing specific innovative initiatives to improve an institution's capacity to commercialize faculty research that can be widely adopted if the research yields measurable results.

(II) CONTENT OF PROPOSALS.—Grants shall be awarded under this clause to proposals demonstrating the capacity for accelerated commercialization, proof-of-concept proficiency, and translating scientific discoveries and cutting-edge inventions into technological innovations and new companies. Grant funds shall be expended to support innovative approaches to achieving these goals that can be replicated by other institutions of higher education if the innovative approaches are successful.

(iii) COMMERCIALIZATION ACCELERATOR GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing initiatives that allow faculty to directly commercialize research in an effort to accelerate research breakthroughs. The Secretary shall prioritize those initiatives that have a management structure that encourages collaboration between other institutions of higher education or other entities with demonstrated proficiency in creating and growing new companies based on verifiable metrics.

(C) ASSESSMENT OF SUCCESS.—Grants awarded under this paragraph shall use criteria for assessing the success of programs through the establishment of benchmarks.

(D) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall have the authority to terminate grant funding to an institution of higher education in accordance with the process and performance metrics recommended by the Council.

(E) LIMITATIONS.—

(i) PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS.—A grant recipient may use not more than 10 percent of grant funds awarded under this paragraph for the purpose of funding project management costs of the grant program.

(ii) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—An institution of higher education that receives a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of such grant funds, be made available for activities described in this subsection.

(F) UNSPENT FUNDS.—Any funds transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year that are not expended by the end of such fiscal year may be expended in any subsequent fiscal year through fiscal year 2019. Any funds transferred under subparagraph (A) that are remaining at the end of the grant program's authorization under this subsection shall be transferred to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(3) COUNCIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall convene and develop recommendations for criteria in awarding grants to institutions of higher education under paragraph (2).

(B) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—The Council shall—

(i) submit the recommendations described in subparagraph (A) to the Secretary; and

(ii) release the recommendations to the public.

(C) MAJORITY VOTE.—The recommendations submitted by the Council under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a majority vote of Council members.

(D) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Council shall develop and provide to the Secretary recommendations on performance metrics to be used to evaluate grants awarded under paragraph (2).

(E) EVALUATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days before the date on which the grant program authorized under paragraph (2) expires, the Council shall conduct an evaluation of the effect that the grant program is having on accelerating the commercialization of faculty research.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The evaluation shall include—

(I) the recommendation of the Council as to whether the grant program should be continued or terminated;

(II) quantitative data related to the effect, if any, that the grant program has had on faculty research commercialization; and

(III) a description of lessons learned in administering the grant program, and how those lessons could be applied to future efforts to accelerate commercialization of faculty research.

(iii) AVAILABILITY.—Upon completion of the evaluation, the evaluation shall be made available on a public website and submitted to Congress. The Secretary shall notify all institutions of higher education when the evaluation is published and how it can be accessed.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to alter, modify, or amend any provision of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act'').

(l) ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SIGNIFICANT FEDERAL AGENCY RULES.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REQUIRED REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE OF SIGNIFICANT RULES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall complete a review, to the extent permitted by law, that—

''(A) analyzes the problem that the proposed rule intends to address, including—

''(i) the specific market failure, such as externalities, market power, or lack of information, that justifies such rule; or

''(ii) any other specific problem, such as the failures of public institutions, that justifies such rule;

''(B) analyzes the expected impact of the proposed rule on the ability of new businesses to form and expand;

''(C) identifies the expected impact of the proposed rule on State, local, and tribal governments, including the availability of resources—

''(i) to carry out the mandates imposed by the rule on such government entities; and

''(ii) to minimize the burdens that uniquely or significantly affect such governmental entities, consistent with achieving regulatory objectives;

''(D) identifies any conflicting or duplicative regulations;

''(E) determines—

''(i) if existing laws or regulations created, or contributed to, the problem that the new rule is intended to correct; and

''(ii) if the laws or regulations referred to in clause (i) should be modified to more effectively achieve the intended goal of the rule; and

''(F) includes the cost-benefit analysis described in paragraph (2).

''(2) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—A cost-benefit analysis described in this paragraph shall include—

''(A)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of benefits anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

''(I) promoting the efficient functioning of the economy and private markets;

''(II) enhancing health and safety;

''(III) protecting the natural environment; and

''(IV) eliminating or reducing discrimination or bias; and

''(ii) the quantification of the benefits described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

''(B)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

''(I) the direct costs to the Federal Government to administer the rule;

''(II) the direct costs to businesses and others to comply with the rule; and

''(III) any adverse effects on the efficient functioning of the economy, private markets (including productivity, employment, and competitiveness), health, safety, and the natural environment; and

''(ii) the quantification of the costs described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

''(C)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs and benefits of potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the proposed rule, which have been identified by the agency or by the public, including taking reasonably viable nonregulatory actions; and

''(ii) an explanation of why the proposed rule is preferable to the alternatives identified under clause (i).

''(3) REPORT.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall—

''(A) submit the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees; and

''(B) post the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) on a publicly available website.

''(4) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any determinations made, or other actions taken, by an agency or independent regulatory agency under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review.

''(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection the term 'significant rule' means a rule that is likely to—

''(A) have an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) adversely affect, in a material way, the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; or

''(C) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency.''.

(m) BIENNIAL STATE STARTUP BUSINESS REPORT.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile information from each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia on State or District laws that affect the formation and growth of new businesses within the State or District.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary, using data compiled under paragraph (1), shall prepare a report that—

(A) analyzes the economic effect of State and District laws that either encourage or inhibit business formation and growth; and

(B) ranks the States and the District based on the effectiveness with which their laws foster new business creation and economic growth.

(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (1) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(4) INCLUSION OF LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the first report under this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a study to Congress on the feasibility and advisability of including, in future reports, information about the effect of local laws and ordinances on the formation and growth of new businesses in large metropolitan areas within the United States.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(n) NEW BUSINESS FORMATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile quantitative and qualitative information on businesses in the United States that are not more than 1 year old.

(2) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) regularly compile information from the Bureau of the Census' business register on new business formation in the United States; and

(B) conduct quarterly surveys of business owners who start a business during the 1-year period ending on the date on which such survey is conducted to gather qualitative information about the factors that influenced their decision to start the business.

(3) RANDOM SAMPLING.—In conducting surveys under paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary may use random sampling to identify a group of business owners who are representative of all the business owners described in paragraph (2)(B).

(4) BENEFITS.—The Secretary shall inform business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection of the benefits they would receive from participating in the survey.

(5) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection may decline to participate without penalty.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary shall use the data compiled under paragraph (2) to prepare a report that—

(A) lists the aggregate number of new businesses formed in the United States;

(B) lists the aggregate number of persons employed by new businesses formed in the United States;

(C) analyzes the payroll of new businesses formed in the United States;

(D) summarizes the data collected under paragraph (2); and

(E) identifies the most effective means by which government officials can encourage the formation and growth of new businesses in the United States.

(7) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (6) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(o) RESCISSION OF UNSPENT FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of all available unobligated funds for fiscal year 2014, the amount necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section in appropriated discretionary funds are hereby rescinded.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine and identify from which appropriation accounts the rescission under paragraph (1) shall apply and the amount of such rescission that shall apply to each such account.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury and Congress of the accounts and amounts determined and identified for rescission under subparagraph (A).

SA 3596. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EXPENSING CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $500,000.''.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds—'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $2,000,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking '', to which section 167 applies, and which is placed in service in a taxable year beginning after 2002 and before 2014'' and inserting ''and to which section 167 applies''.

(c) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''may not be revoked'' and all that follows through ''and before 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''IRREVOCABLE'' in the heading thereof.

(d) AIR CONDITIONING AND HEATING UNITS.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and shall not include air conditioning or heating units''.

(e) QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—Subsection (f) of section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' in paragraph (1), and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(c)(2)(A) for such calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 2012' in clause (ii) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under subparagraph (A) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3597. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AUTHORITY TO OFFER ADDITIONAL PLAN OPTIONS.

(a) CATASTROPHIC PLANS.—Notwithstanding title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), a catastrophic plan as described in section 1302(e) of such Act shall be deemed to be a qualified health plan (including for purposes of receiving tax credits under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and cost-sharing assistance under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act), except that for purposes of enrollment in such plans, the provisions of paragraph (2) of such section 1302(e) shall not apply.

(b) INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.—Coverage under a catastrophic plan under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be minimum essential coverage for purposes of section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 3598. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____. RESTRICTIONS ON APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—Section 4980H(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—The term 'applicable large employer' shall not include any employer which is a small business concern (within the meaning of section 3 of the Small Business Act).''.

(b) DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.—Section 4980H(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(E), by striking ''by 120'' and inserting ''by 174'', and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''30 hours'' and inserting ''40 hours''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3599. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE __—TAX RETURN DUE DATE SIMPLIFICATION AND MODERNIZATION

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Tax Return Due Date Simplification and Modernization Act of 2014''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. __02. NEW DUE DATE FOR PARTNERSHIP FORM 1065, S CORPORATION FORM 1120S, AND C CORPORATION FORM 1120.

(a) PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6072 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) RETURNS OF PARTNERSHIPS.—Returns of partnerships under section 6031 made on the basis of the calendar year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of March following the close of the calendar year, and such returns made on the basis of a fiscal year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6072(a) is amended by striking ''6017, or 6031'' and inserting ''or 6017''.

(b) S CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—So much of subsection (b) of 6072 as precedes the second sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

''(b) RETURNS OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.—Returns of S corporations under sections 6012 and 6037 made on the basis of the calendar year shall be filed on or before the 31st day of March following the close of the calendar year, and such returns made on the basis of a fiscal year shall be filed on or before the last day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 1362(b) is amended—

(i) by striking ''15th'' each place it appears and inserting ''last'',

(ii) by striking ''2½'' each place it appears and inserting ''3'', and

(iii) by striking ''2 months and 15 days'' in paragraph (4) and inserting ''3 months''.

(B) Section 1362(d)(1)(C)(i) is amended by striking ''15th'' and inserting ''last''.

(C) Section 1362(d)(1)(C)(ii) is amended by striking ''such 15th day'' and inserting ''the last day of the 3d month thereof''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO C CORPORATIONS.—

(1) Section 170(a)(2)(B) is amended by striking ''third month'' and inserting ''4th month''.

(2) Section 563 is amended by striking ''third month'' each place it appears and inserting ''4th month''.

(3) Section 1354(d)(1)(B)(i) is amended by striking ''3d month'' and inserting ''4th month''.

(4) Subsection (a) and (c) of section 6167 are each amended by striking ''third month'' and inserting ''4th month''.

(5) Section 6425(a)(1) is amended by striking ''third month'' and inserting ''4th month''.

(6) Subsections (b)(2)(A), (g)(3), and (h)(1) of section 6655 are each amended by striking ''3rd month'' and inserting ''4th month''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. __03. MODIFICATION OF DUE DATES BY REGULATION.

In the case of returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate shall modify appropriate regulations to provide as follows:

(1) The maximum extension for the returns of partnerships filing Form 1065 shall be a 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(2) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts and estates filing Form 1041 shall be a 5½-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(3) The maximum extension for the returns of employee benefit plans filing Form 5500 shall be an automatic 3½-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(4) The maximum extension for the Forms 990 (series) returns of organizations exempt from income tax shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(5) The maximum extension for the returns of organizations exempt from income tax that are required to file Form 4720 returns of excise taxes shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(6) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts required to file Form 5227 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(7) The maximum extension for the returns of Black Lung Benefit Trusts required to file Form 6069 returns of excise taxes shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(8) The maximum extension for a taxpayer required to file Form 8870 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(9) The due date of Form 3520–A, Annual Information Return of a Foreign Trust with a United States Owner, shall be the 15th day of the 4th month after the close of the trust's taxable year, and the maximum extension shall be a 6-month period beginning on such day.

(10) The due date of Form TD F 90–22.1 (relating to Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts) shall be April 15 with a maximum extension for a 6-month period ending on October 15, and with provision for an extension under rules similar to the rules of 26 C.F.R. 1.6081–5. For any taxpayer required to file such form for the first time, the Secretary of the Treasury may waive any penalty for failure to timely request or file an extension.

(11) Taxpayers filing Form 3520, Annual Return to Report Transactions with Foreign Trusts and Receipt of Certain Foreign Gifts, shall be allowed to extend the time for filing such form separately from the income tax return of the taxpayer, for an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

SEC. __04. CORPORATIONS PERMITTED STATUTORY AUTOMATIC 6-MONTH EXTENSION OF INCOME TAX RETURNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6081(b) is amended by striking ''3 months'' and inserting ''6 months''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 3600. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''United States Job Creation and International Tax Reform Act of 2014''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

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

TITLE I—PARTICIPATION EXEMPTION SYSTEM FOR TAXATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

SEC. 101. DEDUCTION FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED BY DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS FROM CERTAIN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—Part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 245 the following new section:

''SEC. 245A. DIVIDENDS RECEIVED BY DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS FROM CERTAIN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any dividend received from a controlled foreign corporation by a domestic corporation which is a United States shareholder with respect to such controlled foreign corporation, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 95 percent of the qualified foreign-source portion of the dividend.

''(b) TREATMENT OF ELECTING NONCONTROLLED SECTION 902 CORPORATIONS AS CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a domestic corporation elects the application of this subsection for any noncontrolled section 902 corporation with respect to the domestic corporation, then, for purposes of this title—

''(A) the noncontrolled section 902 corporation shall be treated as a controlled foreign corporation with respect to the domestic corporation, and

''(B) the domestic corporation shall be treated as a United States shareholder with respect to the noncontrolled section 902 corporation.

''(2) ELECTION.—

''(A) TIME OF ELECTION.—Any election under this subsection with respect to any noncontrolled section 902 corporation shall be made not later than the due date for filing the return of tax for the first taxable year of the taxpayer with respect to which the foreign corporation is a noncontrolled section 902 corporation with respect to the taxpayer (or, if later, the first taxable year of the taxpayer for which this section is in effect).

''(B) REVOCATION OF ELECTION.—Any election under this subsection, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

''(C) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—If a domestic corporation making an election under this subsection with respect to any noncontrolled section 902 corporation is a member of a controlled group of corporations (within the meaning of section 1563(a), except that 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for 'at least 80 percent' each place it appears therein), then, except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, such election shall apply to all members of such group.

''(c) QUALIFIED FOREIGN-SOURCE PORTION OF DIVIDENDS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED FOREIGN-SOURCE PORTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The qualified foreign-source portion of any dividend is an amount which bears the same ratio to such dividend as—

''(i) the post-2014 undistributed qualified foreign earnings, bears to

''(ii) the total post-2014 undistributed earnings.

''(B) POST-2014 UNDISTRIBUTED EARNINGS.—The term 'post-2014 undistributed earnings' means the amount of the earnings and profits of a controlled foreign corporation (computed in accordance with sections 964(a) and 986) accumulated in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014—

''(i) as of the close of the taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation in which the dividend is distributed, and

''(ii) without diminution by reason of dividends distributed during such taxable years.

''(C) POST-2014 UNDISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED FOREIGN EARNINGS.—The term 'post-2014 undistributed qualified foreign earnings' means the portion of the post-2014 undistributed earnings which is attributable to income other than—

''(i) income described in section 245(a)(5)(A), or

''(ii) dividends described in section 245(a)(5)(B).

''(2) ORDERING RULE FOR DISTRIBUTIONS OF EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—Distributions shall be treated as first made out of earnings and profits of a controlled foreign corporation which are not post-2014 undistributed earnings and then out of post-2014 undistributed earnings.

''(d) DISALLOWANCE OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT, ETC.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No credit shall be allowed under section 901 for any taxes paid or accrued (or treated as paid or accrued) with respect to the qualified foreign-source portion of any dividend.

''(2) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for any tax for which credit is not allowable under section 901 by reason of paragraph (1).

''(3) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 78.—Section 78 shall not apply to any tax for which credit is not allowable under section 901 by reason of paragraph (1).

''(4) TREATMENT OF NONDEDUCTIBLE PORTION IN APPLYING FOREIGN TAX CREDIT LIMIT.—For purposes of applying the limitation under section 904(a), the remaining 5 percent of the qualified foreign-source portion of any dividend with respect to which a deduction is not allowable to the domestic corporation under subsection (a) shall be treated as income from sources within the United States.

''(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR HYBRID DIVIDENDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any dividend received by a United States shareholder from a controlled foreign corporation if the dividend is a hybrid dividend.

''(2) HYBRID DIVIDENDS OF TIERED CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—If a controlled foreign corporation with respect to which a domestic corporation is a United States shareholder receives a hybrid dividend from any other controlled foreign corporation with respect to which such domestic corporation is also a United States shareholder, then, notwithstanding any other provision of this title—

''(A) the hybrid dividend shall be treated for purposes of section 951(a)(1)(A) as subpart F income of the receiving controlled foreign corporation for the taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation in which the dividend was received, and

''(B) the United States shareholder shall include in gross income an amount equal to the shareholder's pro rata share (determined in the same manner as under section 951(a)(2)) of the subpart F income described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) DENIAL OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT, ETC.—The rules of subsection (d) shall apply to any hybrid dividend received by, or any amount included under paragraph (2) in the gross income of, a United States shareholder, except that, for purposes of applying subsection (d)(4), all of such dividend or amount shall be treated as income from sources within the United States.

''(4) HYBRID DIVIDEND.—The term 'hybrid dividend' means an amount received from a controlled foreign corporation—

''(A) which is treated as a dividend for purposes of this title, and

''(B) for which the controlled foreign corporation received a deduction (or similar tax benefit) under the laws of the country in which the controlled foreign corporation was created or organized.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) UNITED STATES SHAREHOLDER.—The term 'United States shareholder' has the meaning given such term in section 951(b).

''(2) CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATION.—The term 'controlled foreign corporation' has the meaning given such term in section 957(a).

''(3) NONCONTROLLED SECTION 902 CORPORATION.—The term 'noncontrolled section 902 corporation' has the meaning given such term in section 904(d)(2)(E)(i).

''(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF HOLDING PERIOD REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 246 is amended—

(1) by striking ''or 245'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''245, or 245A'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED FOREIGN-SOURCE PORTION OF DIVIDENDS RECEIVED FROM CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—

''(A) 1-YEAR HOLDING PERIOD REQUIREMENT.—For purposes of section 245A—

''(i) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied—

''(I) by substituting '365 days' for '45 days' each place it appears, and

''(II) by substituting '731-day period' for '91-day period', and

''(ii) paragraph (2) shall not apply.

''(B) STATUS MUST BE MAINTAINED DURING HOLDING PERIOD.—For purposes of section 245A, the holding period requirement of this subsection shall be treated as met only if—

''(i) the controlled foreign corporation referred to in section 245A(a) is a controlled foreign corporation at all times during such period, and

''(ii) the taxpayer is a United States shareholder (as defined in section 951) with respect to such controlled foreign corporation at all times during such period.

''(C) SPECIAL RULES FOR ELECTING NONCONTROLLED SECTION 902 CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an election under section 245A(b) to treat a noncontrolled section 902 corporation as a controlled foreign corporation, the requirements of subparagraph (B) shall be treated as met for any continuous period ending on the day before the effective date of the election for which the taxpayer met the ownership requirements of section 904(d)(2)(E) with respect to such corporation.''.

(c) APPLICATION OF RULES GENERALLY APPLICABLE TO DEDUCTIONS FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED.—

(1) TREATMENT OF DIVIDENDS FROM TAX-EXEMPT CORPORATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 246(a) is amended by striking ''and 245'' and inserting ''245, and 245A''.

(2) ASSETS GENERATING TAX-EXEMPT PORTION OF DIVIDEND NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN ALLOCATING AND APPORTIONING DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSES.—Paragraph (3) of section 864(e) is amended by striking ''or 245(a)'' and inserting '', 245(a), or 245A''.

(3) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 1059.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1059(b)(2) is amended by striking ''or 245'' and inserting ''245, or 245A''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (vi) of section 56(g)(4)(C) is amended by inserting ''245A or'' before ''965''.

(2) Subsection (b) of section 951 is amended—

(A) by striking ''subpart'' and inserting ''title'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall include, with respect to any entity treated as a controlled foreign corporation under section 245A(b), any domestic corporation treated as a United States shareholder with respect to such entity under such section.''.

(3) Subsection (a) of section 957 is amended—

(A) by striking ''subpart'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''title'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall include any entity treated as a controlled foreign corporation under section 245A(b).''.

(4) The table of sections for part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 245 the following new item:

''Sec. 245A. Dividends received by domestic corporations from certain foreign corporations.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

SEC. 102. APPLICATION OF DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION TO CERTAIN SALES AND EXCHANGES OF STOCK.

(a) SALES BY UNITED STATES PERSONS OF STOCK IN CFC.—Section 1248 is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

''(j) COORDINATION WITH DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the sale or exchange by a domestic corporation of stock in a foreign corporation held for 1 year or more, any amount received by the domestic corporation which is treated as a dividend by reason of this section shall be treated as a dividend for purposes of applying section 245A.

''(2) LOSSES DISALLOWED.—If a domestic corporation—

''(A) sells or exchanges stock in a foreign corporation in a taxable year of the domestic corporation with or within which a taxable year of the foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 2014, ends, and

''(B) met the ownership requirements of subsection (a)(2) with respect to such stock, no deduction shall be allowed to the domestic corporation with respect to any loss from the sale or exchange.''.

(b) SALE BY A CFC OF A LOWER TIER CFC.—Section 964(e) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) COORDINATION WITH DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, for any taxable year of a controlled foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 2014, any amount is treated as a dividend under paragraph (1) by reason of a sale or exchange by the controlled foreign corporation of stock in another foreign corporation held for 1 year or more, then, notwithstanding any other provision of this title—

''(i) the qualified foreign-source portion of such dividend shall be treated for purposes of section 951(a)(1)(A) as subpart F income of the selling controlled foreign corporation for such taxable year,

''(ii) a United States shareholder with respect to the selling controlled foreign corporation shall include in gross income for the taxable year of the shareholder with or within which such taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation ends an amount equal to the shareholder's pro rata share (determined in the same manner as under section 951(a)(2)) of the amount treated as subpart F income under clause (i), and

''(iii) the deduction under section 245A(a) shall be allowable to the United States shareholder with respect to the subpart F income included in gross income under clause (ii) in the same manner as if such subpart F income were a dividend received by the shareholder from the selling controlled foreign corporation.

''(B) EFFECT OF LOSS ON EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—For purposes of this title, in the case of a sale or exchange by a controlled foreign corporation of stock in another foreign corporation in a taxable year of the selling controlled foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 2014, to which this paragraph would apply if gain were recognized, the earnings and profits of the selling controlled foreign corporation shall not be reduced by reason of any loss from such sale or exchange.

''(C) QUALIFIED FOREIGN-SOURCE PORTION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the qualified foreign-source portion of any amount treated as a dividend under paragraph (1) shall be determined in the same manner as under section 245A(c).''.

SEC. 103. DEDUCTION FOR FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME DERIVED FROM TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 250. FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME DERIVED FROM TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a domestic corporation, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified foreign intangible income of such domestic corporation for the taxable year.

''(b) QUALIFIED FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified foreign intangible income' means, with respect to any domestic corporation, foreign intangible income which is derived by the domestic corporation from the active conduct of a trade or business within the United States with respect to the intangible property giving rise to the income.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—For purposes of this section, foreign intangible income shall be treated as derived by a domestic corporation from the active conduct of a trade or business within the United States only if—

''(A) the domestic corporation developed, created, or produced within the United States the intangible property giving rise to the income, or

''(B) in any case in which the domestic corporation acquired such intangible property, the domestic corporation added substantial value to the property through the active conduct of such trade or business within the United States.

''(c) FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'foreign intangible income' means any intangible income which is derived in connection with—

''(A) property which is sold, leased, licensed, or otherwise disposed of for use, consumption, or disposition outside the United States, or

''(B) services provided with respect to persons or property located outside the United States.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN INCOME.—The following amounts shall not be taken into account in computing foreign intangible income:

''(A) Any amount treated as received by the domestic corporation under section 367(d)(2) with respect to any intangible property.

''(B) Any payment under a cost-sharing arrangement entered into under section 482.

''(C) Any amount received from a controlled foreign corporation with respect to which the domestic corporation is a United States shareholder to the extent such amount is attributable or properly allocable to income which is—

''(i) effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States and subject to tax under this chapter, or

''(ii) subpart F income.

For purposes of clause (ii), amounts not otherwise treated as subpart F income shall be so treated if the amount creates (or increases) a deficit which under section 952(c) may reduce the subpart F income of the payor or any other controlled foreign corporation.

''(3) INTANGIBLE INCOME.—The term 'intangible income' means gross income from—

''(A) the sale, lease, license, or other disposition of property in which intangible property is used directly or indirectly, or

''(B) the provision of services related to intangible property or in connection with property in which intangible property is used directly or indirectly,

to the extent that such gross income is properly attributable to such intangible property.

''(4) DEDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The gross income of a domestic corporation taken into account under this subsection shall be reduced, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, so as to take into account deductions properly allocable to such income.

''(5) INTANGIBLE PROPERTY.—The term 'intangible property' has the meaning given such term by section 936(h)(3)(B).

''(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 250. Foreign intangible income derived from trade or business within the United States.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of domestic corporations beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 104. TREATMENT OF DEFERRED FOREIGN INCOME UPON TRANSITION TO PARTICIPATION EXEMPTION SYSTEM OF TAXATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 965 is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 965. TREATMENT OF DEFERRED FOREIGN INCOME UPON TRANSITION TO PARTICIPATION EXEMPTION SYSTEM OF TAXATION.

''(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—In the case of a domestic corporation which elects the application of this section to any controlled foreign corporation with respect to which it is a United States shareholder, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year of the United States shareholder with or within which the first taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 2014, ends an amount equal to 70 percent of the amount determined under subsection (b) for the taxable year.

''(b) ELIGIBLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subsection for a United States shareholder with respect to any controlled foreign corporation for the taxable year of the shareholder described in subsection (a) is the lesser of—

''(A) the shareholder's pro rata share of the earnings and profits of the controlled foreign corporation described in section 959(c)(3) as of the close of the taxable year preceding the first taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 2014, or

''(B) an amount equal to the sum of—

''(i) the dividends received by the shareholder during such taxable year from the controlled foreign corporation which are attributable to the earnings and profits described in subparagraph (A), plus

''(ii) the increase in subpart F income required to be included in gross income of the shareholder for the taxable year by reason of the election under paragraph (2).

''(2) ELECTION OF DEEMED SUBPART F INCLUSION.—A United States shareholder may elect for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii) to treat all (or any portion) of the shareholder's pro rata share of the earnings and profits of a controlled foreign corporation described in paragraph (1)(A) as subpart F income includible in the gross income of the shareholder for the taxable year of the shareholder described in subsection (a).

''(3) ORDERING RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(i), distributions shall be treated as first made out of earnings and profits of a controlled foreign corporation described in paragraph (1)(A).

''(4) DIVIDEND.—The term 'dividend' shall not include amounts includible in gross income as a dividend under section 78.

''(c) DISALLOWANCE OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT, ETC.—In the case of a domestic corporation making an election under subsection (a) with respect to any controlled foreign corporation—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No credit shall be allowed under section 901 for any taxes paid or accrued (or treated as paid or accrued) with respect to the earnings and profits taken into account in determining the amount under subsection (b).

''(2) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for any tax for which credit is not allowable under section 901 by reason of paragraph (1).

''(3) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 78.—Section 78 shall not apply to any tax for which credit is not allowable under section 901 by reason of paragraph (1).

''(4) TREATMENT OF NONDEDUCTIBLE PORTION IN APPLYING FOREIGN TAX CREDIT LIMIT.—For purposes of applying the limitation under section 904(a), the remaining 30 percent of the amount determined under subsection (b) with respect to which a deduction is not allowable under subsection (a) shall be treated as income from sources within the United States.

''(d) ELECTION TO PAY LIABILITY FOR DEEMED SUBPART F INCOME IN INSTALLMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a United States shareholder with respect to 1 or more

controlled foreign corporations to which elections under subsections (a) and (b)(2) apply, such United States shareholder may elect to pay the net tax liability determined with respect to its deemed subpart F inclusions with respect to such corporations under subsection (b)(2) for the taxable year described in subsection (a) in 2 or more (but not exceeding 8) equal installments.

''(2) DATE FOR PAYMENT OF INSTALLMENTS.—If an election is made under paragraph (1), the first installment shall be paid on the due date (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the return) for the return of tax for the taxable year for which the election was made and each succeeding installment shall be paid on the due date (as so determined) for the return of tax for the taxable year following the taxable year with respect to which the preceding installment was made.

''(3) ACCELERATION OF PAYMENT.—If there is an addition to tax for failure to pay timely assessed with respect to any installment required under this subsection, a liquidation or sale of substantially all the assets of the taxpayer (including in a title 11 or similar case), a cessation of business by the taxpayer, or any similar circumstance, then the unpaid portion of all remaining installments shall be due on the date of such event (or in the case of a title 11 or similar case, the day before the petition is filed).

''(4) PRORATION OF DEFICIENCY TO INSTALLMENTS.—If an election is made under paragraph (1) to pay the net tax liability described in paragraph (1) in installments and a deficiency has been assessed which increases such net tax liability, the increase shall be prorated to the installments payable under paragraph (1). The part of the increase so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has not arrived shall be collected at the same time as, and as a part of, such installment. The part of the increase so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has arrived shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary. This subsection shall not apply if the deficiency is due to negligence, to intentional disregard of rules and regulations, or to fraud with intent to evade tax.

''(5) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF INTEREST.—Interest payable under section 6601 on the unpaid portion of any amount of tax the time for payment of which as been extended under this subsection shall be paid annually at the same time as, and as part of, each installment payment of such tax. In the case of a deficiency to which paragraph (4) applies, interest with respect to such deficiency which is assigned under the preceding sentence to any installment the date for payment of which has arrived on or before the date of the assessment of the deficiency, shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary.

''(6) NET TAX LIABILITY FOR DEEMED SUBPART F INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The net tax liability described in paragraph (1) with respect to any United States shareholder for any taxable year is the excess (if any) of—

''(i) such taxpayer's net income tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) such taxpayer's net income tax for such taxable year determined as if the elections under subsection (b)(2) with respect to 1 or more controlled foreign corporations had not been made.

''(B) NET INCOME TAX.—The term 'net income tax' means the net income tax (as defined in section 38(c)(1)) reduced by the credit allowed under section 38.

''(e) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ELECTIONS.—Any election under subsection (a), (b)(2), or (d)(1) shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year for which made and shall be made in such manner as the Secretary may provide.

''(2) SECTION NOT TO APPLY TO NONCONTROLLED SECTION 902 CORPORATIONS TREATED AS CFCS.—No election may be made under subsection (a) with respect to a controlled foreign corporation which was a noncontrolled section 902 corporation which a United States shareholder elected under section 245A(b) to treat as a controlled foreign corporation.

''(3) PRO RATA SHARE.—A shareholder's pro rata share of any earnings and profits shall be determined in the same manner as under section 951(a)(2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (vi) of section 56(g)(4)(C), as amended by this Act, is amended—

(A) by striking ''965'' and inserting ''965(b)'', and

(B) by inserting ''AND INCLUSIONS'' after ''CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS'' in the heading thereof.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6601(b) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 6156(a)'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''section 965(d)(1) or 6156(a)'', and

(B) by striking ''section 6156(b)'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''section 965(d)(2) or 6156(b), as the case may be''.

(3) The table of section for subpart F of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 965 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 965. Treatment of deferred foreign income upon transition to participation exemption system of taxation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

TITLE II—OTHER INTERNATIONAL TAX REFORMS

Subtitle A—Modifications of Subpart F

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF LOW-TAXED FOREIGN INCOME AS SUBPART F INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 952 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) low-taxed income (as defined under subsection (e)),''.

(b) LOW-TAXED INCOME.—Section 952 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) LOW-TAXED INCOME.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'low-taxed income' means, with respect to any taxable year of a controlled foreign corporation, the entire gross income of the controlled foreign corporation unless the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such income was subject to an effective rate of income tax (determined under rules similar to the rules of section 954(b)(4)) imposed by a foreign country in excess of one-half of the highest rate of tax under section 11(b) for taxable years of United States corporations beginning in the same calendar year as the taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation begins.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFIED BUSINESS INCOME.—For purposes of paragraph (1), qualified business income—

''(A) shall be taken into account in determining the effective rate of income tax at which the entire gross income of the controlled foreign corporation is taxed, but

''(B) the amount of gross income treated as low-taxed income under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the amount of the qualified business income.

''(3) QUALIFIED BUSINESS INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified business income' means, with respect to any controlled foreign corporation, income derived by the controlled foreign corporation in a foreign country but only if—

''(i) such income is attributable to the active conduct of a trade or business of such corporation in such foreign country,

''(ii) the corporation maintains an office or fixed place of business in such foreign country, and

''(iii) officers and employees of the corporation physically located at such office or place of business in such foreign country conducted (or significantly contributed to the conduct of) activities within the foreign country which are substantial in relation to the activities necessary for the active conduct of the trade or business to which such income is attributable.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR INTANGIBLE INCOME.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), qualified business income of a controlled foreign corporation shall not include intangible income (as defined in section 250(c)(3)).

''(4) DETERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE RATE OF FOREIGN INCOME TAX AND QUALIFIED BUSINESS INCOME.—

''(A) COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY DETERMINATION.—For purposes of determining the effective rate of income tax imposed by any foreign country under paragraph (1) and qualified business income under paragraph (3), each such paragraph shall be applied separately with respect to—

''(i) each foreign country in which a controlled foreign corporation conducts any trade or business, and

''(ii) the entire gross income and qualified business income derived with respect to such foreign country.

''(B) TREATMENT OF LOSSES.—For purposes of determining the effective rate of income tax imposed by any foreign country under paragraph (1)—

''(i) such effective rate shall be determined without regard to any losses carried to the relevant taxable year, and

''(ii) to the extent the income of the controlled foreign corporation reduces losses in the relevant taxable year, such effective rate shall be treated as being the effective rate which would have been imposed on such income without regard to such losses.

''(5) DEDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The gross income of a controlled foreign corporation taken into account under this subsection shall be reduced, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, so as to take into account deductions (including taxes) properly allocable to such income.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 952 is amended—

(A) by striking ''paragraph (4)'' in the next to last sentence and inserting ''paragraph (5)'', and

(B) by striking ''paragraph (5)'' in the last sentence and inserting ''paragraph (6)''.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 952 is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(5)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(6)''.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 999(c) are each amended by striking ''section 952(a)(3)'' and inserting ''section 952(a)(4)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

SEC. 202. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF LOOK-THRU RULE FOR CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 954(c)(6)(C) is amended by striking ''and before January 1, 2014,''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2013, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

SEC. 203. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF EXCEPTIONS FOR ACTIVE FINANCING INCOME.

(a) EXCEPTION FROM INSURANCE INCOME.—Section 953(e)(10) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and before January 1, 2014,'', and

(2) by striking the last sentence.

(b) EXCEPTION FROM FOREIGN PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY INCOME.—Section 954(h)(9) is amended by striking ''and before January 1, 2014,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2013, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

SEC. 204. FOREIGN BASE COMPANY INCOME NOT TO INCLUDE SALES OR SERVICES INCOME.

(a) REPEAL.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 954(a) are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 954(d) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall not apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.''.

(2) Section 954(e) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall not apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2014, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

Subtitle B—Modifications Related to Foreign Tax Credit

SEC. 211. MODIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 902 AND 960 WITH RESPECT TO POST-2014 EARNINGS.

(a) SECTION 902 NOT TO APPLY TO DIVIDENDS FROM POST-2014 EARNINGS.—Section 902 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) SECTION NOT TO APPLY TO DIVIDENDS FROM POST-2014 EARNINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to the portion of any dividend paid by a foreign corporation to the extent such portion is made out of earnings and profits of the foreign corporation (computed in accordance with sections 964(a) and 986) accumulated in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH DISTRIBUTIONS FROM PRE-2015 EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—For purposes of this section—

''(A) ORDERING RULE.—Any distribution in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2014, shall be treated as first made out of earnings and profits of the foreign corporation (computed in accordance with sections 964(a) and 986) accumulated in taxable years beginning before January 1, 2015.

''(B) POST-1986 UNDISTRIBUTED EARNINGS.—Post-1986 undistributed earnings shall not include earnings and profits described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) DETERMINATION OF SECTION 960 CREDIT ON CURRENT YEAR BASIS.—Section 960 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) DEEMED PAID CREDIT FOR SUBPART F INCLUSIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO POST-2014 EARNINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, if there is included in the gross income of a domestic corporation any amount under section 951(a)—

''(A) with respect to any controlled foreign corporation with respect to which such domestic corporation is a United States shareholder, and

''(B) which is attributable to the earnings and profits of the controlled foreign corporation (computed in accordance with sections 964(a) and 986) accumulated in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014,

then subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply and such domestic corporation shall be deemed to have paid so much of such foreign corporation's foreign income taxes as are properly attributable to the amount so included.

''(2) FOREIGN INCOME TAXES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'foreign income taxes' means any income, war profits, or excess profits taxes paid or accrued by the controlled foreign corporation to any foreign country or possession of the United States.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall provide such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this subsection.''.

SEC. 212. SEPARATE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT BASKET FOR FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 904(d) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(C) foreign intangible income (as defined in paragraph (2)(J)).''.

(b) FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 904(d)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (J) and (K) as subparagraphs (K) and (L) and by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) FOREIGN INTANGIBLE INCOME.—For purposes of this section—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'foreign intangible income' has the meaning given such term by section 250(c).

''(ii) COORDINATION.—Passive category income and general category income shall not include foreign intangible income.''.

(2) GENERAL CATEGORY INCOME.—Section 904(d)(2)(A)(ii) is amended by inserting ''or foreign intangible income'' after ''passive category income''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—For purposes of section 904(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by this Act)—

(A) taxes carried from any taxable year beginning before January 1, 2015, to any taxable year beginning on or after such date, with respect to any item of income, shall be treated as described in the subparagraph of such section 904(d)(1) in which such income would be described without regard to the amendments made by this section, and

(B) any carryback of taxes with respect to foreign intangible income from a taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2015, to a taxable year beginning before such date shall be allocated to the general income category.

SEC. 213. INVENTORY PROPERTY SALES SOURCE RULE EXCEPTIONS NOT TO APPLY FOR FOREIGN TAX CREDIT LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 904 is amended by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m) and by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

''(l) INVENTORY PROPERTY SALES SOURCE RULE EXCEPTIONS NOT TO APPLY.—Any amount which would be treated as derived from sources without the United States by reason of the application of section 862(a)(6) or 863(b)(2) for any taxable year shall be treated as derived from sources within the United States for purposes of this section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

Subtitle C—Allocation of Interest on Worldwide Basis

SEC. 221. ACCELERATION OF ELECTION TO ALLOCATE INTEREST ON A WORLDWIDE BASIS.

Section 864(f)(6) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

SA 3601. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ___—IMPACT OF ACA

SEC. _01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Certify It Act of 2014''.

SEC. _02. STUDY ON IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS JOBS.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and December 1 for each of the 4 consecutive years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States, shall conduct a study on the impact of the Affordable Care Act on small businesses, including—

(A) the impact of any increased health insurance costs resulting from the provisions of such Act on economic indicators (including jobs lost, hours worked per employee, and any resulting loss of wages); and

(B) the impact of section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to shared responsibility for employers regarding health coverage) on economic indicators, including any jobs lost.

(2) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States, using data from the Office

of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, under section __03 and economic indicators data from other Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee of the Senate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this title:

(1) AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.—The term ''Affordable Care Act'' means the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) and title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public law 111–152).

(2) SMALL BUSINESS.—The term ''small business'' means an employer with 250 or fewer employees.

SEC. __03. STUDY ON IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH INSURANCE.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and December 1 for each of the 4 consecutive years thereafter, the Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall conduct a study on the impact of the Affordable Care Act on small group health insurance costs, including—

(A) the impact of requirements and benefits pursuant to such Act on the small group health insurance market, including community rating requirements, minimum actuarial value requirements, requirements to provide for essential health benefits described in section 1302(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(b)), requirements related to cost-sharing, the prohibition on annual and lifetime limits on benefits under section 2711 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–11), prohibitions on cost-sharing requirements for preventive services, and the extension of dependent coverage under section 2714 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–14); and

(B) the impact of new taxes and fees on the small group health insurance market costs, including the fee imposed under section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (relating to imposition of annual fee on health insurance providers), the transitional reinsurance program contributions, the fees imposed under subchapter B of chapter 34 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the Patient Centered Outcome Research Institute fees), and Exchange assessments or user fees.

(2) REPORT.—The Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, in consultation with the Comptroller General for purposes of verifying the methodology, assumptions, validity, and reasonableness of the data used by the Actuary, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee of the Senate.

SEC. __04. ONE-YEAR DELAY FOR EMPLOYER MANDATE IN CASE OF NEGATIVE IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Comptroller General of the United States or the Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, determines in any report submitted under section __02 or __03 that the Affordable Care Act has caused net employment loss amongst small businesses or caused small group health insurance costs to rise, section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply for months beginning during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the submission of such report.

(b) FAILURE TO SUBMIT.—If the Comptroller General of the United States or the Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, fails to submit a report in accordance with the timelines specified in this title, section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply the following calendar year.

SA 3602. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—SAVING COAL JOBS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Saving Coal Jobs Act of 2014''.

Subtitle A—Prohibition on Energy Tax

SEC. 211. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, ''The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in cardiovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.'';

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, ''children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor'';

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

Subtitle B—Permits

SEC. 221. NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—

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

''(A) GUIDANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'guidance' means draft, interim, or final guidance issued by the Administrator.

''(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'guidance' includes—

''(I) the comprehensive guidance issued by the Administrator and dated April 1, 2010;

''(II) the proposed guidance entitled 'Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act' and dated April 28, 2011;

''(III) the final guidance proposed by the Administrator and dated July 21, 2011; and

''(IV) any other document or paper issued by the Administrator through any process other than the notice and comment rulemaking process.

''(B) NEW PERMIT.—The term 'new permit' means a permit covering discharges from a structure—

''(i) that is issued under this section by a permitting authority; and

''(ii) for which an application is—

''(I) pending as of the date of enactment of this subsection; or

''(II) filed on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(C) PERMITTING AUTHORITY.—The term 'permitting authority' means—

''(i) the Administrator; or

''(ii) a State, acting pursuant to a State program that is equivalent to the program under this section and approved by the Administrator.

''(2) PERMITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making a determination whether to approve a new permit or a renewed permit, the permitting authority—

''(i) shall base the determination only on compliance with regulations issued by the Administrator or the permitting authority; and

''(ii) shall not base the determination on the extent of adherence of the applicant for the new permit or renewed permit to guidance.

''(B) NEW PERMITS.—If the permitting authority does not approve or deny an application for a new permit by the date that is 270 days after the date of receipt of the application for the new permit, the applicant may operate as if the application were approved in accordance with Federal law for the period of time for which a permit from the same industry would be approved.

''(C) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETENESS.—In determining whether an application for a new permit or a renewed permit received under this paragraph is substantially complete, the permitting authority shall use standards for determining substantial completeness of similar permits for similar facilities submitted in fiscal year 2007.''.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time after the promulgation of the guidelines required by section 304(a)(2), the Governor of each State desiring to administer a permit program for discharges into navigable waters within the jurisdiction of the State may submit to the Administrator—

''(A) a full and complete description of the program the State proposes to establish and administer under State law or under an interstate compact; and

''(B) a statement from the attorney general (or the attorney for those State water pollution control agencies that have independent legal counsel), or from the chief legal officer in the case of an interstate agency, that the laws of the State, or the interstate compact, as applicable, provide adequate authority to carry out the described program.

''(2) APPROVAL.—The Administrator shall approve each program for which a description is submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator determines that adequate authority does not exist—

''(A) to issue permits that—

''(i) apply, and ensure compliance with, any applicable requirements of sections 301, 302, 306, 307, and 403;

''(ii) are for fixed terms not exceeding 5 years;

''(iii) can be terminated or modified for cause, including—

''(I) a violation of any condition of the permit;

''(II) obtaining a permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully all relevant facts; and

''(III) a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the permitted discharge; and

''(iv) control the disposal of pollutants into wells;

''(B)(i) to issue permits that apply, and ensure compliance with, all applicable requirements of section 308; or

''(ii) to inspect, monitor, enter, and require reports to at least the same extent as required in section 308;

''(C) to ensure that the public, and any other State the waters of which may be affected, receives notice of each application for a permit and an opportunity for a public hearing before a ruling on each application;

''(D) to ensure that the Administrator receives notice and a copy of each application for a permit;

''(E) to ensure that any State (other than the permitting State), whose waters may be affected by the issuance of a permit may submit written recommendations to the permitting State and the Administrator with respect to any permit application and, if any part of the written recommendations are not accepted by the permitting State, that the permitting State will notify the affected State and the Administrator in writing of the failure of the State to accept the recommendations, including the reasons for not accepting the recommendations;

''(F) to ensure that no permit will be issued if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, anchorage and navigation of any of the navigable waters would be substantially impaired by the issuance of the permit;

''(G) to abate violations of the permit or the permit program, including civil and criminal penalties and other means of enforcement;

''(H) to ensure that any permit for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works includes conditions to require the identification in terms of character and volume of pollutants of any significant source introducing pollutants subject to pretreatment standards under section 307(b) into the treatment works and a program to ensure compliance with those pretreatment standards by each source, in addition to adequate notice, which shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent to be introduced into the treatment works and any anticipated impact of the change in the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the publicly owned treatment works, to the permitting agency of—

''(i) new introductions into the treatment works of pollutants from any source that would be a new source (as defined in section 306(a)) if the source were discharging pollutants;

''(ii) new introductions of pollutants into the treatment works from a source that would be subject to section 301 if the source were discharging those pollutants; or

''(iii) a substantial change in volume or character of pollutants being introduced into the treatment works by a source introducing pollutants into the treatment works at the time of issuance of the permit; and

''(I) to ensure that any industrial user of any publicly owned treatment works will comply with sections 204(b), 307, and 308.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a program under this subsection on the basis of the following:

''(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

''(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''402(b)(8)'' and inserting ''402(b)(2)(H)''; and

(II) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''402(b)(8)'' and inserting ''402(b)(2)(H)''; and

(ii) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by striking ''402(b)(8)'' and inserting ''402(b)(2)(H)''.

(B) Section 402(m) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(m)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''subsection (b)(8) of this section'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)(H)''.

(c) SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM.—Section 402(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) LIMITATION ON DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (3), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a State program under subsection (b) on the basis of the failure of the following:

''(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

''(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).''.

(d) NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 402(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2)'' and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(2) OBJECTION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), no permit shall issue if—

''(i) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator receives notification under subsection (b)(2)(E), the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit; or

''(ii) not later than 90 days after the date on which the proposed permit of the State is transmitted to the Administrator, the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit as being outside the guidelines and requirements of this Act.'';

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''Whenever the Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator shall not object to or deny the issuance of a permit by a State under subsection (b) or (s) based on the following:

''(i) Guidance, as that term is defined in subsection (s)(1).

''(ii) The interpretation of the Administrator of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).''.

SEC. 222. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through ''SEC. 404. (a) The Secretary may issue'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 404. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

''(a) PERMITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue''; and

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—

''(A) PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, as appropriate, is required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Secretary shall—

''(I) begin the process not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a permit application; and

''(II) approve or deny an application for a permit under this subsection not later than the latter of—

''(aa) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a finding of no significant impact, the date on which the finding of no significant impact is issued; or

''(bb) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a record of decision, 15 days after the date on which the record of decision on an environmental impact statement is issued.

''(ii) PROCESSES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), regardless of whether the Secretary has commenced an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement by the date described in clause (i)(I), the following deadlines shall apply:

''(I) An environmental assessment carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

''(II) An environmental impact statement carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

''(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to act by the deadline specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the application, and the permit requested in the application, shall be considered to be approved;

''(ii) the Secretary shall issue a permit to the applicant; and

''(iii) the permit shall not be subject to judicial review.''.

(b) STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4), until the Secretary has issued a permit under this section, the Administrator is authorized to prohibit the specification (including the withdrawal of specification) of any defined area as a disposal site, and deny or restrict the use of any defined area for specification (including the withdrawal of specification) as a disposal site, if the Administrator determines, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, that the discharge of the materials into the area will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds or fishery areas (including spawning and breeding areas), wildlife, or recreational areas.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—Before making a determination under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary.

''(3) FINDINGS.—The Administrator shall set forth in writing and make public the findings of the Administrator and the reasons of the Administrator for making any determination under this subsection.

''(4) AUTHORITY OF STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—This subsection shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the determination of the Administrator that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).''.

(c) STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 404(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''for the discharge'' and inserting ''for all or part of the discharges''.

SEC. 223. IMPACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term ''covered action'' means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term ''more than a de minimis negative impact'' means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs, except that any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than $1,000,000 over any calendar year, except that any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

(b) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall use the best available economic models.

(B) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post the analysis in the Capitol of the State.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents.

(B) PRIORITY.—In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the congressional delegation, Governor, and legislature of the State at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

SEC. 224. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not—

(1) finalize, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled ''EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act'' (EPA–HQ–OW–2011–0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); and

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), any successor document, or any substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) RULES.—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any successor document or substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacating the rule.

SEC. 225. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO MODIFY STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking ''(4) The'' and inserting the following:

''(4) PROMULGATION OF REVISED OR NEW STANDARDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The'';

(3) by striking ''The Administrator shall promulgate'' and inserting the following:

''(B) DEADLINE.—The Administrator shall promulgate;'' and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Administrator may not promulgate a revised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the determination of the Administrator that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.''.

(b) FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 401(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) STATE OR INTERSTATE AGENCY DETERMINATION.—With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point at which the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.''.

SEC. 226. STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Administrator from time to time, with the first such submission not later than 180 days after the date of publication of the first identification of pollutants under section 304(a)(2)(D), the waters identified and the loads established under subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1).

''(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission, the Administrator shall approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load.

''(ii) APPROVAL.—If the Administrator approves the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the State shall incorporate the identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

''(iii) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection. the Administrator shall submit, not later than 30 days after the date that the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the submission of the State, to the State the written recommendation of the Administrator of those additional waters that the Administrator identifies and such loads for such waters as the Administrator believes are necessary to implement the water quality standards applicable to the waters.

''(C) ACTION BY STATE.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the recommendation of the Administrator, the State shall—

''(i) disregard the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its own identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e);

''(ii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its identification and load as amended by the recommendation of the Administrator into the current plan of the State under subsection (e); or

''(iii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in part, identifying certain additional waters and certain additional loads proposed by the Administrator to be added to the State's identification and load and incorporate the State's identification and load as amended into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

''(D) NONCOMPLIANCE BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator fails to approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load within the time specified in this subsection—

''(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

''(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

''(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS NOT SUBMITTED.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load of the State but fails to submit the written recommendation of the Administrator to the State within 30 days as required by subparagraph (B)(iii)—

''(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

''(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

''(E) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any decision made by the Administrator under this subsection issued on or after March 1, 2013.''.

SA 3603. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—NATURAL GAS GATHERING ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Natural Gas Gathering Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) record volumes of natural gas production in the United States as of the date of enactment of this Act are providing enormous benefits to the United States, including by—

(A) reducing the need for imports of natural gas, thereby directly reducing the trade deficit;

(B) strengthening trade ties among the United States, Canada, and Mexico;

(C) providing the opportunity for the United States to join the emerging global gas trade through the export of liquefied natural gas;

(D) creating and supporting millions of new jobs across the United States;

(E) adding billions of dollars to the gross domestic product of the United States every year;

(F) generating additional Federal, State, and local government tax revenues; and

(G) revitalizing the manufacturing sector by providing abundant and affordable feedstock;

(2) large quantities of natural gas are lost due to venting and flaring, primarily in areas where natural gas infrastructure has not been developed quickly enough, such as States with large quantities of Federal land and Indian land;

(3) permitting processes can hinder the development of natural gas infrastructure, such as pipeline lines and gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; and

(4) additional authority for the Secretary of the Interior to approve natural gas pipelines and gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land would—

(A) assist in bringing gas to market that would otherwise be vented or flared; and

(B) significantly increase royalties collected by the Secretary of the Interior and disbursed to Federal, State, and tribal governments and individual Indians.

SEC. 203. AUTHORITY TO APPROVE NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

Section 1 of the Act of February 15, 1901 (31 Stat. 790, chapter 372; 16 U.S.C. 79) is amended by inserting '', for natural gas pipelines'' after ''distribution of electrical power''.

SEC. 204. CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES LOCATED ON FEDERAL LAND AND INDIAN LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title III of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 685) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 319. CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES LOCATED ON FEDERAL LAND AND INDIAN LAND.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) GAS GATHERING LINE AND ASSOCIATED FIELD COMPRESSION UNIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' means—

''(i) a pipeline that is installed to transport natural gas production associated with 1 or more wells drilled and completed to produce crude oil; and

''(ii) if necessary, a compressor to raise the pressure of that transported natural gas to higher pressures suitable to enable the gas to flow into pipelines and other facilities.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' does not include a pipeline or compression unit that is installed to transport natural gas from a processing plant to a common carrier pipeline or facility.

''(2) FEDERAL LAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Federal land' means land the title to which is held by the United States.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'Federal land' does not include—

''(i) a unit of the National Park System;

''(ii) a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; or

''(iii) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

''(3) INDIAN LAND.—The term 'Indian land' means land the title to which is held by—

''(A) the United States in trust for an Indian tribe or an individual Indian; or

''(B) an Indian tribe or an individual Indian subject to a restriction by the United States against alienation.

''(b) CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the issuance of a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit that is located on Federal land or Indian land and that services any oil well shall be considered to be an action that is categorically excluded (as defined in section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act)) for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if the gas gathering line and associated field compression unit are—

''(A) within a field or unit for which an approved land use plan or an environmental document prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) analyzed transportation of natural gas produced from 1 or more oil wells in that field or unit as a reasonably foreseeable activity; and

''(B) located adjacent to an existing disturbed area for the construction of a road or pad.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—

''(A) FEDERAL LAND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to Federal land, or a portion of Federal land, for which the Governor of the State in which the Federal land is located submits to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, a written request that paragraph (1) not apply to that Federal land (or portion of Federal land).

''(B) INDIAN LAND.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to Indian land, or a portion of Indian land, for which the Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the Indian land submits to the Secretary of the Interior a written request that paragraph (1) apply to that Indian land (or portion of Indian land).

''(c) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section affects or alters any requirement—

''(1) relating to prior consent under—

''(A) section 2 of the Act of February 5, 1948 (25 U.S.C. 324); or

''(B) section 16(e) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 476(e)) (commonly known as the 'Indian Reorganization Act'); or

''(2) under any other Federal law (including regulations) relating to tribal consent for rights-of-way across Indian land.''.

(b) ASSESSMENTS.—Title XVIII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 1122) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1841. NATURAL GAS GATHERING SYSTEM ASSESSMENTS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF GAS GATHERING LINE AND ASSOCIATED FIELD COMPRESSION UNIT.—In this section, the term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' has the meaning given the term in section 319.

''(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Natural Gas Gathering Enhancement Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes, shall conduct a study to identify—

''(1) any actions that may be taken, under Federal law (including regulations), to expedite permitting for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets; and

''(2) any proposed changes to Federal law (including regulations) to expedite permitting for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets.

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Natural Gas Gathering Enhancement Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

''(1) the progress made in expediting permits for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets; and

''(2) any issues impeding that progress.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 594) is amended by adding at the end of subtitle B of title III the following:

''Sec. 319. Natural gas gathering lines located on Federal land and Indian land.''.

(2) Section 1(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 594) is amended by adding at the end of title XXVIII the following:

''Sec. 1841. Natural gas gathering system assessments.''.

SEC. 205. DEADLINES FOR PERMITTING NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT.

Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—The Secretary of the Interior or other appropriate agency head shall issue a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit (as defined in section 319(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) that is located on Federal lands—

''(1) for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit described in section 319(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, not later than 30 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance; and

''(2) for all other gas gathering lines and associated field compression units, not later than 60 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance.''.

SEC. 206. DEADLINES FOR PERMITTING NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.

Section 504 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—The Secretary concerned shall issue a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit (as defined in section 319(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) that is located on public lands—

''(1) for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit described in section 319(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, not later than 30 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance; and

''(2) for all other gas gathering lines and associated field compression units, not later than 60 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance.''.

SA 3604. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. NATURAL GAS EXPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term 'World Trade Organization member country' has the meaning given the term 'WTO member country' in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

''(2) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—For purposes''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking ''nation with which there is in effect a free trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas'' and inserting ''World Trade Organization member country''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3605. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FIDUCIARY EXCLUSION.

Section 3(21)(A) of the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(21)(A)) is amended by inserting ''and except to the extent a person is providing an appraisal or fairness opinion with respect to qualifying employer securities (as defined in section 407(d)(5)) included in an employee stock ownership plan (as defined in section 407(d)(6)),'' after ''subparagraph (B),''.

SA 3606. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION __—AMERICAN ENERGY RENAISSANCE

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''American Energy Renaissance Act of 2014''.

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

TITLE I—EXPANDING AMERICAN ENERGY EXPORTS

SEC. 2101. FINDING.

Congress finds that opening up energy exports will contribute to economic development, private sector job growth, and continued growth in American energy production.

SEC. 2102. NATURAL GAS EXPORTS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that expanding natural gas exports will lead to increased investment and development of domestic supplies of natural gas that will contribute to job growth and economic development.

(b) NATURAL GAS EXPORTS.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or any other nation not excluded by this section'' after ''trade in natural gas'';

(2) by striking ''(c) For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCLUSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any nation subject to sanctions or trade restrictions imposed by the United States is excluded from expedited approval under paragraph (1).

''(B) DESIGNATION BY PRESIDENT OR CONGRESS.—The President or Congress may designate nations that may be excluded from expedited approval under paragraph (1) for reasons of national security.

''(3) ORDER NOT REQUIRED.—No order is required under subsection (a) to authorize the export or import of any natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico.''.

SEC. 2103. CRUDE OIL EXPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the restrictions on crude oil exports from the 1970s are no longer necessary due to the technological advances that have increased the domestic supply of crude oil; and

(2) repealing restrictions on crude oil exports will contribute to job growth and economic development.

(b) REPEAL OF PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT OIL EXPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 12 of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 719j) is amended—

(i) by striking ''and section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act''; and

(ii) by striking ''such Acts'' and inserting ''that Act''.

(B) The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(i) in section 251 (42 U.S.C. 6271)—

(I) by striking subsection (d); and

(II) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(ii) in section 523(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 6393(a)(1)), by striking ''(other than section 103 thereof)''.

(c) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON EXPORTS OF OIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (u); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (v) through (y) as subsection (u) through (x), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 1107(c) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3167(c)) is amended by striking ''(u) through (y)'' and inserting ''(u) through (x)''.

(B) Section 23 of the Deep Water Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1522) is repealed.

(C) Section 203(c) of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (43 U.S.C. 1652(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''(w)(2), and (x))'' and inserting ''(v)(2), and (w))''.

(D) Section 509(c) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 2009(c)) is amended by striking ''subsection (w)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (v)(2)''.

(d) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON EXPORT OF OCS OIL OR GAS.—Section 28 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1354) is repealed.

(e) TERMINATION OF LIMITATION ON EXPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL.—Section 7(d) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(d)) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) shall have no force or effect.

(f) CLARIFICATION OF CRUDE OIL REGULATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 754.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to crude oil) shall have no force or effect.

(2) CRUDE OIL LICENSE REQUIREMENTS.—The Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce shall grant licenses to export to a country crude oil (as the term is defined in subsection (a) of the regulation referred to in paragraph (1)) (as in effect on the date that is 1 day before the date of enactment of this Act) unless—

(A) the country is subject to sanctions or trade restrictions imposed by the United States; or

(B) the President or Congress has designated the country as subject to exclusion for reasons of national security.

SEC. 2104. COAL EXPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) increased international demand for coal is an opportunity to support jobs and promote economic growth in the United States; and

(2) exports of coal should not be unreasonably restricted or delayed.

(b) NEPA REVIEW FOR COAL EXPORTS.—In completing an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for an approval or permit for coal export terminals, or transportation of coal to coal export terminals, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers—

(1) may only take into account domestic environmental impacts; and

(2) may not take into account any impacts resulting from the final use overseas of the exported coal.

TITLE II—IMPROVING NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

Subtitle A—North American Energy Infrastructure

SEC. 2201. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States should establish a more efficient, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil, natural gas, and electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

SEC. 2202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The term ''Electric Reliability Organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

(2) INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR.—The term ''Independent System Operator'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(3) NATURAL GAS.—The term ''natural gas'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a).

(4) OIL.—The term ''oil'' means petroleum or a petroleum product.

(5) REGIONAL ENTITY.—The term ''regional entity'' has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

(6) REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.—The term ''Regional Transmission Organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

SEC. 2203. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsections (d) and (e), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining approval of the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance under this section.

(b) APPROVAL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a request for approval of construction, connection, operation, or maintenance under this section, the relevant official identified under paragraph (2), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall approve the request unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance harms the national security interests of the United States.

(2) RELEVANT OFFICIAL.—The relevant official referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) the Secretary of Commerce with respect to oil pipelines;

(B) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to natural gas pipelines; and

(C) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(3) APPROVAL NOT MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—An approval of construction, connection, operation, or maintenance under paragraph (1) shall not be considered a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for approval of the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of approval of the request under paragraph (1), that the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(A) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(B) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the electric transmission facility.

(c) NO OTHER APPROVAL REQUIRED.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; 69 Fed. Reg. 25299 (April 30, 2004)), Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; 33 Fed. Reg. 11741 (August 16, 1968)), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order 12038 (43 Fed. Reg. 3674 (January 26, 1978)), Executive Order 10485 (18 Fed. Reg. 5397 (September 9, 1953)), or any other Executive order shall be necessary for construction, connection, operation, or maintenance to which this section applies.

(d) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

(1) any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico if—

(A) the pipeline or facility is operating at the national boundary for that import or export as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) a permit described in subsection (c) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(C) approval of the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been obtained under this section; or

(D) an application for a permit described in subsection (c) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which the application is denied; and

(ii) July 1, 2015; or

(2) the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline.

(e) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No approval under this section, or permit described in subsection (c), shall be required for modifications to construction, connection, operation, or maintenance described in subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (d)(1), including reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnection, or adjustments to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations).

(f) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section affects the application of any other Federal law to a project for which approval of construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is sought under this section.

SEC. 2204. TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsection (e) and (f), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), by striking ''insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)''.

(2) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking ''the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.''.

SEC. 2205. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 2203 and 2204, and the amendments made by those sections, shall take effect on July 1, 2015.

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official described in section 2203(b)(2) shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of section 2203; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of section 2203.

Subtitle B—Keystone XL Permit Approval

SEC. 2211. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) building the Keystone XL pipeline will provide jobs and economic growth to the United States; and

(2) the Keystone XL pipeline should be approved immediately.

SEC. 2212. KEYSTONE XL PERMIT APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note ; 69 Fed. Reg. 25299 (April 30, 2004)), Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; 33 Fed. Reg. 11741 (August 16, 1968)), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and any other Executive order or provision of law, no presidential permit shall be required for the pipeline described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State for the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline from the Canadian border to the border between the States of South Dakota and Nebraska.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The final environmental impact statement issued by the Secretary of State on January 31, 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), shall be considered to satisfy all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(c) CRITICAL HABITAT.—No area necessary to construct or maintain the Keystone XL pipeline shall be considered critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or any other provision of law.

(d) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, shall remain in effect.

(e) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this section, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

TITLE III—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING

SEC. 3001. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States has enormous potential for offshore energy development and that the people of the United States should have access to the jobs and economic benefits from developing those resources.

SEC. 3002. EXTENSION OF LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2010–2015 issued by the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this title as the ''Secretary'') under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) shall be considered to be the final oil and gas leasing program under that section for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

(b) FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Secretary is considered to have issued a final environmental impact statement for the program applicable to the period described in subsection (a) in accordance with all requirements under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Lease Sales 214, 232, and 239 shall not be included in the final oil and gas leasing program for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

SEC. 3003. LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 270 days thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a lease sale in each outer Continental Shelf planning area for which the Secretary determines that there is a commercial interest in purchasing Federal oil and gas leases for production on the outer Continental Shelf.

(b) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS AND SALES.—If the Secretary determines that there is not a commercial interest in purchasing Federal oil and gas leases for production on the outer Continental Shelf in a planning area under this section, not later than 2 years after the date of the determination and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(1) make an additional determination on whether there is a commercial interest in purchasing Federal oil and gas leases for production on the outer Continental Shelf in the planning area; and

(2) if the Secretary determines that there is a commercial interest under paragraph (1), conduct a lease sale in the planning area.

(c) PROTECTION OF STATE INTEREST.—In developing future leasing programs, the Secretary shall give deference to affected coastal States (as the term is used in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) in determining leasing areas to be included in the leasing program.

(d) PETITIONS.—If a person petitions the Secretary to conduct a lease sale for an outer Continental Shelf planning area in which the person has a commercial interest, the Secretary shall conduct a lease sale for the area in accordance with subsection (a).

SEC. 3004. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.

Section 5 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall approve or disapprove an application for a permit to drill submitted under this Act not later than 20 days after the date on which the application is submitted to the Secretary.

''(2) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves an application for a permit to drill under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the disapproval of the application;

''(B) allow the applicant to resubmit an application during the 10-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of the description described in subparagraph (A) by the applicant; and

''(C) approve or disapprove any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date on which the application is submitted to the Secretary.''.

SEC. 3005. LEASE SALES FOR CERTAIN AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable but not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct Lease Sale 220 for areas offshore of the State of Virginia.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER LAWS.—For purposes of the lease sale described in subsection (a), the environmental impact statement prepared under section 3001 shall satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(c) ENERGY PROJECTS IN GULF OF MEXICO.—

(1) JURISDICTION.—The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit shall have exclusive jurisdiction over challenges to offshore energy projects and permits to drill carried out in the Gulf of Mexico.

(2) FILING DEADLINE.—Any civil action to challenge a project or permit described in paragraph (1) shall be filed not later than 60 days after the date of approval of the project or the issuance of the permit.

TITLE IV—UTILIZING AMERICA'S ONSHORE RESOURCES

SEC. 4001. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) current policy has failed to take full advantage of the natural resources on Federal land;

(2) the States should be given the option to lead energy development on all available Federal land in a State; and

(3) the Federal Government should not inhibit energy development on Federal land.

SEC. 4002. STATE OPTION FOR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a State may elect to control energy development and production on available Federal land in accordance with the terms and conditions of subtitle A and the amendments made by subtitle A in lieu of being subject to the Federal system established under subtitle B and the amendments made by subtitle B.

Subtitle A—Energy Development by States

SEC. 4011. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''available Federal land'' means any Federal land that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) is located within the boundaries of a State;

(B) is not held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe;

(C) is not a unit of the National Park System;

(D) is not a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(E) is not a congressionally designated wilderness area.

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

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4012. STATE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State—

(1) may establish a program covering the leasing and permitting processes, regulatory requirements, and any other provisions by which the State would exercise the rights of the State to develop all forms of energy resources on available Federal land in the State; and

(2) as a condition of certification under section 4013(b) shall submit a declaration to the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy that a program under paragraph (1) has been established or amended.

(b) AMENDMENT OF PROGRAMS.—A State may amend a program developed and certified under this subtitle at any time.

(c) CERTIFICATION OF AMENDED PROGRAMS.—Any program amended under subsection (b) shall be certified under section 4013(b).

SEC. 4013. LEASING, PERMITTING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) SATISFACTION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each program certified under this section shall be considered to satisfy all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations), including—

(1) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(2) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(3) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(b) FEDERAL CERTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.—Upon submission of a declaration by a State under section 4012(a)(2)—

(1) the program under section 4012(a)(1) shall be certified; and

(2) the State shall receive all rights from the Federal Government to develop all forms of energy resources covered by the program.

(c) ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND LEASES.—If a State elects to issue a permit or lease for the development of any form of energy resource on any available Federal land within the borders of the State in accordance with a program certified under subsection (b), the permit or lease shall be considered to meet all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

SEC. 4014. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Activities carried out in accordance with this subtitle shall not be subject to Federal judicial review.

SEC. 4015. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.

Activities carried out in accordance with this subtitle shall not be subject to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

Subtitle B—Onshore Oil and Gas Permit Streamlining

PART I—OIL AND GAS LEASING CERTAINTY

SEC. 4021. MINIMUM ACREAGE REQUIREMENT FOR ONSHORE LEASE SALES.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 17. (a) All lands'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 17. LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LAND.

''(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—All land''; and

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(2) MINIMUM ACREAGE REQUIREMENT FOR ONSHORE LEASE SALES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting lease sales under paragraph (1)—

''(i) there shall be a presumption that nominated land should be leased; and

''(ii) the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale all of the nominated acreage not previously made available for lease, unless the Secretary demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that an individual lease should not be granted.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—Acreage offered for lease pursuant to this paragraph—

''(i) shall not be subject to protest; and

''(ii) shall be eligible for categorical exclusions under section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942), except that the categorical exclusions shall not be subject to the test of extraordinary circumstances or any other similar regulation or policy guidance.

''(C) AVAILABILITY.—In administering this paragraph, the Secretary shall only consider leasing of Federal land that is available for leasing at the time the lease sale occurs.''.

SEC. 4022. LEASING CERTAINTY.

Section 17(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(a)) (as amended by section 4061) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LEASING CERTAINTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not withdraw any covered energy project (as defined in section 4051 of the American Energy Renaissance Act of 2014) issued under this Act without finding a violation of the terms of the lease by the lessee.

''(B) DELAY.—The Secretary shall not infringe on lease rights under leases issued under this Act by indefinitely delaying issuance of project approvals, drilling and seismic permits, and rights-of-way for activities under the lease.

''(C) AVAILABILITY FOR LEASE.—Not later than 18 months after an area is designated as open under the applicable land use plan, the Secretary shall make available nominated areas for lease using the criteria established under section 2.

''(D) LAST PAYMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall issue all leases sold not later than 60 days after the last payment is made.

''(ii) CANCELLATION.—The Secretary shall not cancel or withdraw any lease parcel after a competitive lease sale has occurred and a winning bidder has submitted the last payment for the parcel.

''(E) PROTESTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date a lease sale is held under this Act, the Secretary shall adjudicate any lease protests filed following a lease sale.

''(ii) UNSETTLED PROTEST.—If, after the 60-day period described in clause (i) any protest is left unsettled—

''(I) the protest shall be considered automatically denied; and

''(II) the appeal rights of the protestor shall begin.

''(F) ADDITIONAL LEASE STIPULATIONS.—No additional lease stipulation may be added after the parcel is sold without consultation and agreement of the lessee, unless the Secretary considers the stipulation as an emergency action to conserve the resources of the United States.''.

SEC. 4023. LEASING CONSISTENCY.

A Federal land manager shall follow existing resource management plans and continue to actively lease in areas designated as open when resource management plans are being amended or revised, until such time as a new record of decision is signed.

SEC. 4024. REDUCE REDUNDANT POLICIES.

Bureau of Land Management Instruction Memorandum 2010–117 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 4025. STREAMLINED CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.

Section 31(e) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188(e)) is amended in the first sentence of the matter following paragraph (4) by striking ''at least thirty days in advance of the reinstatement'' and inserting ''in an annual report''.

PART II—APPLICATION FOR PERMITS TO DRILL PROCESS REFORM

SEC. 4031. PERMIT TO DRILL APPLICATION TIMELINE.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date an application for a permit to drill is received by the Secretary, the Secretary shall decide whether to issue the permit.

''(B) EXTENSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may extend the period described in subparagraph (A) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant.

''(ii) NOTICE.—The notice shall—

''(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

''(II) include—

''(aa) the names and titles of the persons processing the application;

''(bb) the specific reasons for the delay; and

''(cc) a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

''(C) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

''(i) a written statement that provides clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

''(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

''(D) APPLICATION DEEMED APPROVED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application shall be considered approved.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply in cases in which existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

''(E) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

''(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

''(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

''(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.

''(F) FEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall collect a single $6,500 permit processing fee per application from each applicant at the time the final decision is made whether to issue a permit under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) RESUBMITTED APPLICATION.—The fee required under clause (i) shall not apply to any resubmitted application.

''(iii) TREATMENT OF PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—Subject to appropriation, of all fees collected under this paragraph for each fiscal year, 50 percent shall be—

''(I) transferred to the field office at which the fees are collected; and

''(II) used to process protests, leases, and permits under this Act.''.

SEC. 4032. ADMINISTRATIVE PROTEST DOCUMENTATION REFORM.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) (as amended by section 4031) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PROTEST FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall collect a $5,000 documentation fee to accompany each administrative protest for a lease, right-of-way, or application for a permit to drill.

''(B) TREATMENT OF FEES.—Subject to appropriation, of all fees collected under this paragraph for each fiscal year, 50 percent shall—

''(i) remain in the field office at which the fees are collected; and

''(ii) be used to process protests.''.

SEC. 4033. IMPROVED FEDERAL ENERGY PERMIT COORDINATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENERGY PROJECT.—The term ''energy project'' includes any oil, natural gas, coal,

or other energy project, as defined by the Secretary.

(2) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Federal Permit Streamlining Project established under subsection (b).

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

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Federal Permit Streamlining Project in each Bureau of Land Management field office with responsibility for permitting energy projects on Federal land.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding for purposes of carrying out this section with—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(B) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(C) the Chief of Engineers.

(2) STATE PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary may request that the Governor of any State with energy projects on Federal land to be a signatory to the memorandum of understanding.

(d) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the signing of the memorandum of understanding under subsection (c), each Federal signatory party shall, if appropriate, assign to each Bureau of Land Management field office an employee who has expertise in the regulatory issues relating to the office in which the employee is employed, including, as applicable, particular expertise in—

(A) the consultations and the preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536);

(B) permits under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344);

(C) regulatory matters under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(D) planning under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); and

(E) the preparation of analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) DUTIES.—Each employee assigned under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of assignment, report to the Bureau of Land Management Field Managers in the office to which the employee is assigned;

(B) be responsible for all issues relating to the energy projects that arise under the authorities of the home agency of the employee; and

(C) participate as part of the team of personnel working on proposed energy projects, planning, and environmental analyses on Federal land.

(e) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall assign to each Bureau of Land Management field office described in subsection (b) any additional personnel that are necessary to ensure the effective approval and implementation of energy projects administered by the Bureau of Land Management field office, including inspection and enforcement relating to energy development on Federal land, in accordance with the multiple use mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(f) FUNDING.—Funding for the additional personnel shall come from the Department of the Interior reforms under paragraph (2) of section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) (as amended by section 4031 and section 4032).

(g) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the operation of any Federal or State law; or

(2) any delegation of authority made by the head of a Federal agency any employee of which is participating in the Project.

SEC. 4034. ADMINISTRATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall not require a finding of extraordinary circumstances in administering section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942).

PART III—OIL SHALE

SEC. 4041. EFFECTIVENESS OF OIL SHALE REGULATIONS, AMENDMENTS TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS, AND RECORD OF DECISION.

(a) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the final regulations regarding oil shale management published by the Bureau of Land Management on November 18, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 69414) shall be considered to satisfy all legal and procedural requirements under any law, including—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall implement the regulations described in paragraph (1) (including the oil shale leasing program authorized by the regulations) without any other administrative action necessary.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND RECORD OF DECISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations) to the contrary, the Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision for Oil Shale and Tar Sands Resources to Address Land Use Allocations in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming and the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement of the Bureau of Land Management, as in effect on November 17, 2008, shall be considered to satisfy all legal and procedural requirements under any law, including—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall implement the oil shale leasing program authorized by the regulations described in paragraph (1) in those areas covered by the resource management plans covered by the amendments, and covered by the record of decision, described in paragraph (1) without any other administrative action necessary.

SEC. 4042. OIL SHALE LEASING.

(a) ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LEASE SALES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall hold a lease sale offering an additional 10 parcels for lease for research, development, and demonstration of oil shale resources, under the terms offered in the solicitation of bids for such leases published on January 15, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 2611).

(b) COMMERCIAL LEASE SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Interior shall hold not less than 5 separate commercial lease sales in areas considered to have the most potential for oil shale development, as determined by the Secretary, in areas nominated through public comment.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Each lease sale shall be—

(A) for an area of not less than 25,000 acres; ;and

(B) in multiple lease blocs.

PART IV—NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA ACCESS

SEC. 4051. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REAFFIRMING NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska remains explicitly designated, both in name and legal status, for purposes of providing oil and natural gas resources to the United States; and

(2) accordingly, the national policy is to actively advance oil and gas development within the Reserve by facilitating the expeditious exploration, production, and transportation of oil and natural gas from and through the Reserve.

SEC. 4052. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: LEASE SALES.

Section 107 of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6506a) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the Reserve—

''(1) in accordance with this Act; and

''(2) that shall include at least 1 lease sale annually in the areas of the Reserve most likely to produce commercial quantities of oil and natural gas for each of calendar years 2014 through 2023.''.

SEC. 4053. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: PLANNING AND PERMITTING PIPELINE AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, shall facilitate and ensure permits, in a timely and environmentally responsible manner, for all surface development activities, including for the construction of pipelines and roads, necessary—

(1) to develop and bring into production any areas within the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska that are subject to oil and gas leases; and

(2) to transport oil and gas from and through the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska in the most direct manner possible to existing transportation or processing infrastructure on the North Slope of Alaska.

(b) TIMELINE.—The Secretary shall ensure that any Federal permitting agency shall issue permits in accordance with the following timeline:

(1) Permits for the construction described in subsection (a) for transportation of oil and natural gas produced under existing Federal oil and gas leases with respect to which the Secretary has issued a permit to drill shall be approved not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Permits for the construction described in subsection (a) for transportation of oil and natural gas produced under Federal oil and gas leases shall be approved not later than 180 days after the date on which a request for a permit to drill is submitted to the Secretary.

(c) PLAN.—To ensure timely future development of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress a plan for approved rights-of-way for a plan for pipeline, road, and any other surface infrastructure that may be necessary infrastructure that will ensure that all leasable tracts in the Reserve are within 25 miles of an approved road and pipeline right-of-way that can serve future development of the Reserve.

SEC. 4054. ISSUANCE OF A NEW INTEGRATED ACTIVITY PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

(a) ISSUANCE OF NEW INTEGRATED ACTIVITY PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue—

(1) a new proposed integrated activity plan from among the nonadopted alternatives in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision issued by the Secretary of the Interior and dated February 21, 2013; and

(2) an environmental impact statement under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) for issuance of oil and gas leases in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska to promote efficient and maximum development of oil and natural gas resources of the Reserve.

(b) NULLIFICATION OF EXISTING RECORD OF DECISION, IAP, AND EIS.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision issued by the Secretary of the Interior and dated February 21, 2013, including the integrated activity plan and environmental impact statement referred to in that record of decision, shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 4055. DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT.

The Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate regulations not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that establish clear requirements to ensure that the Department of the Interior is supporting development of oil and gas leases in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska.

SEC. 4056. DEADLINES UNDER NEW PROPOSED INTEGRATED ACTIVITY PLAN.

At a minimum, the new proposed integrated activity plan issued under section 4054(a)(1) shall—

(1) require the Department of the Interior to respond within 5 business days to a person who submits an application for a permit for development of oil and natural gas leases in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska acknowledging receipt of the application; and

(2) establish a timeline for the processing of each application that—

(A) specifies deadlines for decisions and actions on permit applications; and

(B) provides that the period for issuing a permit after the date on which the application is submitted shall not exceed 60 days without the concurrence of the applicant.

SEC. 4057. UPDATED RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall complete a comprehensive assessment of all technically recoverable fossil fuel resources within the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including all conventional and unconventional oil and natural gas.

(b) COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall be carried out by the United States Geological Survey in cooperation and consultation with the State of Alaska and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

(c) TIMING.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) FUNDING.—In carrying out this section, the United States Geological Survey may cooperatively use resources and funds provided by the State of Alaska.

PART V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4061. SANCTIONS.

Nothing in this title authorizes the issuance of a lease under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) to any person designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to—

(1) the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note; Public Law 108–175);

(2) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestiture Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(3) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(4) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.);

(5) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.);

(6) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; Public Law 104–172);

(7) Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism);

(8) Executive Order 13338 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting the export of certain goods to Syria);

(9) Executive Order 13622 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to authorizing additional sanctions with respect to Iran);

(10) Executive Order 13628 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to authorizing additional sanctions with respect to Iran); or

(11) Executive Order 13645 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to authorizing additional sanctions with respect to Iran).

SEC. 4062. INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the third sentence, by inserting '', except as provided in subparagraph (C)'' after ''by oral bidding''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) INTERNET-BASED BIDDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In order to diversify and expand the onshore leasing program of the United States to ensure the best return to the Federal taxpayer, reduce fraud, and secure the leasing process, the Secretary may conduct onshore lease sales through Internet-based bidding methods.

''(ii) CONCLUSION.—Each individual Internet-based lease sale shall conclude not later than 7 days after the date on which the sale begins.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the tenth Internet-based lease sale conducted under the amendment made by subsection (a) concludes, the Secretary of the Interior shall analyze the first 10 Internet-based lease sales and report to Congress the findings of the analysis, including—

(1) estimates on increases or decreases in Internet-based lease sales, compared to sales conducted by oral bidding, in—

(A) the number of bidders;

(B) the average amount of bid;

(C) the highest amount bid; and

(D) the lowest bid;

(2) an estimate on the total cost or savings to the Department of the Interior as a result of Internet-based lease sales, compared to sales conducted by oral bidding; and

(3) an evaluation of the demonstrated or expected effectiveness of different structures for lease sales which may provide an opportunity to better—

(A) maximize bidder participation;

(B) ensure the highest return to the Federal taxpayers;

(C) minimize opportunities for fraud or collusion; and

(D) ensure the security and integrity of the leasing process.

PART VI—JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 4071. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) COVERED CIVIL ACTION.—The term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action (as defined for the purposes of that section) affecting a covered energy project on Federal land.

(2) COVERED ENERGY PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered energy project'' means—

(i) the leasing of Federal land for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, wind, or any other source of energy; and

(ii) any action under the lease.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered energy project'' does not include any dispute between the parties to a lease regarding the obligations under the lease, including any alleged breach of the lease.

SEC. 4072. EXCLUSIVE VENUE FOR CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS.

Venue for any covered civil action shall lie in the United States district court in which the covered energy project or lease exists or is proposed.

SEC. 4073. TIMELY FILING.

To ensure timely redress by the courts, a covered civil action shall be filed not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which the covered civil action relates.

SEC. 4074. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as practicable.

SEC. 4075. LIMITATION ON INJUNCTION AND PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In a covered civil action, a court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that the relief—

(1) is narrowly drawn;

(2) extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement; and

(3) is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation.

(b) DURATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A court shall limit the duration of preliminary injunctions to halt covered energy projects to not more than 60 days, unless the court finds clear reasons to extend the injunction.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In the case of an extension, the extension shall—

(A) only be in 30-day increments; and

(B) require action by the court to renew the injunction.

SEC. 4076. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COURT COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Equal Access to Justice Act''), shall not apply to a covered civil action.

(b) COURT COSTS.—A party to a covered civil action shall not receive payment from the Federal Government for the attorneys' fees, expenses, or other court costs incurred by the party.

SEC. 4077. LEGAL STANDING.

A challenger that files an appeal with the Department of the Interior Board of Land Appeals shall meet the same standing requirements as a challenger before a United States district court.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL ONSHORE RESOURCES

Subtitle A—Leasing Program for Land Within Coastal Plain

SEC. 5001. FINDING.

Congress finds that development of energy reserves under the Coastal Plain of Alaska, performed in an environmentally responsible manner, will contribute to job growth and economic development.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COASTAL PLAIN.—The term ''Coastal Plain'' means the area described in appendix I to part 37 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) PEER REVIEWED.—The term ''peer reviewed'' means reviewed—

(A) by individuals chosen by the National Academy of Sciences with no contractual relationship with, or those who have no application for a grant or other funding pending with, the Federal agency with leasing jurisdiction; or

(B) if individuals described in subparagraph (A) are not available, by the top individuals in the specified biological fields, as determined by the National Academy of Sciences.

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

SEC. 5003. LEASING PROGRAM FOR LAND ON THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) establish and implement, in accordance with this subtitle and acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain; and

(2) administer the provisions of this subtitle through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain do not result in any significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, or the environment, including, in furtherance of this goal, by requiring the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production to all exploration, development, and production operations under this subtitle in a manner that ensures the receipt of fair market value by the public for the mineral resources to be leased.

(b) REPEAL OF EXISTING RESTRICTION.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3143) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 1003.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—

(1) COMPATIBILITY.—For purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the oil and gas leasing program and activities authorized by this section on the Coastal Plain are deemed to be compatible with the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established, and no further findings or decisions are required to implement this determination.

(2) ADEQUACY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The document of the Department of the Interior entitled ''Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement'' and dated April 1987 relating to the Coastal Plain prepared pursuant to section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142) and section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is deemed to satisfy the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) that apply with respect to prelease activities under this subtitle, including actions authorized to be taken by the Secretary to develop and promulgate regulations for the establishment of a leasing program authorized by this subtitle before the conduct of the first lease sale.

(3) COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA FOR OTHER ACTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to conducting the first lease sale under this subtitle, the Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to the actions authorized by this subtitle not covered by paragraph (2).

(B) NONLEASING ALTERNATIVES NOT REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in preparing the environmental impact statement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

(i) shall—

(I) only identify a preferred action for leasing and a single leasing alternative; and

(II) analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for those 2 alternatives; and

(ii) is not required—

(I) to identify nonleasing alternative courses of action; or

(II) to analyze the environmental effects of nonleasing alternative courses of action.

(C) DEADLINE.—The identification under subparagraph (B)(i)(I) for the first lease sale conducted under this subtitle shall be completed not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(D) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary shall only consider public comments that—

(i) specifically address the preferred action of the Secretary; and

(ii) are filed not later than 20 days after the date on which the environmental analysis is published.

(E) COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, compliance with this paragraph is deemed to satisfy all requirements for the analysis and consideration of the environmental effects of proposed leasing under this subtitle.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subtitle expands or limits State or local regulatory authority.

(e) SPECIAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after consultation with the State of Alaska, the city of Kaktovik and the North Slope Borough of the State of Alaska, may designate not more than 45,000 acres of the Coastal Plain as a ''Special Area'' if the Secretary determines that the area is of such unique character and interest so as to require special management and regulatory protection.

(2) SADLEROCHIT SPRING AREA.—The Secretary shall designate the Sadlerochit Spring area, consisting of approximately 4,000 acres, as a Special Area.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Each Special Area shall be managed to protect and preserve the unique and diverse character of the area, including the fish, wildlife, and subsistence resource values of the area.

(4) EXCLUSION FROM LEASING OR SURFACE OCCUPANCY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may exclude any Special Area from leasing.

(B) NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY.—If the Secretary leases a Special Area, or any part of a Special Area, for oil and gas exploration, development, production, or related activities, there shall be no surface occupancy of the land comprising the Special Area.

(5) DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may lease all or a portion of a Special Area under terms that permit the use of horizontal drilling technology from sites on leases tracts located outside the Special Area.

(f) LIMITATION ON CLOSED AREAS.—The authority of the Secretary to close land on the Coastal Plain to oil and gas leasing, exploration, development, or production shall be limited to the authority provided under this subtitle.

(g) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations necessary to carry out this subtitle, including regulations relating to protection of fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, and environment of the Coastal Plain.

(2) REVISION OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall, through a rulemaking conducted in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, periodically review and, if appropriate, revise the regulations promulgated under paragraph (1) to reflect a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures.

SEC. 5004. LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the requirements of this subtitle, the Secretary may lease land under this subtitle to any person qualified to obtain a lease for deposits of oil and gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(b) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by regulation and not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, establish procedures for—

(1) receipt and consideration of sealed nominations for any area of the Coastal Plain for inclusion in, or exclusion from, a lease sale;

(2) the holding of lease sales after the nomination process; and

(3) public notice of and comment on designation of areas to be included in, or excluded from, a lease sale.

(c) LEASE SALE BIDS.—Lease sales under this subtitle may be conducted through an Internet leasing program, if the Secretary determines that the Internet leasing program will result in savings to the taxpayer,

an increase in the number of bidders participating, and higher returns than oral bidding or a sealed bidding system.

(d) SALE ACREAGES AND SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall—

(1) offer for lease under this subtitle—

(A) those tracts the Secretary considers to have the greatest potential for the discovery of hydrocarbons, taking into consideration nominations received under subsection (b)(1); and

(B)(i) not fewer than 50,000 acres by not later than 22 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) not fewer than an additional 50,000 acres at 6-, 12-, and 18-month intervals following the initial offering under subclause (i);

(2) conduct 4 additional lease sales under the same terms and schedule as the last lease sale under paragraph (1)(B)(ii) not later than 2 years after the date of that sale, if sufficient interest in leasing exists to warrant, in the judgment of the Secretary, the conduct of the sales; and

(3) evaluate the bids in each lease sale under this subsection and issue leases resulting from the sales not later than 90 days after the date on which the sale is completed.

SEC. 5005. GRANT OF LEASES BY THE SECRETARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder in a lease sale conducted under section 5004 any land to be leased on the Coastal Plain upon payment by the bidder of any bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary.

(b) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—No lease issued under this subtitle may be sold, exchanged, assigned, sublet, or otherwise transferred except with the approval of the Secretary after the Secretary consults with, and gives due consideration to the views of, the Attorney General.

SEC. 5006. LEASE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

An oil or gas lease issued under this subtitle shall—

(1) provide for the payment of a royalty of not less than 12.5 percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold under the lease, as determined by the Secretary under the regulations applicable to other Federal oil and gas leases;

(2) provide that the Secretary may close, on a seasonal basis, portions of the Coastal Plain to exploratory drilling activities as necessary to protect caribou calving areas and other species of fish and wildlife based on a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures;

(3) require that the lessee of land on the Coastal Plain shall be fully responsible and liable for the reclamation of land on the Coastal Plain and any other Federal land that is adversely affected in connection with exploration, development, production, or transportation activities conducted under the lease and on the Coastal Plain by the lessee or by any of the subcontractors or agents of the lessee;

(4) provide that the lessee may not delegate or convey, by contract or otherwise, the reclamation responsibility and liability to another person without the express written approval of the Secretary;

(5) provide that the standard of reclamation for land required to be reclaimed under this subtitle shall be, as nearly as practicable, a condition capable of supporting the uses which the land was capable of supporting prior to any exploration, development, or production activities, or upon application by the lessee, to a higher or better use as certified by the Secretary;

(6) contain terms and conditions relating to protection of fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, and the environment as required under section 5003(a)(2);

(7) provide that the lessee, agents of the lessee, and contractors of the lessee use best efforts to provide a fair share, as determined by the level of obligation previously agreed to in the 1974 agreement implementing section 29 of the Federal Agreement and Grant of Right of Way for the Operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, of employment and contracting for Alaska Natives and Alaska Native corporations from throughout the State; and

(8) contain such other provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with this subtitle and the regulations issued pursuant to this subtitle.

SEC. 5007. COASTAL PLAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

(a) NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT STANDARD TO GOVERN AUTHORIZED COASTAL PLAIN ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall, consistent with the requirements of section 5003, administer this subtitle through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that—

(1) ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain shall not result in any significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, or the environment;

(2) require the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production on all new exploration, development, and production operations; and

(3) ensure that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support of pipelines, does not exceed 10,000 acres on the Coastal Plain for each 100,000 acres of area leased.

(b) SITE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION.—With respect to any proposed drilling and related activities, the Secretary shall require that—

(1) a site-specific analysis be made of the probable effects, if any, that the drilling or related activities will have on fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, and the environment;

(2) a plan be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate (in that order and to the extent practicable) any significant adverse effect identified under paragraph (1); and

(3) the development of the plan shall occur after consultation with the agency or agencies having jurisdiction over matters mitigated by the plan.

(c) REGULATIONS TO PROTECT COASTAL PLAIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES, SUBSISTENCE USERS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—Prior to implementing the leasing program authorized by this subtitle, the Secretary shall prepare and promulgate regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other measures designed to ensure that the activities undertaken on the Coastal Plain under this subtitle are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes and environmental requirements of this subtitle.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The proposed regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations for the leasing program under this subtitle shall require compliance with all applicable provisions of Federal and State environmental law and compliance with the following:

(1) Standards at least as effective as the safety and environmental mitigation measures set forth in items 1 through 29 at pages 167 through 169 of the document of the Department of the Interior entitled ''Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement'' and dated April 1987 relating to the Coastal Plain.

(2) Seasonal limitations on exploration, development, and related activities, where necessary, to avoid significant adverse effects during periods of concentrated fish and wildlife breeding, denning, nesting, spawning, and migration based on a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures.

(3) That exploration activities, except for surface geological studies—

(A) be limited to the period between approximately November 1 and May 1 each year; and

(B) be supported, if necessary, by ice roads, winter trails with adequate snow cover, ice pads, ice airstrips, and air transport methods, except that exploration activities may occur at other times if the Secretary finds that the exploration will have no significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, and the environment of the Coastal Plain.

(4) Design safety and construction standards for all pipelines and any access and service roads, that minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, adverse effects on—

(A) the passage of migratory species such as caribou; and

(B) the flow of surface water by requiring the use of culverts, bridges, and other structural devices.

(5) Prohibitions on general public access and use on all pipeline access and service roads.

(6) Stringent reclamation and rehabilitation requirements, consistent with the standards set forth in this subtitle, requiring the removal from the Coastal Plain of all oil and gas development and production facilities, structures, and equipment upon completion of oil and gas production operations, except that the Secretary may exempt from the requirements of this paragraph those facilities, structures, or equipment that the Secretary determines would assist in the management of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and that are donated to the United States for that purpose.

(7) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on access by all modes of transportation.

(8) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on sand and gravel extraction.

(9) Consolidation of facility siting.

(10) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on the use of explosives.

(11) Avoidance, to the extent practicable, of springs, streams, and river systems, the protection of natural surface drainage patterns, wetlands, and riparian habitats, and the regulation of methods or techniques for developing or transporting adequate supplies of water for exploratory drilling.

(12) Avoidance or minimization of air traffic-related disturbance to fish and wildlife.

(13) Treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic wastes, solid wastes, reserve pit

fluids, drilling muds and cuttings, and domestic wastewater, including an annual waste management report, a hazardous materials tracking system, and a prohibition on chlorinated solvents, in accordance with applicable Federal and State environmental law (including regulations).

(14) Fuel storage and oil spill contingency planning.

(15) Research, monitoring, and reporting requirements.

(16) Field crew environmental briefings.

(17) Avoidance of significant adverse effects upon subsistence hunting, fishing, and trapping by subsistence users.

(18) Compliance with applicable air and water quality standards.

(19) Appropriate seasonal and safety zone designations around well sites, within which subsistence hunting and trapping shall be limited.

(20) Reasonable stipulations for protection of cultural and archeological resources.

(21) All other protective environmental stipulations, restrictions, terms, and conditions determined necessary by the Secretary.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—In preparing and promulgating regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the stipulations and conditions that govern the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska leasing program, as set forth in the 1999 Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Final Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement;

(2) the environmental protection standards that governed the initial Coastal Plain seismic exploration program under parts 37.31 to 37.33 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(3) the land use stipulations for exploratory drilling on the KIC–ASRC private land that are set forth in appendix 2 of the August 9, 1983, agreement between Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States.

(f) FACILITY CONSOLIDATION PLANNING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, after providing for public notice and comment, prepare and update periodically a plan to govern, guide, and direct the siting and construction of facilities for the exploration, development, production, and transportation of Coastal Plain oil and gas resources.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—The plan shall have the following objectives:

(A) Avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities and activities.

(B) Encouraging consolidation of common facilities and activities.

(C) Locating or confining facilities and activities to areas that will minimize impact on fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, and the environment.

(D) Using existing facilities wherever practicable.

(E) Enhancing compatibility between wildlife values and development activities.

(g) ACCESS TO PUBLIC LAND.—The Secretary shall—

(1) manage public land in the Coastal Plain subject to section 811 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3121); and

(2) ensure that local residents shall have reasonable access to public land in the Coastal Plain for traditional uses.

SEC. 5008. EXPEDITED JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) FILING OF COMPLAINT.—

(1) DEADLINE.—Subject to paragraph (2), any complaint seeking judicial review of—

(A) any provision of this subtitle shall be filed by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any action of the Secretary under this subtitle shall be filed—

(i) except as provided in clause (ii), during the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the action is challenged; or

(ii) in the case of a complaint based solely on grounds arising after the period described in clause (i), not later than 90 days after the date on which the complainant knew or reasonably should have known of the grounds for the complaint.

(2) VENUE.—Any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this subtitle or any action of the Secretary under this subtitle may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

(3) LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF CERTAIN REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Judicial review of a decision by the Secretary to conduct a lease sale under this subtitle, including an environmental analysis, shall be—

(i) limited to whether the Secretary has complied with this subtitle; and

(ii) based on the administrative record of that decision.

(B) PRESUMPTION.—The identification by the Secretary of a preferred course of action to enable leasing to proceed and the analysis by the Secretary of environmental effects under this subtitle is presumed to be correct unless shown otherwise by clear and convincing evidence.

(b) LIMITATION ON OTHER REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary with respect to which review could have been obtained under this section shall not be subject to judicial review in any civil or criminal proceeding for enforcement.

(c) LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COURT COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Equal Access to Justice Act''), shall not apply to any action under this subtitle.

(2) COURT COSTS.—A party to any action under this subtitle shall not receive payment from the Federal Government for the attorneys' fees, expenses, or other court costs incurred by the party.

SEC. 5009. TREATMENT OF REVENUES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 90 percent of the amount of bonus, rental, and royalty revenues from Federal oil and gas leasing and operations authorized under this subtitle shall be deposited in the Treasury.

SEC. 5010. RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue rights-of-way and easements across the Coastal Plain for the transportation of oil and gas produced under leases under this subtitle—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), without regard to title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.); and

(2) under title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.), for access authorized by sections 1110 and 1111 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3170, 3171).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall include in any right-of-way or easement issued under subsection (a) such terms and conditions as may be necessary to ensure that transportation of oil and gas does not result in a significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, the habitat of fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, or the environment of the Coastal Plain, including requirements that facilities be sited or designed so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of roads and pipelines.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall include in regulations promulgated under section 5003(g) provisions granting rights-of-way and easements described in subsection (a).

SEC. 5011. CONVEYANCE.

In order to maximize Federal revenues by removing clouds on titles to land and clarifying land ownership patterns on the Coastal Plain, and notwithstanding section 1302(h)(2) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3192(h)(2)), the Secretary shall convey—

(1) to the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation, the surface estate of the land described in paragraph 1 of Public Land Order 6959, to the extent necessary to fulfill the entitlement of the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation under sections 12 and 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611, 1613) in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement between the Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation dated January 22, 1993; and

(2) to the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation the remaining subsurface estate to which the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation is entitled pursuant to the August 9, 1983, agreement between the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States of America.

Subtitle B—Native American Energy

SEC. 5021. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government has unreasonably interfered with the efforts of Indian tribes to develop energy resources on tribal land; and

(2) Indian tribes should have the opportunity to gain the benefits of the jobs, investment, and economic development to be gained from energy development.

SEC. 5022. APPRAISALS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title XXVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2607. APPRAISAL REFORMS.

''(a) OPTIONS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—With respect to a transaction involving Indian land or the trust assets of an Indian tribe that requires the approval of the Secretary, any appraisal or other estimates of value relating to fair market value required to be conducted under applicable law, regulation, or policy may be completed by—

''(1) the Secretary;

''(2) the affected Indian tribe; or

''(3) a certified, third-party appraiser pursuant to a contract with the Indian tribe.

''(b) TIME LIMIT ON SECRETARIAL REVIEW AND ACTION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an appraisal conducted by or for an Indian tribe pursuant to paragraphs (2) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

''(1) review the appraisal; and

''(2) provide to the Indian tribe a written notice of approval or disapproval of the appraisal.

''(c) FAILURE OF SECRETARY TO APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE.—If the Secretary has failed to approve or disapprove any appraisal by the date that is 60 days after the date on which the appraisal is received, the appraisal shall be deemed approved.

''(d) OPTION OF INDIAN TRIBES TO WAIVE APPRAISAL.—An Indian tribe may waive the requirements of subsection (a) if the Indian

tribe provides to the Secretary a written resolution, statement, or other unambiguous indication of tribal intent to waive the requirements that—

''(1) is duly approved by the governing body of the Indian tribe; and

''(2) includes an express waiver by the Indian tribe of any claims for damages the Indian tribe might have against the United States as a result of the waiver.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement this section, including standards the Secretary shall use for approving or disapproving an appraisal under subsection (b).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 note) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title XXVI the following:

''Sec. 2607. Appraisal reforms.''.

SEC. 5023. STANDARDIZATION.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall implement procedures to ensure that each agency within the Department of the Interior that is involved in the review, approval, and oversight of oil and gas activities on Indian land shall use a uniform system of reference numbers and tracking systems for oil and gas wells.

SEC. 5024. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LAND.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The Congress authorizes''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) REVIEW OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LAND.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS OF INDIAN LAND AND INDIAN TRIBE.—In this subsection, the terms 'Indian land' and 'Indian tribe' have the meaning given those terms in section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501).

''(2) IN GENERAL.—For any major Federal action on Indian land of an Indian tribe requiring the preparation of a statement under subsection (a)(2)(C), the statement shall only be available for review and comment by—

''(A) the members of the Indian tribe; and

''(B) any other individual residing within the affected area.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—The Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, in consultation with Indian tribes, shall develop regulations to implement this section, including descriptions of affected areas for specific major Federal actions.''.

SEC. 5025. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY ACTION.—The term ''agency action'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) ENERGY RELATED ACTION.—The term ''energy-related action'' means a civil action that—

(A) is filed on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) seeks judicial review of a final agency action relating to the issuance of a permit, license, or other form of agency permission allowing—

(i) any person or entity to conduct on Indian Land activities involving the exploration, development, production, or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity; or

(ii) any Indian Tribe, or any organization of 2 or more entities, not less than 1 of which is an Indian tribe, to conduct activities involving the exploration, development, production, or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity, regardless of where such activities are undertaken.

(3) INDIAN LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Indian land'' has the meaning given the term in section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501).

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''Indian land'' includes land owned by a Native Corporation (as that term is defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)) under that Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(4) ULTIMATELY PREVAIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''ultimately prevail'' means, in a final enforceable judgment that the court rules in the party's favor on at least 1 civil claim that is an underlying rationale for the preliminary injunction, administrative stay, or other relief requested by the party.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''ultimately prevail'' does not include circumstances in which the final agency action is modified or amended by the issuing agency unless the modification or amendment is required pursuant to a final enforceable judgment of the court or a court-ordered consent decree.

(b) TIME FOR FILING COMPLAINT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any energy related action shall be filed not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the action or decision by a Federal official that constitutes the covered energy project concerned.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Any energy related action that is not filed within the time period described in paragraph (1) shall be barred.

(c) DISTRICT COURT VENUE AND DEADLINE.—An energy related action—

(1) may only be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

(2) shall be resolved as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after the energy related action is filed.

(d) APPELLATE REVIEW.—An interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court in an energy related action—

(1) may be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

(2) if the court described in paragraph (1) undertakes the review, the court shall resolve the review as expeditiously as possible, and in any event by not later than 180 days after the interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court was issued.

(e) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, no award may be made under section 504 of title 5, United States Code, or under section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, and no amounts may be obligated or expended from the Claims and Judgment Fund of the United States Treasury to pay any fees or other expenses under such sections, to any person or party in an energy related action.

(f) LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COURT COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Equal Access to Justice Act''), shall not apply to an energy related action.

(2) COURT COSTS.—A party to a covered civil action shall not receive payment from the Federal Government for the attorneys' fees, expenses, or other court costs incurred by the party.

SEC. 5026. TRIBAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Unless otherwise explicitly exempted by Federal law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, any activity conducted or resources harvested or produced pursuant to a tribal resource management plan or an integrated resource management plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) or the American Indian Agricultural Resource Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), shall be considered a sustainable management practice for purposes of any Federal standard, benefit, or requirement that requires a demonstration of such sustainability.

SEC. 5027. LEASES OF RESTRICTED LANDS FOR THE NAVAJO NATION.

Subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415) (commonly known as the ''Long-Term Leasing Act''), is amended—

(1) by striking '', except a lease for'' and inserting '', including leases for'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''25 years, except'' and all that follows through ''; and'' and inserting ''99 years;'';

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) in the case of a lease for the exploration, development, or extraction of mineral resources, including geothermal resources, 25 years, except that the lease may include an option to renew for 1 additional term not to exceed 25 years.''.

SEC. 5028. NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RULES.

No rule promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior regarding hydraulic fracturing used in the development or production of oil or gas resources shall affect any land held in trust or restricted status for the benefit of Indians except with the express consent of the beneficiary on behalf of which the land is held in trust or restricted status.

Subtitle C—Additional Regulatory Provisions

PART I—STATE AUTHORITY OVER HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

SEC. 5031. FINDING.

Congress finds that given variations in geology, land use, and population, the States are best placed to regulate the process of hydraulic fracturing occurring on any land within the boundaries of the individual State.

SEC. 5032. STATE AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAND.—In this section, the term ''Federal land'' means—

(1) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702));

(2) National Forest System land;

(3) land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

(4) land under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) STATE AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State shall have the sole authority to promulgate or enforce any regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding the treatment of a well by the application of fluids under pressure to which propping agents may be added for the expressly designed purpose of initiating or propagating fractures in a target geologic

formation in order to enhance production of oil, natural gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land within the boundaries of the State.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the treatment of a well by the application of fluids under pressure to which propping agents may be added for the expressly designed purpose of initiating or propagating fractures in a target geologic formation in order to enhance production of oil, natural gas, or geothermal production activities on Federal land shall be subject to the law of the State in which the land is located.

PART II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5041. ENVIRONMENTAL LEGAL FEES.

Section 504 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) ENVIRONMENTAL LEGAL FEES.—Notwithstanding section 1304 of title 31, no award may be made under this section and no amounts may be obligated or expended from the Claims and Judgment Fund of the Treasury to pay any legal fees of a nongovernmental organization related to an action that (with respect to the United States)—

''(1) prevents, terminates, or reduces access to or the production of—

''(A) energy;

''(B) a mineral resource;

''(C) water by agricultural producers;

''(D) a resource by commercial or recreational fishermen; or

''(E) grazing or timber production on Federal land;

''(2) diminishes the private property value of a property owner; or

''(3) eliminates or prevents 1 or more jobs.''.

SEC. 5042. MASTER LEASING PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, shall not establish a master leasing plan as part of any guidance issued by the Secretary.

(b) EXISTING MASTER LEASING PLANS.—Instruction Memorandum No. 2010–117 and any other master leasing plan described in subsection (a) issued on or before the date of enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING AMERICA'S DOMESTIC REFINING CAPACITY

Subtitle A—Refinery Permitting Reform

SEC. 6001. FINDING.

Congress finds that the domestic refining industry is an important source of jobs and economic growth and whose growth should not be limited by an excessively drawn out permitting and approval process.

SEC. 6002. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

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

(2) EXPANSION.—The term ''expansion'' means a physical change that results in an increase in the capacity of a refinery.

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) PERMIT.—The term ''permit'' means any permit, license, approval, variance, or other form of authorization that a refiner is required to obtain—

(A) under any Federal law; or

(B) from a State or tribal government agency delegated authority by the Federal Government, or authorized under Federal law, to issue permits.

(5) REFINER.—The term ''refiner'' means a person that—

(A) owns or operates a refinery; or

(B) seeks to become an owner or operator of a refinery.

(6) REFINERY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''refinery'' means—

(i) a facility at which crude oil is refined into transportation fuel or other petroleum products; and

(ii) a coal liquification or coal-to-liquid facility at which coal is processed into synthetic crude oil or any other fuel.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''refinery'' includes an expansion of a refinery.

(7) REFINERY PERMITTING AGREEMENT.—The term ''refinery permitting agreement'' means an agreement entered into between the Administrator and a State or Indian tribe under subsection (c).

(8) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6003. STREAMLINING OF REFINERY PERMITTING PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Governor of a State or the governing body of an Indian tribe, the Administrator shall enter into a refinery permitting agreement with the State or Indian tribe under which the process for obtaining all permits necessary for the construction and operation of a refinery shall be streamlined using a systematic, interdisciplinary multimedia approach, as provided in this section.

(b) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Under a refinery permitting agreement, the Administrator shall have the authority, as applicable and necessary—

(1) to accept from a refiner a consolidated application for all permits that the refiner is required to obtain to construct and operate a refinery;

(2) in consultation and cooperation with each Federal, State, or tribal government agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit, to establish a schedule under which each agency shall—

(A) concurrently consider, to the maximum extent practicable, each determination to be made; and

(B) complete each step in the permitting process; and

(3) to issue a consolidated permit that combines all permits issued under the schedule established under paragraph (2).

(c) REFINERY PERMITTING AGREEMENTS.—Under a refinery permitting agreement, a State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall agree that—

(1) the Administrator shall have each of the authorities described in subsection (b); and

(2) the State or tribal government agency shall—

(A) in accordance with State law, make such structural and operational changes in the agencies as are necessary to enable the agencies to carry out consolidated, project-wide permit reviews concurrently and in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies; and

(B) comply, to the maximum extent practicable, with the applicable schedule established under subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEADLINES.—

(1) NEW REFINERIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the construction of a new refinery, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(A) 365 days after the date of receipt of an administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(B) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 90 days after the expiration of the deadline described in subparagraph (A).

(2) EXPANSION OF EXISTING REFINERIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the expansion of an existing refinery, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(A) 120 days after the date of receipt of an administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(B) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 30 days after the expiration of the deadline described in subparagraph (A).

(e) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit shall comply with the applicable schedule established under subsection (b)(2).

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any civil action for review of a permit determination under a refinery permitting agreement shall be brought exclusively in the United States district court for the district in which the refinery is located or proposed to be located.

(g) EFFICIENT PERMIT REVIEW.—In order to reduce the duplication of procedures, the Administrator shall use State permitting and monitoring procedures to satisfy substantially equivalent Federal requirements under this subtitle.

(h) SEVERABILITY.—If 1 or more permits that are required for the construction or operation of a refinery are not approved on or before an applicable deadline under subsection (d), the Administrator may issue a consolidated permit that combines all other permits that the refiner is required to obtain, other than any permits that are not approved.

(i) CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Administrator, States, and tribal governments shall consult, to the maximum extent practicable, with local governments in carrying out this section.

(j) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the operation or implementation of any otherwise applicable law regarding permits necessary for the construction and operation of a refinery;

(2) the authority of any unit of local government with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(3) any requirement or ordinance of a local government (such as a zoning regulation).

Subtitle B—Repeal of Renewable Fuel Standard

SEC. 6011. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that the mandates under the renewable fuel standard contained in section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o))—

(1) impose significant costs on American citizens and the American economy, without offering any benefit; and

(2) should be repealed.

SEC. 6012. PHASE OUT OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking clause (ii); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking clauses (ii) through (v) and inserting the following:

''(ii) CALENDAR YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—Notwithstanding clause (i), for purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable volumes of renewable fuel for each of calendar years 2014 through 2018 shall be determined as follows:

''(I) For calendar year 2014, in accordance with the table entitled 'I-2—Proposed 2014 Volume Requirements' of the proposed rule published at pages 71732 through 71784 of volume 78 of the Federal Register (November 29, 2013).

''(II) For calendar year 2015, the applicable volumes established under subclause (I), reduced by 20 percent.

''(III) For calendar year 2016, the applicable volumes established under subclause (I), reduced by 40 percent.

''(IV) For calendar year 2017, the applicable volumes established under subclause (I), reduced by 60 percent.

''(V) For calendar year 2018, the applicable volumes established under subclause (I), reduced by 80 percent.'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''2021'' and inserting ''2017'' each place it appears; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting '', subject to the condition that the renewable fuel obligation determined for a calendar year is not more than the applicable volumes established under paragraph (2)(B)(ii)'' before the period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) SUNSET.—The program established under this subsection shall terminate on December 31, 2018.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Effective beginning on January 1, 2019, the regulations contained in subparts K and M of part 80 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on that date of enactment), shall have no force or effect.

TITLE VII—STOPPING EPA OVERREACH

SEC. 7001. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Environmental Protection Agency has exceeded its statutory authority by promulgating regulations that were not contemplated by Congress in the authorizing language of the statutes enacted by Congress;

(2) no Federal agency has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases under current law; and

(3) no attempt to regulate greenhouse gases should be undertaken without further Congressional action.

SEC. 7002. CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY TO EXCLUDE GREENHOUSE GASES FROM REGULATION UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT.

(a) REPEAL OF FEDERAL CLIMATE CHANGE REGULATION.—

(1) GREENHOUSE GAS REGULATION UNDER CLEAN AIR ACT.—Section 302(g) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7602(g)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(g) The term'' and inserting the following:

''(g) AIR POLLUTANT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCLUSION.—The term 'air pollutant' does not include carbon dioxide, water vapor, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, or sulfur hexafluoride.''.

(2) NO REGULATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in any of the following Acts or any other law authorizes or requires the regulation of climate change or global warming:

(A) The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

(B) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(C) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(D) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(E) The Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(b) EFFECT ON PROPOSED RULES OF THE EPA.—In accordance with this section, the following proposed or contemplated rules (or any similar or successor rules) of the Environmental Protection Agency shall be void and have no force or effect:

(1) The proposed rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 1430 (January 8, 2014)).

(2) The contemplated rules on carbon pollution for existing power plants.

(3) Any other contemplated or proposed rules proposed to be issued pursuant to the purported authority described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 7003. JOBS ANALYSIS FOR ALL EPA REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before proposing or finalizing any regulation, rule, or policy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall provide an analysis of the regulation, rule, or policy and describe the direct and indirect net and gross impact of the regulation, rule, or policy on employment in the United States.

(b) LIMITATION.—No regulation, rule, or policy described in subsection (a) shall take effect if the regulation, rule, or policy has a negative impact on employment in the United States unless the regulation, rule, or policy is approved by Congress and signed by the President.

TITLE VIII—DEBT FREEDOM FUND

SEC. 8001. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the national debt being over $17,000,000,000,000 in 2014—

(A) threatens the current and future prosperity of the United States;

(B) undermines the national security interests of the United States; and

(C) imposes a burden on future generations of United States citizens; and

(2) revenue generated from the development of the natural resources in the United States should be used to reduce the national debt.

SEC. 8002. DEBT FREEDOM FUND.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in accordance with all revenue sharing arrangement with States in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, an amount equal to the additional amount of Federal funds generated by the programs and activities under this division (and the amendments made by this division)—

(1) shall be deposited in a special trust fund account in the Treasury, to be known as the ''Debt Freedom Fund''; and

(2) shall not be withdrawn for any purpose other than to pay down the national debt of the United States, for which purpose payments shall be made expeditiously.

SA 3607. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—REINS ACT

SECTION __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2014'' or the ''REINS Act''.

SEC. __02. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress.

(2) Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes.

(3) By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the people of the United States for the laws imposed upon them.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process.

SEC. __03. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

''(iii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 1532, 1533, 1534, and 1535 of title 2, United States Code; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of

the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date as provided in section 802(b)(2). The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of compliance by the agency with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B).

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, sections 802 and 803 shall apply, in the succeeding session of Congress, to any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title: 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in);

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following: 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in); and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or the designee of the majority leader) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for not fewer than 5 legislative days to call up the joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up, a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'identical joint resolution' means a joint resolution of the first House that proposes to approve the same major rule as a joint resolution of the second House.

''(2) If the second House receives from the first House a joint resolution, the Chair shall determine whether the joint resolution is an identical joint resolution.

''(3) If the second House receives an identical joint resolution—

''(A) the identical joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the second House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the first house, except that the vote on final passage shall be on the identical joint resolution.

''(4) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b)(1) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'submission or publication date' means the later of the date on which—

''(A) the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); or

''(B) the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1);

''(2) the term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

''(3) the term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule; and

''(4) the term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not—

''(1) be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule;

''(2) extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule; and

''(3) form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. __04. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SA 3608. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which such audit is completed and made available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests it.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after ''in writing.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. _____. AUDIT OF LOAN FILE REVIEWS REQUIRED BY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the review of loan files of homeowners in foreclosure in 2009 or 2010, required as part of the enforcement actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System against supervised financial institutions.

(b) CONTENT OF AUDIT.—The audit carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the guidance given by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to independent consultants retained by the supervised financial institutions regarding the procedures to be followed in conducting the file reviews;

(2) the factors considered by independent consultants when evaluating loan files;

(3) the results obtained by the independent consultants pursuant to those reviews;

(4) the determinations made by the independent consultants regarding the nature and extent of financial injury sustained by each homeowner as well as the level and type of remediation offered to each homeowner; and

(5) the specific measures taken by the independent consultants to verify, confirm, or rebut the assertions and representations made by supervised financial institutions regarding the contents of loan files and the extent of financial injury to homeowners.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the audit required under subsection (a).

SA 3609. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NATIONAL RIGHT-TO-WORK.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.—

(1) RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.—Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 157) is amended by striking ''except to'' and all that follows through ''authorized in section 8(a)(3)''.

(2) UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.—Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by striking '': Provided, That'' and all that follows through ''retaining membership'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or to discriminate'' and all that follows through ''retaining membership''; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ''covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a)(3) of this section''; and

(C) in subsection (f), by striking clause (2) and redesignating clauses (3) and (4) as clauses (2) and (3), respectively.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT.—Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152) is amended by striking paragraph Eleven.

SA 3610. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESS JOBS.

Section 558 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) Before any enforcement action is taken on a sanction on a business for a violation of a rule or pursuant to an adjudication, and subject to subsection (e) and (f), an agency shall—

''(1) not later than 10 business days after the date on which the agency determines that the sanction may be imposed on the business, provide notice to the business that, if the business is a small business, the small business may be subject to a sanction at the end of the grace period described in paragraph (3);

''(2) delay any further action relating to the sanction until the end of the 15-calendar day period beginning on the date on which the agency provides notice under paragraph (1);

''(3) for a small business—

''(A) delay any further action relating to the sanction until not earlier than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date on which the agency provides notice under paragraph (1); and

''(B) upon application by the small business demonstrating reasonable efforts made in good faith to remedy the violation or other conduct giving rise to the sanction, extending the period under subparagraph (A) by 3 months;

''(4) after the end of the period described in paragraph (3), redetermine whether, as of the day after the end of the period, the small business would still be subject to the sanction; and

''(5) if the agency determines under paragraph (4) that the small business would not be subject to the sanction, waive the sanction.

''(e) If an agency provides notice described in subsection (d)(1) to a business on or after the date that is 11 business days after the date on which the agency determines that a sanction may be imposed on the business—

''(1) if the agency determines that the same sanction may have been imposed on the business 10 business days before the date of the notice, the agency shall take further action in accordance with subsection (d); and

''(2) if the agency determines that the same sanction could not have been imposed on the business 10 business days before the date of the notice, the agency shall waive the sanction and take no further action relating to imposition of the sanction.

''(f) The period during which further action is delayed under subsection (d)—

''(1) shall apply to a business only 1 time in relation to any single rule;

''(2) until the end of such period, as determined in accordance with subsection (d), shall apply to action by the agency relating to any subsequent violation of the same rule; and

''(3) shall not apply to a violation that puts any person in imminent danger, within the meaning given that term under section 13 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (29 U.S.C. 662).

''(g) Nothing in subsection (d) shall be construed to prevent a small business from appealing any sanction imposed in accordance with the procedures of the agency, or from seeking review under chapter 7.

''(h) Any sanction imposed by an agency on a small business for any violation of a rule or pursuant to an adjudication, absent proof of written notice of the sanction and the date on which the agency determined that a sanction may be imposed, or in violation of subsection (d)(3), shall have no force or effect.

''(i) Each Federal agency shall submit to the Ombudsman an annual report on the implementation of subsection (d), including a discussion of the deferral of action relating to and waiver of sanctions on small businesses.

''(j) The Ombudsman shall include in the annual report to Congress required under section 30(b)(2)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657(b)(2)(C)) the agency reports described by subsection (i) and a summary of the findings.

''(k) For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'consumer price index' means the consumer price index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor;

''(2) the term 'CPI adjusted gross receipts' means the amount of gross receipts, divided by the consumer price index for calendar year 2012, and multiplied by the consumer price index for the preceding calendar year, rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000 (or, if midway between multiples of $100,000, to the next higher multiple of $100,000);

''(3) the term 'Ombudsman' has the same meaning given such term in section 30(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657(a)); and

''(4) term 'small business' means any sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other business entity, that—

''(A) had less than $10,000,000 in gross receipts in the preceding calendar year;

''(B) is considered a small-business concern (as defined under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a));

''(C) employed fewer than 200 individuals in the preceding calendar year; or

''(D) had CPI adjusted gross receipts of less than $10,000,000 in the preceding calendar year.''.

SA 3611. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION—ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Economic Freedom Zones Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CITY.—The term ''city'' means any unit of general local government that is classified as a municipality by the United States Census Bureau, or is a town or township as determined jointly by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary.

(2) COUNTY.—The term ''county'' means any unit of local general government that is classified as a county by the United States Census Bureau.

(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means a municipality or a zip code.

(4) MUNICIPALITY.—The term ''municipality'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(40) of title 11, United States Code.

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

(6) ZIP CODE.—The term ''zip code'' means any area or region associated with or covered by a United States Postal zip code of not less than 5 digits.

TITLE I—PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BAILOUTS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BAILOUTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''credit rating'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(a)(60) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(60));

(2) the term ''credit rating agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(a)(61) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(61));

(3) the term ''Federal assistance'' means the use of any advances from the Federal Reserve credit facility or discount window that is not part of a program or facility with broad-based eligibility under section 13(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 343(3)(A)), Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insurance, or guarantees for the purpose of—

(A) making a loan to, or purchasing any interest or debt obligation of, a municipality;

(B) purchasing the assets of a municipality;

(C) guaranteeing a loan or debt issuance of a municipality; or

(D) entering into an assistance arrangement, including a grant program, with an eligible entity;

(4) the term ''insolvent'' means, with respect to an eligible entity, a financial condition such that the eligible entity—

(A) has any debt that has been given a credit rating lower than a ''B'' by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization or a credit rating agency;

(B) is not paying its debts as they become due, unless such debts are the subject of a bona fide dispute; or

(C) is unable to pay its debts as they become due; and

(5) the term ''nationally recognized statistical rating organization'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(a)(62) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(62)).

(b) PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BAILOUTS.—

(1) PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal assistance may be provided to an eligible entity (other than the assistance provided for in this division for an area that is designated as an Economic Free Zone).

(2) PROHIBITION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO BANKRUPT OR INSOLVENT ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), the Federal Government may not provide financial assistance—

(A) to a municipality that is a debtor under chapter 9 of title 11, United States Code; or

(B) to a municipality that is insolvent.

TITLE II—DESIGNATION OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES (EFZ)

SEC. 201. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE STATUS.

(a) DESIGNATION OF MUNICIPALITIES AS ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that is a municipality may be designated by the Secretary as an Economic Freedom Zone if the municipality—

(A) meets the requirements under section 109(c) of title 11, United States Code; or

(B) is at risk of insolvency, as determined under paragraph (2).

(2) AT RISK OF INSOLVENCY.—A municipality is at risk of insolvency if—

(A) an independent actuarial firm that has been engaged by the municipality and that does not have a conflict of interest with the municipality, including any previous relationship with the municipality, as determined by the Secretary—

(i) determines that the municipality is insolvent (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 11, United States Code); and

(ii) submits its analysis regarding the insolvency of the municipality to the Secretary; and

(B) the Secretary has reviewed and approved the determination of insolvency by the actuarial firm.

(b) DESIGNATION OF COUNTIES, CITIES, AND ZIP CODES AS ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may be designated by the Secretary as an Economic Freedom Zone if the eligible entity—

(A) is a county or city that—

(i) is located in a non-metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget); and

(ii) meets the requirements under paragraph (2); or

(B) is a zip code that meets the requirements under paragraph (2).

(2) LOW ECONOMIC AND HIGH POVERTY AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall be eligible for designation as an Economic Freedom Zone under paragraph (1) if the eligible entity is designated by the Secretary as a low economic or high poverty area under subparagraph (B).

(B) DESIGNATION AS LOW ECONOMIC AND HIGH POVERTY AREA.—The Secretary, after reviewing supporting data as determined appropriate, shall designate an eligible entity as a low economic or high poverty area if—

(i) the State or local government with jurisdiction over the eligible entity certifies that—

(I) the eligible entity is one of pervasive poverty, unemployment, and general distress;

(II) the average rate of unemployment within such eligible entity during the most recent 3-month period for which data is available is at least 1.5 times the national unemployment rate for the period involved;

(III) during the most recent 3-month period, at least 30 percent of the residents of the eligible entity have incomes below the national poverty level; or

(IV) at least 70 percent of the residents of the eligible have incomes below 80 percent of the median income of households within the jurisdiction of the local government (as determined in the same manner as under section 119(b)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974); and

(ii) the Secretary determines that such a designation is appropriate.

(c) REFUSAL TO GRANT STATUS.—The Secretary may refuse to designate an eligible entity as an Economic Freedom Zone if the Secretary determines that any requirement under this division, including any requirement under subsection (a)(2), has not been satisfied.

SEC. 202. APPLICATION AND DURATION OF DESIGNATION.

(a) APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall develop procedures to enable an eligible entity to submit to the Secretary an application for designation as an Economic Freedom Zone under this title.

(b) DURATION.—The designation by the Secretary of an eligible entity as a Economic Freedom Zone shall be for a period of 10 years.

TITLE III—FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES

SEC. 301. TAX INCENTIVES RELATED TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter Z—Economic Freedom Zones

''PART I—TAX INCENTIVES

''PART II—DEFINITIONS

"PART I—TAX INCENTIVES

"SEC. 1400V–1. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE INDIVIDUAL FLAT TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any individual whose principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) is located in an Economic Freedom Zone for the taxable year, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there shall be imposed a tax equal to 5 percent of the taxable income of such taxpayer. For purposes of this title, the tax imposed by the preceding sentence shall be treated as a tax imposed by section 1.

''(b) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return under section 6013, subsection (a) shall apply so long as either spouse has a principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) in an Economic Freedom Zone for the taxable year.

''(c) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX NOT TO APPLY.—The tax imposed by section 55 shall not apply to any taxpayer to whom subsection (a) applies.

"SEC. 1400V–2. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE CORPORATE FLAT TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any corporation located in an Economic Freedom Zone for the taxable year, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 11, there shall be imposed a tax equal to 5 percent of the taxable income of such corporation. For purposes of this title, the tax imposed by the preceding sentence shall be treated as a tax imposed by section 11.

''(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any corporation for any taxable year if the adjusted gross income of such corporation for such taxable year exceeds $500,000,000.

''(c) LOCATED.—For purposes of this section, a corporation shall be considered to be located in an Economic Freedom Zone if—

''(1) not less than 10 percent of the total gross income of such corporation is derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within an Economic Freedom Zone, or

''(2) at least 25 percent of the employees of such corporation are residents of an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(d) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX NOT TO APPLY.—The tax imposed by section 55 shall not apply to any taxpayer to whom subsection (a) applies.

"SEC. 1400V–3. ZERO PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE.

''(a) EXCLUSION.—Gross income shall not include qualified capital gain from the sale or exchange of—

''(1) any Economic Freedom Zone asset held for more than 5 years,

''(2) any real property located in an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(b) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE ASSET.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone asset' means—

''(A) any Economic Freedom Zone business stock,

''(B) any Economic Freedom Zone partnership interest, and

''(C) any Economic Freedom Zone business property.

''(2) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESS STOCK.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone business stock' means any stock in a domestic corporation if—

''(i) such stock is acquired by the taxpayer, before the date on which such corporation no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones, at its original issue (directly or through an underwriter) solely in exchange for cash,

''(ii) as of the time such stock was issued, such corporation was an Economic Freedom Zone business (or, in the case of a new corporation, such corporation was being organized for purposes of being an Economic Freedom Zone business), and

''(iii) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such stock, such corporation qualified as an Economic Freedom Zone business.

''(B) REDEMPTIONS.—A rule similar to the rule of section 1202(c)(3) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

''(3) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE PARTNERSHIP INTEREST.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone partnership interest' means any capital or profits interest in a domestic partnership if—

''(A) such interest is acquired by the taxpayer, before the date on which such partnership no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones, from the partnership solely in exchange for cash,

''(B) as of the time such interest was acquired, such partnership was an Economic Freedom Zone business (or, in the case of a new partnership, such partnership was being organized for purposes of being an Economic Freedom Zone business), and

''(C) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such interest, such partnership qualified as an Economic Freedom Zone business.

A rule similar to the rule of paragraph (2)(B) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

''(4) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESS PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone business property' means tangible property if—

''(i) such property was acquired by the taxpayer by purchase (as defined in section 179(d)(2)) after the date on such taxpayer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business and before the date on which such taxpayer no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones,

''(ii) the original use of such property in the Economic Freedom Zone commences with the taxpayer, and

''(iii) during substantially all of the taxpayer's holding period for such property, substantially all of the use of such property was in an Economic Freedom Zone business of the taxpayer.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR BUILDINGS WHICH ARE SUBSTANTIALLY IMPROVED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met with respect to—

''(I) property which is substantially improved by the taxpayer before the date on which such taxpayer no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones, and

''(II) any land on which such property is located.

''(ii) SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT.—For purposes of clause (i), property shall be treated as substantially improved by the taxpayer only if, during any 24-month period beginning after the date on which the taxpayer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business additions to basis with respect to such property in the hands of the taxpayer exceed the greater of—

''(I) an amount equal to the adjusted basis of such property at the beginning of such 24-month period in the hands of the taxpayer, or

''(II) $5,000.

''(5) TREATMENT OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE TERMINATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the termination of the designation of the Economic Freedom Zone shall be disregarded for purposes of determining whether any property is an Economic Freedom Zone asset.

''(6) TREATMENT OF SUBSEQUENT PURCHASERS, ETC.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone asset' includes any property which would be an Economic Freedom Zone asset but for paragraph (2)(A)(i), (3)(A), or (4)(A)(i) or (ii) in the hands of the taxpayer if such property was an Economic Freedom Zone asset in the hands of a prior holder.

''(7) 5-YEAR SAFE HARBOR.—If any property ceases to be an Economic Freedom Zone asset by reason of paragraph (2)(A)(iii), (3)(C), or (4)(A)(iii) after the 5-year period beginning on the date the taxpayer acquired such property, such property shall continue to be treated as meeting the requirements of such paragraph; except that the amount of gain to which subsection (a) applies on any sale or exchange of such property shall not exceed the amount which would be qualified capital gain had such property been sold on the date of such cessation.

''(c) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Economic Freedom Zone business' means any enterprise zone business (as defined in section 1397C), determined—

''(1) after the application of section 1400(e),

''(2) by substituting '80 percent' for '50 percent' in subsections (b)(2) and (c)(1) of section 1397C, and

''(3) by treating only areas that are Economic Freedom Zones as an empowerment zone or enterprise community.

''(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED CAPITAL GAIN.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'qualified capital gain' means any gain recognized on the sale or exchange of—

''(A) a capital asset, or

''(B) property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(b)).

''(2) CERTAIN GAIN NOT QUALIFIED.—The term 'qualified capital gain' shall not include any gain attributable to periods before the date on which the a business qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business or after the date that is 4 years after the date on which such business no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones.

''(3) CERTAIN GAIN NOT QUALIFIED.—The term 'qualified capital gain' shall not include any gain which would be treated as ordinary income under section 1245 or under section 1250 if section 1250 applied to all depreciation rather than the additional depreciation.

''(4) INTANGIBLES NOT INTEGRAL PART OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESS.—In the

case of gain described in subsection (a)(1), the term 'qualified capital gain' shall not include any gain which is attributable to an intangible asset which is not an integral part of an Economic Freedom Zone business.

''(5) RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS.—The term 'qualified capital gain' shall not include any gain attributable, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, to a transaction with a related person. For purposes of this paragraph, persons are related to each other if such persons are described in section 267(b) or 707(b)(1).

''(e) SALES AND EXCHANGES OF INTERESTS IN PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS WHICH ARE ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESSES.—In the case of the sale or exchange of an interest in a partnership, or of stock in an S corporation, which was an Economic Freedom Zone business during substantially all of the period the taxpayer held such interest or stock, the amount of qualified capital gain shall be determined without regard to—

''(1) any gain which is attributable to an intangible asset which is not an integral part of an Economic Freedom Zone business, and

''(2) any gain attributable to periods before the date on which the a business qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business or after the date that is 4 years after the date on which such business no longer qualifies as an Economic Freedom Zone business due to the lapse of 1 or more Economic Freedom Zones.

''SEC. 1400V–4. REDUCED PAYROLL TAXES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) EMPLOYEES.—The rate of tax under 3101(a) (including for purposes of determining the applicable percentage under sections 3201(a) and 3211(a)(1)) shall be 4.2 percent for any remuneration received during any period in which the individual's principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) is located in an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(2) EMPLOYERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The rate of tax under section 3111(a) (including for purposes of determining the applicable percentage under sections 3221(a)) shall be 4.2 percent with respect to remuneration paid for qualified services during any period in which the employer is located in an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(B) QUALIFIED SERVICES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified services' means services performed—

''(i) in a trade or business of a qualified employer, or

''(ii) in the case of a qualified employer exempt from tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in furtherance of the activities related to the purpose or function constituting the basis of the employer's exemption under section 501 of such Code.

''(C) LOCATION OF EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this paragraph, the location of an employer shall be determined in the same manner as under section 1400V—2(c).

''(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—The rate of tax under section 1401(a) shall be 8.40 percent any taxable year in which such individual was located (determined under section 1400V—2(c) as if such individual were a corporation) in an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(b) TRANSFERS OF FUNDS.—-

''(1) TRANSFERS TO FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of the application of subsection (a). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund had such amendments not been enacted.

''(2) TRANSFERS TO SOCIAL SECURITY EQUIVALENT BENEFIT ACCOUNT.—There are hereby appropriated to the Social Security Equivalent Benefit Account established under section 15A(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231n-1(a)) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of the application of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Account had such amendments not been enacted.

''(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.—For purposes of applying any provision of Federal law other than the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the rate of tax in effect under section 3101(a) shall be determined without regard to the reduction in such rate under this section.

''SEC. 1400V–5. INCREASE IN EXPENSING UNDER SECTION 179.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an Economic Freedom Zone business, for purposes of section 179—

''(1) the limitation under section 179(b)(1) shall be increased by the lesser of—

''(A) 200 percent of the amount in effect under such section (determined without regard to this section), or

''(B) the cost of section 179 property which is Economic Freedom Zone business property placed in service during the taxable year, and

''(2) the amount taken into account under section 179(b)(2) with respect to any section 179 property which is Economic Freedom Zone business property shall be 50 percent of the cost thereof.

''(b) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE BUSINESS PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Economic Freedom Zone business property' has the meaning given such term under section 1400V—3(b)(4), except that for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof, if property is sold and leased back by the taxpayer within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service, such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date on which such property is used under the leaseback

''(c) RECAPTURE.—Rules similar to the rules under section 179(d)(10) shall apply with respect to any qualified zone property which ceases to be used in an empowerment zone by an enterprise zone business.

''PART II—DEFINITIONS

''Sec. 1400V–6. Economic Freedom Zone.

''SEC. 1400V–6. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE.

''For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'Economic Freedom Zone' means any area which is an Economic Freedom Zone under title II of the Economic Freedom Zone Act.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to subchapter Y the following new item:

''SUBCHAPTER Z—ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONES''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL REGULATORY REDUCTIONS

SEC. 401. SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—For each area designated as an Economic Freedom Zone under this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not enforce, with respect to that Economic Freedom Zone, and the Economic Freedom Zone shall be exempt from compliance with—

(1) part D of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.) (including any regulations promulgated under that part);

(2) section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342);

(3) sections 139, 168, 169, 326, and 327 of title 23, United States Code;

(4) section 304 of title 49, United States Code; and

(5) sections 1315 through 1320 of Public Law 112–141 (126 Stat. 549).

(b) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—

(1) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.—For each area designated as an Economic Freedom Zone under this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall not enforce, with respect to that Economic Freedom Zone, and the Economic Freedom Zone shall be exempt from compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

(2) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.—For the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which an area is removed from designation as an Economic Freedom Zone, any National Heritage Area located within that Economic Freedom Zone shall not be considered to be a National Heritage Area and any applicable Federal law (including regulations) relating to that National Heritage Area shall not apply.

TITLE V—EDUCATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 501. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION EXPENSES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the qualified elementary and secondary education expenses of an eligible student.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The amount taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to any student for any taxable year shall not exceed $5,000.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION EXPENSES.—The term 'qualified elementary and secondary education expenses' has the meaning given such term under section 530(b)(3).

''(2) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term 'eligible student' means any student who—

''(A) is enrolled in, or attends, any public, private, or religious school (as defined in section 530(b)(3)(B)), and

''(B) whose principal residence (within the meaning of section 123) is located in an Economic Freedom Zone.

''(3) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone' means any area which is an Economic Freedom Zone under title II of the Economic Freedom Zone Act.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is

amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. Credit for qualified elementary and secondary education expenses.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures made in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 502. SCHOOL CHOICE THROUGH PORTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1128. SCHOOL CHOICE THROUGH PORTABILITY.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 1124, 1124A, and 1125 and any other provision of law, and to the extent permitted under State law, a State educational agency may allocate grant funds under this subpart among the local educational agencies in the State based on the formula described in paragraph (2).

''(2) FORMULA.—A State educational agency may allocate grant funds under this subpart for a fiscal year among the local educational agencies in the State in proportion to the number of eligible children enrolled in public schools served by the local educational agency and enrolled in State-accredited private schools within the local educational agency's geographic jurisdiction, for the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available, compared to the number of such children in all such local educational agencies for that fiscal year.

''(b) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'eligible child' means a child—

''(A) from a family with an income below the poverty level, on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data published by the Department of Commerce; and

''(B) who resides in an Economic Freedom Zone as designated under title II of the Economic Freedom Zones Act of 2014.

''(2) CRITERIA OF POVERTY.—In determining the families with incomes below the poverty level for the purposes of paragraph (2), a State educational agency shall use the criteria of poverty used by the Census Bureau in compiling the most recent decennial census.

''(3) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN.—On an annual basis, on a date to be determined by the State educational agency, each local educational agency that receives grant funding in accordance with subsection (a) shall inform the State educational agency of the number of eligible children enrolled in public schools served by the local educational agency and enrolled in State-accredited private schools within the local educational agency's geographic jurisdiction.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION TO SCHOOLS.—Each local educational agency that receives grant funding under subsection (a) shall distribute such funds to the public schools served by the local educational agency and State-accredited private schools with the local educational agency's geographic jurisdiction—

''(1) based on the number of eligible children enrolled in such schools; and

''(2) in the manner that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, supplement the funds made available from the non-Federal resources for the education of pupils participating in programs under this part, and not to supplant such funds.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1127 the following:

''Sec. 1128. School choice through portability.''.

SEC. 503. SPECIAL ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE VISAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ABANDONED; DILAPIDATED.—The terms ''abandoned'' and ''dilapidated'' shall be defined by the States in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(2) FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT.—The term ''full-time employment'' means employment in a position that requires at least 35 hours of service per week at any time, regardless of who fills the position.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to facilitate increased investment and enhanced human capital in Economic Freedom Zones through the issuance of special regional visas.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in collaboration with the Secretary of Labor, may issue Special Economic Freedom Zone Visas, in a number determined by the Governor of each State, in consultation with local officials in regions designated by the Secretary of Treasury as Economic Freedom Zones, to authorize qualified aliens to enter the United States for the purpose of—

(1) engaging in a new commercial enterprise (including a limited partnership)—

(A) in which such alien has invested, or is actively in the process of investing, capital in an amount not less than the amount specified in subsection (d); and

(B) which will benefit the region designated as an Economic Freedom Zone by creating full-time employment of not fewer than 5 United States citizens, aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or other immigrants lawfully authorized to be employed in the United States (excluding the alien and the alien's immediate family);

(2) engaging in the purchase and renovation of dilapidated or abandoned properties or residences (as determined by State and local officials) in which such alien has invested, or is actively in the process of investing, in the ownership of such properties or residences; or

(3) residing and working in an Economic Freedom Zone.

(d) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—A visa issued to an alien under this section shall expire on the later of—

(1) the date on which the relevant Economic Freedom Zone loses such designation; or

(2) the date that is 5 years after the date on which such visa was issued to such alien.

(e) CAPITAL AND EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) NEW COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES.—Except as otherwise provided under this section, the minimum amount of capital required to comply with subsection (c)(1)(A) shall be $50,000.

(2) RENOVATION OF DILAPIDATED OR ABANDONED PROPERTIES.—An alien is not in compliance with subsection (c)(2) unless the alien—

(A) purchases a dilapidated or abandoned property in an Economic Freedom Zone; and

(B) not later than 18 months after such purchase, invests not less than $25,000 to rebuild, rehabilitate, or repurpose the property.

(3) VERIFICATION.—A visa issued under subsection (c) shall not remain in effect for more than 2 years unless the Secretary of Homeland Security has verified that the alien has complied with the requirements described in subsection (c).

(4) EDUCATION AND SKILL REQUIREMENTS.—An alien is not in compliance with subsection (c)(3) unless the alien possesses—

(A) a bachelor's degree (or its equivalent) or an advanced degree;

(B) a degree or specialty certification that—

(i) is required for the job the alien will be performing; and

(ii) is specific to an industry or job that is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with the specialty certification;

(C)(i) the knowledge required to perform the duties of the job the alien will be performing; and

(ii) the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that such knowledge is usually associated with attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree; or

(D) a skill or talent that would benefit the Economic Freedom Zone.

(f) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION.—An alien who has been issued a visa under this section is not permitted to live or work outside of an Economic Freedom Zone.

(2) RESCISSION.—A visa issued under this section shall be rescinded if the visa holder resides or works outside of an Economic Freedom Zone or otherwise fails to comply with the provisions of this section.

(3) OTHER VISAS.—An alien who has been issued a visa under this section may apply for any other visa for which the alien is eligible in order to pursue employment outside of an Economic Freedom Zone.

(g) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of an alien who has been issued a visa under this section to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, without numerical limitation, if the alien—

(1) has fully complied with the requirements set forth in this section for at least 5 years;

(2) submits a completed application to the Secretary; and

(3) is not inadmissible to the United States based on any of the factors set forth in section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)).

SEC. 504. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE EDUCATIONAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VIII of subchapter F of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 530A. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE EDUCATIONAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, an Economic Freedom Zone educational savings account shall be treated for purposes of this title in the same manner as a Coverdell education savings account.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE EDUCATIONAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone educational savings account' means a trust created or organized in the United States exclusively for the purpose of paying the qualified education expenses (as defined in section 530(b)(2)) of an individual who is the designated beneficiary of the trust (and designated as an Economic Freedom Zone educational saving account at the time created or organized) and who is a qualified individual at the time such trust is established, but only if the written governing instrument creating the trust meets the following requirements:

''(A) No contribution will be accepted—

''(i) unless it is in cash,

''(ii) after the date on which such beneficiary attains age 25, or

''(iii) except in the case of rollover contributions, if such contribution would result in aggregate contributions for the taxable year exceeding $10,000.

''(B) No contribution shall be accepted at any time in which the designated beneficiary is not a qualified individual.

''(C) The trust meets the requirements of subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of section 530(b)(1).

The age limitations in subparagraphs (A)(ii), subparagraph (E) of section 530(b)(1), and paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 530(d), shall not apply to any designated beneficiary with special needs (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary).

''(2) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'qualified individual' means any individual whose principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) is located in an Economic Freedom Zone (as defined in section 1400V—6).

''(c) DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a deduction under part VII of subchapter B of this chapter an amount equal to the aggregate amount of contributions made by the taxpayer to any Economic Freedom Zone educational savings account during the taxable year .

''(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of the deduction allowed under paragraph (1) for any taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed $40,000.

''(3) NO DEDUCTION FOR ROLLOVER CONTRIBUTIONS.—No deduction shall be allowed under paragraph (1) for any rollover contribution described in section 530(d)(5).

''(d) OTHER RULES.—

''(1) NO INCOME LIMIT.—In the case of an Economic Freedom Zone educational savings account, subsection (c) of section 530 shall not apply.

''(2) CHANGE IN BENEFICIARIES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 530(b), a change in the beneficiary of an Economic Freedom Zone education savings account shall be treated as a distribution unless the new beneficiary is a qualified individual.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VIII of subchapter F of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 530A. Economic Freedom Zone educational savings accounts.''.

TITLE VI—COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE AND REBUILDING

SEC. 601. NONAPPLICATION OF DAVIS-BACON.

The wage rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Davis-Bacon Act''), shall not apply with respect to any area designated as an Economic Freedom Zone under this Act.

SEC. 602. ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE CHARITABLE TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (p) as subsection (q) and by inserting after subsection (o) the following new subsection:

''(o) ELECTION TO TREAT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE CHARITIES AS A CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, at the election of the taxpayer, so much of the deduction allowed under subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection) which is attributable to Economic Freedom Zone charitable contributions—

''(A) shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, and

''(B) shall not be allowed as a deduction for such taxable year under subsection (a).

Any amount allowable as a credit under this subsection shall be treated as a credit allowed under subpart A of part IV of subchapter A for purposes of this title.

''(2) AMOUNT ATTRIBUTABLE TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the total charitable contributions of a taxpayer for a taxable year exceed the contribution base, the amount of Economic Freedom Zone charitable contributions taken into account under paragraph (1) shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the total charitable contributions made by the taxpayer during such taxable year as the amount of the deduction allowed under subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection and after application of subsection (b)) bears to the total charitable contributions made by the taxpayer for such taxable year.

''(B) CARRYOVERS.—In the case of any contribution carried from a preceding taxable year under subsection (d), such amount shall be treated as attributable to an Economic Freedom Zone charitable contribution in the amount that bears the same ratio to the total amount carried from preceding taxable years under subsection (d) as the amount of Economic Freedom Zone charitable contributions not allowed as a deduction under subsection (a) (other than by reason of this subsection) for the preceding 5 taxable year bears to total amount carried from preceding taxable years under subsection (d).

''(3) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone charitable contribution' means any contribution to a corporation, trust, or community chest fund, or foundation described in subsection (c)(2), but only if—

''(A) such entity is created or organized exclusively for—

''(i) religious purposes,

''(ii) educational purposes, or

''(iii) any of the following charitable purposes: providing educational scholarships, providing shelters for homeless individuals, or setting up or maintaining food banks,

''(B) the primary mission of such entity is serving individuals in an Economic Freedom Zone,

''(C) the entity maintains accountability to residents of such Economic Freedom Zone through their representation on any governing board of the entity or any advisory board to the entity, and

''(D) the entity is certified by the Secretary for purposes of this subsection.

Such term shall not include any contribution made to an entity described in the preceding sentence after the date in which the designation of the Economic Freedom Zone serviced by such entity lapses.

''(4) ECONOMIC FREEDOM ZONE.—The term 'Economic Freedom Zone' means any area which is an Economic Freedom Zone under title II of the Economic Freedom Zone Act.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VII—STATE AND COMMUNITY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

SEC. 701. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that State and local governments should review and adopt the following policy recommendations:

(1) PENSION REFORM.—State and local governments should—

(A) implement reforms to address any fiscal shortfall in public pension funding, including utilizing accrual accounting methods, such as those reforms undertaken by the private sector pension funds; and

(B) restructure and renegotiate any public pension fund that is deemed to be insolvent or underfunded, including adopting defined contribution retirement systems.

(2) TAXES.—State and local governments should reduce jurisdictional tax rates below the national average in order to help facilitate capital investment and economic growth, particularly in combination with the provisions of this division.

(3) EDUCATION.—State and local governments should adopt school choice options to provide children and parents more educational choices, particularly in impoverished areas.

(4) COMMUNITIES.—State and local governments should adopt right-to-work laws to allow more competitiveness and more flexibility for businesses to expand.

(5) REGULATIONS.—State and local governments should streamline the regulatory burden on families and businesses, including streamlining the opportunities for occupational licensing.

(6) ABANDONED STRUCTURES.—State and local governments should consider the following options to reduce or fix areas with abandoned properties or residences:

(A) In the case of foreclosures, tax notifications should be sent to both the lien holder (if different than the homeowner) and the homeowner.

(B) Where State constitutions permit, property tax abatement or credits should be provided for individuals who purchase or invest in abandoned or dilapidated properties.

(C) Non-profit or charity demolition entities should be permitted or encouraged to help remove abandoned properties.

(D) Government or municipality fees and penalties should be limited, and be proportional to the outstanding tax amount and the ability to pay.

(E) The sale of tax liens to third parties should be reviewed, and where available, should prohibit the selling of tax liens below a certain threshold (for example the prohibition of the sale of tax liens to third parties under $1,000).

SA 3612. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new title:

TITLE II—CERTAIN PROVISIONS MADE PERMANENT

SEC. 201. PERMANENT EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF INCREASED EXPENSING LIMITATIONS AND TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SECTION 179 PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code

of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $500,000.''.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds—'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $2,000,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking '', to which section 167 applies, and which is placed in service in a taxable year beginning after 2002 and before 2014'' and inserting ''and to which section 167 applies''.

(c) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''may not be revoked'' and all that follows through ''and before 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''IRREVOCABLE'' in the heading thereof.

(d) AIR CONDITIONING AND HEATING UNITS.—The last sentence of section 179(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''and shall not include air conditioning or heating units''.

(e) QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—Subsection (f) of section 179 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' in paragraph (1), and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(f) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2013, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting 'calendar year 2012' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—

''(i) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—If the amount in paragraph (1) as increased under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000.

''(ii) PHASEOUT AMOUNT.—If the amount in paragraph (2) as increased under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 202. BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT; INCLUSION OF QUALIFIED RETAIL IMPROVEMENT PROPERTY.—Section 168(k)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified property' means property—

''(i)(I) to which this section applies which has a recovery period of 20 years or less,

''(II) which is computer software (as defined in section 167(f)(1)(B)) for which a deduction is allowable under section 167(a) without regard to this subsection,

''(III) which is water utility property,

''(IV) which is qualified leasehold improvement property, or

''(V) which is qualified retail improvement property, and

''(ii) the original use of which commences with the taxpayer.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR ALTERNATIVE DEPRECIATION PROPERTY.—The term 'qualified property' shall not include any property to which the alternative depreciation system under subsection (g) applies, determined—

''(i) without regard to paragraph (7) of subsection (g) (relating to election to have system apply), and

''(ii) after application of section 280F(b) (relating to listed property with limited business use).

''(C) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(i) SALE-LEASEBACKS.—For purposes of clause (ii) and subparagraph (A)(ii), if property is—

''(I) originally placed in service by a person, and

''(II) sold and leased back by such person within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service,

such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date on which such property is used under the leaseback referred to in subclause (II).

''(ii) SYNDICATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), if—

''(I) property is originally placed in service by the lessor of such property,

''(II) such property is sold by such lessor or any subsequent purchaser within 3 months after the date such property was originally placed in service (or, in the case of multiple units of property subject to the same lease, within 3 months after the date the final unit is placed in service, so long as the period between the time the first unit is placed in service and the time the last unit is placed in service does not exceed 12 months), and

''(III) the user of such property after the last sale during such 3-month period remains the same as when such property was originally placed in service,

such property shall be treated as originally placed in service not earlier than the date of such last sale.

''(D) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 280F.—For purposes of section 280F—

''(i) AUTOMOBILES.—In the case of a passenger automobile (as defined in section 280F(d)(5)) which is qualified property, the Secretary shall increase the limitation under section 280F(a)(1)(A)(i) by $8,000.

''(ii) LISTED PROPERTY.—The deduction allowable under paragraph (1) shall be taken into account in computing any recapture amount under section 280F(b)(2).

''(iii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2014, the $8,000 amount in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the automobile price inflation adjustment determined under section 280F(d)(7)(B)(i) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting '2013' for '1987' in subclause (II) thereof.

If any increase under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $100, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

''(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—For purposes of determining alternative minimum taxable income under section 55, the deduction under section 167 for qualified property shall be determined without regard to any adjustment under section 56.''.

(b) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—Section 168(k)(4) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(4) ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a corporation elects to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year—

''(i) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply for such taxable year,

''(ii) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method, and

''(iii) the limitation imposed by section 53(c) for such taxable year shall be increased by the bonus depreciation amount which is determined for such taxable year under subparagraph (B).

''(B) BONUS DEPRECIATION AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) applied to all such property, over

''(II) the aggregate amount of depreciation which would be allowed under this section for qualified property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year if paragraph (1) did not apply to any such property.

The aggregate amounts determined under subclauses (I) and (II) shall be determined without regard to any election made under subsection (b)(2)(D), (b)(3)(D), or (g)(7) and without regard to subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The bonus depreciation amount for any taxable year shall not exceed the lesser of—

''(I) 50 percent of the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for the first taxable year ending after December 31, 2013, or

''(II) the minimum tax credit under section 53(b) for such taxable year determined by taking into account only the adjusted net minimum tax for taxable years ending before January 1, 2014 (determined by treating credits as allowed on a first-in, first-out basis).

''(iii) AGGREGATION RULE.—All corporations which are treated as a single employer under section 52(a) shall be treated—

''(I) as 1 taxpayer for purposes of this paragraph, and

''(II) as having elected the application of this paragraph if any such corporation so elects.

''(C) CREDIT REFUNDABLE.—For purposes of section 6401(b), the aggregate increase in the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A for any taxable year resulting from the application of this paragraph shall be treated as allowed under subpart C of such part (and not any other subpart).

''(D) OTHER RULES.—

''(i) ELECTION.—Any election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

''(ii) PARTNERSHIPS WITH ELECTING PARTNERS.—In the case of a corporation which is a partner in a partnership and which makes an election under subparagraph (A) for the taxable year, for purposes of determining such corporation's distributive share of partnership items under section 702 for such taxable year—

''(I) paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(D)(i), and (5)(A)(i) shall not apply, and

''(II) the applicable depreciation method used under this section with respect to any qualified property shall be the straight line method.

''(iii) CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership in which more than 50 percent of the capital and profits interests are owned (directly or indirectly) at all times during the taxable year by 1 corporation (or by corporations treated as 1 taxpayer under subparagraph (B)(iii)), each partner shall compute its bonus depreciation amount under clause (i) of subparagraph (B) by taking into account its distributive share of the amounts determined by the partnership under subclauses (I) and (II) of such clause for the taxable year of the partnership ending with or within the taxable year of the partner.''.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—Section 168(k) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREES AND VINES BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any tree or vine bearing fruits or nuts which is planted, or is grafted to a plant that has already been planted, by the taxpayer in the ordinary course of the taxpayer's farming business (as defined in section 263A(e)(4))—

''(i) a depreciation deduction equal to 50 percent of the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be allowed under section 167(a) for the taxable year in which such tree or vine is so planted or grafted, and

''(ii) the adjusted basis of such tree or vine shall be reduced by the amount of such deduction.

''(B) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this subparagraph for any taxable year, this paragraph shall not apply to any tree or vine planted or grafted during such taxable year. An election under this subparagraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

''(C) ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION MAY BE CLAIMED ONLY ONCE.—If this paragraph applies to any tree or vine, such tree or vine shall not be treated as qualified property in the taxable year in which placed in service.

''(D) COORDINATION WITH ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS.—If a corporation makes an election under paragraph (4) for any taxable year, the amount under paragraph (4)(B)(i)(I) for such taxable year shall be increased by the amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) for such taxable year.

''(E) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING MINIMUM TAX.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (2)(E) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 168(e)(8) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) ELECTION OUT.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this paragraph with respect to any class of property for any taxable year, this subsection shall not apply to all property in such class placed in service (or, in the case of paragraph (5), planted or grafted) during such taxable year. An election under this paragraph may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.''.

(3) Section 168(l)(5) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 168(k)(2)(G)'' and inserting ''section 168(k)(2)(E)''.

(4) Section 263A(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 168(k)(5).—This section shall not apply to any amount allowable as a deduction by reason of section 168(k)(5) (relating to special rules for trees and vines bearing fruits and nuts).''.

(5) Section 460(c)(6)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''which—'' and all that follows and inserting ''which has a recovery period of 7 years or less.''.

(6) Section 168(k) of such Code is amended by striking ''ACQUIRED AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2007, AND BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014'' in the heading thereof.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

(2) EXPANSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE AMT CREDITS IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (b) (other than so much of such amendment as relates to section 168(k)(4)(D)(iii) of such Code, as added by such amendment) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(B) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 2014, and ending after December 31, 2013, the bonus depreciation amount determined under section 168(k)(4) of such Code for such year shall be the sum of—

(i) such amount determined without regard to the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service before January 1, 2014, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(C)(ii) of such Code (determined without regard to the amendments made by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year before January 1, 2014, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year, and

(ii) such amount determined after taking into account the amendments made by this section and—

(I) by taking into account only property placed in service after December 31, 2013, and

(II) by multiplying the limitation under section 168(k)(4)(B)(ii) of such Code (as amended by this section) by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year after December 31, 2013, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year.

(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TREES AND VINES.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall apply to trees and vines planted or grafted after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 203. PERMANENT EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.

(a) SIMPLIFIED CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) of section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined.''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES AND TERMINATION OF BASE AMOUNT CALCULATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 41 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(c) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—

''(1) TAXPAYERS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—The credit under this section shall be determined under this subsection, and not under subsection (a), if, in any one of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses.

''(2) CREDIT RATE.—The credit determined under this subsection shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.''.

(2) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES.—Subsection (b) of section 41 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding whether the period for filing a claim for credit or refund has expired for any taxable year in the 3-taxable-year period taken into account under subsection (a), the qualified research expenses taken into account for such year shall be determined on a basis consistent with the determination of qualified research expenses for the credit year.

''(B) PREVENTION OF DISTORTIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations to prevent distortions in calculating a taxpayer's qualified research expenses caused by a change in accounting methods used by such taxpayer between the credit year and a year in such 3-taxable-year period.''.

(c) INCLUSION OF QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES OF AN ACQUIRED PERSON.—

(1) PARTIAL INCLUSION OF PRE-ACQUISITION QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 41(f)(3) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(A) ACQUISITIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a person acquires the major portion of a trade or business of another person (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'predecessor') or the major portion of a separate unit of a trade or business of a predecessor, then the amount of qualified research expenses paid or incurred by the acquiring person during the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year in which the credit under this section is determined shall be increased by—

''(I) for purposes of applying this section for the taxable year in which such acquisition is made, the amount determined under clause (ii), and

''(II) for purposes of applying this section for any taxable year after the taxable year in which such acquisition is made, so much of the qualified research expenses paid or incurred by the predecessor with respect to the acquired trade or business during the portion of the measurement period that is part of the 3-taxable-year period preceding the taxable year for which the credit is determined as is attributable to the portion of such trade or business or separate unit acquired by such person.

''(ii) AMOUNT DETERMINED.—The amount determined under this clause is the amount equal to the product of—

''(I) so much of the qualified research expenses paid or incurred by the predecessor with respect to the acquired trade or business during the 3 taxable years before the taxable year in which the acquisition is made as is attributable to the portion of such trade or business or separate unit acquired by the acquiring person, and

''(II) the number of months in the period beginning on the date of the acquisition and ending on the last day of the taxable year in which the acquisition is made,

divided by 12.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULES FOR COORDINATING TAXABLE YEARS.—In the case of an acquiring

person and a predecessor whose taxable years do not begin on the same date—

''(I) each reference to a taxable year in clauses (i) and (ii) shall refer to the appropriate taxable year of the acquiring person,

''(II) the qualified research expenses paid or incurred by the predecessor during each taxable year of the predecessor any portion of which is part of the measurement period shall be allocated equally among the months of such taxable year, and

''(III) the amount of such qualified research expenses taken into account under clauses (i) and (ii) with respect to a taxable year of the acquiring person shall be equal to the total of the expenses attributable under subclause (II) to the months occurring during such taxable year.

''(iv) MEASUREMENT PERIOD.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'measurement period' means the taxable year of the acquiring person in which the acquisition is made and the 3 taxable years of the acquiring person preceding such taxable year.''.

(2) EXPENSES OF A PREDECESSOR.—Subparagraph (B) of section 41(f)(3) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(B) DISPOSITIONS.—If the predecessor furnished to the acquiring person such information as is necessary for the application of subparagraph (A), then, for purposes of applying this section for any taxable year ending after such disposition, the amount of qualified research expenses paid or incurred by the predecessor during the 3 taxable years preceding such taxable year shall be reduced—

''(i) in the case of the taxable year in which such disposition is made, by an amount equal to the product of—

''(I) the amount of qualified research expenses paid or incurred during such 3 taxable years with respect to the acquired business, and

''(II) the number of days in the period beginning on the date of acquisition (as determined for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)) and ending on the last day of the taxable year of the predecessor in which the disposition is made,

divided by the number of days in the taxable year of the predecessor, and

''(ii) in the case of any taxable year ending after the taxable year in which such disposition is made, the amount described in clause (i)(I).''.

(d) AGGREGATION OF EXPENDITURES.—Paragraph (1) of section 41(f) of such Code, as amended by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, is amended—

(1) by striking ''of the qualified research expenses, basic research payments, and amounts paid or incurred to energy research consortiums,'' in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting ''qualified research expenses'', and

(2) by striking ''of the qualified research expenses, basic research payments, and amounts paid or incurred to energy research consortiums,'' in subparagraph (B)(ii) and inserting ''qualified research expenses''.

(e) PERMANENT EXTENSION.—

(1) Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 45C(b) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TERMINATION OF BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENT CALCULATION.—Section 41 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e),

(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (e), and

(C) by relocating subsection (e), as so redesignated, immediately after subsection (d).

(2) SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) Paragraph (4) of section 41(f) of such Code is amended by striking ''and gross receipts''.

(B) Subsection (f) of section 41 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(3) CROSS-REFERENCES.—

(A) Paragraph (2) of section 45C(c) of such Code is amended by striking ''base period research expenses'' and inserting ''average qualified research expenses''.

(B) Subparagraph (A) of section 54(l)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(g)'' and inserting ''section 41(e)''.

(C) Clause (i) of section 170(e)(4)(B) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(i) the contribution is to a qualified organization,''.

(D) Paragraph (4) of section 170(e) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified organization' means—

''(i) any educational organization which—

''(I) is an institution of higher education (within the meaning of section 3304(f)), and

''(II) is described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), or

''(ii) any organization not described in clause (i) which—

''(I) is described in section 501(c)(3) and is exempt from tax under section 501(a),

''(II) is organized and operated primarily to conduct scientific research, and

''(III) is not a private foundation.''.

(E) Section 280C of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''or basic research expenses (as defined in section 41(e)(2))'' in subsection (c)(1),

(ii) by striking ''section 41(a)(1)'' in subsection (c)(2)(A) and inserting ''section 41(a)'', and

(iii) by striking ''or basic research expenses'' in subsection (c)(2)(B).

(F) Clause (i) of section 1400N(l)(7)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(g)'' and inserting ''section 41(e)''.

(g) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 409 of such Code is amended—

(1) by inserting '', as in effect before the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1984)'' after ''section 41(c)(1)(B)'' in subsection (b)(1)(A),

(2) by inserting '', as in effect before the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1984'' after ''relating to the employee stock ownership credit'' in subsection (b)(4),

(3) by inserting ''(as in effect before the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1984)'' after ''section 41(c)(1)(B)'' in subsection (i)(1)(A),

(4) by inserting ''(as in effect before the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1984)'' after ''section 41(c)(1)(B)'' in subsection (m), and

(5) by inserting ''(as so in effect)'' after ''section 48(n)(1)'' in subsection (m).

(h) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the amendments made by this section shall apply to credits determined for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PERMANENT EXTENSION.—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2013.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—The amendments made by subsection (g) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. PERMANENT FULL EXCLUSION APPLICABLE TO QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 1202(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and before January 1, 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''CERTAIN PERIODS IN 2010, 2011, 2012, AND 2013'' in the heading and inserting ''CERTAIN PERIODS AFTER 2009''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for section 1202 of such Code is amended by striking ''**PARTIAL**''.

(2) The item relating to section 1202 in the table of sections of such Code for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 is amended by striking ''Partial exclusion'' and inserting ''Exclusion''.

(3) Section 1223(13) of such Code is amended by striking ''1202(a)(2),''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to stock acquired after December 31, 2013.

SA 3613. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE III—INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Building and Renewing Infrastructure for Development and Growth in Employment Act'' or the ''BRIDGE Act''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) infrastructure has always been a vital element of the economic strength of the United States and a key indicator of the international leadership of the United States;

(2) the Erie Canal, the Hoover Dam, the railroads, and the interstate highway system are all testaments to the ingenuity of the United States and have helped propel and maintain the United States as the largest economy in the world;

(3) according to the 2013-2014 World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report, the United States—

(A) ranked fifth in the world on the Global Competitiveness Index; and

(B) ranked 19th in the world in the ''Quality of overall infrastructure'' category;

(4) according to the World Bank's 2012 Logistic Performance Index, the capacity of countries to efficiently move goods and connect manufacturers and consumers with international markets is improving around the world, and the United States now ranks ninth in the world in logistics-related infrastructure behind countries from both Europe and Asia;

(5) according to a January 2009 report from the University of Massachusetts/Alliance for American Manufacturing entitled ''Employment, Productivity and Growth'', infrastructure investment is a ''highly effective engine of job creation'' such that $1,000,000,000 in new investment in infrastructure results in 18,000 total long-term jobs;

(6) according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the current condition of the

infrastructure in the United States earns a grade point average of D+, and an estimated $1,600,000,000,000 of additional investment is needed over the next 7 years to bring the infrastructure of the United States up to adequate condition;

(7) according to the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, $225,000,000,000 is needed annually from all sources for the next 50 years to upgrade the United States surface transportation system to a state of good repair and create a more advanced system;

(8) the current infrastructure financing mechanisms of the United States, both on the Federal and State level, will fail to meet current and foreseeable demands and will create large funding gaps;

(9) published reports state that there may not be enough demand for municipal bonds to maintain the same level of borrowing at the same rates, resulting in significantly decreased infrastructure investment at the State and local level;

(10) current funding mechanisms are not readily scalable and do not—

(A) serve large in-State or cross-jurisdictional infrastructure projects, projects of regional or national significance, or projects that cross sector silos;

(B) sufficiently catalyze private sector investment; or

(C) ensure the optimal return on public resources;

(11) although grant programs of the Federal Government must continue to play a central role in financing the infrastructure needs of the United States, current and foreseeable demands on existing Federal, State, and local funding for infrastructure expansion clearly exceed the resources to support those programs by margins wide enough to prompt serious concerns about the ability of the United States to sustain long-term economic development, productivity, and international competitiveness;

(12) the capital markets, including pension funds, private equity funds, mutual funds, sovereign wealth funds, and other investors, have a growing interest in infrastructure investment and represent hundreds of billions of dollars of potential investment; and

(13) the establishment of a federally owned, independent, professionally managed institution that could provide credit support to qualified infrastructure projects of regional and national significance, making transparent merit-based investment decisions based on the commercial viability of infrastructure projects, would catalyze the participation of significant private investment capital.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to facilitate investment in, and the long-term financing of, economically viable eligible infrastructure projects of regional or national significance that are in the public interest in a manner that complements existing Federal, State, local, and private funding sources for these projects and introduces a merit-based system for financing those projects, in order to mobilize significant private sector investment, create long-term jobs, and ensure United States competitiveness through a self-sustaining institution that limits the need for ongoing Federal funding.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BLIND TRUST.—The term ''blind trust'' means a trust in which the beneficiary has no knowledge of the specific holdings and no rights over how those holdings are managed by the fiduciary of the trust prior to the dissolution of the trust.

(2) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The term ''Board of Directors'' means the Board of Directors of IFA.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The term ''Chairperson'' means the Chairperson of the Board of Directors of IFA.

(4) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The term ''chief executive officer'' means the chief executive officer of IFA, appointed under section 313.

(5) COST.—The term ''cost'' has the meaning given the term in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a).

(6) DIRECT LOAN.—The term ''direct loan'' has the meaning given the term in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a).

(7) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means—

(A) an individual;

(B) a corporation;

(C) a partnership, including a public-private partnership;

(D) a joint venture;

(E) a trust;

(F) a State or any other governmental entity, including a political subdivision or any other instrumentality of a State; or

(G) a revolving fund.

(8) ELIGIBLE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible infrastructure project'' means the construction, consolidation, alteration, or repair of the following sectors:

(i) Intercity passenger or freight rail lines.

(ii) Intercity passenger rail facilities or equipment.

(iii) Intercity freight rail facilities or equipment.

(iv) Intercity passenger bus facilities or equipment.

(v) Public transportation facilities or equipment.

(vi) Highway facilities, including bridges and tunnels.

(vii) Airports.

(viii) Air traffic control systems.

(ix) Port or marine terminal facilities, including approaches to marine terminal facilities or inland port facilities.

(x) Port or marine equipment, including fixed equipment to serve approaches to marine terminals or inland ports.

(xi) Transmission or distribution pipelines.

(xii) Inland waterways.

(xiii) Intermodal facilities or equipment related to 2 or more of the sectors described in clauses (i) through (xii).

(xiv) Water treatment and solid waste disposal facilities, including drinking water facilities.

(xv) Storm water management systems.

(xvi) Dams and levees.

(xvii) Facilities or equipment for energy transmission, distribution or storage.

(B) AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO MODIFY SECTORS.—The Board of Directors may make modifications, at the discretion of the Board, to any of the sectors described in subparagraph (A) by a vote of not fewer than 5 of the voting members of the Board of Directors.

(9) IFA.—The term ''IFA'' means the Infrastructure Financing Authority established under subtitle A.

(10) INVESTMENT-GRADE RATING.—The term ''investment-grade rating'' means a rating of BBB minus, Baa3, or higher assigned to an eligible infrastructure project by a ratings agency.

(11) LOAN GUARANTEE.—The term ''loan guarantee'' has the meaning given the term in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a).

(12) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''public-private partnership'' means any eligible entity—

(A)(i) that is undertaking the development of all or part of an eligible infrastructure project that will have a measurable public benefit, pursuant to requirements established in 1 or more contracts between the entity and a State or an instrumentality of a State; or

(ii) the activities of which, with respect to such an eligible infrastructure project, are subject to regulation by a State or any instrumentality of a State;

(B) that owns, leases, or operates or will own, lease, or operate, the project in whole or in part; and

(C) the participants in which include not fewer than 1 nongovernmental entity with significant investment and some control over the project or entity sponsoring the project vehicle.

(13) RATING AGENCY.—The term ''rating agency'' means a credit rating agency registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a nationally recognized statistical rating organization (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))).

(14) RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—The term ''rural infrastructure project''—

(A) has the same meaning given the term in section 601(15) of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) includes any eligible infrastructure project located in an area described in such section 601(15).

(15) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the designee of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(16) SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The term ''senior management'' means the chief financial officer, chief risk officer, chief compliance officer, general counsel, chief lending officer, and chief operations officer of IFA, and such other officers as the Board of Directors may, by majority vote, add to senior management.

(17) SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The term ''Special Inspector General'' means the Special Inspector General for IFA.

(18) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) each of the several States of the United States; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

Subtitle A—Infrastructure Financing Authority

SEC. 311. ESTABLISHMENT AND GENERAL AUTHORITY OF IFA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF IFA.—The Infrastructure Financing Authority is established as a wholly owned Government corporation.

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY OF IFA.—IFA shall—

(1) provide direct loans and loan guarantees to facilitate eligible infrastructure projects that are economically viable, in the public interest, and of regional or national significance; and

(2) carry out any other activities and duties authorized under this title.

(c) INCORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board of Directors first appointed shall be deemed the incorporator of IFA, and the incorporation shall be held to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the Board of Directors.

(2) CORPORATE OFFICE.—IFA shall—

(A) maintain an office in Washington, DC; and

(B) for purposes of venue in civil actions, be considered to be a resident of Washington, DC.

(d) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall take such action as may

be necessary to assist in implementing IFA and in carrying out the purpose of this title.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, does not apply to IFA, unless otherwise specifically provided in this title.

SEC. 312. VOTING MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

(a) VOTING MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—IFA shall have a Board of Directors consisting of 7 voting members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, not more than 4 of whom shall be from the same political party.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—One of the voting members of the Board of Directors shall be designated by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve as Chairperson of the Board of Directors.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives shall each submit a recommendation to the President for appointment of a member of the Board of Directors, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress.

(4) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF RURAL INTERESTS AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—In making an appointment under this subsection, the President shall give consideration to the geographic areas of the United States in which the members of the Board of Directors live and work, particularly to ensure that the infrastructure priorities and concerns of each region of the country, including rural areas and small communities, are represented on the Board of Directors.

(b) VOTING RIGHTS.—Each voting member of the Board of Directors shall have an equal vote in all decisions of the Board of Directors.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS OF VOTING MEMBERS.—Each voting member of the Board of Directors shall—

(1) be a citizen of the United States; and

(2) have significant demonstrated expertise in—

(A) the management and administration of a financial institution relevant to the operation of IFA; or

(B) the financing, development, or operation of infrastructure projects, including in the evaluation and selection of eligible infrastructure projects based on the purposes, goals, and objectives of this title.

(d) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, each voting member of the Board of Directors shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

(2) INITIAL STAGGERED TERMS.—Of the voting members first appointed to the Board of Directors—

(A) the initial Chairperson and 3 of the other voting member shall each be appointed for a term of 5 years; and

(B) the remaining 3 voting members shall each be appointed for a term of 2 years.

(3) DATE OF INITIAL NOMINATIONS.—The initial nominations for the appointment of all voting members of the Board of Directors shall be made not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) BEGINNING OF TERM.—The term of each of the initial voting members appointed under this section shall commence immediately upon the date of appointment, except that, for purposes of calculating the term limits specified in this subsection, the initial terms shall each be construed as beginning on January 22 of the year following the date of the initial appointment.

(5) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy in the position of a voting member of the Board of Directors shall be filled by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) TERM.—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Board of Directors occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

(e) MEETINGS.—

(1) OPEN TO THE PUBLIC; NOTICE.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), all meetings of the Board of Directors shall be—

(A) open to the public; and

(B) preceded by reasonable public notice.

(2) FREQUENCY.—The Board of Directors shall meet—

(A) not later than 60 days after the date on which all members of the Board of Directors are first appointed;

(B) at least quarterly after the date described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) at the call of the Chairperson or 3 voting members of the Board of Directors.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR CLOSED MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The voting members of the Board of Directors may, by majority vote, close a meeting to the public if, during the meeting to be closed, there is likely to be disclosed proprietary or sensitive information regarding an eligible infrastructure project under consideration for assistance under this title.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF MINUTES.—The Board of Directors shall prepare minutes of any meeting that is closed to the public, which minutes shall be made available as soon as practicable, but not later than 1 year after the date of the closed meeting, with any necessary redactions to protect any proprietary or sensitive information.

(4) QUORUM.—For purposes of meetings of the Board of Directors, 5 voting members of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum.

(f) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each voting member of the Board of Directors shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board of Directors.

(g) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—A voting member of the Board of Directors may not participate in any review or decision affecting an eligible infrastructure project under consideration for assistance under this title, if the member has or is affiliated with an entity who has a financial interest in that project.

SEC. 313. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF IFA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The chief executive officer shall—

(1) be a nonvoting member of the Board of Directors;

(2) be responsible for all activities of IFA; and

(3) support the Board of Directors in accordance with this title and as the Board of Directors determines to be necessary.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND TENURE OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint the chief executive officer, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) TERM.—The chief executive officer shall be appointed for a term of 6 years.

(3) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any vacancy in the office of the chief executive officer shall be filled by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) TERM.—The person appointed to fill a vacancy in the chief executive officer position that occurs before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—The chief executive officer—

(1) shall have significant expertise in management and administration of a financial institution, or significant expertise in the financing and development of infrastructure projects; and

(2) may not—

(A) hold any other public office;

(B) have any financial interest in an eligible infrastructure project then being considered by the Board of Directors, unless that interest is placed in a blind trust; or

(C) have any financial interest in an investment institution or its affiliates or any other entity seeking or likely to seek financial assistance for any eligible infrastructure project from IFA, unless any such interest is placed in a blind trust for the tenure of the service of the chief executive officer plus 2 additional years.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The chief executive officer shall have such executive functions, powers, and duties as may be prescribed under this title, the bylaws of IFA, or the Board of Directors, including—

(1) responsibility for the development and implementation of the strategy of IFA, including—

(A) the development and submission to the Board of Directors of the annual business plans and budget;

(B) the development and submission to the Board of Directors of a long-term strategic plan; and

(C) the development, revision, and submission to the Board of Directors of internal policies; and

(2) responsibility for the management and oversight of the daily activities, decisions, operations, and personnel of IFA.

(e) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any compensation assessment or recommendation by the chief executive officer under this section shall be without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 or subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The compensation assessment or recommendation required under this subsection shall take into account merit principles, where applicable, as well as the education, experience, level of responsibility, geographic differences, and retention and recruitment needs in determining compensation of personnel.

SEC. 314. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

The Board of Directors shall—

(1) as soon as practicable after the date on which all members are appointed, approve or disapprove senior management appointed by the chief executive officer;

(2) not later than 180 days after the date on which all members are appointed—

(A) develop and approve the bylaws of IFA, including bylaws for the regulation of the affairs and conduct of the business of IFA, consistent with the purpose, goals, objectives, and policies set forth in this title;

(B) establish subcommittees, including an audit committee that is composed solely of members of the Board of Directors, other than the chief executive officer;

(C) develop and approve, in consultation with senior management, a conflict-of-interest policy for the Board of Directors and for senior management;

(D) approve or disapprove internal policies that the chief executive officer shall submit to the Board of Directors, including—

(i) policies regarding the loan application and approval process, including application procedures and project approval processes;

(ii) operational guidelines; and

(E) approve or disapprove a 1-year business plan and budget for IFA;

(3) ensure that IFA is at all times operated in a manner that is consistent with this title, by—

(A) monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of IFA in achieving its strategic goals;

(B) reviewing and approving internal policies, annual business plans, annual budgets, and long-term strategies submitted by the chief executive officer;

(C) reviewing and approving annual reports submitted by the chief executive officer;

(D) engaging 1 or more external auditors, as set forth in this title; and

(E) reviewing and approving all changes to the organization of senior management;

(4) appoint and fix, by a vote of not less than 5 of the 7 voting members of the Board of Directors, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 or subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, the compensation and adjustments to compensation of all IFA personnel, provided that in appointing and fixing any compensation or adjustments to compensation under this paragraph, the Board shall—

(A) consult with, and seek to maintain comparability with, other comparable Federal personnel, as the Board of Directors may determine to be appropriate;

(B) consult with the Office of Personnel Management; and

(C) carry out those duties consistent with merit principles, where applicable, as well as the education, experience, level of responsibility, geographic differences, comparability to private sector positions, and retention and recruitment needs in determining compensation of personnel;

(5) serve as the primary liaison for IFA in interactions with Congress, the Secretary of Transportation and other Executive Branch officials, and State and local governments, and to represent the interests of IFA in those interactions and others;

(6) approve by a vote of not less than 5 of the 7 voting members of the Board of Directors any changes to the bylaws or internal policies of IFA;

(7) have the authority and responsibility—

(A) to oversee entering into and carrying out such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as are necessary to carry out this title;

(B) to approve of the acquisition, lease, pledge, exchange, and disposal of real and personal property by IFA and otherwise approve the exercise by IFA of all of the usual incidents of ownership of property, to the extent that the exercise of those powers is appropriate to and consistent with the purposes of IFA;

(C) to determine the character of, and the necessity for, the obligations and expenditures of IFA, and the manner in which the obligations and expenditures will be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to this title and other Federal law specifically applicable to wholly owned Federal corporations;

(D) to execute, in accordance with applicable bylaws and regulations, appropriate instruments;

(E) to approve other forms of credit enhancement that IFA may provide to eligible projects, as long as the forms of credit enhancements are consistent with the purposes of this title and the terms set forth in subtitle B;

(F) to exercise all other lawful powers which are necessary or appropriate to carry out, and are consistent with, the purposes of IFA;

(G) to sue or be sued in the corporate capacity of IFA in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(H) to indemnify the members of the Board of Directors and officers of IFA for any liabilities arising out of the actions of the members and officers in that capacity, in accordance with, and subject to the limitations contained in this title;

(I) to review all financial assistance packages to all eligible infrastructure projects, as submitted by the chief executive officer and to approve, postpone, or deny the same by majority vote;

(J) to review all restructuring proposals submitted by the chief executive officer, including assignation, pledging, or disposal of the interest of IFA in a project, including payment or income from any interest owned or held by IFA, and to approve, postpone, or deny the same by majority vote;

(K) to enter into binding commitments, as specified in approved financial assistance packages;

(L) to determine whether—

(i) to obtain a lien on the assets of an eligible entity that receives assistance under this title; and

(ii) to subordinate a lien under clause (i) to any other lien securing project obligations; and

(M) to ensure a measurable public benefit in the selection of eligible infrastructure projects and to provide for reasonable public input in the selection of such projects;

(8) delegate to the chief executive officer those duties that the Board of Directors determines to be appropriate, to better carry out the powers and purposes of the Board of Directors under this section; and

(9) to approve a maximum aggregate amount of principal exposure of IFA at any given time.

SEC. 315. SENIOR MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Senior management shall support the chief executive officer in the discharge of the responsibilities of the chief executive officer.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The chief executive officer shall appoint such senior managers as are necessary to carry out the purposes of IFA, as approved by a majority vote of the voting members of the Board of Directors, including a chief compliance officer, general counsel, chief operating officer, chief lending officer, and other positions as determined to be appropriate by the chief executive officer and Board of Directors.

(c) TERM.—Each member of senior management shall serve at the pleasure of the chief executive officer and the Board of Directors.

(d) REMOVAL OF SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Any member of senior management may be removed—

(1) by a majority of the voting members of the Board of Directors at the request of the chief executive officer; or

(2) by a vote of not fewer than 5 voting members of the Board of Directors.

(e) SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member of senior management shall report directly to the chief executive officer, other than the chief risk officer, who shall report directly to the Board of Directors.

(2) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—The chief risk officer shall be responsible for all functions of IFA relating to—

(A) the creation of financial, credit, and operational risk management guidelines and policies;

(B) the establishment of guidelines to ensure diversification of lending activities by region, infrastructure project type, and project size;

(C) the creation of conforming standards for infrastructure finance agreements;

(D) the monitoring of the financial, credit, and operational exposure of IFA; and

(E) risk management and mitigation actions, including by reporting those actions, or recommendations of actions to be taken, directly to the Board of Directors.

(f) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—No individual appointed to senior management may—

(1) hold any other public office;

(2) have any financial interest in an eligible infrastructure project then being considered by the Board of Directors, unless that interest is placed in a blind trust; or

(3) have any financial interest in an investment institution or its affiliates, IFA or its affiliates, or other entity then seeking or likely to seek financial assistance for any eligible infrastructure project from IFA, unless any such interest is placed in a blind trust during the term of service of that individual in a senior management position, and for a period of 2 years thereafter.

SEC. 316. OFFICE OF TECHNICAL AND RURAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The chief executive officer shall create and manage within IFA an office, to be known as the ''Office of Technical and Rural Assistance''.

(b) DUTIES.—The Office of Technical and Rural Assistance shall—

(1) in consultation with the Secretary, the Secretary of Transportation, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, as determined by the chief executive officer, provide technical assistance to State and local governments and parties in public-private partnerships in the development and financing of eligible infrastructure projects, including rural infrastructure projects;

(2) assist the entities described in paragraph (1) with coordinating loan and loan guarantee programs available through Federal agencies, including the Department of Transportation and other Federal agencies as appropriate; and

(3) work with the entities described in paragraph (1) to identify and develop a pipeline of projects suitable for financing through innovative project financing and performance based project delivery, including those projects with the potential for financing through IFA.

SEC. 317. SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IFA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INITIAL PERIOD.—For the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Treasury shall serve as the Special Inspector General for IFA in addition to the existing duties of the Inspector General of the Department of Treasury.

(2) OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the day that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, there is established the Office of the Special Inspector General for IFA.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL; REMOVAL.—

(1) HEAD OF OFFICE.—The head of the Office of the Special Inspector General for IFA

shall be the Special Inspector General for IFA, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) BASIS OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of the Special Inspector General shall be made on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

(3) TIMING OF NOMINATION.—The nomination of an individual as Special Inspector General shall be made as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) REMOVAL.—The Special Inspector General shall be removable from office in accordance with the provisions of section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of section 7324 of title 5, United States Code, the Special Inspector General shall not be considered an employee who determines policies to be pursued by the United States in the nationwide administration of Federal law.

(6) RATE OF PAY.—The annual rate of basic pay of the Special Inspector General shall be the annual rate of basic pay for an Inspector General under section 3(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) DUTIES.—The Special Inspector General shall—

(1) conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations of the business activities of IFA;

(2) establish, maintain, and oversee such systems, procedures, and controls as the Special Inspector General considers appropriate to discharge the duty under paragraph (1); and

(3) carry out any other duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties specified in subsection (c), the Special Inspector General shall have the authorities set forth in section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The Special Inspector General shall carry out the duties specified in subsection (c)(1) in accordance with section 4(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(e) PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND OTHER RESOURCES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL OFFICERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Special Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the duties of the Special Inspector General, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(B) EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Special Inspector General may exercise the authorities under subsections (b) through (i) of section 3161 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to subsection (a) of that section).

(2) RETENTION OF SERVICES.—The Special Inspector General may obtain services as authorized under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate prescribed for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of such title.

(3) ABILITY TO CONTRACT FOR AUDITS, STUDIES, AND OTHER SERVICES.—The Special Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, and make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Special Inspector General.

(4) REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of the Special Inspector General for information or assistance from any department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government, the head of that entity shall, insofar as is practicable and not in contravention of any existing law, furnish the information or assistance to the Special Inspector General or an authorized designee.

(B) REFUSAL TO COMPLY.—If information or assistance requested by the Special Inspector General is, in the judgment of the Special Inspector General, unreasonably refused or not provided, the Special Inspector General shall report the circumstances to the Secretary, without delay.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Special Inspector General is confirmed, and every calendar year thereafter, the Special Inspector General shall submit a report to the President and to appropriate committees of Congress that summarizes the activities of the Special Inspector General during the 1-year period ending on the date of that report.

(2) PUBLIC DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information that is—

(A) specifically prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law;

(B) specifically required by Executive order to be protected from disclosure in the interest of national defense or national security or in the conduct of foreign affairs; or

(C) a part of an ongoing criminal investigation.

SEC. 318. OTHER PERSONNEL.

(a) APPOINTMENT, REMOVAL, AND DEFINITION OF DUTIES.—Except as otherwise provided in the IFA bylaws, the chief executive officer, in consultation with the Board of Directors, shall appoint, remove, and define the duties of such qualified personnel as are necessary to carry out the powers, duties, and purpose of IFA, other than senior management, who shall be appointed in accordance with section 315.

(b) COORDINATION IN IDENTIFYING QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERTISE.—In appointing qualified personnel under subsection (a), the chief executive officer shall coordinate with, and seek assistance from, the Secretary of Transportation in identifying the appropriate qualifications and expertise in infrastructure project finance.

SEC. 319. COMPLIANCE.

The provision of assistance by IFA under this title does not supersede any provision of State law or regulation otherwise applicable to an eligible infrastructure project.

Subtitle B—Terms and Limitations on Direct Loans and Loan Guarantees

SEC. 321. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR ASSISTANCE FROM IFA AND TERMS AND LIMITATIONS OF LOANS.

(a) PUBLIC BENEFIT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any project the use or purpose of which is private and for which no public benefit is created, as determined by the Board of Directors, shall not be eligible for financial assistance from IFA under this title.

(2) CRITERIA.—Financial assistance under this title shall only be made available if the applicant for assistance has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Board of Directors that—

(A) the eligible infrastructure project for which assistance is being sought—

(i) is not for the refinancing of an existing infrastructure project; and

(ii) meets—

(I) any pertinent requirements set forth in this title;

(II) any criteria established by the Board of Directors or chief executive officer in accordance with this title; and

(III) the definition of an eligible infrastructure project; and

(B) for projects involving public-private partnerships, the project has received contributed capital or commitments for contributed capital equal to not less than 10 percent of the total cost of the eligible infrastructure project for which assistance is being sought, if such contributed capital includes—

(i) equity;

(ii) deeply subordinate loans or other credit and debt instruments, which shall be junior to any IFA assistance provided for the project;

(iii) appropriated funds or grants from governmental sources other than the Federal Government; or

(iv) irrevocable private contributions of funds, grants, property (including rights-of way), and other assets that directly reduce or offset project costs.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The criteria established by the Board of Directors under this title shall provide adequate consideration of—

(1) the economic, financial, technical, environmental, and public benefits and costs of each eligible infrastructure project under consideration for financial assistance under this title, prioritizing eligible infrastructure projects that—

(A) demonstrate a clear and measurable public benefit;

(B) offer value for money to taxpayers;

(C) contribute to regional or national economic growth;

(D) lead to long-term job creation; and

(E) mitigate environmental concerns;

(2) the means by which development of the eligible infrastructure project under consideration is being financed, including—

(A) the terms, conditions, and structure of the proposed financing;

(B) the creditworthiness and standing of the project sponsors, providers of equity, and cofinanciers;

(C) the financial assumptions and projections on which the eligible infrastructure project is based; and

(D) whether there is sufficient State or municipal political support for the successful completion of the eligible infrastructure project;

(3) the likelihood that the provision of assistance by IFA will cause the development to proceed more promptly and with lower costs for financing than would be the case without IFA assistance;

(4) the extent to which the provision of assistance by IFA maximizes the level of private investment in the eligible infrastructure project or supports a public-private partnership, while providing a significant public benefit;

(5) the extent to which the provision of assistance by IFA can mobilize the participation of other financing partners in the eligible infrastructure project;

(6) the technical and operational viability of the eligible infrastructure project;

(7) the proportion of financial assistance from IFA;

(8) the geographical location of the project, prioritizing geographical diversity of projects funded by IFA;

(9) the size of the project and the impact of the project on the resources of IFA; and

(10) the infrastructure sector of the project, prioritizing projects from more than 1 sector funded by IFA.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any eligible entity seeking assistance from IFA under this title for an eligible infrastructure project shall submit an application to IFA at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Board of Directors or the chief executive officer may require.

(2) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—IFA shall review applications for assistance under this title on an ongoing basis.

(B) PREPARATION.—The chief executive officer, in cooperation with the senior management, shall prepare eligible infrastructure projects for review and approval by the Board of Directors.

(3) DEDICATED REVENUE SOURCES.—The Federal credit instrument shall be repayable, in whole or in part, from tolls, user fees, or other dedicated revenue sources derived from users or beneficiaries that also secure the eligible infrastructure project obligations.

(d) ELIGIBLE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), to be eligible for assistance under this title, an eligible infrastructure project shall have project costs that are reasonably anticipated to equal or exceed $50,000,000.

(2) RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—To be eligible for assistance under this title a rural infrastructure project shall have project costs that are reasonably anticipated to equal or exceed $10,000,000.

(e) LOAN ELIGIBILITY AND MAXIMUM AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a direct loan or loan guarantee under this title shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) 49 percent of the reasonably anticipated eligible infrastructure project costs; and

(B) the amount of the senior project obligations, if the direct loan or loan guarantee does not receive an investment grade rating.

(2) MAXIMUM ANNUAL LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE VOLUME.—The aggregate amount of direct loans and loan guarantees made by IFA shall not exceed—

(A) during the first 2 fiscal years of the operations of IFA, $10,000,000,000 per year;

(B) during fiscal years 3 through 9 of the operations of IFA, $20,000,000,000 per year; and

(C) during any fiscal year thereafter, $50,000,000,000.

SEC. 322. LOAN TERMS AND REPAYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A direct loan or loan guarantee under this title with respect to an eligible infrastructure project shall be on such terms, subject to such conditions, and contain such covenants, representations, warranties, and requirements (including requirements for audits) as the chief executive officer determines appropriate.

(b) TERMS.—A direct loan or loan guarantee under this title—

(1) shall—

(A) be payable, in whole or in part, from tolls, user fees, or other dedicated revenue sources derived from users or beneficiaries; and

(B) include a rate covenant, coverage requirement, or similar security feature supporting the project obligations; and

(2) may be secured by a lien—

(A) on the assets of the obligor, including revenues described in paragraph (1); and

(B) which may be subordinated to any other lien securing project obligations.

(c) BASE INTEREST RATE.—The base interest rate on a direct loan under this title shall be not less than the yield on Treasury obligations of a similar maturity to the maturity of the direct loan on the date of execution of the loan agreement.

(d) RISK ASSESSMENT.—Before entering into an agreement for assistance under this title, the chief executive officer, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and each rating agency providing a preliminary rating opinion letter under this section, shall determine an appropriate Federal credit subsidy amount for each direct loan and loan guarantee, taking into account that preliminary rating opinion letter and any comparable market rates available for such a loan or loan guarantee.

(e) CREDIT FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each agreement for assistance under this title, the chief executive officer shall charge a credit fee to the recipient of that assistance to pay for, over time, all or a portion of the Federal credit subsidy determined under subsection (d), with the remainder paid by the account established for IFA.

(2) DIRECT LOANS.—In the case of a direct loan, the credit fee described in paragraph (1) shall be in addition to the base interest rate established under subsection (c).

(f) MATURITY DATE.—The final maturity date of a direct loan or loan guaranteed by IFA under this title shall be not later than 35 years after the date of substantial completion of the eligible infrastructure project, as determined by the chief executive officer.

(g) PRELIMINARY RATING OPINION LETTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The chief executive officer shall require each applicant for assistance under this title to provide a preliminary rating opinion letter from at least 1 rating agency, indicating that the senior obligations of the eligible infrastructure project, which may be the Federal credit instrument, have the potential to achieve an investment-grade rating.

(2) RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—With respect to a rural infrastructure project, a rating agency opinion letter described in paragraph (1) shall not be required, except that the loan or loan guarantee shall receive an internal rating score, using methods similar to the rating agencies generated by IFA, measuring the proposed direct loan or loan guarantee against comparable direct loans or loan guarantees of similar credit quality in a similar sector.

(h) INVESTMENT-GRADE RATING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—The execution of a direct loan or loan guarantee under this title shall be contingent on the senior obligations of the eligible infrastructure project receiving an investment-grade rating.

(2) RATING OF IFA OVERALL PORTFOLIO.—The average rating of the overall portfolio of IFA shall be not less than investment grade after 5 years of operation.

(i) TERMS AND REPAYMENT OF DIRECT LOANS.—

(1) SCHEDULE.—The chief executive officer shall establish a repayment schedule for each direct loan under this title, based on the projected cash flow from eligible infrastructure project revenues and other repayment sources.

(2) COMMENCEMENT.—Scheduled loan repayments of principal or interest on a direct loan under this title shall commence not later than 5 years after the date of substantial completion of the eligible infrastructure project, as determined by the chief executive officer.

(3) DEFERRED PAYMENTS OF DIRECT LOANS.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—If, at any time after the date of substantial completion of an eligible infrastructure project assisted under this title, the eligible infrastructure project is unable to generate sufficient revenues to pay the scheduled loan repayments of principal and interest on the direct loan under this title, the chief executive officer may allow the obligor to add unpaid principal and interest to the outstanding balance of the direct loan, if the result would benefit the taxpayer.

(B) INTEREST.—Any payment deferred under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) continue to accrue interest, in accordance with the terms of the obligation, until fully repaid; and

(ii) be scheduled to be amortized over the remaining term of the loan.

(C) CRITERIA.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Any payment deferral under subparagraph (A) shall be contingent on the eligible infrastructure project meeting criteria established by the Board of Directors.

(ii) REPAYMENT STANDARDS.—The criteria established under clause (i) shall include standards for reasonable assurance of repayment.

(4) PREPAYMENT OF DIRECT LOANS.—

(A) USE OF EXCESS REVENUES.—Any excess revenues that remain after satisfying scheduled debt service requirements on the eligible infrastructure project obligations and direct loan and all deposit requirements under the terms of any trust agreement, bond resolution, or similar agreement securing project obligations under this title may be applied annually to prepay the direct loan, without penalty.

(B) USE OF PROCEEDS OF REFINANCING.—A direct loan under this title may be prepaid at any time, without penalty, from the proceeds of refinancing from non-Federal funding sources.

(j) LOAN GUARANTEES.—The terms of a loan guaranteed by IFA under this title shall be consistent with the terms set forth in this section for a direct loan, except that the rate on the guaranteed loan and any payment, prepayment, or refinancing features shall be negotiated between the obligor and the lender (as defined in section 601(a) of title 23, United States Code) with the consent of the chief executive officer.

(k) COMPLIANCE WITH FCRA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), direct loans and loan guarantees authorized under this title shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Section 504(b) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661c(b)) shall not apply to a loan or loan guarantee under this title.

(l) POLICY OF CONGRESS.—It is the policy of Congress that IFA shall only make a direct loan or loan guarantee under this title if IFA determines that IFA is reasonably expected to recover the full amount of the direct loan or loan guarantee.

SEC. 323. COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CREDIT AGREEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each eligible entity that receives assistance under this title

shall enter into a credit agreement that requires such entity to comply with all applicable policies and procedures of IFA, in addition to all other provisions of the loan agreement.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAWS.—Each eligible entity that receives assistance under this title shall provide written assurance, in such form and manner and containing such terms as are to be prescribed by IFA, that the eligible infrastructure project will be performed in compliance with the requirements of all Federal laws that would otherwise apply to similar projects to which the United States is a party, or financed in whole or in part from Federal funds or in accordance with guarantees of a Federal agency or financed from funds obtained by pledge of any contract of a Federal agency to make a loan, grant, or annual contribution.

(c) IFA AUTHORITY ON NONCOMPLIANCE.—In any case in which an eligible entity that receives assistance under this title is materially out of compliance with the loan agreement, or any applicable policy or procedure of IFA, the Board of Directors may take action—

(1) to cancel unused loan amounts; or

(2) to accelerate the repayment terms of any outstanding obligation.

SEC. 324. AUDITS; REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.

(a) ACCOUNTING.—The books of account of IFA shall be—

(1) maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; and

(2) subject to an annual audit by independent public accountants of nationally recognized standing appointed by the Board of Directors.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Not later than 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year, the Board of Directors shall submit to the President and Congress a complete and detailed report with respect to the preceding fiscal year, setting forth—

(A) a summary of the operations of IFA for that fiscal year;

(B) a schedule of the obligations of IFA and capital securities outstanding at the end of that fiscal year, with a statement of the amounts issued and redeemed or paid during that fiscal year;

(C) the status of eligible infrastructure projects receiving funding or other assistance under this title during that fiscal year, including—

(i) all nonperforming loans; and

(ii) disclosure of all entities with a development, ownership, or operational interest in those eligible infrastructure projects;

(D) a description of the successes and challenges encountered in lending to rural communities, including the role of the Office of Technical and Rural Assistance established under this title; and

(E) an assessment of the risks of the portfolio of IFA, which shall be prepared by an independent source.

(2) GAO EVALUATION.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of, and submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the activities of IFA for the fiscal years covered by the report that includes—

(A) an assessment of the impact and benefits of each funded eligible infrastructure project, including a review of how effectively each eligible infrastructure project accomplished the goals prioritized by the eligible infrastructure project criteria of IFA; and

(B) an evaluation of the effectiveness of, and challenges facing, loan programs at the Department of Transportation and Department of Energy, and an analysis of the advisability of consolidating those programs within IFA.

(3) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the status of actions taken to make IFA a self-sustaining entity, including providing recommendations for such legislative or administrative actions as the Comptroller General considers necessary for IFA to achieve self-sustaining status or to promote a greater likelihood of achieving such status.

(c) BOOKS AND RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—IFA shall maintain adequate books and records to support the financial transactions of IFA, with a description of financial transactions and eligible infrastructure projects receiving funding, and the amount of funding for each project maintained on a publically accessible database.

(2) AUDITS BY THE SECRETARY AND GAO.—The books and records of IFA shall at all times be open to inspection by the Secretary, the Special Inspector General, and the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 325. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this title affects or alters the responsibility of an eligible entity that receives assistance under this title to comply with applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations) relating to an eligible infrastructure project.

Subtitle C—Funding of IFA

SEC. 331. FEES.

The chief executive officer shall establish fees with respect to loans and loan guarantees under this title that—

(1) are sufficient to cover all the administrative costs to the Federal Government for the operations of IFA;

(2) may be in the form of an application or transaction fee, or interest rate adjustment; and

(3) may be based on the risk premium associated with the loan or loan guarantee, taking into consideration—

(A) the price of Treasury obligations of a similar maturity;

(B) prevailing market conditions;

(C) the ability of the eligible infrastructure project to support the loan or loan guarantee; and

(D) the total amount of the loan or loan guarantee.

SEC. 332. SELF-SUFFICIENCY OF IFA.

The chief executive officer shall, to the extent practicable, take actions consistent with this title to make IFA a self-sustaining entity, with administrative costs and Federal credit subsidy costs fully funded by fees and risk premiums on loans and loan guarantees.

SEC. 333. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to IFA to make direct loans and loan guarantees under this title $10,000,000,000—

(1) which shall remain available until expended;

(2) of which not more than $25,000,000 may be used for the administrative costs of IFA for each of the fiscal years 2014 and 2015; and

(3) of which not more than $50,000,000 may be used for the administrative costs of IFA for fiscal year 2016.

(b) INTEREST.—The amounts made available to IFA under this title shall be placed in interest-bearing accounts.

(c) RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—Of the amounts made available to IFA under this title, not less than 5 percent shall be used to offset subsidy costs associated with rural infrastructure projects.

SEC. 334. CONTRACT AUTHORITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, approval by the Board of Directors of a Federal credit instrument that uses funds made available under this title shall impose upon the United States a contractual obligation to fund the Federal credit investment.

SEC. 335. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.

IFA shall not have the authority to issue debt in its own name.

Subtitle D—Budgetary Effects

SEC. 341. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 3614. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—SOUTHERN ENERGY ACCESS JOBS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Southern Energy Access Jobs Act'' or the ''SEA Jobs Act''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(3) QUALIFIED REVENUES.—The term ''qualified revenues'' means all bonus bids, rentals and royalties (and other sums) due and payable to the United States from all leases entered into after the date of enactment of this Act that covers an area in the South Atlantic planning area.

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

(5) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term ''South Atlantic planning area'' means the area of the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)) that is located between the northern lateral seaward administrative boundary of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the southernmost lateral seaward administrative boundary of the State of Georgia.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any of the following States:

(A) Georgia.
(B) North Carolina.
(C) South Carolina.
(D) Virginia.

(7) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD.—The term ''workforce investment board'' means a State or local workforce investment board established under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.).

SEC. 203. ENHANCING STATE RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that establish management of the surface occupancy of each portion of the South Atlantic planning area for the applicable coastline of a State for any lease sale authorized under this title to the effect that—

(1) the applicable State shall have sole authority to restrict or allow surface facilities above the waterline for the purpose of production of oil or gas resources in any area that is within 12 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(2) unless permanent surface occupancy is authorized by a State, only sub-surface production facilities may be installed in areas that are located between the point that is 12 nautical miles from seaward from the coastline of the State and the point that is 20 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(3) new offshore production facilities are encouraged and the impacts on coastal vistas are minimized, to the maximum extent practical; and

(4) onshore facilities that facilitate the development and production of the oil and gas resources of the South Atlantic planning area within 12 nautical miles seaward of the coastline of a State are allowed.

(b) TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in the regulations described in subsection (a) shall restrict, or give the States authority to restrict, temporary surface activities related to operations associated with outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases.

SEC. 204. REINSTATEMENT OF VIRGINIA LEASE SALE 220.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct Lease Sale 220 (as described in the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement dated November 13, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 67201)).

SEC. 205. SOUTH CAROLINA LEASE SALE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the exclusion of the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2012–2017 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344), the Secretary shall conduct a lease sale not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act in areas off the coast of the State of South Carolina—

(1) determined by the Secretary to have the most geologically promising hydrocarbon resources; and

(2) that constitute not less than 25 percent of the leasable area located within the offshore administrative boundaries of the State of South Carolina depicted in the notice entitled ''Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Administrative Boundaries Extending from the Submerged Lands Act Boundary seaward to the Limit of the United States Outer Continental Shelf'', published January 3, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 127).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Secretary shall complete a multisale environmental impact statement for the lease sales conducted under subsection (a) and section 204.

SEC. 206. SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct 3 lease sales in the South Atlantic planning area before June 30, 2017, in areas—

(1) to be determined by the Secretary based on—

(A) analysis by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; and

(B) industry nomination; and

(2) determined by the Secretary to contain the most hydrocarbon resource potential.

(b) 2017–2022 LEASING PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall—

(1) include the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2017–2022 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344); and

(2) conduct 1 lease sale in the South Atlantic planning area during each year of the program, for a total of 5 lease sales.

SEC. 207. BALANCING OF MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In recognition that the outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced under the program are integral to national security, the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing lease sales under this title—

(1) to preserve the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through their continued use of the outer Continental Shelf; and

(2) to allow effective exploration, development, and production of the oil, gas, and renewable energy resources of the United States.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas on the outer Continental Shelf under a lease issued under this title that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with—

(1) the agreement entitled ''Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf'' signed July 20, 1983; and

(2) any revision or replacement for the agreement described in paragraph (1) that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which the exploration, development, or production is conducted.

SEC. 208. REVENUE SHARING AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338), each fiscal year the Secretary shall deposit—

(1) 37.5 percent of the qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary shall allocate amounts in accordance with section 209;

(2) 2.5 percent of the qualified revenues in the fund established by section 210(b)(1), from which the Secretary shall allocate amounts in accordance with that section;

(3) 10 percent of the qualified revenues dedicated towards deficit reduction; and

(4) 50 percent of the qualified revenues in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 209. ALLOCATION TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the qualified revenues deposited in the account under section 208(1), 37.5 percent shall be distributed to each State—

(1) using the formula established under subsection (b); and

(2) in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(b) FORMULA.—The formula used to make the calculation under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) established by the Secretary by regulation; and

(2) modeled after the final rule entitled ''Allocation and Disbursement of Royalties, Rentals, and Bonuses—Oil and Gas, Offshore'', dated December 23, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 78622).

(c) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Each State shall be entitled to an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the qualified revenues allocated under subsection (a).

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A State receiving amounts under this section may use the amounts in accordance with State law.

SEC. 210. VETERANS JOBS GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ''Oil and Gas Production Veterans Workforce Training Fund'' (referred to in this section as the ''Fund''), consisting of such amounts as are transferred to the Fund under section 208(2).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Fund shall be administered by the Secretary to fund the grants authorized by subsection (b).

(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible institutions of higher education and workforce investment boards to establish and fund oil and gas exploration, development, and production workforce training programs.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an institution of higher education or workforce investment board shall—

(A) establish or expand and administer an oil and gas exploration, development, and production workforce training program; and

(B) in granting admission to applicants to the program, give priority to veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(3) APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(4) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 0.5 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used to pay for the administrative expenses of the programs described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 211. ENHANCING GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL EDUCATION FOR AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall partner with institutions of higher education selected under subsection (c) to facilitate the practical study of geological and geophysical sciences of areas on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf and elsewhere on the Continental Shelf of the United States.

(b) FOCUS.—Activities conducted by institutions of higher education under this section shall focus all geological and geophysical scientific research on obtaining a better understanding of hydrocarbon potential in the South Atlantic Planning Area while fostering the study of the geological

and geophysical sciences at institutions of higher education in the United States.

(c) SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) NOMINATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Governor of each State may nominate for participation in a partnership—

(A) 1 institution of higher education located in the State; and

(B) 1 institution of higher education that is a historically Black college or university, as defined in section 631(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1132(a)) located in the State.

(2) PREFERENCE.—In making nominations under paragraph (1), each Governor shall give preference to those institutions of higher education that demonstrate a vigorous rate of admissions of veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States and meet the criteria described in paragraph (3).

(3) SELECTION.—The Director shall select as a partner any institution of higher education nominated under paragraph (1) that the Director determines demonstrates excellence in 1 or more of the following criteria:

(A) Geophysical sciences curriculum.

(B) Engineering curriculum.

(C) Information technology or other technical studies related to seismic research, including data processing.

(d) RESEARCH AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an institution of higher education selected under subsection (c)(3) may conduct research under this section upon the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date the institution of higher education submits notice of the research to the South Atlantic Regional Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

(2) PERMIT REQUIRED.—An institution of higher education may not under this section conduct research that uses solid or liquid explosives except as authorized by a permit issued by the Director.

(e) DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Geological and geophysical activities conducted under this section—

(A) shall be considered scientific research and data produced by the activities;

(B) shall not be used or shared for commercial purposes;

(C) shall not be produced for proprietary use or sale; and

(D) shall be made available by the Director to the public.

(2) SUBMISSION OF DATA TO BOEM.—Not later than 60 days after completion of initial analysis of data collected under this section by an institution of higher education selected under subsection (c)(3), the institution of higher education shall share with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management any data collected that is requested by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

(3) FEES.—The Director may not charge any fee for the provision of data produced in research under this section, other than a data reprocessing fee to pay the cost of duplicating the data.

(f) REPORT.—Not less frequently than once every 180 days, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the data derived from partnerships under this section.

SEC. 212. ATLANTIC REGIONAL OFFICE.

Not later than the last day of the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2012–2017 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344), the Director shall establish an Atlantic regional office in an area that is—

(1) included in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2017–2022 prepared under section 18 of that Act; and

(2) determined by the Director to have the most potential resource development.

SA 3615. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—NATIONAL REGULATORY BUDGET ACT

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Regulatory Budget Act of 2014''.

SEC. __02. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 6 the following:

''CHAPTER 6A—NATIONAL REGULATORY BUDGET AND OFFICE OF REGULATORY ANALYSIS

''§ 613. Definitions

''In this chapter—

''(1) the term 'aggregate costs', with respect to a covered Federal rule, means the sum of—

''(A) the direct costs of the covered Federal rule; and

''(B) the regulatory costs of the covered Federal rule;

''(2) the term 'covered Federal rule' means—

''(A) a rule (as defined in section 551);

''(B) an information collection requirement given a control number by the Office of Management and Budget; or

''(C) guidance or a directive that—

''(i) is not described in subparagraph (A) or (B);

''(ii)(I) is mandatory in its application to regulated entities; or

''(II) represents a statement of agency position that regulated entities would reasonably construe as reflecting the enforcement or litigation position of the agency; and

''(iii) imposes not less than $25,000,000 in annual costs on regulated entities;

''(3) the term 'direct costs' means—

''(A) expenditures made by an Executive branch agency that relate to the promulgation, administration, or enforcement of a covered Federal rule; or

''(B) costs incurred by an Executive branch agency, a Government corporation, the United States Postal Service, or any other instrumentality of the Federal Government because of a covered Federal rule;

''(4) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Regulatory Analysis established under section 614(b);

''(5) the term 'Executive branch agency' means—

''(A) an Executive department (as defined in section 101); and

''(B) an independent establishment (as defined in section 104);

''(6) the term 'regulated entity' means—

''(A) a for-profit private sector entity (including an individual who is in business as a sole proprietor);

''(B) a not-for-profit private sector entity; or

''(C) a State or local government; and

''(7) the term 'regulatory costs' means all costs incurred by a regulated entity because of covered Federal rules.

''§ 614. Office of Regulatory Analysis; establishment; powers

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch an independent establishment to be known as the 'Office of Regulatory Analysis'.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Regulatory Analysis a Director, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) TERM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term of office of the Director shall—

''(i) be 4 years; and

''(ii) expire on the last day of February following each Presidential election.

''(B) APPOINTMENTS PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF TERM.—Subject to subparagraph (C), an individual appointed as Director to fill a vacancy prior to the expiration of a term shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term.

''(C) SERVICE UNTIL APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR.—An individual serving as Director at the expiration of a term may continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

''(3) POWERS.—

''(A) APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director may appoint Deputy Directors, officers, and employees, including attorneys, in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53.

''(ii) TERM OF DEPUTY DIRECTORS.—A Deputy Director shall serve until the expiration of the term of office of the Director who appointed the Deputy Director (and until a successor to that Director is appointed), unless sooner removed by the Director.

''(B) CONTRACTING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director may contract for financial and administrative services (including those related to budget and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) with the General Services Administration, or such other Federal agency as the Director determines appropriate, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Office of Regulatory Analysis in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Director and the head of the Federal agency providing the services.

''(ii) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Contract authority under clause (i) shall be effective for any fiscal year only to the extent that appropriations are available for that purpose.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Regulatory Analysis for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Office of Regulatory Analysis to carry out its duties and functions.

"§ 615. Functions of Office of Regulatory Analysis; Executive branch agency compliance

''(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 30 of each year, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a Report on National Regulatory Costs (referred to in this section as the 'Report') that includes the information specified under paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each Report shall include—

''(A) an estimate, for the fiscal year during which the Report is submitted and for the preceding fiscal year, of—

''(i) the regulatory costs imposed by each Executive branch agency on regulated entities;

''(ii) the aggregate costs imposed by each Executive branch agency;

''(iii) the aggregate costs imposed by all Executive branch agencies combined;

''(iv) the direct costs incurred by the Federal Government because of covered Federal rules issued by each Executive branch agency;

''(v) the sum of the costs described in clauses (iii) and (iv);

''(vi) the regulatory costs imposed by each Executive branch agency on small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions (as those terms are defined in section 601); and

''(vii) the sum of the costs described in clause (vi);

''(B) an analysis of any major changes in estimation methodology used by the Office of Regulatory Analysis since the previous annual report;

''(C) an analysis of any major estimate changes caused by improved or inadequate data since the previous annual report;

''(D) recommendations, both general and specific, regarding—

''(i) how regulations may be streamlined, simplified, and modernized;

''(ii) regulations that should be repealed; and

''(iii) how the Federal Government may reduce the costs of regulations without diminishing the effectiveness of regulations; and

''(E) any other information that the Director determines may be of assistance to Congress in determining the National Regulatory Budget required under section 617.

''(b) REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF NEW RULES.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall publish in the Federal Register and on the website of the Office of Regulatory Analysis a regulatory analysis of each proposed covered Federal rule issued by an Executive branch agency, and each proposed withdrawal or modification of a covered Federal rule by an Executive branch agency, that—

''(A) imposes costs on a regulated entity; or

''(B) reduces costs imposed on a regulated entity.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each regulatory analysis published under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) an estimate of the change in regulatory cost of each proposed covered Federal rule (or proposed withdrawal or modification of a covered Federal rule); and

''(B) any other information or recommendation that the Director may choose to provide.

''(3) TIMING OF REGULATORY ANALYSIS.—

''(A) INITIAL REGULATORY ANALYSIS.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Director receives a copy of a proposed covered Federal rule from the head of an Executive branch agency under paragraph (4), the Director shall publish an initial regulatory analysis.

''(B) REVISED REGULATORY ANALYSIS.—The Director may publish a revised regulatory analysis at any time.

''(4) NOTICE TO DIRECTOR OF PROPOSED COVERED FEDERAL RULE.—The head of an Executive branch agency shall provide a copy of each proposed covered Federal rule to the Director in a manner prescribed by the Director.

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a covered Federal rule may not take effect earlier than 75 days after the date on which the head of the Executive branch agency proposing the covered Federal rule submits a copy of the proposed covered Federal rule to the Director in the manner prescribed by the Director under subsection (b)(4).

''(2) EXCEPTION.—If the head of the Executive branch agency proposing a covered Federal rule determines that the public health or safety or national security requires that the covered Federal rule be promulgated earlier than the date specified under paragraph (1), the head of the Executive branch agency may promulgate the covered Federal rule without regard to paragraph (1).

"§ 616. Public disclosure of estimate methodology and data; privacy

''(a) PRIVACY.—The Director shall comply with all relevant privacy laws, including—

''(1) the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note);

''(2) section 9 of title 13; and

''(3) section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(b) DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Director shall disclose, by publication in the Federal Register and on the website of the Office of Regulatory Analysis, the methodology and data used to generate the estimates in the Report on National Regulatory Costs required under section 615.

''(2) GOAL OF DISCLOSURE.—In disclosing the methodology and data under paragraph (1), the Director shall seek to provide sufficient information so that outside researchers may replicate the results contained in the Report on National Regulatory Costs.

"§ 617. National Regulatory Budget; timeline

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'annual overall regulatory cost cap' means the maximum amount of regulatory costs that all Executive branch agencies combined may impose in a fiscal year;

''(2) the term 'annual agency regulatory cost cap' means the maximum amount of regulatory costs that an Executive branch agency may impose in a fiscal year; and

''(3) the term 'National Regulatory Budget' means an Act of Congress that establishes, for a fiscal year—

''(A) the annual overall regulatory cost cap; and

''(B) an annual agency regulatory cost cap for each Executive branch agency.

''(b) COMMITTEE DEADLINES.—

''(1) REFERRAL.—Not later than March 31 of each year—

''(A) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate shall refer to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a bill that sets forth a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year; and

''(B) the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives shall refer to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a bill that sets forth a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year.

''(2) REPORTING.—Not later than May 31 of each year—

''(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report a bill establishing a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year; and

''(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives shall report a bill establishing a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year.

''(c) PASSAGE.—Not later than July 31 of each year, the House of Representatives and the Senate shall each pass a bill establishing a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year.

''(d) PRESENTMENT.—Not later than September 15 of each year, Congress shall pass and present to the President a National Regulatory Budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of that year.

''(e) DEFAULT BUDGET.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a National Regulatory Budget is not enacted with respect to a fiscal year, the most recently enacted National Regulatory Budget shall apply to that fiscal year.

''(2) DEFAULT INITIAL BUDGET.—

''(A) CALCULATION.—If a National Regulatory Budget is not enacted with respect to a fiscal year, and no National Regulatory Budget has previously been enacted—

''(i) the annual agency regulatory cost cap for an Executive branch agency for the fiscal year shall be equal to the amount of regulatory costs imposed by that Executive branch agency on regulated entities during the preceding fiscal year, as estimated by the Director in the annual report submitted to Congress under section 615(a); and

''(ii) the annual overall regulatory cost cap for the fiscal year shall be equal to the sum of the amounts described in clause (i).

''(B) EFFECT.—For purposes of section 619, an annual agency regulatory cost cap described in subparagraph (A) that applies to a fiscal year shall have the same effect as if the annual agency regulatory cost cap were part of a National Regulatory Budget applicable to that fiscal year.

''(f) INITIAL BUDGET.—The first National Regulatory Budget shall be with respect to fiscal year 2016.

"§ 618. Executive branch agency cooperation mandatory; information sharing

''(a) EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCY COOPERATION MANDATORY.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Director requests any information from an Executive branch agency, the Executive branch agency shall provide the Director with the information.

''(b) MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING CONFIDENTIALITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An Executive branch agency may require the Director to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the confidentiality of information

provided by the Executive branch agency to the Director under subsection (a) as a condition precedent to providing any requested information.

''(2) DEGREE OF CONFIDENTIALITY OR DATA PROTECTION.—An Executive branch agency may not require a greater degree of confidentiality or data protection from the Director in a memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1) than the Executive branch agency itself must adhere to.

''(3) SCOPE.—A memorandum of understanding entered into by the Director and an Executive branch agency under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) be general in scope; and

''(B) govern all pending and future requests made to the Executive branch agency by the Director.

''(c) SANCTIONS FOR NON-COOPERATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The appropriations of an Executive branch agency for a fiscal year shall be reduced by one-half of 1 percent if, during that fiscal year, the Director finds that—

''(A) the Executive branch agency has failed to timely provide information that the Director requested under subsection (a);

''(B) the Director has provided notice of the failure described in subparagraph (A) to the Executive branch agency;

''(C) the Executive branch agency has failed to cure the failure described in subparagraph (A) within 30 days of being notified under subparagraph (B); and

''(D) the information that the Director requested under subsection (a)—

''(i) is in the possession of the Executive branch agency; or

''(ii) may reasonably be developed by the Executive branch agency.

''(2) SEQUESTRATION.—The Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Office of Federal Financial Management and Financial Management Service, shall enforce a reduction in appropriations under paragraph (1) by sequestering the appropriate amount of funds and returning the funds to the Treasury.

''(3) APPEALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may reduce the amount of, or except as provided in subparagraph (B), waive, a sanction imposed under paragraph (1) if the Director of the Office of Management and Budget finds that—

''(i) the sanction is unwarranted;

''(ii) the sanction is disproportionate to the gravity of the failure;

''(iii) the failure has been cured; or

''(iv) providing the requested information would adversely affect national security.

''(B) NO WAIVER FOR HISTORICALLY NON-COMPLIANT AGENCIES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may not waive a sanction imposed on an Executive branch agency under paragraph (1) if the Executive branch agency has a history of non-compliance with requests for information by the Director of the Office of Regulatory Analysis under subsection (a).

''(d) NATIONAL SECURITY.—The Director may not require an Executive branch agency to provide information under subsection (a) that would adversely affect national security.

''§ 619. Enforcement

''(a) EXCEEDING ANNUAL AGENCY REGULATORY COST CAP.—An Executive branch agency that exceeds the annual agency regulatory cost cap imposed by the National Regulatory Budget for a fiscal year may not promulgate a new covered Federal rule that increases regulatory costs until the Executive branch agency no longer exceeds the annual agency regulatory cost cap imposed by the applicable National Regulatory Budget.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF DIRECTOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An Executive branch agency may not promulgate a covered Federal rule unless the Director determines, in conducting the regulatory analysis of the covered Federal rule under section 615(b)(3)(A) that, after the Executive branch agency promulgates the covered Federal rule, the Executive branch agency will not exceed the annual agency regulatory cost cap for that Executive branch agency.

''(2) TIMING.—The Director shall make a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to a proposed covered Federal rule not later than 60 days after the Director receives a copy of the proposed covered Federal rule under section 615(b)(4).

''(c) EFFECT OF VIOLATION OF THIS SECTION.—

''(1) NO FORCE OR EFFECT.—A covered Federal rule that is promulgated in violation of this section shall have no force or effect.

''(2) JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT.—Any party may bring an action in a district court of the United States to declare that a covered Federal rule has no force or effect because the covered Federal rule was promulgated in violation of this section.

''§ 620. Regulatory Analysis Advisory Board

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD.—In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Director shall—

''(1) establish a Regulatory Analysis Advisory Board; and

''(2) appoint not fewer than 9 and not more than 15 individuals as members of the Regulatory Analysis Advisory Board.

''(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director shall appoint individuals with technical and practical expertise in economics, law, accounting, science, management, and other areas that will aid the Director in preparing the annual Report on National Regulatory Costs required under section 615.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters for part I of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 6 the following:

''6A. National Regulatory Budget and Office of Regulatory Analysis 613''.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Section 6103(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) OFFICE OF REGULATORY ANALYSIS.—Upon written request by the Director of the Office of Regulatory Analysis established under section 614 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall furnish to officers and employees of the Office of Regulatory Analysis return information for the purpose of, but only to the extent necessary for, an analysis of regulatory costs.''.

SEC. __03. REPORT ON DUPLICATIVE PERSONNEL; REPORT ON REGULATORY ANALYSIS.

(a) REPORT ON DUPLICATIVE PERSONNEL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, the Director shall submit to Congress a report determining positions in the Federal Government that are—

(1) duplicative of the work performed by the Office of Regulatory Analysis established under section 614 of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) otherwise rendered cost ineffective by the work of the Office of Regulatory Analysis.

(b) REPORT ON REGULATORY ANALYSIS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than June 30, 2015, the Director shall provide to Congress a report analyzing the practice with respect to, and the effectiveness of—

(A) chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Regulatory Flexibility Act'');

(B) the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note);

(C) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act'');

(D) each Executive order that mandates economic analysis of Federal regulations; and

(E) Office of Management and Budget circulars, directives, and memoranda that mandate the economic analysis of Federal regulation.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations about how Federal regulatory analysis may be improved.

SEC. __04. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.

(a) DEFINITION OF ''RULE''.—Section 551(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''requirements of an agency'' the following: '', whether or not the agency statement amends the Code of Federal Regulations and including, without limitation, a statement described by the agency as a regulation, rule, directive, or guidance,''.

(b) NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—Section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended, following the flush text, in subparagraph (A) by striking ''interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or''.

SA 3616. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''income and gains derived from the exploration'' and inserting ''income and gains derived from the following:

''(i) MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.—The exploration'',

(2) by inserting ''or'' before ''industrial source'',

(3) by inserting a period after ''carbon dioxide'', and

(4) by striking '', or the transportation or storage'' and all that follows and inserting the following:

''(ii) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

''(iii) ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

''(iv) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

''(v) RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

''(vi) WASTE HEAT TO POWER.—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act).

''(vii) RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

''(viii) RENEWABLE FUELS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act) or section 40A(d)(1).

''(ix) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

''(x) ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.—The audit and installation through contract or other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

''(xi) GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project's total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

''(xii) CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.—The generation or storage of electric power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).''.

(b) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—The term 'renewable chemical' means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 3617. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—ELIMINATING IMPROPER AND ABUSIVE IRS AUDITS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Eliminating Improper and Abusive IRS Audits Act of 2014''.

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

SEC. 202. CIVIL DAMAGES ALLOWED FOR RECKLESS OR INTENTIONAL DISREGARD OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—Section 7433(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$1,000,000 ($100,000, in the case of negligence)'' and inserting ''$3,000,000 ($300,000, in the case of negligence)''.

(b) EXTENSION OF TIME TO BRING ACTION.—Section 7433(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''5 years''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions of employees of the Internal Revenue Service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN OFFENSES BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN CONNECTION WITH REVENUE LAWS.

(a) INCREASE IN PENALTY.—Section 7214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$10,000'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''$25,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$5,000'' in subsection (b) and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO CIVIL DAMAGES FOR UNAUTHORIZED INSPECTION OR DISCLOSURE OF RETURNS AND RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 7431(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to inspections and disclosure occurring on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONTESTING IRS LEVY.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEVY.—Subsection (b) of section 6343 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''9 months'' and inserting ''3 years''.

(b) PERIOD OF LIMITATION ON SUITS.—Subsection (c) of section 6532 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''9 months'' and inserting ''3 years'', and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''9-month'' and inserting ''3-year''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) levies made after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) levies made on or before such date if the 9-month period has not expired under section 6343(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (without regard to this section) as of such date.

SEC. 206. INCREASE IN MONETARY PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 7213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 207. BAN ON RAISING NEW ISSUES ON APPEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 7529. PROHIBITION ON INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RAISING NEW ISSUES IN AN INTERNAL APPEAL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing an appeal of any determination initially made by the Internal Revenue Service, the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals may not consider or decide any issue that is not within the scope of the initial determination.

''(b) CERTAIN ISSUES DEEMED OUTSIDE OF SCOPE OF DETERMINATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the following matters shall be considered to be not within the scope of a determination:

''(1) Any issue that was not raised in a notice of deficiency or an examiner's report which is the subject of the appeal.

''(2) Any deficiency in tax which was not included in the initial determination.

''(3) Any theory or justification for a tax deficiency which was not considered in the initial determination.

''(c) NO INFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO ISSUES RAISED BY TAXPAYERS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide any limitation in addition to any limitations in effect on the date of the enactment of this section on the right of a taxpayer to raise an issue, theory, or justification on an appeal from a determination initially made by the Internal Revenue Service that was not within the scope of the initial determination.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 7529. Prohibition on Internal Revenue Service raising new issues in an internal appeal.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to matters filed or pending with the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON ENFORCEMENT OF LIENS AGAINST PRINCIPAL RESIDENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7403(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''In any case'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any property used as the principal residence of the taxpayer (within the meaning of section 121) unless the Secretary of the Treasury makes a written determination that—

''(i) all other property of the taxpayer, if sold, is insufficient to pay the tax or discharge the liability, and

''(ii) such action will not create an economic hardship for the taxpayer.

''(B) DELEGATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of the Treasury may not delegate any responsibilities under subparagraph (A) to any person other than—

''(i) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or

''(ii) a district director or assistant district director of the Internal Revenue Service.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions filed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO MANDATORY TERMINATION FOR MISCONDUCT.

(a) TERMINATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR INAPPROPRIATE REVIEW OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.—Section 1203(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) in the case of any review of an application for tax-exempt status by an organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, developing or using any methodology that applies disproportionate scrutiny to any applicant based on the ideology expressed in the name or purpose of the organization.''.

(b) MANDATORY UNPAID ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR MISCONDUCT.—Paragraph (1) of Section 1203(c) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the Commissioner of Internal Revenue takes a personnel action other than termination for an act or omission described in subsection (b), the Commissioner shall place the employee on unpaid administrative leave for a period of not less than 30 days.''.

(c) LIMITATION ON ALTERNATIVE PUNISHMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 1203(c) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note) is amended by striking ''The Commissioner'' and inserting ''Except in the case of an act or omission described in subsection (b)(3)(A), the Commissioner''.

SEC. 210. EXTENSION OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT PROCEDURES TO SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7428(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C) and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) with respect to the initial classification or continuing classification of an organization described in section 501(c)(4) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to pleading filed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 211. REVIEW BY THE TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REVIEW.—Subsection (k)(1) of section 8D of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

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

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) shall—

''(i) review any criteria employed by the Internal Revenue Service to select tax returns (including applications for recognition of tax-exempt status) for examination or audit, assessment or collection of deficiencies, criminal investigation or referral, refunds for amounts paid, or any heightened scrutiny or review in order to determine whether the criteria discriminates against taxpayers on the basis of race, religion, or political ideology; and

''(ii) consult with the Internal Revenue Service on recommended amendments to such criteria in order to eliminate any discrimination identified pursuant to the review described in clause (i); and''; and

(4) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking ''and (C)'' and inserting ''(C), and (D)''.

(b) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) Any semiannual report made by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration that is required pursuant to section 5(a) shall include—

''(A) a statement affirming that the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration has reviewed the criteria described in subsection (k)(1)(D) and consulted with the Internal Revenue Service regarding such criteria; and

''(B) a description and explanation of any such criteria that was identified as discriminatory by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.''.

SA 3618. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Small Business Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2014''.

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

TITLE II—SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS

SEC. 202. MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS FOR AWARDING OF COSTS AND CERTAIN FEES.

(a) SMALL BUSINESSES ELIGIBLE WITHOUT REGARD TO NET WORTH.—Subparagraph (D) of section 7430(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting ''and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) in the case of an eligible small business, the net worth limitation in clause (ii) of such section shall not apply.''.

(b) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—Paragraph (4) of section 7430(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of subparagraph (D)(iii), the term 'eligible small business' means, with respect to any proceeding commenced in a taxable year—

''(i) a corporation the stock of which is not publicly traded,

''(ii) a partnership, or

''(iii) a sole proprietorship,

if the average annual gross receipts of such corporation, partnership, or sole proprietorship for the 3-taxable-year period preceding such taxable year does not exceed $50,000,000. For purposes of applying the test under the preceding sentence, rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 448(c) shall apply.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to proceedings commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. CIVIL DAMAGES ALLOWED FOR RECKLESS OR INTENTIONAL DISREGARD OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—Section 7433(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$1,000,000 ($100,000, in the case of negligence)'' and inserting ''$3,000,000 ($300,000, in the case of negligence)''.

(b) EXTENSION OF TIME TO BRING ACTION.—Section 7433(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''5 years''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions of employees of the Internal Revenue Service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN OFFENSES BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN CONNECTION WITH REVENUE LAWS.

(a) INCREASE IN PENALTY.—Section 7214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$10,000'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''$25,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$5,000'' in subsection (b) and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO CIVIL DAMAGES FOR UNAUTHORIZED INSPECTION OR DISCLOSURE OF RETURNS AND RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 7431(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to inspections and disclosure occurring on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. INTEREST ABATEMENT REVIEWS.

(a) FILING PERIOD FOR INTEREST ABATEMENT CASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 6404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''REVIEW OF DENIAL'' in the heading and inserting ''JUDICIAL REVIEW'', and

(B) by striking '' 'if such action is brought' '' and all that follows in paragraph (1) and inserting ''if such action is brought—

''(A) at any time after the earlier of—

''(i) the date of the mailing of the Secretary's final determination not to abate such interest, or

''(ii) the date which is 180 days after the date of the filing with the Secretary (in such form as the Secretary may prescribe) of a claim for abatement under this section, and

''(B) not later than the date which is 180 days after the date described in subparagraph (A)(i).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to claims for abatement of interest filed with the Secretary after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SMALL TAX CASE ELECTION FOR INTEREST ABATEMENT CASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 7463 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1),

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting '', and'', and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) a petition to the Tax court under section 6404(h) in which the amount of interest abatement sought does not exceed $50,000.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to—

(A) cases pending as of the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) cases commenced after such date of enactment.

SEC. 207. BAN ON EX PARTE DISCUSSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1001(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, the Internal Revenue Service shall prohibit any ex parte communications between officers in the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals and other Internal Revenue Service employees with respect to any matter pending before such officers.

(b) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT FOR MISCONDUCT.—Subject to subsection (c), the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall terminate the employment of any employee of the Internal Revenue Service if there is a final administrative or judicial determination that such employee committed any act or omission prohibited under subsection (a) in the performance of the employee's official duties. Such termination shall be a removal for cause on charges of misconduct.

(c) DETERMINATION OF COMMISSIONER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue may take a personnel action other than termination for an act prohibited under subsection (a).

(2) DISCRETION.—The exercise of authority under paragraph (1) shall be at the sole discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and may not be delegated to any other officer. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in his sole discretion, may establish a procedure which will be used to determine whether an individual should be referred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a determination by the Commissioner under paragraph (1).

(3) NO APPEAL.—Any determination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under this subsection may not be appealed in any administrative or judicial proceeding.

(d) TIGTA REPORTING OF TERMINATION OR MITIGATION.—Section 7803(d)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''or section 7 of the Small Business Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2014'' after ''1998''.

SEC. 208. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7123 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) AVAILABILITY OF DISPUTE RESOLUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (b)(1) and the pilot program established under subsection (b)(2) shall provide that a taxpayer may request mediation or arbitration in any case unless the Secretary has specifically excluded the type of issue involved in such case or the class of cases to which such case belongs as not appropriate for resolution under such subsection. The Secretary shall make any determination that excludes a type of issue or a class of cases public within 5 working days and provide an explanation for each determination.

''(2) INDEPENDENT MEDIATORS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (b)(1) shall provide the taxpayer an opportunity to elect to have the mediation conducted by an independent, neutral individual not employed by the Office of Appeals.

''(B) COST AND SELECTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any taxpayer making an election under subparagraph (A) shall be required—

''(I) to share the costs of such independent mediator equally with the Office of Appeals, and

''(II) to limit the selection of the mediator to a roster of recognized national or local neutral mediators.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i)(I) shall not apply to any taxpayer who is an individual or who was a small business in the preceding calendar year if such taxpayer had an adjusted gross income that did not exceed 250 percent of the poverty level, as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in the taxable year preceding the request.

''(iii) SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of clause (ii), the term 'small business' has the meaning given such term under section 41(b)(3)(D)(iii).

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF PROCESS.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (b)(1) and the pilot program established under subsection (b)(2) shall provide the opportunity to elect mediation or arbitration at the time when the case is first filed with the Office of Appeals and at any time before deliberations in the appeal commence.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONTESTING IRS LEVY.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEVY.—Subsection (b) of section 6343 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''9 months'' and inserting ''3 years''.

(b) PERIOD OF LIMITATION ON SUITS.—Subsection (c) of section 6532 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''9 months'' and inserting ''3 years'', and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''9-month'' and inserting ''3-year''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) levies made after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) levies made on or before such date if the 9-month period has not expired under section 6343(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (without regard to this section) as of such date.

SEC. 210. WAIVER OF INSTALLMENT AGREEMENT FEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6159 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) WAIVER OF INSTALLMENT AGREEMENT FEE.—The Secretary shall waive the fees imposed on installment agreements under this section for any taxpayer with an adjusted gross income that does not exceed 250 percent of the poverty level, as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and who has agreed to make payments under the installment agreement by electronic payment through a debit instrument.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 211. SUSPENSION OF RUNNING OF PERIOD FOR FILING PETITION OF SPOUSAL RELIEF AND COLLECTION CASES.

(a) PETITIONS FOR SPOUSAL RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) SUSPENSION OF RUNNING OF PERIOD FOR FILING PETITION IN TITLE 11 CASES.—In the case of a person who is prohibited by reason of a case under title 11, United States Code, from filing a petition under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to a final determination of relief under this section, the running of the period prescribed by such paragraph for filing such a petition with respect to such final determination shall be suspended for the period during which the person is so prohibited from filing such a petition, and for 60 days thereafter.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to petitions filed under section 6015(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) COLLECTION PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''appeal such determination to the Tax Court'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''petition the Tax Court for review of such determination'',

(B) by striking ''JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DETERMINATION'' in the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting ''PETITION FOR REVIEW BY TAX COURT'',

(C) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) SUSPENSION OF RUNNING OF PERIOD FOR FILING PETITION IN TITLE 11 CASES.—In the case of a person who is prohibited by reason of a case under title 11, United States Code, from filing a petition under paragraph (1) with respect to a determination under this section, the running of the period prescribed by such subsection for filing such a petition with respect to such determination shall be suspended for the period during which the person is so prohibited from filing such a petition, and for 30 days thereafter.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 6320 of such Code is amended by striking ''(2)(B)'' and inserting ''(3)(B)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to petitions filed under section 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 212. VENUE FOR APPEAL OF SPOUSAL RELIEF AND COLLECTION CASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 7482(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (E),

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting a comma, and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraphs:

''(G) in the case of a petition under section 6015(e), the legal residence of the petitioner, or

''(H) in the case of a petition under section 6320 or 6330—

''(i) the legal residence of the petitioner if the petitioner is an individual, and

''(ii) the principal place of business or principal office or agency if the petitioner is an entity other than an individual.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to petitions filed after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 213. INCREASE IN MONETARY PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 7213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 214. DE NOVO TAX COURT REVIEW OF CLAIMS FOR EQUITABLE INNOCENT SPOUSE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 6015(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''Any review of a determination by the Secretary with respect to a claim for equitable relief under subsection (f) shall be reviewed de novo by the Tax Court.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to petitions filed or pending before the Tax Court on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 215. BAN ON RAISING NEW ISSUES ON APPEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 7529. PROHIBITION ON INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RAISING NEW ISSUES IN AN INTERNAL APPEAL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing an appeal of any determination initially made by the Internal Revenue Service, the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals may not consider or decide any issue that is not within the scope of the initial determination.

''(b) CERTAIN ISSUES DEEMED OUTSIDE OF SCOPE OF DETERMINATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the following matters shall be considered to be not within the scope of a determination:

''(1) Any issue that was not raised in a notice of deficiency or an examiner's report which is the subject of the appeal.

''(2) Any deficiency in tax which was not included in the initial determination.

''(3) Any theory or justification for a tax deficiency which was not considered in the initial determination.

''(c) NO INFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO ISSUES RAISED BY TAXPAYERS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide any limitation in addition to any limitations in effect on the date of the enactment of this section on the right of a taxpayer to raise an issue, theory, or justification on an appeal from a determination initially made by the Internal Revenue Service that was not within the scope of the initial determination.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 7529. Prohibition on Internal Revenue Service raising new issues in an internal appeal.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to matters filed or pending with the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3619. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF UNEARNED INCOME MEDICARE CONTRIBUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 2A.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3620. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER ON LEGISLATION THAT RAISES INCOME TAX RATES ON SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that includes any provision which increases Federal income tax rates.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Federal income tax rates'' means any rate of tax under—

(A) subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

(B) section 11(b) of such Code, or

(C) section 55(b) of such Code.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, dully chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 3621. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TAX EFFECT TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 102 the following:

''§ 102a. Tax effect transparency

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each Act of Congress, bill, resolution, conference report thereon, or amendment there to, that modifies Federal tax law shall contain a statement describing the general effect of the modification on Federal tax law.

''(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A failure to comply with subsection (a) shall give rise to a point of order in either House of Congress, which may be raised by any Senator during consideration in the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives during consideration in the House of Representatives.

''(2) NONEXCLUSIVITY.—The availability of a point of order under this section shall not affect the availability of any other point of order.

''(c) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may raise a point of order that any matter is not in order under subsection (a).

''(2) WAIVER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may move to waive a point of order raised under paragraph (1) by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

''(B) PROCEDURES.—For a motion to waive a point of order under subparagraph (A) as to a matter—

''(i) a motion to table the point of order shall not be in order;

''(ii) all motions to waive one or more points of order under this section as to the matter shall be debatable for a total of not more than 1 hour, equally divided between the Senator raising the point of order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees; and

''(iii) a motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

''(d) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a Member of the House of Representatives makes a point of order under this section, the Chair shall put the

question of consideration with respect to the proposition of whether any statement made under subsection (a) was adequate or, in the absence of such a statement, whether a statement is required under subsection (a).

''(2) CONSIDERATION.—For a point of order under this section made in the House of Representatives—

''(A) the question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Member making the point of order and by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House of Representatives adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be;

''(B) in selecting the opponent, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should first recognize an opponent from the opposing party; and

''(C) the disposition of the question of consideration with respect to a measure shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this section with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

''(e) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—The provisions of this section are enacted by the Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

''102a. Tax effect transparency.''.

SA 3622. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL.

Section 18A of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 218a), as added by section 1511 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, is repealed.

SA 3623. Mr. CASEY (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 489, supporting the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week''; as follows:

In the ninth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''providing resources'' and insert ''support''.

SA 3624. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FEDERALISM IN MEDICAL MARIJUANA.

(a) STATE MEDICAL MARIJUANA LAWS.—Notwithstanding section 708 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 903) or any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enact and implement a law that authorizes the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of marijuana for medical use.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN PROSECUTIONS.—No prosecution may be commenced or maintained against any physician or patient for a violation of any Federal law (including regulations) that prohibits the conduct described in subsection (a) if the State in which the violation occurred has in effect a law described in subsection (a) before, on, or after the date on which the violation occurred, including—

(1) Alabama;
(2) Alaska;
(3) Arizona;
(4) California;
(5) Colorado;
(6) Connecticut;
(7) Delaware;
(8) the District of Columbia;
(9) Florida;
(10) Hawaii;
(11) Illinois;
(12) Iowa;
(13) Kentucky;
(14) Maine;
(15) Maryland;
(16) Massachusetts;
(17) Michigan;
(18) Minnesota;
(19) Mississippi;
(20) Missouri;
(21) Montana;
(22) Nevada;
(23) New Hampshire;
(24) New Jersey;
(25) New Mexico;
(26) Oregon;
(27) Rhode Island;
(28) South Carolina;
(29) Tennessee;
(30) Utah;
(31) Vermont;
(32) Washington; and
(33) Wisconsin.

SA 3625. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE I—ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH ELECTRONIC VERIFICATION

SEC. 11. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act''.

SEC. 12. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking ''Unless the Congress otherwise provides, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall terminate a pilot program on September 30, 2015.''.

SEC. 13. MANDATORY USE OF E-VERIFY.

(a) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 402(e)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each department and agency of the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', that conducts hiring in a State'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.''.

(b) FEDERAL CONTRACTORS; CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—Section 402(e) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) UNITED STATES CONTRACTORS.—Any person, employer, or other entity that enters into a contract with the Federal Government shall participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section.

''(3) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL EMPLOYERS.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(A) conduct an assessment of employers that are critical to the homeland security or national security needs of the United States;

''(B) designate and publish a list of employers and classes of employers that are deemed to be critical pursuant to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) require that critical employers designated pursuant to subparagraph (B) participate in E-Verify by complying with the terms and conditions set forth in this section not later than 30 days after the Secretary makes such designation.''.

(c) ALL EMPLOYERS.—Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) MANDATORY PARTICIPATION IN E-VERIFY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), all employers in the United States shall participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(2) USE OF CONTRACT LABOR.—Any employer who uses a contract, subcontract, or exchange to obtain the labor of an individual in the United States shall certify in such contract, subcontract, or exchange that the employer uses E-Verify. If such certification is not included in a contract, subcontract, or exchange, the employer shall be deemed to have violated paragraph (1).

''(3) INTERIM MANDATORY PARTICIPATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the date set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require any employer or class of employers to participate in E-Verify, with respect to all employees recruited, referred, or hired by such employer if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that the employer is or has been engaged in a material violation of section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 14 days before an employer or class of employers is required to begin participating in E-Verify pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide such employer or class of employers with—

''(i) written notification of such requirement; and

''(ii) appropriate training materials to facilitate compliance with such requirement.''.

SEC. 14. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(e)(5) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as redesignated by section 13(b)(1), is amended to read as follows:

''(5) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—If a person or other entity that is required to participate in E-Verify fails to comply with the requirements under this title with respect to an individual—

''(A) such failure shall be treated as a violation of section 274A(a)(1)(B) with respect to such individual; and

''(B) a rebuttable presumption is created that the person or entity has violated section 274A(a)(1)(A).''.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', subject to paragraph (10),'' after ''in an amount'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''not less than $250 and not more than $2,000'' and inserting ''not less than $2,500 and not more than $5,000'';

(iii) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000'' and inserting ''not less than $5,000 and not more than $10,000'';

(iv) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''not less than $3,000 and not more than $10,000'' and inserting ''not less than $10,000 and not more than $25,000''; and

(v) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) may require the person or entity to take such other remedial action as is appropriate.'';

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting '', subject to paragraphs (10) through (12),'' after ''in an amount'';

(ii) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$1,000'';

(iii) by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$25,000'';

(iv) by striking ''the size of the business of the employer being charged, the good faith of the employer'' and inserting ''the good faith of the employer being charged''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following: ''Failure by a person or entity to utilize the employment eligibility verification system as required by law, or providing information to the system that the person or entity knows or reasonably believes to be false, shall be treated as a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A).''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) EXEMPTION FROM PENALTY.—In the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (4)(A) with respect to a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A) or (a)(2) for hiring or continuation of employment or recruitment or referral by person or entity and in the case of imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (5) for a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) for hiring or recruitment or referral by a person or entity, the penalty otherwise imposed may be waived or reduced if the violator establishes that the violator acted in good faith.

''(11) AUTHORITY TO DEBAR EMPLOYERS FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a person or entity is determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be a repeat violator of paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of subsection (a), or is convicted of a crime under this section, such person or entity may be considered for debarment from the receipt of Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements in accordance with the debarment standards and pursuant to the debarment procedures set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(B) DOES NOT HAVE CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and such an person or entity does not hold a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall refer the matter to the Administrator of General Services to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

''(C) HAS CONTRACT, GRANT, AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General wishes to have a person or entity considered for debarment in accordance with this paragraph, and such person or entity holds a Federal contract, grant or cooperative agreement, the Secretary or Attorney General shall advise all agencies or departments holding a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with the person or entity of the Government's interest in having the person or entity considered for debarment, and after soliciting and considering the views of all such agencies and departments, the Secretary or Attorney General may waive the operation of this paragraph or refer the matter to any appropriate lead agency to determine whether to list the person or entity on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement, and if so, for what duration and under what scope.

''(D) REVIEW.—Any decision to debar a person or entity under in accordance with this paragraph shall be reviewable pursuant to part 9.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person or entity which engages in a pattern or practice of violations of subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be fined not more than $15,000 for each unauthorized alien with respect to which such a violation occurs, imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, or both, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Federal law relating to fine levels.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Attorney General'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

SEC. 15. PREEMPTION; LIABILITY.

Section 402 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) LIMITATION ON STATE AUTHORITY.—

''(1) PREEMPTION.—A State or local government may not prohibit a person or other entity from verifying the employment authorization of new hires or current employees through E-Verify.

''(2) LIABILITY.—A person or other entity that participates in E-Verify may not be held liable under any Federal, State, or local law for any employment-related action taken with respect to the wrongful termination of an individual in good faith reliance on information provided through E-Verify.''.

SEC. 16. EXPANDED USE OF E-VERIFY.

Section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) BEFORE HIRING.—The person or other entity may verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify before the individual is hired, recruited, or referred if the individual consents to such verification. If an employer receives a tentative nonconfirmation for an individual, the employer shall comply with procedures prescribed by the Secretary, including—

''(I) providing the individual employees with private, written notification of the finding and written referral instructions;

''(II) allowing the individual to contest the finding; and

''(III) not taking adverse action against the individual if the individual chooses to contest the finding.

''(ii) AFTER EMPLOYMENT OFFER.—The person or other entity shall verify the employment eligibility of an individual through E-Verify not later than 3 days after the date of the hiring, recruitment, or referral, as the case may be.

''(iii) EXISTING EMPLOYEES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Secretary shall require all employers to use E-Verify to verify the identity and employment eligibility of any individual who has not been previously verified by the employer through E-Verify.''.

SEC. 17. REVERIFICATION.

Section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REVERIFICATION.—Each person or other entity participating in E-Verify shall use the E-Verify confirmation system to reverify the work authorization of any individual not later than 3 days after the date on which such individual's employment authorization is scheduled to expire (as indicated by the Secretary or the documents provided to the employer pursuant to section 274A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(b))), in accordance with the procedures set forth in this subsection and section 402.''.

SEC. 18. HOLDING EMPLOYERS ACCOUNTABLE.

(a) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—Section 403(a)(4)(C) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF NONCONFIRMATION.—

''(i) TERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—If the person or other entity receives a final nonconfirmation regarding an individual, the employer shall immediately—

''(I) terminate the employment, recruitment, or referral of the individual; and

''(II) submit to the Secretary any information relating to the individual that the Secretary determines would assist the Secretary in enforcing or administering United States immigration laws.

''(ii) CONSEQUENCE OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.—If the person or other entity continues to employ, recruit, or refer the individual after receiving final nonconfirmation, a rebuttable presumption is created that the employer has violated section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).''.

(b) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—Section 405 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) INTERAGENCY NONCONFIRMATION REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall submit a weekly report to the Assistant Secretary of Immigration and Customs Enforcement that includes, for each individual who receives final nonconfirmation through E-Verify—

''(A) the name of such individual;

''(B) his or her Social Security number or alien file number;

''(C) the name and contact information for his or her current employer; and

''(D) any other critical information that the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(2) USE OF WEEKLY REPORT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall use information provided under paragraph (1) to enforce compliance of the United States immigration laws.''.

SEC. 19. INFORMATION SHARING.

The Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly establish a program to share information among such agencies that may or could lead to the identification of unauthorized aliens (as defined under section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act), including any no-match letter and any information in the earnings suspense file.

SEC. 20. FORM I–9 PROCESS.

Not later than 9 months after date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that contains recommendations for—

(1) modifying and simplifying the process by which employers are required to complete and retain a Form I–9 for each employee pursuant to section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a); and

(2) eliminating the process described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 21. ALGORITHM.

Section 404(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF SYSTEM.—E-Verify shall be designed and operated—

''(1) to maximize its reliability and ease of use by employers;

''(2) to insulate and protect the privacy and security of the underlying information;

''(3) to maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information;

''(4) to respond accurately to all inquiries made by employers on whether individuals are authorized to be employed;

''(5) to register any times when E-Verify is unable to receive inquiries;

''(6) to allow for auditing use of the system to detect fraud and identify theft;

''(7) to preserve the security of the information in all of the system by—

''(A) developing and using algorithms to detect potential identity theft, such as multiple uses of the same identifying information or documents;

''(B) developing and using algorithms to detect misuse of the system by employers and employees;

''(C) developing capabilities to detect anomalies in the use of the system that may indicate potential fraud or misuse of the system; and

''(D) auditing documents and information submitted by potential employees to employers, including authority to conduct interviews with employers and employees;

''(8) to confirm identity and work authorization through verification of records maintained by the Secretary, other Federal departments, States, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or an outlying possession of the United States, as determined necessary by the Secretary, including—

''(A) records maintained by the Social Security Administration;

''(B) birth and death records maintained by vital statistics agencies of any State or other jurisdiction in the United States;

''(C) passport and visa records (including photographs) maintained by the Department of State; and

''(D) State driver's license or identity card information (including photographs) maintained by State department of motor vehicles;

''(9) to electronically confirm the issuance of the employment authorization or identity document; and

''(10) to display the digital photograph that the issuer placed on the document so that the employer can compare the photograph displayed to the photograph on the document presented by the employee or, in exceptional cases, if a photograph is not available from the issuer, to provide for a temporary alternative procedure, specified by the Secretary, for confirming the authenticity of the document.''.

SEC. 22. IDENTITY THEFT.

Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by striking ''of another person'' and inserting ''that is not his or her own''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) to facilitate or assist in harboring or hiring unauthorized workers in violation of section 274, 274A, or 274C of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324, 1324a, and 1324c).''.

SEC. 23. SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) SMALL BUSINESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of the Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act, the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall establish a demonstration program that assists small businesses in rural areas or areas without internet capabilities to verify the employment eligibility of newly hired employees solely through the use of publicly accessible internet terminals.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, July 30, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 1049 and H.R. 2166, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes;

S. 1437, to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon;

S. 1554, to direct the heads of Federal public land management agencies to prepare reports on the availability of public access and egress to Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide funding for recreational public access to Federal land, and for other purposes;

S. 1605, for the relief of Michael G. Faber;

S. 1640, to facilitate planning, permitting, administration, implementation, and monitoring of pinyon-juniper dominated landscape restoration projects within Lincoln County, Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 1888 and H.R. 1241, to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System land in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 2123, to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Minnesota;

S. 2616, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1684, to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and for other purposes; and,

H.R. 3008, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Los Padres National Forest in California, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to John Assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Meghan Conklin (202)–224–8046 or John Assini (202)–224–9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Meeting the Challenges of Feeding America's School Children.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2:45 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Cruise Passenger Protection Act (S. 1340): Improving Consumer Protections for Cruise Passengers.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Oversight Hearing: EPA's Proposed Carbon Pollution Standards for Existing Power Plants.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Indian Gaming: The Next 25 Years.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR–301 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The DISCLOSE Act (S. 2516) and the Need for Expanded Public Disclosure of Funds Raised and Spent to Influence Federal Elections.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Empowering Women Entrepreneurs: Understanding Successes, Addressing Persistent Challenges, and Identifying New Opportunities.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 11 a.m., in room S–219 of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''A More Efficient and Effective Government: The National Technical Information Service.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND IRS OVERSIGHT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Saving for an Uncertain Future: How the ABLE Act can Help People with Disabilities and their Families.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Rachel Kane, my intern, have privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 929, Harris, on Thursday, July 24, 2014, the Senate remain in executive session and consider Calendar No. 777, Disbrow; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to the vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. For the information of all Senators, we expect this nomination to be confirmed by voice vote.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 934 through 951 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Partrick J. Donahue, II

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Lee E. Payne

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Ricky N. Rupp

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Walter J. Lindsley

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John L. Gronski

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Mark A. Brown

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Roger W. Teague

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Commandant of the Marine Corps, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., sections 5043 and 601:

To be general

Joseph F. Dunford, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Joseph L. Votel

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. John F. Campbell

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. William E. Gortney

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James K. McLaughlin

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment as the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 3034:

To be general

Gen. Daniel B. Allyn

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Mark A. Milley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Sean B. MacFarland

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Lori J. Robinson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. Herbert J. Carlisle

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick B. Hodges

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1668 AIR FORCE nominations (364) beginning JOHN T. AALBORG, JR., and ending MICHAEL A. ZROSTLIK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2014.

PN1670 AIR FORCE nominations (62) beginning ROY G. ALLEN, III, and ending JOHN M. WILLIAMSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2014.

PN1860 AIR FORCE nomination of Mark D. Levin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1861 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CRAIG H. RHYNE, and ending DAVID E. VIZURRAGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1862 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning STEVEN E. KOEHL, and ending CHRISTOPHER YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

PN1817 ARMY nominations (5) beginning CURTIS L. ABENDROTH, and ending MICHAEL J. WISE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1818 ARMY nomination of Brian C. Copeland, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1819 ARMY nominations (3) beginning PAUL E. LINZEY, and ending GARY L. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1820 ARMY nominations (7) beginning JOEL R. BURKE, and ending MICHAEL J. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1821 ARMY nomination of Norman A. Hetzler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1822 ARMY nominations (2) beginning STEVEN F. FINDER, and ending DANIEL H. ALDANA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1823 ARMY nomination of Jason S. Hetzel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1824 ARMY nomination of Felipe O. Blanding, Sr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1825 ARMY nomination of Douglas T. Mo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1863 ARMY nomination of Ruben J. Vazquez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

IN THE NAVY

PN1826 NAVY nomination of Jody M. Powers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1827 NAVY nomination of James R. Powers, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1828 NAVY nomination of Christopher D. Snyder, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1829 NAVY nomination of Richard Jimenez, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1830 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JAIME A. QUEJADA, and ending STEPHEN S. DONOHOE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1831 NAVY nomination of Timika B. Lindsay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014,

PN1832 NAVY nomination of Christopher A. Middleton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2014.

PN1864 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JOSEPH S. GONDUSKY, and ending HASAN A. HOBBS, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1865 NAVY nomination of Richard A. Portillo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1866 NAVY nomination of Henry S. Thrift, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1867 NAVY nomination of Leah M. Tunnell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

PN1868 NAVY nomination of Travelyan M. Walker, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

APPOINTMENT OF SMITHSONIAN REGENT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 40, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) providing for the appointment of Michael Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved the Senate Representatives of the United States of America Congress Assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the resignation of France A. Córdova of Indiana on March 13, 2014, is filled by the appointment of Michael Lynton of California. The appointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

REGARDING ENHANCED RELATIONS WITH THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 470, S. Res. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 500) expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 500) was agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I further ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, July 10, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

GROWTH AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 489.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 489) supporting the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week.''

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the Kirk amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 489) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3623) was agreed to, as follows:

In the ninth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''providing resources'' and insert ''support''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 489

Whereas, according to the Pictures of Standard Syndromes and Undiagnosed Malformations database (commonly known as the ''POSSUM'' database), more than 600 serious diseases and health conditions cause growth failure;

Whereas health conditions that cause growth failure may affect the overall health of a child;

Whereas short stature may be a symptom of a serious underlying health condition;

Whereas children with growth failure are often undiagnosed;

Whereas, according to the MAGIC Foundation for children's growth, 48 percent of children in the United States who were evaluated for the 2 most common causes of growth failure were undiagnosed with growth failure;

Whereas the longer a child with growth failure goes undiagnosed, the greater the potential for damage and higher costs of care;

Whereas early detection and a diagnosis of growth failure are crucial to ensure a healthy future for a child with growth failure;

Whereas raising public awareness of, and educating the public about, growth failure is a vital public service;

Whereas support for identification of growth failure will allow for early detection; and

Whereas the MAGIC Foundation for children's growth has designated the third week of September as ''Growth Awareness Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the third week of September 2014 as ''Growth Awareness Week''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week''.

COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WRIGHT MUSEUM OF WWII HISTORY

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 501) commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Wright Museum of WWII History in Wolfeboro, New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 501) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Monday, July 14, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration, en bloc, of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 514, S. Res. 515, and S. Res. 516.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

S. RES. 516

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony

and documents in a criminal misdemeanor action pending in South Central Judicial District Court in Bismarck, ND. In this action, the defendant is charged with menacing and simple assault of a staffer in Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP's Bismarck, ND, office. A trial is scheduled for August 26, 2014.

The prosecution has requested the production of testimony from both the staffer at issue and another Heitkamp staffer who witnessed the event. The prosecution also seeks production of a video recording from a security camera in the Senator's office that captured the event. Senator HEITKAMP would like to cooperate by providing such relevant evidence. The resolution would authorize those two staffers, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, to testify and produce documents in this action, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2648

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2648, introduced earlier today by Senator MIKULSKI, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2648) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

Mr. CASEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, while presiding for a couple of hours just now I listened to some very powerful and eloquent debate organized by the Presiding Officer—I thank him for doing so—regarding the migrant unaccompanied children who are coming across our border. Those remarks moved and inspired me. They were followed afterward by an effort by Senators SHAHEEN and others to bring to the floor a measure on energy efficiency.

The connection between the two may not seem immediately apparent. But, in fact, I was struck by the irony of an effort by some of our colleagues to eliminate and repeal, in effect, a measure called the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. It is actually named the Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, very symbolically and significantly named after a leader who sought to abolish the slave trade.

Our colleagues who seek to repeal, in effect, that measure are calling its provisions a ''loophole'' because it provides for screening of migrant children, such as those who are reaching our border, who are not from the immediate bordering countries. They are from other Central American countries. They are seeking to apply to them the same procedures or lack of procedures, lack of screening, lack of individual consideration that apply to migrant children from Canada and Mexico on the theory that those provisions are a ''loophole'' in our law. In fact, those screening procedures are the very intent and substance of our law. They are meant to provide individual, careful, fair consideration of each child.

On a day when consideration of the energy efficiency bill named for Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN was blocked from consideration, colleagues are considering a measure and advocating a measure that is completely unnecessary. The Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill is vitally necessary. The repeal of the Trafficking Victims Protection and Reauthorization Act of 2008 is entirely unnecessary, in fact unhelpful and downright harmful.

The question of what to do about the flow of migrant children to our border is one of profound importance for our Chamber and our country to face in the coming days and weeks.

I recently visited the border in a trip organized, thankfully, by Senator HIRONO and joined by Senator MURKOWSKI. We met Senator CORNYN while we were there. We went to various of the facilities to see for ourselves and speak with the children who were coming to our borders, the professionals who were seeking to care for them, the Border Patrol agents endeavoring to enforce the law, all of whom are involved in this situation on the ground.

That experience has formed—I hesitate to say transformed, but it has certainly changed my view of this problem, because we speak in this body about these unaccompanied minors, as they are called, as though they are an interchangeable mass. They are massive in numbers, but each is an individual. Each has a story to tell. Each is different.

They have in common, most of them, stories of horror and terror, vicious persecution, cruelty and brutality, rape, murder, and forced prostitution in the countries they are seeking to escape. This brutality is spawned by gang warfare, the result of conflict among gangs trading in drugs; cartels and organized crime that have put children in the middle of their murderous activities.

As others during that eloquent colloquy organized by the Presiding Officer observed, much of that drug trade has moved from Colombia to Central America. It is fueled by demand, the same demand that fuels the Colombian gang warfare, from the United States. The demand comes from this country, the demand for those illicit drugs.

Those children, caught in the horrific violence plaguing their home, have fled to this country seeking safety and security. Many of them are also seeking their parents, because the majority have one or more parent in this country already. The vast majority have a close relative, if not a parent, an aunt or uncle. So their journey seeks to reunify them with their families, as well as to escape the grisly, grinding horror of their existence in those homelands they have left. Those journeys are plagued by the harshest, most inhumane of conditions: deserts, swamps and, most dangerously, the traffickers.

The smugglers who exploit them put them in stash houses, take them hostage, hold them for ransom, threaten their lives, and often rape and murder them, preventing them from reaching this country. These faces are of the children I saw, with fear in their eyes, fear of all adults, because most of the adults in their lives have been a threat, not a protector; fear in their eyes about the Border Patrol agents who are there when they arrive at the loading dock at the McAllen border facility. It is a loading dock where produce or goods might be dumped or left to be shipped elsewhere. They arrive at the loading dock and sit on a bench, fear in their eyes, apprehension in their voices.

They are then interviewed by the Border Patrol, who are wearing uniforms, looking like the authoritarian figures they are. In the lives of these children, the police are not a source of comfort, they are a source of danger because in their country the police are corrupt and a threat, not a protector.

They are not apprehended by the Border Patrol; they surrender to them. Border security is not the issue. Again, as some of my colleagues remarked earlier, these children are coming in to give themselves up in the hope of being

taken into custody, fed, housed, and given some basic security and safety.

Their numbers are down—anywhere from 30 to 50 percent down in July as compared to June, so we were told by the Border Patrol agent. Whether that is a temporary phenomenon or a trend remains to be seen, but the numbers are down.

After this holding detention center, where they are kept in cement-floor cellblocks, segregated by age and gender, so densely packed that they can barely sit let alone lie down, and provided with foil blankets, they are sent to more permanent facilities, such as the Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, where we also visited.

That facility has a dormitory, a health clinic, a school. Classes are conducted in tents, and the treatment is far more humane. They are given classes in English. They are eager—intensely eager—to learn English, and they are taught in classrooms in these tents where there is a blackboard and an American flag outside an artificial turf soccer field, where they are intensely eager to play soccer.

They stay there about 7 days to 3 weeks until they are moved to a home because many of them have relatives. Most of them have some family members in this country or another facility. They move from one temporary facility to a better one and then to a home.

In the second facility, they are in the custody of the HHS or the Office of Refugee Settlement, not the Border Patrol. It is a better facility, no question, but still rudimentary.

One of the most powerful moments of this trip was to watch these students—I would say about 20 of them in a class—show how they were learning English, show the words they have learned and tell us where they were from—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador—and then to rise to show us Senators how they could recite the Pledge of Allegiance. We joined with them in reciting that pledge. I wish my colleagues—I wish every American could have been there at that moment. There was something basic, fundamental about us as Americans in that moment, about what we offer—hope, opportunity, freedom, and protection—to people who come here with that aspiration, that those children epitomized at that moment. Whether you agree or disagree on what should be done, whether you feel we ought to do something differently with these children, that moment evoked a fundamental value in our society.

Another moment did as well—when a busload arrived. As we were about to leave, the staff of that facility lined up on both sides of the children coming off the bus into the facility, clapping for them. The staff was clapping and cheering for these children arriving at the facility, after leaving the border crossing where they were under the custody of the Border Patrol agents. They were clapping and cheering for children who recently arrived in this country, and the children were beaming.

The staff and the professionals who care for these children are truly to be thanked. They are dedicated professionals—the Border Patrol agents who do their very best to make these kids feel at home under very adverse conditions; the HHS counselors and teachers who seek to interview them, give them some basic hope and comfort; all of the professionals in the Office of Refugee Resettlement who seek against the odds to provide them with a future.

The mayor of McAllen, who runs a small town on the border—which is where that border crossing is, where the McAllen facility is housed—I think many of us expected him to complain to us about the burden of this flood of children coming into his town, the expenditure of resources necessary to support the infrastructure, the burden on him and his fellow townspeople. To the contrary, the mayor of McAllen, Jim Darling, said to us that they welcome these children. They regard the border as part of their home. They have an interchange in culture and family.

He said to us, in effect—I don't remember whether they were his exact words—about welcoming these children: This is what we do. We are Americans. This is what we do. We are Americans—not asking for reimbursement for the expenses for his town, although it is a significant part of his budget. Comparable to the Federal Government, it would be in the billions. His budget is much smaller, so the proportion, obviously, is much less, but it is a major fiscal burden on McAllen.

Mayor Jim Darling impressed us and inspired us with his willingness to welcome these children—at least to care for them while the law is enforced. That is the point I want to emphasize to my colleagues tonight.

What is needed is not a repeal of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. What is needed is not to send these children back without screening or consideration. What is needed is not a wholesale closing of due process. It is enforcement of that law, resources to enforce that law, resources to provide the immigration judges and the advocates who are so desperately needed for these children. After all, they look at any authoritarian figure with fear, even the teachers, many of them, as well as the border agents who seek to elicit from them those stories about why they fled their home. They fear retaliation from anyone who might learn they are talking about the reasons they left. They need spokespeople for this process, and they need the individual consideration, child by child by child. That is what the law requires. That law should be enforced, not repealed.

Enforcement also means border security. It means better facilities while they are under care of the Department of HHS as well as the Border Patrol. It means that we support State officials if they provide State facilities. Those decisions about where, when, and how many should be made by State officials, but the Federal Government can support them.

That is why I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership on the supplemental, as well as the Presiding Officer for his leadership in organizing the colloquy earlier today because raising awareness, as well as resources, is what is necessary to make sure we reunite these children with their families when, in fact, their request for asylum is justified child by child, justified by the facts and the evidence, upheld by due process, by justice and by fairness—not demonizing, as may be done by calling out the National Guard or denouncing children who are doing nothing more—6-, 7-, 8-, 9-, 10-year-olds—than seeking safety and security.

Their courage, as well as their resilience, finally, was inspiring as well. Having crossed so many miles, against so many obstacles, in the face of so many threats, their smiles as they recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America is the picture I will have in advocating a bipartisan solution, long-term immigration reform, and a fair and just resolution to their fight as they seek freedom and security in our great Nation, the greatest country in the history of the world.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2014

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 24, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, postcloture; and that at 1:45 p.m., all postcloture debate time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, at 1:45 p.m. there will be a voice vote on the motion to proceed to the Bring Jobs Home Act. There will then be an immediate rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Pamela Harris to be a circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:26 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 24, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2015, VICE WILLIAM D. MAGWOOD, IV, RESIGNING.

STEPHEN G. BURNS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2019, VICE GEORGE APOSTOLAKIS, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANDREW H. SCHAPIRO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

JULIA AKINS CLARK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PARTRICK J. DONAHUE II

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEE E. PAYNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICKY N. RUPP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. WALTER J. LINDSLEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. GRONSKI

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK A. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROGER W. TEAGUE

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTIONS 5043 AND 601:

To be general

JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. JOSEPH L. VOTEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. JOHN F. CAMPBELL

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. WILLIAM E. GORTNEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES K. MCLAUGHLIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3034:

To be general

GEN. DANIEL B. ALLYN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MARK A. MILLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SEAN B. MACFARLAND

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. LORI J. ROBINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. HERBERT J. CARLISLE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. FREDERICK B. HODGES

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN T. AALBORG, JR. AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. ZROSTLIK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROY G. ALLEN III AND ENDING WITH JOHN M. WILLIAMSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARK D. LEVIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG H. RHYNE AND ENDING WITH DAVID E. VIZURRAGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 14, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN E. KOEHL AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 14, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CURTIS L. ABENDROTH AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. WISE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN C. COPELAND, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL E. LINZEY AND ENDING WITH GARY L. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOEL R. BURKE AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NORMAN A. HETZLER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN F. FINDER AND ENDING WITH DANIEL H. ALDANA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JASON S. HETZEL, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FELIPE O. BLANDING, SR., TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS T. MO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RUBEN J. VAZQUEZ, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JODY M. POWERS, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAMES R. POWERS, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER D. SNYDER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD JIMENEZ, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAIME A. QUEJADA AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN S. DONOHOE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMIKA B. LINDSAY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. MIDDLETON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH S. GONDUSKY AND ENDING WITH HASAN A. HOBBS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 14, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD A. PORTILLO, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF HENRY S. THRIFT III, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LEAH M. TUNNELL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TRAVELYAN M. WALKER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. JAMES FARLEY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Mr. James Farley on the occasion of his retirement as the Director of the Marin County Department of Cultural and Visitor Services after four decades of service to the people of Marin.

Beginning his career with Marin County in 1974 as an usher, Farley also spent 28 years as manager of the Marin County Fair and 34 years managing the Marin Center. During his illustrious and long career, Jim has brought wide recognition and praise to the Marin County Fair, including four Western Fairs Association Merrill Awards for being the most innovative county fair in addition to more than 700 other Individual Achievement Awards since 1987. Additionally, under his leadership, the Marin County Fair became the Greenest County Fair on Earth, a recognition it has received since 2008.

Throughout his years of managing the fair, Mr. Farley has built a reputation for his unselfish sharing of knowledge with fair leaders across the continent, and has helped make the Marin County Fair's reputation for unparalleled excellence known internationally. Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Mr. James Farley for his long and singularly exceptional career, and for his outstanding record of service to the people of Marin County and beyond.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW ORLEANS TRIBUNE

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the New Orleans Tribune, the country's first African American daily newspaper.

Originally founded in 1864 by Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez, a free man of color and native Louisianian from St. James Parish, the Tribune served as an outspoken voice for the interests of African Americans during a period of turmoil and uncertainty in the final year of the Civil War and early Reconstruction. The Tribune aggressively advocated for civil rights, black suffrage, desegregated public education, and better wages and working conditions for freed slaves. It operated under the radical philosophy that ''freedom without equality before the law and at the ballot box is impossible.'' Although primarily a lens to conditions in Louisiana, the paper worked towards reforming all of Southern society by sending a copy of each issue to every member of Congress. It quickly received national recognition, and its editorials were often read here on the floor of Congress.

Though the Tribune ceased publishing in 1870, its spirit of advocacy, justice, fairness and uncompromising purpose was invoked in 1985 by Dr. Dwight and Beverly Stanton McKenna, when they began their newspaper and named it in honor of Dr. Roudanez's Tribune. The modern-day Tribune continues to offer an invaluable voice on issues affecting the Black community in New Orleans and around the country. In June, the African American Leadership Project honored the Tribune as its Institution of the Year for its ''outstanding reporting, incisive commentary, and journalistic advocacy for social justice on behalf of those needing a voice.''

In commemoration of its success, I would like to share part of the Tribune's mission statement, published in July 1864 on the front page of its first issue: ''Under the above title we publish a new paper devoted to the principles heretofore defended by the Union. Convinced that a newspaper, under the present circumstances, representing the principles and interest which we propose to defend and advocate was much needed in New Orleans, we shall spare no means at our command to render the Tribune worthy of public confidence and respect.'' Today we recognize the fulfillment of this mission. I wish to congratulate the McKenna family on this historic milestone, and to thank everyone at the New Orleans Tribune for the exceptional service that it provides to the African American community.

SHORT-TERM EXTENSION OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act. There are few issues that have united such a diverse group of constituents as the need to maintain funding for federal transportation programs. Construction projects serve as a strong form of economic stimulus not just in Oregon, but across the country. From the workers who build our roads to the companies who use them to transport their goods, many of our constituents have emphasized their concern about the pending depletion of the Highway Trust Fund. Those constituents are frustrated and don't understand why Congress can't act to support such a clear national priority as the need for safe and reliable transportation infrastructure.

Although I do plan to support the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, this 8-month fix is far too short. We must develop a long-term solution to the fund's insolvency. I, and many like me in Congress, voted to support today's short-term legislation because it protects funding for current construction projects and current jobs. But we do so knowing that more comprehensive, substantive action is needed to ensure that projects in 2015 and beyond are not in jeopardy. In Oregon, we recently received notice from the state's Department of Transportation that eliminating funding in 2015 would cost our state roughly $470 million in transportation funding and would reduce the construction workforce by an estimated 4,700 jobs.

Passing a temporary fix to the Highway Trust Fund creates uncertainty among states, local governments, and contractors, all of whom may be less likely to take on new projects and in turn less likely to hire workers. Not only does the uncertainty hurt our constituents who work in the industry and the long-term transportation planning undertaken by state and local governments, it also hurts our economic competitiveness. When groups like the America Society of Civil Engineers give our infrastructure a near failing grade of D+, as they did in their 2013 scorecard, companies considering relocating their business operations to the United States may think twice. This is an unacceptable situation.

With an economy still working to regain its full strength, another short-term fix is an economic risk we should not take. Millions of people rely on our roads, bridges, and ground transportation to get to work and transport goods. Businesses in Oregon increasingly raise concerns about the ability of our freight infrastructure to support the high volume of goods they are transporting to market. This legislation represents the bare minimum we can do. Our constituents deserve a more comprehensive, long-term solution so that our infrastructure can support a growing and thriving economy.

Therefore, I will vote yes on this legislation with caution, and I urge my colleagues to take a long-term look at the need to stabilize our transportation funding source.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and recognize the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus on July 20th, 1974. As a proud representative of countless Greek and Cypriot American families in Brooklyn and Staten Island who have contributed immeasurably to

New York's vibrant culture and economy, I have come to know the lasting impact that this heartbreaking saga of military occupation, forced eviction, seized property, and desecration of sacred religious sites has had on this wonderful community. As such, I am honored to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Affairs, and to lend my unwavering support to Cyprus in its struggle for justice and restitution for these ongoing offenses.

It is with a heavy heart that I have listened to my constituents retell the tragic account of how family, friends, and sometimes they themselves were driven from their homeland and still yearn for peace and resolution after almost half a century of unjustified occupation. The Cypriot people's desire is for the same inalienable right to national sovereignty that the United States has championed at home and abroad. Recognizing this inescapable truth, I have been proud to cosponsor legislation urging Turkey to return confiscated churches and property, affirming our nation's commitment to the reunification of Cyprus, and strengthening our bilateral relationship with Greece. I call on all of my colleagues to support these efforts on behalf of our trusted ally as they work to overcome the political, cultural, and economic challenges wrought by four decades of illegal occupation.

Furthermore, the assault on Greek Orthodox culture and religious heritage is unfortunately not limited to Cyprus' struggle, as recent efforts by Islamist forces to convert the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul—one of the most sacred Greek Orthodox basilicas—into a mosque, make all too clear. Mr. Speaker, any efforts to stifle and diminish Orthodox Christian heritage in the region is the type of tyranny and intolerance that must be denounced by all free people across the globe.

I conclude Mr. Speaker, that if the United States is to truly honor its reputation as the world's brightest beacon of freedom and democracy, then our support for Cyprus must be clear and unwavering. I hope that on this somber occasion, we may unite in solidarity with our Cypriot allies, reassure them of our nation's ardent support, and look forward to replacing an annual observation of continued occupation with a joyous celebration of a re-unified Cyprus.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In 1974, Congress—with bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon—established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territory.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from domestic violence, mothers trying to obtain child support or navigate custody hearings, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

In my district, LSC provides funding to Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County, an organization which provided legal aid to over 4,600 clients last year and looks to increase that number this year. But despite that enormous contribution to our society and an increasing demand for their services, Neighborhood Services of Los Angeles County, and many of its sister institutions across the country, have seen their LSC funding diminish in recent years.

Given the vital role played by LSC-funded attorneys, we need to do better than turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance because of lack of LSC program resources. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel, as well as the thousands of attorneys who contribute pro bono services to clients in need. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to reunification efforts in Cyprus. July 20th marked the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus which tore the island in two. It is time to end this forcible division and ensure the rights of all Cypriots.

In the summer of 1974, Turkish armed forces invaded Cyprus and captured portions of the northern region of the island. Nearly a quarter of the captured residents were expelled from the island, of which about 80 percent were Greek Cypriots. The invasion concluded with the installation of the UN-monitored buffer zone which still divides Cyprus today. It is crucial that we find a solution that allows Greek and Turkish Cypriots to prosper together.

Cyprus is an anchor for U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and has been a reliable partner in combating terrorism and threats to international peace. Cyprus has played a critical role in the removal of chemical weapons from Syria. At a time when the stability of the wider Middle East has become increasingly fragile, it is important to ensure the security of a reliable ally in the region.

The Cypriot people deserve a free republic, one without foreign troops patrolling their neighborhoods and one where exiled Cypriots have the right to return to their homes. In early 2013, the President of Cyprus outlined several measures that, if adopted, could significantly contribute to a favorable atmosphere for reunification negotiations. I am reassured by the efforts made by the Cypriot government; however, as a nation who highly values its relationships with our allies, the United States should support initiatives to end the 40 year division of Cyprus. A united Cyprus is the best solution to respect the sovereignty of the Mediterranean nation as well as the rich history of its people.

RECOGNIZING 40 YEARS SINCE THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus and to call for a reunited and independent Cyprus. The Turkish invasion in 1974 affected hundreds of thousands of Greek Cypriots and its impact continues to be felt today as Cyprus is still one of the most highly militarized areas in the world. Furthermore Greek Cypriots are still being denied human rights. They have been denied their right to return to their homes, their properties have been sold or confiscated, and their right to religious freedom has been restricted.

The United States has strongly encouraged continuing formal negotiations between the leaders of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish communities. It is important that we continue to support Cyprus as it is an ally and strategic partner in combatting terrorism. Cyprus has also helped in the promotion of security and stability in the eastern Mediterranean. On the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus, the United States is reminded that we should strive to end this injustice and continue to support the long overdue reunification and independence of Cyprus.

REMEMBERING TRUMBULL COUNTY COMMISSIONER PAUL HELTZEL

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of my dear friend, Trumbull County, Ohio, Commissioner Paul Heltzel, 69, who passed away peacefully

on the morning of Monday, June 30, 2014 at his home in the company of family after a valiant and brief fight with cancer.

Paul was a deeply thoughtful, concerned, and dedicated public servant. He was one of Trumbull County's greatest assets, previously serving in various roles in the community throughout his professional career before joining the Trumbull County Board of Commissioners in 2005. Paul was a proud advocate of our veterans and worked hard to secure the Samuel E. Lanza Veterans Resource Center for our local veterans. He was the recipient of the Regional Chamber of Commerce Chairman's Political Achievement Award given to the members of the Trumbull County Board of Commissioners for outstanding political achievement. Paul was a lively and active man who enjoyed the outdoors, antique motor cars, and spending time with his family.

Preceded in death by parents, Robert E. and Mary Jane Heltzel Sr. as well as his brother Mark E. Heltzel, Paul will continue to live on through the lives he has touched. Paul is survived by his wife of 30 years, Rosemary Heltzel; his sons, Ryan, Michael, Robert, and Paul; his siblings, Robert E. Heltzel Jr., Lawrence, Carl, Mary Jo, and D. Michael; five grandchildren Rae, Desmond, Theo, Christopher, and Michael Duke as well as 12 nieces and nephews. It gives me great pride to honor the life of Paul Heltzel. I am deeply saddened and I extend my condolences to his entire family. His sound and straightforward advice will be missed by me and my entire staff. Our county is a much better place because of Paul's service. He and his contributions to our community will never be forgotten.

HONORING MS. BERTHA SEPULVEDA

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Bertha Sepulveda for the honor she is receiving from the National Association of Hispanic Nurses and for her work in serving our community.

I first met Ms. Sepulveda when she was my sister's roommate at Arizona State University, and I observed her dedication firsthand when she worked for Maricopa Integrated Health Systems (MIHS) and I was on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Sepulveda's leadership and community service career spans over four decades and includes her work as co-founder and President of the National Association of Hispanic Nurses, Valle del Sol-Phoenix Chapter, as well as her role as co-founder of the Mesa Association of Hispanic Citizens in Mesa, AZ. In tribute to Ms. Sepulveda, for this and for her many years of selfless dedication to improving the health and well being of our community, an annual scholarship is being established in her honor by the National Hispanic Nurses Association. This scholarship will be known as The Bertha Sepulveda Community Service Scholarship and will be awarded to students who show exceptional community involvement, continuing her passion and legacy of serving our community.

Early in her career, Ms. Sepulveda served in the United States Air Force, and the Arizona National Guard as a Flight Nurse and First Lieutenant. It was during her service that she developed strong leadership skills as she provided nursing care to patients in the Air Force, in the United States, and abroad.

As Senior Vice-President for Marketing and Business Development MIHS, Ms. Sepulveda led strategic planning and outreach, including development of a strong network of community partnerships. During her career at MIHS, she also held the position of Director of Ambulatory Care, where she managed 13 outpatient health centers in Maricopa County and all outpatient clinics at Maricopa Medical Center.

Ms. Sepulveda retired from MIHS in 1997, after 28 years of service and dedication. She went on to give six more years of service as Director of Special Projects with Mesa Community College. Ms. Sepulveda has worked as a Public Health Nurse, Outpatient Nurse, Administrator, Senior Executive, Leader, Mentor and Educator. It is without a doubt that Ms. Sepulveda has had a great impact on the health care of the Hispanic community and the uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging Ms. Bertha Sepulveda for receiving this recognition from the National Hispanic Nurses Association in honor of the program development and community service she has performed during her long career, and for her contributions to the health and well being of the Hispanic community in Arizona.

HONORING MR. BILL ALLEN

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a courageous American and proud son of Tennessee, U.S. Navy medic Bill Allen.

On June 7, 1944, during the Allied invasion of German occupied France, Bill Allen was a Navy medic aboard Coast Guard LST 523. His unit was tasked with ferrying dead and wounded American soldiers from the beaches of Normandy back to England, under heavy enemy fire in turbulent waters. 19-year-old Allen was assigned to the unimaginable job of ''death detail.''

On their 4th trip back into the fray, the ship hit a submerged mine which split the boat in half. As the boat sank beneath him, Mr. Allen narrowly made the leap to a life raft where he helped rescue other soldiers from certain death. Only 28 of the 145-member crew survived.

After the War, Mr. Allen moved back to Murfreesboro, Tennessee and worked at the Murfreesboro Electric Department for 32 years. He resides in Murfreesboro today, with his wife of 58 years, and continues to serve the local community as a funeral assistant at Woodfin Memorial Chapel.

I would like to recognize Mr. Allen on behalf of Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District. We are grateful for your service.

HONORING LAURA SCHER

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Laura Scher of Delray Beach, who turns 90 years old on August 2, 2014.

Laura Frankel Scher was born on August 2, 1924 in Brooklyn, New York, to Jewish immigrant parents. Along with her three siblings, she was raised to understand the value of hard work and education. After her high school graduation Laura began working as a legal secretary and married Seymour Roy Scher in 1944. Laura and Roy soon welcomed three daughters to their family—Carol, Judy, and Sandy—and raised them in East Meadow, Long Island. After a successful career working as the Executive Assistant to the president of Hofstra University, she retired and moved with Roy to Florida in 1986. Today, Laura lives in Abbey Delray South, a community where she has had the opportunity to be involved in some of her favorite hobbies, including gardening and painting, and enjoy the fruits of a full and wonderful life.

Laura is truly an exceptional woman whom I am proud to represent in Florida's 21st District. I join her friends and family in celebrating this wonderful milestone, and I wish her good health and continued success in the coming year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 22, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on No. 433 and No. 434 and I would have voted ''nay'' on No. 435 and No. 436.

CONGRATULATING THE BUCKS COUNTY PLAYHOUSE ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Bucks County Playhouse—located along the banks of the Delaware River in New Hope—has been a community icon in my district for generations.

Built inside a historic former mill by a group of artists and community leaders, the Bucks County Playhouse officially opened on July 1, 1939 with a production of the comedy Springtime for Henry.

In the 75 years since its opening, the Playhouse has played host to some of the biggest names in stage and screen; and entertained families from across my district and around the region. Thanks to the resolute support of

volunteers and non-profits, the theater was pulled through tough times and beautifully renovated and re-opened in 2012.

The Playhouse's mission is to ''stimulate, support, inspire and celebrate the performing arts in New Hope and Bucks County''—a goal worth fighting for and one made easier by their continued involvement in the arts in my district.

This year we celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Bucks County Playhouse and join the New Hope community, Bucks County and all theater lovers in wishing it another 75 years of continued success and entertainment.

HONORING LESLIE WOODY

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, Abecedarium. A-b-e-c-e-d-a-r-i-u-m. Abecedarium.

It was 1985 and I was in the fifth grade at Yuma Middle School. Back then, the school held the fourth through eighth grades under one roof. As a fifth grader, we weren't the new kids any more, getting used to a new school. And we certainly weren't the oldest or the coolest. We weren't in junior high and we didn't get outdoor camp like the sixth graders. We were in sort of a ''tweener'' grade for a tweener age—long before any of us knew there was any such thing as a tween.

But what we lacked in age rights or age slights, we made up for in our teacher, Leslie Woody. With a Bachelor's degree from Colorado College, Mrs. Woody began her teaching career in 1980, and after 34 years in the Yuma School District RJ–1 (and a Master's degree along the way), retired this year. It's hard to believe that anyone can stay in the same workplace for 34 years; today, the average length of a job is just under 5 years. But for the hundreds of kids who were lucky enough to call her our teacher, we are very glad (and blessed) that she did. It's hard to believe she had only been teaching for 5 years when she met the motley class of 1993!

She taught us to be happy (it's hard to do!). Positive about life. To surprise people with optimism.

And she was the Superspeller's super coach. I couldn't spell bupkis (sp?) without her. She taught us to compete, to excel, and not be afraid. To work hard and study. We made it to the district, regional, and state spelling bees. We got crushed by the students from St. Mary's, but we made it nonetheless. We gained confidence that only comes from hard work and perseverance and hours of practice. Perhaps the most important thing, and her secret lesson plan all along, was that Mrs. Woody taught us the lesson of how to learn.

Our daughter is entering fifth grade this year. And while Mrs. Woody will not be teaching her, there are other great teachers who will shape her young life the way Mrs. Woody shaped ours, something Jaime and I are certainly grateful for. But no one can ever replace the special place for a special teacher who helped make someone—who helped make me—who they are today.

For your years of service to our children and the future, and for the impact you had on my life, thank you. Please accept this recognition from one member of the United States House of Representatives and your student, knowing you made a difference.

Thank you. T-h-a-n-k y-o-u. Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 433 I inadvertently voted ''nay'' when I intended to vote ''yea.'' I would like to make it clear that I support H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014.

HONORING KILLEEN, TEXAS DETECTIVE CHARLES DINWIDDIE

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the life and service of Killeen, TX Detective Charles Dinwiddie who was tragically killed in the line of duty in May. His loss is a sobering reminder of the bravery and sacrifice of our nation's law enforcement officers.

Detective Dinwiddie was born in Frankfurt, Germany but grew up in Harker Heights, TX. He shouldered many responsibilities during his 18 years with the Killeen Police Department: Patrol Division, Criminal Investigation Division, SWAT, and more. Detective Dinwiddie, a mentor and role model to other officers, was relied upon to conduct the most difficult and complex investigations.

As a former judge, I know firsthand the essential role police officers play in maintaining law and order and the risks they face every time they report for duty. These brave men and women awake each day uncertain of what dangers await. Yet they carry on, strengthened by their resolve to protect and serve. Police officers, be they big city beat cops or small town sheriffs, help preserve our way of life and guard us from those lost souls who wish harm to others.

While Detective Dinwiddie's watch has ended, his legacy and the commitment of all who wear the badge live on. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, family, friends, and the entire Killeen community. Let us all honor and remember a man who gave his life to protect his fellow citizens.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 22, 2014 I was not present for 4 votes. I wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 433, I would have voted ''yea.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 434, I would have voted ''yea.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 435, I would have voted ''yea.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 436, I would have voted ''yea.''

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT KILPATRICK

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, within this great institution, we often honor notable Americans who dedicate themselves, whether personally or professionally, to serving this nation and strengthening its core. I am honored today to continue this tradition and pay tribute to Robert Kilpatrick, who recently retired after many good years as President and General Manager of BAE Systems, San Diego Ship Repair.

Robert was no stranger to shipyards—notching more than 30 years of experience in an industry that is critical to both America's global security and competitiveness. He started with the company in 1981, when he joined what is now BAE Systems San Francisco Ship Repair as an Electrical Estimator for shipboard communication and power installations. In the years that followed, Robert held various positions within the company and in January 2004, he was promoted to President and General Manager. Ask anyone who knows Robert and they'll tell you he's a proven leader with authentic talent and skills.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that a strong Navy and sealift capability is the foundation of our nation. As a Marine, I never floated, meaning I never went out to sea, but you don't have to be on a vessel or part of an ocean crew to appreciate the value and the power of a steel-clad ship that is capable of sailing the world. The ingenuity and know-how required to build and maintain these vessels is a national asset—and so too are the men and women who work in America's shipyards. Robert's experience and leadership has been invaluable and surely his mentorship will be no less influential for the future of San Diego Ship Repair.

I want to congratulate Robert on his retirement and wish him happiness in the years to come. I also want to recognize Robert's wife of 26 years, Michele, and his two sons, Keith and Kyle. Surely, they are proud of Robert for an honorable and distinguished career. And, on behalf of this body, we are thankful for his service and wish him all the best as he enjoys his retirement.

RECOGNIZING DUY BUI AND DIVERSE SCHOLARS FORUM

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Duy Bui, a constituent of mine from Carrollton, Texas, who is a rising junior at the University of Texas at Dallas, majoring in biochemistry, and a recipient of the United Health Foundation Diverse Scholars Initiative scholarship. This week, Duy will be in Washington, DC participating in the Diverse Scholars Forum, during which time he will have a unique opportunity to interact with experts in various health care fields, engage with policymakers, and network with his peers. Additionally, he will spend an afternoon here on Capitol Hill to participate in an activity to examine some of the nation's most pressing health care problems and discuss proposed solutions. Beyond his significant academic achievements and his goal to become a physician to change the way health care is administered and communicated, Duy has spent a significant amount of time giving back to his community.

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation for Duy's dedication to making the health care system more enriched by professionals with varied perspectives and backgrounds. His enthusiasm for his work and his promise to improve the health outcomes of the individuals he will one day serve will be a great asset to our nation's health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Duy Bui and wishing him success in all of his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes Nos. 433–436: I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall No. 433, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 434, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 435, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 436, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

IN MEMORY OF MICHAEL GEORGE AND HIS DECADES OF LEADERSHIP IN THE GREATER DETROIT REGION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, with a heavy heart, to mark the passing of Michael J. George, a respected business leader, philanthropist and patriarch of the Chaldean American community in Southeast Michigan.

From a young age, Mr. George worked to develop his expertise in business and entrepreneurship. After graduating from Catholic Central High School, he went on to work with his brother, Sharkey, to establish Melody Farm Dairy Company. From a single milk route, Mr. George and Sharkey grew Melody Farms to a business with over $150 million in revenue, and a customer base 10,000 strong. He later went on to found George Enterprises LLC with interests in food products, real estate, technology, healthcare and banking

As a man dedicated to his community, Mr. George felt a responsibility to help empower other aspiring entrepreneurs to achieve success. It was undoubtedly this commitment that led to his leading role in the creation of the Bank of Michigan, a community-oriented institution that specializes in small business lending programs. As a result of Mr. George's leadership, many small business owners have been able to realize their dreams—results that have strengthened the backbone of Michigan's economy.

Mr. George applied his commitment to serving others to every facet of his life. Therefore, it seemed only natural that when his country asked him to serve, he answered its call and proudly defended democracy in Korea. In taking time away from his business interests and family, Mr. George's sacrifices and service helped millions of Koreans to realize their dreams of a free and democratic society.

In Greater Detroit's Chaldean American community, Mr. George was a leader whose actions and vision were instrumental in its development. As the former Chairman of the Chaldean Federation of America and cofounder of the Chaldean Iraqi American Association of Michigan, Mr. George was a driving force behind so many charitable endeavors that assisted newly arrived immigrants and refugees to integrate into their new home country. With his experience and engaging in refugee issues, Mr. George was an important advisor to me and other legislative leaders on the challenges that religious minorities have faced in their ancestral homelands. Specifically, Mr. George's advice was vital to my ongoing efforts to modernize the Refugee Assistance Act.

However, regardless of the transformational impact Mr. George has made on communities, families and lives across the Southeast Michigan region, no achievements brought him more pride than those of his family. To his loving wife, Najat, their six sons, and many grandchildren, he displayed unwavering dedication. Whether it was working in business with his sons or his family's Sunday night dinners, his moments with his family were of the greatest importance to Mr. George.

Mr. Speaker, Michael George approached every endeavor in his life with passion and expectations that allowed him to see the best qualities of those with whom he worked. His belief in the goodness of others was exemplified by his method of engaging in business deals on a simple handshake. With unending optimism and dedication to helping others achieve the success that came to him so early on in his life, Mr. George has touched the lives of many people in Southeast Michigan and has left the region with a brighter future because of his endeavors. While I will miss his leadership, experience and friendship, I know that his legacy will continue to inspire future generations of leaders to be active in the Greater Detroit community.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL BRIAN M. NEWBERRY FOR HIS SERVICE AS COMMANDER OF THE 92ND AIR REFUELING WING, FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary service of Colonel Brian M. Newberry, Commander, 92nd Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington.

Col. Newberry entered the Air Force in 1991 as a distinguished military graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy. Since that time, he has flown as an evaluator pilot in the C–17A Globemaster III and has flown missions in support of Operations ENDURING FREEDOM, IRAQI FREEDOM and ALLIED FORCE. Additionally, Col. Newberry served as the 817th Expeditionary Airlift Squadron commander at Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, in 2007. Prior to assuming command at Fairchild, Col. Newberry was the Commander, 376th Expeditionary Operations Group, Transit Center at Manas, Kyrgyz Republic, directing aerial refueling, airlift, onward movement of troops to Afghanistan and strengthening the partnership with the Kyrgyz Republic.

Since assuming command, Col. Newberry has made caring for Fairchild's Airmen and their families a top priority. With the loss of Shell 77 in Kyrgyzstan which claimed the lives of three Airmen from Fairchild, last year was arguably one of the more difficult years for the base. However, during this difficult time, Col. Newberry's leadership provided a pillar of strength for a base and community in mourning.

Additionally, Col. Newberry has tirelessly worked to strengthen the bond between Fairchild and our community here in Eastern Washington. This year, Col. Newberry championed for the Abilene Trophy 2013 to be awarded to the Spokane community. Presented annually, this award recognizes the community in Air Mobility Command that is most supportive of its local Air Force base. Ultimately successful, in May, Spokane was awarded the Abilene Trophy. Fairchild has been an integral part of our community since 1942, when the City of Spokane and local residents purchased the land and donated it to the War Department and I applaud Col. Newberry for his efforts to strengthen this relationship.

So, today I urge all of my colleagues to join me in thanking Colonel Brian M. Newberry for his service to the United States Air Force and the 92nd Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild. I am grateful for his unyielding dedication to our

country and for all of his accomplishments as Commander of the 92nd Air Refueling Wing.

IN HONOR OF OUR CITIZENSHIP DAY VOLUNTEERS

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and honor the hard-working volunteers who helped make our 20th Annual Citizenship Day a big success.

Thanks to the help of community volunteers, many legal permanent residents began the process of becoming an American citizen during our Citizenship Day workshop on June 21, 2014.

Participants discussed the privileges, rights, responsibilities and obligations of all citizens. Men and women who have lived in the U.S. for decades, but had been too intimidated to begin the process, had the opportunity to take that first step.

Over the years, we've heard so many great stories of those who have gone on to become citizens. I have had the pleasure of attending many naturalization ceremonies in Houston and Harris County. It is inspiring to see the pride and patriotism in the eyes of those who choose to become part of our great country.

None of this would be possible without the help of our volunteers, some of whom have been serving our community since the first Citizenship Day, held in 1994.

We appreciate their time, dedication, compassion and heart to serve our community.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE RALPH FROEHLICH

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and public service of the Honorable Ralph Froehlich, who passed away earlier this week following more than 37 years as Sheriff of Union County, New Jersey.

Sheriff Froehlich was one of the most respected law enforcement officials in the country. His life of public service began as a young man in the U.S. Marine Corps and later as a member of the Elizabeth, New Jersey Police Department for almost 20 years where he attained the rank of Lieutenant.

First elected Sheriff in 1977, Ralph Froehlich was known for his passion to serve, exemplified by his work with children, teenagers and senior citizens. He holds the distinction of being the longest-serving County Sheriff in New Jersey state history.

During his tenure as Union County's top law enforcement officer, Sheriff Froehlich received numerous commendations for his dedication to duty, including the New Jersey PBA Valor Award and Policeman of the Year Award. Always respected by his colleagues, he served four terms as president of the New Jersey Sheriffs' Association.

Sheriff Ralph Froehlich was a beloved New Jersey public servant whose law enforcement expertise and professionalism will be deeply missed by the officers he commanded and the people he swore to protect and serve.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,602,846,009,056.50. We've added $6,975,968,960,143.42 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 25th, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, which was established by Congress in 1974, with bipartisan support, including that of President Richard Nixon. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress. Its mission is to ensure equal access to justice under the law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC funds 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every state and U.S. territory.

I have long been a supporter of legal assistance for low income Americans and of the LSC dating back to the 1970s, when I led the effort to establish the LSC funded Virginia Peninsula Legal Aid Center, Inc. So I know from first-hand experience that LSC-funded legal aid programs make a critical difference to low income Americans by assisting with their most basic civil legal needs.

Many Americans are helped by this organization. Three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs often identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities. LSC funded attorneys help women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking duly earned benefits, seniors impacted by consumer scams, individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits, and parents seeking to obtain and keep custody of their children.

Today, 63.5 million Americans are eligible for LSC services, which is the highest number in LSC history. Unfortunately, LSC grantees are forced to turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek their assistance because of lack of adequate funding. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater.

Mr. Speaker, on this 40th anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of millions of Americans who need qualified, competent legal counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security, health, and economic well being of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, July 20 represented the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion and subsequent illegal occupation of Cyprus. As the situation in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East is becoming more unstable, it is time to resolve the decades-long forcible division of Cyprus.

As a result of Turkey's occupation of northern Cyprus, thousands of Greek Cypriots are still being denied their fundamental right to return to their homes; Greek Cypriot properties are constantly being illegally confiscated or sold without their owners' consent; Turkish troops continue to be stationed on the island; thousands of colonists from mainland Turkey have been transplanted to the occupied area; freedom of worship continues to be severely restricted, access to religious sites blocked, religious sites destroyed and a large number of religious and archaeological objects stolen.

I have been to the island and seen Turkey's destruction and aggression on the northern part of Cyprus first-hand. It was particularly heartbreaking to see the devastation done to the centuries-old churches, and the ghost-town that the once thriving resort town of Famagusta has become.

Unfortunately, over the past 40 years Turkey has continued to obstruct the negotiating process of reunifying Cyprus. Specifically, Turkey has prohibited the exhumation of remains from mass graves, even under supervision from the United Nations (UN), and rejected proposals to carry out a simple technical survey to determine what needs to be done to rebuild Famagusta in the future.

A solid foundation was laid for result-oriented talks on February 11, 2014, with the release of a joint statement from the two community leaders regarding the intention of cooperation between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. The Cyprus Government remains fully committed to the UN sponsored process to reach a sustainable and enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolution.

Now, particularly in the wake of the discovery of offshore gas reserves in the eastern Mediterranean, it is more important than ever that Congress stand with our Cypriot allies in finding a fair and functional solution of the Cyprus problem—not only for the best interest of the people of Cyprus but also for the United States' interest of stability in the region.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CHRISTOPHER P. McCULLION

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Chris McCullion. Since 2000, Chris has served in various positions in local government, finance, and economic development. Chris was appointed Orlando City Treasurer by Mayor Buddy Dyer in 2008.

Chris does his part to support causes that further the goal of equality for all people. He has worked with leaders in City government to advocate for policy changes that would improve the City of Orlando's already strong rating in the Human Rights Campaign's (HRC) Municipal Equality Index. The Index examines the laws, policies, and services of municipalities across the country and rates them on the basis of their inclusivity of the LGBT community.

Chris has also been a member of HRC's Federal Club and has supported LGBT and LGBT-friendly candidates for elected office. Chris is proud to have played a part in electing Central Florida representatives who support the LGBT community at the local, state, and national levels.

Chris serves on the boards of directors for the Orlando Federal Credit Union and the Sunshine State Governmental Financing Commission. He is a member of the Florida League of Cities Finance, Taxation and Personnel Committee and the Florida League of Cities Investment Advisory Committee. He holds a master's in business administration and bachelor's degrees in finance and political science, from the University of Florida.

I am happy to honor Chris McCullion, during LGBT Pride Month, for his work to secure equality for LGBT community in Central Florida.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In 1974, Congress—with bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon—established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

It is LSC-funded attorneys who help parents obtain and keep custody of their children, assist parents in enforcing child support payments and help women who are victims of domestic violence. In fact, three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities.

Given the vital role played by LSC-funded attorneys, we need to do better than turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance because of lack of LSC program resources. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF THOMASBORO

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Village of Thomasboro upon the 150th anniversary of the village. The village celebrated this special anniversary on the weekend of June 13th and 14th, 2014, with live music, games, a Raminator demonstration, and a 5k run.

The Village of Thomasboro was founded in 1864 and named after John Thomas, who owned a considerable amount of land in the area. The Village boasts a number of entertainment opportunities including a tradition of street dances, a mobile comedy club, and the Thomasboro Fire Museum.

The village is now home to 1,200 residents, and remembers its past fondly. This past includes Olympian Mark Arie, a former resident and trapshooter who won two gold medals in the 1920 Olympics, and a visit from President Gerald Ford during the country's bicentennial celebration in 1976.

I extend my congratulations to the Village of Thomasboro upon this special occasion. It is my prayer that the Lord blesses them with many more years of extending hospitality.

HONORING MARIJAN OREŠNIK

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak as Co-Chair of the Congressional Croatian Caucus, and I know I speak for the entire Caucus in recognition of the outstanding service of Dr. Marijan Orešnik, Consul for the Consulate of the Republic of Croatia.

Marijan is truly devoted to bridging the gap between cultures and illuminating the commonalities that all of us share as human beings.

He was born and raised in Zagreb, Croatia, where he quickly discovered that he had an interest in foreign cultures and a calling to acquire fluency in other ways of life. After receiving an undergraduate degree in American and Spanish literature at the University of Zagreb, he was compelled to continue his education in the United States. In 1979 he received a Master's degree in American Literature from the University of Washington.

Following completion of graduate studies, he returned to Croatia to work in the field of linguistics and to teach English. He enjoyed enriching Croatian culture by exposing his people to foreign cultures, and he was able to do this in an even greater capacity when he became the head of the International Unit of Croatian Television from 1990 to 1995. It was during this period that Croatia established itself as an independent nation, and the new Croatian Government took notice of Marijan's skill and commitment during this pivotal time. The government reached out to him and asked him to serve his country in a new post at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He accepted the call of duty and became a Political Counselor, specializing in culture and media, first in Indonesia, then in Canada. Finally in 2010, he was promoted to Minister Counselor and posted in Los Angeles.

The Croatian Community in Los Angeles is the third largest in the United States, and Marijan was warmly welcomed there. He has been a tremendous asset these past four years. I have come to know him as a modest and thoughtful man whose every action on duty demonstrates his goal of improving the lives of the Croatian people both here and abroad. It is very inspiring to know someone like him who believes that our differences should not divide us, and that cultural exchange strengthens us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members of the House join me in congratulating the service of Dr. Marijan Orešnik.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TED MAINES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Ted Maines. Born and raised in the New York City metropolitan area, Ted started doing volunteer work as a teenager in high school. He was taught at an early age that ''giving back'' was not only expected of everyone who was capable, but that over time it would also serve to define his character and give his life meaning.

Upon moving to Central Florida in 1986, Ted realized that he was at the point in his life where he had the means and the time to make a difference in his community. Ted became a board member at AIDS Resource Alliance/Serenity House, an organization providing assistance to HIV positive adults, children, and their families. After the LGBT March on Washington in 1993, Ted joined, and quickly became an officer of both the Orange County Rainbow Democratic Club, and Central Floridians United Against Discrimination, helping to advance the issue of LGBT Equality. Ted and his partner, Jeff Miller, also began fundraising for local, statewide, and national Democratic candidates, which they continue to do today.

Ted has served on several City Boards, most notably serving five years on the City of Orlando's Historic Preservation Board, including two years as Chair. For the past four years he has also served on the Orange County Library System's Board of Trustees, of which he is currently President.

In addition to political fund raising, Ted served as Chair of Hope & Help's Headdress Ball in 2005 and 2006, and is an honorary Co-Chair again this year. Ted and his now husband, Jeff, have been Chairs of the Holocaust Memorial Center of Central Florida's Dinner of Tribute in 2012 and 2013, and Chaired the Orlando Ballet's 40th Anniversary Gala, 'Expose!', in 2014. The Gala was so successful that it has become an annual event that Ted and Jeff will co-chair again in 2015. Ted and Jeff are also Co-Chairs of the Grand Opening Gala for the Dr. Phillips Center for the Performing Arts.

Ted is proud to currently serve on Nemours Children's Hospital Council, on the Board of the Orlando Ballet, as President of the Orange County Library System's Board of Trustees, and his Homeowners Association Board of Trustees. Ted and Jeff are supporters of the Holocaust Center's UpStander Anti-Bullying program, which was founded by Jeff. They are members of The Orlando Museum of Art's Acquisition Trust, University of Central Florida's Flying Horse Press, Hope & Help's Circle of Life, Equality Florida, and Human Rights Campaign's Federal Club.

Marrying Jeff, his partner of 31 years, last August in New York City fulfilled a lifelong dream. Ted and Jeff are both strongly committed to realizing the goal of achieving Marriage Equality in all 50 states, including their home state, Florida.

Ted and Jeff have been extremely proud and grateful to have had their contributions and achievements acknowledged in their local community. They were named to Orlando Magazine's ''50 Most Powerful'' list for the past five years, and in 2012 they were named Orlando's ''Most Powerful Couple'', quite an achievement for a same-sex couple and truly a sign of progress for the LGBT community.

I am happy to honor Ted Maines, during LGBT Pride Month, for his work on behalf of HIV/AIDS patients, the LGBT community, and the arts in Central Florida.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, to many people, human trafficking seems like an issue a world away. But, as we're hearing tonight, the tragic reality is that it affects children and communities in neighborhoods across our nation.

This evening, in bipartisan fashion, lawmakers are standing together to address the continuing need to support anti-trafficking programs and upgrade our nation's response to this crime—both locally and nationally. I have proudly cosponsored most of the bills we have debated tonight.

While these bills are important, legislation alone isn't the only solution to stopping trafficking or abuse in our country or in the Bucks and Montgomery county towns across my District. It's the continued interaction and sharing of ideas between all stakeholders that will ultimately help us address this problem at all stages—from prevention, to counseling to prosecution.

To that end, I am proud to represent a district that is leading the way in proactive and innovative efforts to end trafficking while supporting the individuals it affects. Groups like Network of Victim Assistance, Bucks Coalition Against Trafficking and Worthwhile Wear each contribute to the fabric of victim assistance in our region, while government and law enforcement organizations work side-by-side to adapt to the challenges presented by this crime.

Supporting these groups and legislation like that being considered tonight are vital steps in the fight against trafficking. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting for these measures and protecting those most in need in our communities.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CARLOS CARBONELL

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Carlos Carbonell.

Carlos has more than 15 years of media and technology experience, and a reputation for creativity, versatility and innovation across numerous industries. In 2008, Carlos founded Echo Interaction Group, one of the nation's leading mobile application development companies. Under his leadership, Orlando-based Echo has built a portfolio that includes more than 60 apps for Apple and Android devices.

An active member of the community, Carlos is not only an advocate for the LGBT community, but also a leader in the technology, business and Latino community. He is often seen as bridging the gap between these four, sometimes distinct, groups. Carlos was on the Board of Governors of the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) and a founding member of the HRC Central Florida Steering Committee. He currently serves as the Orlando Tech Association's first President. In addition, Carlos serves as Editor-in-Chief for Vision Magazine and sits on the City of Orlando's Hispanic Advisory Committee.

Carlos has received numerous awards and recognitions. This year, he received the Governor's Business Ambassador Award. In 2013, Carlos was named one of Orlando's Power Brokers by the Orlando Sentinel and in 2012 he was selected as one of Orlando Business Journal's 40 Under 40. HRC awarded Carlos an Individual Achievement Award for his work on the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Carlos graduated from the University of Florida with a bachelor's degree in advertising and an outside concentration in civil engineering.

I am happy to honor Carlos Carbonell, during LGBT Pride Month, for his contributions to the LGBT, business, and Latino communities in Central Florida.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CHARLES ''CHASE'' THOMAS SMITH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize the life of Charles ''Chase'' Smith, who passed away on August 28, 2013, at the age of 41. He left this world, surrounded by his close family and friends.

Born on April 3, 1972 in Blountstown, Florida, Chase is a graduate of Hardee High School and Barry University. Chase was successful in many areas of his professional life. After hand-writing letters to every voter in Wauchula, he was the youngest person ever elected to the City Council at the age of 20. He served three four-year terms on the City Council, before moving to Orlando and working as Commissioner Patty Sheehan's Aide for seven years. Chase was beloved by the neighborhood and business people he worked with. He was Commissioner Sheehan's confidant and friend.

Chase moved from City to County Government where he was an Aide to Orange County Mayor Theresa Jacobs from 2011 to the time of his death in August 2013. Mayor Jacobs appointed him to be Orange County's first

Ombudsman. Chase's personal integrity and work ethic enabled him to excel in the position.

We will never forget Chase's beautiful smile, compassion for those less fortunate, and ability to rock an Easter Bunny costume. He was a proud gay man and fashionista, frequently giving his boss, Patty Sheehan, fashion advice. He loved wearing bow ties and decorating for Halloween and Christmas.

Chase was a lifelong Democrat, but worked well with people from all party affiliations. He was the very definition of a public servant Chase loved public service with his whole heart, and lived his life in service to others. He touched many lives with his care and genuine concern for others.

Chase was preceded in death by his father, Gilbert. He is survived by his mother, Frances, brother, Bryan, and a countless number of friends and extended family of loved ones.

The day of his funeral, Tuesday September 10, 2013, was declared Charles "Chase" Smith Day in the City of Orlando and Orange County. While we all miss him terribly, we can honor his legacy by serving our community to the best of our ability. He would have wanted it that way.

I am saddened by the loss of such a valuable member of the Central Florida community and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family and friends.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 24, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 29

9:30 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the economic and budgetary consequences of climate change, focusing on the cost of inaction.
SD–608

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine tobacco, focusing on taxes owed, avoided, and evaded.
SD–215

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine revisiting the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities and Revived Economies (RESTORE) Act, focusing on progress and challenges in Gulf restoration post-*Deepwater Horizon*.
SR–253

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Francis Tefft, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State.
SD–419

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine breaking the logjam at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), focusing on ways to more efficiently process permits for energy production on Federal lands, and understanding the obstacles in permitting more energy projects on Federal lands, including S. 279, to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and S. 2440, to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management.
SD–366

Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety
To hold hearings to examine the threats posed by climate change.
SD–406

Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness
To hold hearings to examine the United States-Korea free trade agreement, focusing on lessons learned two years later.
SD–215

Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine increasing economic opportunity for African Americans, focusing on local initiatives that are making a difference.
SD–G50

3 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security
To hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges for improving truck safety on our highways.
SR–253

JULY 30

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 1049 and H.R. 2166, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 1437, to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon, S. 1554, to direct the heads of Federal public land management agencies to prepare reports on the availability of public access and egress to Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide funding for recreational public access to Federal land, S. 1605, for the relief of Michael G. Faber, S. 1640, to facilitate planning, permitting, administration, implementation, and monitoring of pinyon-juniper dominated landscape restoration projects within Lincoln County, Nevada, S. 1888 and H.R. 1241, bills to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, S. 2123, to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Minnesota, S. 2616, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, H.R. 1684, to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and H.R. 3008, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Los Padres National Forest in California.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development
To hold hearings to examine flood insurance claims process in communities after Sandy, focusing on lessons learned and potential improvements.
SD–538

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the "African Growth and Opportunity Act" at 14, focusing on the road ahead.
SD–215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider H.R. 4007, to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, S. 1618, to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government, S. 1347, to provide transparency, accountability, and limitations of Government sponsored conferences, S. 1396, to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfire, an original bill entitled, "Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2014", S. 2547, to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under

the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, S. 2323, to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service, an original bill entitled, ''Integrated Public Alert and Warning System Authorization Act of 2014'', an original bill entitled, ''DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014'', H.R. 4197, to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, an original bill entitled, ''Emergency Information Improvement Act of 2014'', S. 1898, to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, S. 2447, to amend title 31, United States Code, to clarify the use of credentials by enrolled agents, H.R. 606, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building'', H.R. 1671, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the ''James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office'', H.R. 2291, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the ''Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office'', H.R. 3472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the ''Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office'', H.R. 3762, to impose penalties for the unauthorized disclosure of personal tax information by Federal employees, and the nominations of Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, and James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, and Victoria Reggie Kennedy, of Massachusetts, all to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the next steps for the ''Violence Against Women Act'' (VAWA), focusing on protecting women from gun violence.

SD–226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Children and Families

To hold hearings to examine paid family leave, focusing on the benefits for businesses and working families.

SD–430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine domestic challenges and global competition in aviation manufacturing.

SR–253

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the impact of Medicare observation status on seniors.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine wireless phone bills, focusing on a review of consumer protection practices and gaps.

SR–253

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine responses to natural disasters in Indian country.

SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine pricing policies and competition in the contact lens industry.

SD–226

JULY 31

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carolyn Watts Colvin, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

SD–215

SENATE—*Thursday, July 24, 2014*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our rock and fortress, thank You for even giving us credit for our good intentions. You examine our motives, discerning the nuances of our motivation and the chasm between what we desire and what we are able to accomplish. Lord, we are grateful for Your mercy that does not make our limitations the standard for judging us, but You accept our faith in Your redemptive power.

Give our Senators a blessed day. May they produce a harvest of good deeds for Your glory. Help them to submit to Your spirit's control. Provide them with vision, wisdom, and courage to meet today's challenges.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, the Bring Jobs Home Act. This will be postcloture time. Cloture has been invoked on this measure.

At 1:45 this afternoon there will be a voice vote on the adoption of the motion to proceed to the Bring Jobs Home Act. There will be a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Pamela Harris to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit, followed by a voice vote on confirmation of the nomination of Lisa Disbrow to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that at 3:40 this afternoon, the Senate conduct a moment of silence in memory of the 1998 Capitol shooting that resulted in the deaths of Special Agent John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2648

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2648 is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2648) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REMEMBERING OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, many years ago I came to Washington, DC, to go to law school. I came back here because Nevada did not have a law school. Although I had opportunities to go other places, I came back here because it was kind of the thing Nevadans did. I got a job through my Nevada Congressman—we only had one at the time—Walter S. Baring. I had what was called a patronage job. I was a Capitol police officer. I was assigned here to the Capitol, assigned to the House side. That is what I did. My badge is still in my conference room. I worked the evening shift—from 3 to 11, as I recall.

When I was a member of the Capitol Police Force, as I have said here on the floor, I did not do anything that was very dangerous. The most dangerous thing I did was direct traffic out on Constitution Avenue. At that time they had subway tracks in the road, and cars would bounce around. I did not do anything that was very dangerous; but I was a police officer. I am very proud of that.

In this Senate Chamber, as we speak, there are people who are assigned to take care of us, staff, and all of the tourists who come in. We have tourists in the galleries. The police officers are assigned everyplace. Some have uniforms; most of them do not. Their job is to do everything they can to make sure this magnificent Capitol Complex is safe. Every day there are people who, if they could, would do damage to this Capitol and to the people who work here.

In 1998 two of our Capitol police officers were on duty. A crazed man—16 years ago—came into the Capitol and shot Jacob Chestnut cold dead, right there at what we call the Memorial Door. John Gibson heard this commotion and saved many tourists and staff from this crazed man, but in the process he was also killed. Both officers died that day. They had served a combined 36 years on the force protecting all of us and all of the many people who come to this Capitol Complex.

I know the families of these two officers. I have met with them on a yearly basis. I know nothing can make up for the loss of these two fine men 16 years ago, but I hope their families and friends take comfort in knowing that those of us who were here that day hold them in our memories and in our hearts.

While it is little solace to their families, the tragedy that day made the Capitol a safer place. It was because of them that we finally were able to make this a safer place. We had worked on it for well more than 10 years. We now have a visitor center. You walk outside; you see a beautiful lawn. Under that is a visitor center. There is as much underground there as on top of the ground.

Now people can come into the Capitol. They can be safe and secure. There are places to go to the bathroom. There is food and wonderful viewing in that complex. So because of these two men, we were able to get that done and make the Capitol a safer place. We have a Capitol visitor center now which prevents a madman like the one who shot these two police officers from entering the Capitol. We are grateful

for their sacrifice. We are grateful every day to the devoted men and women like them who guard these hallowed halls.

As I remember, we had a Senate retreat in southern Virginia. My wife became ill. As I have said a number of times before, Agent Gibson rushed to her side. He had to run a long way from where they were. I can remember how he was perspiring when he came in. So I have fond memories of these two police officers and recognize the sacrifice they made for us.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I would like to begin by remembering two men to whom we owe so much: Officer J.J. Chestnut and Detective John Gibson. Exactly 16 years ago these Capitol policemen were shot in the line of duty, paying a terrible price in defense of every one of us—Senators, staffers, pages, fellow officers, and every American citizen who passes through these hallowed halls. These men knew the grave risk that came with the job. Yet they chose to wear the badge anyway. They made the decision to stand in defense of the democratic ideal this building symbolizes.

We owe these men a debt that can never be repaid. So let's never forget their lives or their final act of heroism. We are reminded every time we pass the Capitol Police headquarters, which bears both of their names. We are reminded every time we notice the plaque in the Capitol that commemorates them. We are reminded by observing today's men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police as they continue to protect this institution, honorably continuing the watch of these two fallen officers.

Today the Senate honors Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson for their sacrifice. We send our sincere condolences to the family and friends left behind.

AMERICAN JOBS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if Senate Democrats were half as concerned about American jobs as they are about saving their own jobs this November, there would be almost no limit to what we could accomplish. Yet, rather than work with us to get anything serious accomplished for our constituents, we see the majority leader once again bowing to the whims of his campaign consultants and the Senate becoming little more than a campaign studio this week.

The majority leader can spend all of his time fighting for the consultant class if he wants, but that will not stop Republicans from offering commonsense, job-saving ideas that both sides should be able to support. For example, the senior Senator from Utah will offer an amendment that would repeal a Democratic tax that helped push manufacturing overseas and could kill as many as 165,000 American jobs. It is a measure that would likely pass if the majority leader would only allow a vote. I know some of our friends on the other side plan to offer amendments too. The question is, Will those Senators join us to demand that their amendments be considered too or will they allow the majority leader to shut down the legislative process one more time, silencing their constituents. I hope they will make the right decision.

Since the majority leader seems so determined to convince everyone that he cares about protecting American jobs this week, I am going to offer an opportunity to prove he is serious about it. He can do it by allowing a vote or even voting himself for an amendment of mine called the Saving Coal Jobs Act. He has already blocked this bill once before, but I will give him a chance to reconsider.

Everyone knows the administration's war on coal jobs is little more than an elitist crusade that threatens to undermine Kentucky's traditionally low utility rates, splinter our manufacturing base, and ship well-paying jobs overseas. My amendment seeks to push back against this war on coal, this war on ordinary American livelihoods, and it seeks to help protect the administration's targets too—Kentucky coal families who want little more than to put food on the table and give their children a better life. It is really not too much to ask. So the majority leader has a choice. Is he in favor of shipping Kentucky jobs overseas or will he help me protect the middle class by supporting this amendment?

Regardless of what he decides, though, I am going to keep fighting against this administration's unfair regulations. Yesterday the EPA Administrator came to Capitol Hill to defend the administration's extreme proposed energy regulations. She tried to assure legislators that the administration wanted input from the public as it went about developing and implementing its job-killing agenda. But it is hard to take her seriously because earlier this week I met with her in person and urged her to hold at least one listening session in coal country, the region most likely to be affected by the administration's regulations. She was unmoved. Apparently the Obama administration isn't all that interested in what Kentucky thinks. Well, if Washington officials won't come to Kentucky, then Kentuckians will come to Washington. Beginning next week, the administration plans to hold one of its listening sessions in Washington. I plan to testify and so do several of my constituents. Even though they will have to travel hundreds of miles to get here, these Kentuckians will make Washington understand they are more than just some statistic. They are our neighbors, they are moms and dads, and they refuse to be collateral damage in some elitist war dreamed up in a bureaucratic boardroom in Washington.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LT. COL. JOHN DARIN LOFTIS

Mr. President, today I celebrate the life of a Kentucky airman who lost his life while wearing our country's uniform. Lt. Col. John Darin Loftis of Paducah, KY, a 17-year veteran of the Air Force, was killed on February 25, 2012, in an attack on the Interior Ministry in Kabul, Afghanistan. He was 44 years old.

For his service in uniform, Lieutenant Colonel Loftis received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Air Force Combat Action Medal.

Darin, as his friends called him, was working in the ministry as an adviser to a program that developed a team of U.S. service personnel skilled in Afghan and Pakistani culture and language. Darin himself spoke the Pashto language fluently and also was proficient in Dari and Arabic, enabling him to relate to the local Afghans. Darin was a liaison officer with top Afghan National Police officials in Pashto.

Darin's work was so important that after his death he was praised by the Governor of Afghanistan's Zabul Province. The Governor said this about Darin:

> When the Afghan people see that an American is speaking Pashto, they're more inclined to open up to him, and that's the reason why he's so successful. He can go among the local population and get their impression of U.S. forces. He can do this better than any other soldier because he speaks their language and knows their culture.

Darin's commander, Lt. Gen. Eric Fiel of the Air Force Special Operations Command, said this about Darin: Lieutenant Colonel Loftis ''embodies the first Special Operations Forces truth that humans are more valuable than hardware, and through his work with the Afghan people, he was undoubtedly bettering their society.''

Darin's wife Holly agrees with these kind words but has one more important point to add: ''Darin was a great American, but more importantly he was a

devoted father to our two daughters, a loving husband, and caring son.''

Born on February 22, 1968, in Indiana, Darin's family moved to Kentucky when he was 3 years old. He attended Calloway County schools from kindergarten through his senior year in high school, from where he graduated in 1986. Described as a high school whiz kid by some, Darin received excellent grades and drove a black Studebaker with plain, cream-colored tires.

Jerry Ainley, former principal of Calloway County High School, said:

He was such a fine young man. I remember his smile when he'd greet me in the hallways. He was very polite, a young man of high morals and high integrity, I guess everything you'd think of in an airman.

Darin went on to study engineering at Vanderbilt. While there, he met a girl named Holly while working for a university service that arranged security for anyone requesting it rather than walking on campus alone.

Darin and Holly got married, and in 1992 the couple joined the Peace Corps. Together they served 2 years in Papua, New Guinea, with the Duna tribe, where Darin spoke Melanesian pidgin. He clearly had a gift for languages.

Loftis entered the Air Force in 1996 and received his commission through officer training school. Originally classified as a space and missile officer, he became a regional affairs strategist in 2008.

By his first tour in Afghanistan in 2009, he had become a major serving in special operations forces. He deployed to Afghanistan for his second deployment with the 866th Air Expeditionary Squadron in 2011.

Darin continued to be an excellent student, earning three master's degrees over the course of his Air Force career. His wife Holly recalls: ''He loved learning . . . he loved going to school.''

Family was especially important to Darin. John M. Loftis, Darin's father, said:

He lived for his kids and his family, I can tell you that. When he was home, he fooled with those kids all the time. He'd take them to school. They are going to miss him.

Darin was so skilled in communicating and respected for cementing relationships with the Afghans he worked with in Kabul that during his tour in 2009 he was given a Pashto name—Esan—which translates to mean generous. Darin explained the nickname to his daughters by saying: ''It's an honorable sense of duty to help others.''

In Darin's memory, the U.S. Air Force Special Operations School in Florida dedicated the school's auditorium in his name—an auditorium Darin himself had previously taught and lectured in. The class of 1986 at Darin's alma mater, Calloway County High School, organized an annual scholarship fund in his name, beginning with two $1,000 scholarships to members of the Class of 2014.

We are thinking of Darin's family today as I share his story with my Senate colleagues. He leaves behind his wife Holly, his two daughters Alison and Camille, his mother Chris Janne, his father John M. Loftis, his brother-in-law Brian Brewer, and many other beloved family members and friends.

The Airman's Creed, learned by every American airmen, reads in part as follows:

I am an American Airman. . . .
Guardian of Freedom and Justice,
My Nation's Sword and Shield,
Its Sentry and Avenger.
I defend my Country with my Life.

I hope the family of Lt. Col. John Darin Loftis knows this Senate believes his life and his service fulfilled every word of this sacred motto. That is why we pause today to remember his life, recognize his service, and stand grateful for his sacrifice.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for business to bring jobs back to America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAEL-GAZA CONFLICT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you very much.

For 3 weeks we have seen fighting going on in Israel and the Gaza Strip carried on between the Israeli military and Hamas. In both Gaza and Israel lives, unfortunately, are being lost, homes are destroyed, families are devastated, security is threatened, and daily life is polluted by this war.

Since the fighting began, Hamas has made it abundantly clear it is unwilling to behave in any responsible manner. The organization is using civilian areas such as schools and hospitals, mosques and playgrounds, as rocket-launching sites. Caches of rockets have been discovered inside two Gaza schools sponsored by the United Nations. A chance for peace emerged when Egypt put forward a cease-fire plan that Israel agreed to. Hamas refused to cease hostilities. Later Israel agreed to a temporary truce, the pause requested by Hamas to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian supplies to Gaza. Despite the Israeli cooperation, Hamas quickly violated the cease-fire, resuming rocket launches into Israeli territory.

Hamas's actions seek to kill and terrorize those across the Israeli border while they also do great harm to the people of Gaza. Ending the rocket attacks would hasten an end to the current violence and bloodshed that has taken a disproportionate toll on Gazan lives.

On July 17, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution to express American support for Israeli self-defense efforts and called for an immediate cessation of Hamas's attacks against Israel. S. Res. 498 also serves as a reminder to anyone ascribing legitimacy to Hamas's deadly aggression toward Israel; despite any governing agreement with Fatah and the Palestinian Authority, Hamas's violence is not legitimate in the eyes of the United States of America. Since 1997, Hamas has been included on the U.S. State Department's list of designated foreign terrorist organizations. The group's ongoing attack on civilian targets further justifies this designation.

Hamas's participation in a unity government limits improvements to life in Gaza as American law restricts U.S. aid to Palestinian groups aligned with terrorist organizations such as Hamas. Gaza's poor economic state, which is cited by Hamas as justification for their attacks on Israel, is not at all improved by Hamas's belligerence. Instead, Hamas's strategy of violence only worsens Gaza's economic outlook. Hamas's actions compound the consequences of funding weapons and smuggling tunnels rather than investing in the future of Gaza and its people, the point being that what Hamas is doing is damaging to the people of not only Israel but to the folks who live in Gaza.

This reality begs observers to question Hamas's commitment to the people it supposedly represents. Since the beginning of the current conflict, Hamas's commitment to violence against Israel appears to be their primary mission, not the care and well-being of their people. Unless cessation of hostilities becomes Hamas's priority, Israel will retain and must retain the right to defend its people and the welfare of those living in Gaza will regretfully continue to deteriorate.

Americans would not tolerate this. We would not. Our constituents would be insistent that we not tolerate the threat of terrorism that Israel faces on a daily basis. Since 1947, attacks from its neighboring Arab States have repeatedly forced Israel to defend its people.

This Senate has and will continue to demonstrate that the United States

stands with Israel, especially during these turbulent times as Israel takes necessary action to reduce Hamas's means of terror, to disarm those who stand firmly in the way of a real and lasting peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the important efforts made each day by our public servants. We often forget that our public servants are Federal employees who go to work every day with the sole mission to make this country a better and safer place to live. Day after day they go about their work receiving little recognition for the great work they do, and many times, unfortunately, they are actually berated rather than acclaimed for what they do during difficult times.

Since 2010 I have come to the Senate floor on a regular basis to honor exemplary Federal employees, a tradition that was begun by my friend from Delaware Senator Ted Kaufman.

Today I wish to take this opportunity to recognize another extraordinary public servant who has served in the U.S. Department of Treasury for 41 years. Forty-one years. That is not a typo. Mr. Richard L. Gregg has dedicated more than four decades to Federal service. He most recently served as the Fiscal Assistant Secretary at the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Gregg began his Federal civilian service in 1970 at Treasury's Financial Management Service. During his 10 years at Treasury, he served as the Commissioner of Treasury's Financial Management Service and as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Debt.

Mr. Gregg retired—for the first time—in June 2006 and was asked to return to Treasury in 2009 to serve as Fiscal Assistant Secretary. Mr. Gregg retired again this month, and in honor of his second retirement I wanted to highlight a couple of his noteworthy accomplishments.

During his long tenure at Treasury, Mr. Gregg was well known for his innovative thinking, the ability to make hard decisions, and the desire to make government more efficient, more open, and, very importantly, less costly.

Mr. Gregg led the Treasury into the 21st century by modernizing Federal payment operations. He moved Treasury from paper-based benefits payments toward the more sensible, secure, and reliable electronic payment system. We should have done that a lot earlier. This is a really big deal since Treasury makes more than 1 billion payments per year—think about that, more than 1 billion separate payments per year—including all Social Security benefit payments as well as others. His work will help save taxpayers $1 billion over the next decade. That is a pretty great value.

Mr. Gregg also helped achieve one of the more rare feats in the Federal Government—the actual consolidation of Federal programs. Mr. Gregg recognized that operations could be improved if Treasury consolidated two complementary Treasury agencies into one. By merging Treasury's Financial Management Service, which makes government payments, with Treasury's Bureau of Public Debt, which borrows the money to fund government, taxpayers will save tens of millions over the next decade.

This isn't going to clear up our $17 trillion in debt that goes up $3 billion a night, but these are the kinds of commonsense steps in the right direction we need to see more often.

I am also proud that Mr. Gregg is not only an inspiring public servant, but he is also a Virginian. He resides in Springfield, VA.

I thank Mr. Richard L. Gregg for his leadership at the Department of Treasury and for being a tireless advocate for the American people. His work in support of a more efficient, responsive, and accountable government will continue to make government work better for all Americans for many years to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence after quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, with the concurrence of Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 952; that there be 4 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is postcloture on the motion to proceed.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VA HEALTH CARE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I have come to realize that we are never going to get politics completely out of the legislative process. In the system we have today, there is always another election and there is always another campaign. This political posturing must be addressed. It is hurting our democracy, and it is a prime reason Congress's approval rating is in the single digits.

Today politics is hurting the men and women who bravely served our Nation. It is hurting our veterans.

When the news about the problems at the VA became public, lawmakers ran to the press and slammed the VA. They called for reform and accountability. They even dragged good men through the mud to score political points.

Members from both sides of the aisle said politics needed to be set aside because if there is just one thing that should cause our politicians to look past political games, it is our veterans. It is our commitment to our veterans, our commitment to making sure they get the care they have earned. But today some lawmakers decided to forgo the hard work of compromise. Instead of putting veterans first, they have made improving veterans care political.

We have been working for 6 weeks to find a compromise bill that improves veterans' access to care, that holds the VA more accountable, and that hires more medical professionals so veterans can get the care they need when they need it. But for 6 weeks Members on the other side of the aisle in both the House and the Senate have balked at the cost of taking care of our veterans. Many of these lawmakers are the same ones—the same ones—who put our wars

in Iraq and Afghanistan on a credit card. Many of them didn't blink twice when we sent hundreds of troops into Iraq earlier this month. Way back when, when the Iraq war was authorized, Congress spent less than 3 weeks debating Iraq. But now when it comes to taking care of our men and women who served—many in the same wars they put on a credit card—they worry about the cost.

Well, I have news for them: Taking care of our veterans is a cost of war. We do not send young Americans to war and then not take care of them. And it should not be the case that we rush to war but drag our feet when it comes to our vets.

Republicans today will announce they are forgoing the veterans conference committee and introducing a bill of their own. It is not a proposal aimed at benefiting our veterans. It is not. It is not a bill that takes the best ideas of veterans organizations, experts, or VA officials and moves the ball forward. It is a proposal that is meant to gain political favor. It is a proposal that sheds the responsibility of governing, of honoring our commitment to veterans. It is a proposal that is aimed at the November election.

Chairman SANDERS has been working hard to bridge the divide and produce a bill that gets veterans the support they need and can pass in Congress, but Chairman SANDERS can't do it himself, and neither can just one-half of the conference committee.

I am incredibly disappointed by what is taking place today. I had real hopes that this conference committee could rise above the political process and get something done for our veterans.

I have been holding listening sessions with Montana's veterans since early June. They didn't have much faith. Those veterans did not have much faith in Washington politicians solving the problem, but I told them it could be done. If we don't change course, if we don't leave politics at the door as we promised, then it is going to be hard for me to go back to Montana and look those veterans in the eye.

We can do better, and we must do better.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, on June 11—a month and a half ago—in a very strong bipartisan way, the Senate voted 93 to 3—an overwhelming vote—to pass legislation written by Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, and myself to address crises facing our veterans community and the VA and to protect and defend the men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend us. I wish to take this opportunity again to thank Senator MCCAIN for his very strong efforts on getting that legislation passed.

As you know, the legislation we passed was estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, to cost about $35 billion. At just about the same time, the House of Representatives passed legislation dealing with, more or less, the same issues, and the bill they passed in the House was estimated by CBO to cost $44 billion—$9 billion more than what we passed in the Senate.

In the last 6 weeks, my staff, my colleagues, and I have been working very hard to refine this legislation, to come up with a more reasonable pricetag, and to address the needs of our veterans community in a significant way. In that process, I have been accused by some of ''moving the goalposts.'' I guess I have. I have moved the goalposts so the legislation we are introducing today is substantially lower—substantially lower—than what passed the Senate and what passed the House. If that is called moving the goalposts, I suspect in this case it is moving the goalposts in a positive direction. In fact, the bill we are presenting would cost less than $25 billion—a lot of money, no doubt—but that is some $10 billion less than what we passed on the Senate floor, and it is $19 billion less than what the House passed.

Our proposal is a commonsense proposal which deals in a significant way with the needs of the veterans community. What it does is provide emergency funding for contract services so veterans can, when they find themselves in long waiting periods—as in fact is the case in a number of locations around the country—they can go outside of the VA and get private health care or care at a community health center or whatever. They no longer have to wait during this emergency period for long periods of time to get into the VA. I think that is a very important part of this proposal. It is something we have to do.

In addition, what we also say is if a veteran is living more than 40 miles from a VA facility—and there are veterans who in some cases are living hundreds of miles away—they do not have to, when they are ill, get in their car and travel for 3 or 4 hours to get health care at a VA facility. They will be able to go to a non-VA facility, a private physician, if they live more than 40 miles away from a VA facility. I think that is a significant step forward.

But what our legislation also does is address an issue of huge concern to the veterans community. Just yesterday—just yesterday—I received, and many members in the Veterans' Committee received, a letter from 16 major veterans organizations. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 23, 2014.

Chairman BERNIE SANDERS,
Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member RICHARD BURR,
Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Chairman JEFF MILLER,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member MIKE MICHAUD,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN SANDERS, CHAIRMAN MILLER, RANKING MEMBER BURR, RANKING MEMBER MICHAUD: Last week, Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson appeared before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to discuss the progress made by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) over the past two months to address the health care access crisis for thousands of veterans. Secretary Gibson testified that after re-examining VA's resource needs in light of the revelations about secret waiting lists and hidden demand, VA required supplemental resources totaling $17.6 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year through the end of FY 2017.

As the leaders of organizations representing millions of veterans, we agree with Secretary Gibson that there is a need to provide VA with additional resources now to ensure that veterans can access the health care they have earned, either from VA providers or through non-VA purchased care. We urge Congress to expeditiously approve supplemental funding that fully addresses the critical needs outlined by Secretary Gibson either prior to, or at the same time as, any compromise legislation that may be reported out of the House-Senate Conference Committee. Whether it costs $17 billion or $50 billion over the next three years, Congress has a sacred obligation to provide VA with the funds it requires to meet both immediate needs through non-VA care and future needs by expanding VA's internal capacity.

Last month, we wrote to you to outlining the principles and priorities essential to addressing the access crisis, a copy of which is attached. The first priority ''. . . must be to ensure that all veterans currently waiting for treatment must be provided access to timely, convenient health care as quickly as medically indicated.'' Second, when VA is unable to provide that care directly, ''. . . VA must be involved in the timely coordination of and fully responsible for prompt payment for all authorized non-VA care.'' Third, Congress must provide supplemental funding for this year and additional funding for next year to pay for the temporary expansion of non-VA purchased care. Finally, whatever actions VA or Congress takes to address the current access crisis must also ''. . . protect, preserve and strengthen the VA health care system so that it remains capable of providing a full continuum of high-quality, timely health care to all enrolled veterans.''

In his testimony to the Senate, Secretary Gibson stated that the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) has already reached out to over 160,000 veterans to get them off wait lists and into clinics. He said that VHA accomplished this by adding more clinic hours, aggressively recruiting to fill physician vacancies, deploying mobile medical units,

using temporary staffing resources, and expanding the use of private sector care. Gibson also testified that VHA made over 543,000 referrals for veterans to receive non-VA care in the private sector—91,000 more than in the comparable period a year ago. In a subsequent press release, VA stated that it had reduced the New Enrollee Appointment Report (NEAR) from its peak of 46,000 on June 1, 2014 to 2,000 as of July 1, 2014, and that there was also a reduction of over 17,000 veterans on the Electronic Waiting List since May 15, 2014. We appreciate this progress, but more must be done to ensure that every enrolled veteran has access to timely care.

The majority of the supplemental funding required by VA, approximately $8.1 billion, would be used to expand access to VA health care over the next three fiscal years by hiring up to 10,000 new clinical staff, including 1,500 new doctors, nurses and other direct care providers. That funding would also be used to cover the cost of expanded non-VA purchased care, with the focus shifting over the three years from non-VA purchased care to VA-provided care as internal capacity increased. The next biggest portion would be $6 billion for VA's physical infrastructure, which according to Secretary Gibson would include 77 lease projects for outpatient clinics that would add about two million square feet, as well as eight major construction projects and 700 minor construction and nonrecurring maintenance projects that together could add roughly four million appointment slots at VA facilities. The remainder of the funding would go to IT enhancements, including scheduling, purchased care and project coordination systems, as well as a modest increase of $400 million for additional ''VBA staff to address the claims and appeals backlogs.

In reviewing the additional resource requirements identified by Secretary Gibson, the undersigned find them to be commensurate with the historical funding shortfalls identified in recent years by many of our organizations, including The Independent Budget (IB), which is authored and endorsed by many of our organizations. For example, in the prior ten VA budgets, the amount of funding for medical care requested by the Administration and ultimately provided to VA by Congress was more than $7.8 billion less than what was recommended by the IB. Over just the past five years, the IB recommended $4 billion more than VA requested or Congress approved and for next year, FY 2015, the IB has recommended over $2 billion more than VA requested. Further corroboration of the shortfall in VA's medical care funding came two weeks ago from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), which issued a revised report on H.R. 3230 estimating that, ''. . . under current law for 2015 and CBO's baseline projections for 2016, VA's appropriations for health care are not projected to keep pace with growth in the patient population or growth in per capita spending for health care—meaning that waiting times will tend to increase. . .''

Similarly, over the past decade the amount of funding requested by VA for major and minor construction, and the final amount appropriated by Congress, has been more than $9 billion less than what the IB estimated was needed to allow VA sufficient space to deliver timely, high-quality care. Over the past five years alone, that shortfall is more than $6.6 billion and for next year the VA budget request is more than $2.5 billion less than the IB recommendation. Funding for nonrecurring maintenance (NRM) has also been woefully inadequate. Importantly, the IB recommendations closely mirror VA's Strategic Capital Investment Plan (SCIP), which VA uses to determine infrastructure needs. According to SCIP, VA should invest between $56 to $69 billion in facility improvements over the next ten years, which would require somewhere between $5 to $7 billion annually. However, the Administration's budget requests over the past four years have averaged less than $2 billion annually for major and minor construction and for NRM, and Congress has not significantly increased those funding requests in the final appropriations.

Taking into account the progress achieved by VA over the past two months, and considering the funding shortfalls our organizations have identified over the past decade and in next year's budget, the undersigned believe that Congress must quickly approve supplemental funding that fully meets the critical needs identified by Secretary Gibson, and which fulfills the principles and priorities we laid out a month ago. Such an approach would be a reasonable and practical way to expand access now, while building internal capacity to avoid future access crises in the future. In contrast to the legislative proposals in the Conference Committee which would require months to promulgate new regulations, establish new procedures and set up new offices, the VA proposal could have an immediate impact on increasing access to care for veterans today by building upon VA's ongoing expanded access initiatives and sustaining them over the next three years. Furthermore, by investing in new staff and treatment space, VA would be able to continue providing this expanded level of care, even while increasing its use of purchased care when and where it is needed.

In our jointly signed letter last month, we applauded both the House and Senate for working expeditiously and in a bipartisan manner to move legislation designed to address the access crisis, and we understand you are continuing to work towards a compromise bill. As leaders of the nation's major veterans organization, we now ask that you work in the same bipartisan spirit to provide VA supplemental funding addressing the needs outlined by Secretary Gibson to the floor as quickly as feasible, approve it and send it to the President so that he can enact it to help ensure that no veteran waits too long to get the care they earned through their service. We look forward to your response.

Respectfully,

Garry J. Augustine, Executive Director, Washington Headquarters, DAV (Disabled American Veterans); Homer S. Townsend, Jr., Executive Director, Paralyzed Veterans of America; Tom Tarantino, Chief Policy Officer, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America; Robert E. Wallace, Executive Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Rick Weidman, Executive Director for Policy and Government Affairs, Vietnam Veterans of America; VADM Norbert R. Ryan, Jr., USN (Ret.), President, Military Officers Association of America; Randy Reid, Executive Director, U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty, Officers Association; James T. Currie, Ph.D, Colonel, USA (Ret.), Executive Director, Commissioned Officers, Association of the U.S. Public Health Service; Robert L. Frank, Chief Executive Officer, Air Force Sergeants Association; VADM John Totushek, USN (Ret), Executive Director, Association of the U.S. Navy (AUSN); Herb Rosenbleeth, National Executive Director, Jewish War Veterans of the USA; Heather L. Ansley, Esq., MSW, Vice President, VetsFirst, a program of United Spinal Association; CW4 (Ret) Jack Du Teil, Executive Director, United States Army Warrant Officers Association; John R. Davis, Director, Legislative Programs, Fleet Reserve Association; Robert Certain, Executive Director, Military Chaplain Association of the United States; Michael A. Blum, National Executive Director, Marine Corps League.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, 16 major veterans organizations, including the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars—the VFW—Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Military Officers Association of America, and many others—wonderful veterans organizations that have worked for years representing the needs of millions and millions of veterans—what these organizations say in this letter is that while we must address the immediate crisis of doing away with these long waiting lines and allowing veterans to get private care, what they also say—loudly and clearly—is that the VA must have the doctors, the nurses, and the space capacity that it needs so that in the future it will be able to permanently eliminate these long waiting lines so that 2 years from now, 3 years from now, when veterans come into the VA, they will get quality care, they will get timely care. That is what the veterans organizations have said.

I will quote to you one small paragraph of a long letter. They say that the charge of the conference committee should be ''to ensure that all veterans currently waiting for treatment must be provided access to timely, convenient health care as quickly as medically indicated,'' and at the same time ''protect, preserve and strengthen the VA health care system so that it remains capable of providing a full continuum of high-quality, timely health care to all enrolled veterans.''

Last week, in a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee meeting, Sloan Gibson, the Acting Secretary of the VA, stated that the VA needed over $16 billion in order to hire thousands and thousands of doctors, nurses, other medical providers. In many VA facilities doctors do not have the examining rooms they need. There are space problems all over this country. What the veterans organizations—16 of them—said loudly and clearly is that Sloan Gibson, the new Acting Secretary of the VA—approved with wide Republican support—they said we support his proposal.

Our legislation does not give the VA all that Mr. GIBSON would like, but we do provide them with the doctors and the nurses and the medical staff they

need so we do not continue to have long waiting lines at VA hospitals all over this country, so we do not come back 2 years from now in the same position, with veterans not being able to get timely care.

I have worked for a month and a half with my House Republican colleagues, led by the Veterans' Affairs chairman there, JEFF MILLER, to find a compromise. Everybody knows the House looks at the world differently than the Senate—we all know that—and if we go forward, we need a compromise.

We have put good-faith offers on the table time and time again and we have tried to meet our Republican colleagues more than halfway, but I am very sad to say that at this point—and I hope this changes—but at this point I can only conclude, with great reluctance, that the good faith we have shown is simply not being reciprocated by the other side.

Standing here and saying this is the last thing I want to be doing. Our veterans deserve a responsible solution to this crisis.

Last night—this is an example of what has happened—somewhere around 10 o'clock in the night, the cochairman of the veterans conference committee, Mr. MILLER in the House, announced unilaterally, without my knowledge or without my concurrence, that he was going to hold a so-called conference committee meeting in order to introduce his proposals.

Needless to say, his proposal is something I have yet to see. I do not know what it is. This is a proposal nobody on our side has seen. My understanding is he then wants to take this to the House on Monday to come up with a vote. In other words, his idea of negotiation is: We have a proposal. Take it or leave it. Any sixth grader in a school in the United States understands this is not negotiation, this is not what democracy is about.

I note the presence on the floor of the coauthor of the bill passed in the Senate, Senator MCCAIN, and I am happy to yield the floor for Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, could I say that I understand the frustration the chairman of the committee feels, and this has been, for everyone involved, a very frustrating process. I think to some degree the real effort has been diverted on this whole issue of the pay-fors, the cost of this legislation. I fully understand the frustration of the Senator from Vermont, the distinguished chairman of the committee. I would hope we could maybe, all of us, cool down some and maybe go to this meeting at noon, and ahead of time—as far ahead of time as is possible—tell the chairman what their proposal is and also a counterproposal of Senator SANDERS' would be fully considered by the conference as well.

It is the proper process to go to a conference. Unfortunately, we only did that once, and that was largely a pro forma kind of activity.

Again, I fully appreciate Senator SANDERS, who has worked very hard on this very terrible issue. But I hope all of my colleagues recognize that for us to not come to agreement on legislation which is not that dissimilar, which passed this body 93 to 3, and over on the House side I believe it was unanimous, is a gross disservice to those who deserve our consideration most.

There is no group of citizens in this country who deserve our help in this time of crisis more than our veterans, the men and women who have served. So may I say to my friend from Vermont, who, like me, is very given to calm deliberation of all issues, we are very similar in that respect. I say, with some humor, I hope, that I hope we can go to this conference at noon today and sit down together, and listen to the various proposals.

I believe the fundamentals, as were passed by this body on a 93-to-3 vote, should be a basis for largely the final legislation we reach. The other body's legislation is strikingly similar. It seems to me where we have a difference is how much additional funding to the fundamentals of the legislation we are considering.

I was watching my friend from Vermont on the floor here. I want to say to him, I fully understand his frustration. I hope we will be able to sit down at noon with both Republicans and Democrats, both sides of the aisle, with the overriding priority of not leaving and going out into an August recess without acting on this issue. Veterans are dying. There are allegations that 40 veterans in my State at the Phoenix VA hospital died because they did not receive care. There is not a policy/academic issue here. This is the very lives of the men and women who are serving.

I guess for the third time I would say to my colleague, and I will yield to him in just a second: I would be more than happy to look at what we have proposed and what has passed through this body, as compared to what the other side of the Capitol is proposing. Perhaps we can come to some agreement and compromise, which is the way we are supposed to pass laws in this body.

I ask unanimous consent to yield to Senator SANDERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. First of all, I want to thank Senator MCCAIN again for all of his hard work on this issue.

Let me ask a few questions. The Senator and I have been talking the last few days. Does the Senator not think—he has been here for 1 or 2 years—that the best way to go forward is for people to sit down at a table and knock out their differences? And then the idea of presenting it to a conference is absolutely right. But the Senator knows, and I know, that what conference committees are largely about are 5-minute speeches.

I have been disappointed that I have not—I think the Senator will agree with me, maybe not, that the best way forward is for people to sit down in a room and work out their differences, not to go forward with unilateral statements. Does that make sense?

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, could I say to my friend from Vermont, I believe it is a matter of simple courtesy, that the Senator, as the chairman of a committee, should be asked to come to a meeting with the other major chairmen and ranking members of the committees. I hope that kind of thing does not happen again.

What I would like to see—and I beg my colleagues to sit down and let's work this out. It is a matter of money. It is not a matter of the provisions of the bill. That cannot be the reason for us not to reach some agreement. I intend at noon to attend. I intend to make a strong case that we would be glad to hear any proposal by the chairmen and ranking members on the other side of the Capitol, and that we would have a counterproposal and maybe could start a discussion and dialog which could lead to an agreement.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me ask Senator MCCAIN one more question. I thank the Senator very much. He is not on, at this moment, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, but he has jumped into this with both feet and is playing a very big role. Would the Senator be prepared if, generally speaking, what happens is the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate and the House get together—you are not the chairman, you are not the ranking member, but I think you could play a good role. Would the Senator be prepared to sit down with the other four members, myself, the other three, and help us reach a compromise?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would be more than glad to do that, I would say to my friend from Vermont. I would also like to say I hope the participation of a number of people would lead us to some agreement today. Because once we reach an agreement, then, of course, we have to go through the normal votes and all of the things that require some period of time.

I want to say to my friends who are deeply concerned about the costs here of some of these provisions: My argument is that, yes, we should seek ways to pay for as much as we can. I believe we can compromise on some areas of spending. But we cannot allow that alone to prevent us from acting.

I thank my friend from Vermont. I look forward to engaging with him. I think maybe it is important that we show courtesy to all Members who are

involved in this, including the chairman of the committee. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SANDERS. One more second. I wanted to paraphrase. Tell me if I am misquoting. I do not have it in front of me, but when we were debating this bill on the floor, the Senator said—we were talking about emergency funding—something to the effect of if this is not an emergency, I do not know what an emergency is. Is that a correct paraphrase?

Mr. MCCAIN. That is absolutely my conviction, that the reason why we have emergency funding from time to time in times of crisis is for when there is an emergency. I will repeat: I do not know of a greater domestic emergency than the care we owe the men and women who have served this country.

I thank my colleague. I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator MCCAIN very much for his statements and for his hard work on this and would reiterate what he said; that is, my belief that what we have here on the Senate floor, that if taking care of the men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend us and who came home without arms or legs, or without their eyesight or 500,000 of them who came home with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury—if that is not an emergency, taking care of those brave men and women, I agree with Senator MCCAIN, I do not know what an emergency is.

I am happy to yield the floor for my colleague from Alaska, Senator BEGICH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. I say to my chairman on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, we talked very briefly on the phone. I wanted to come down here because I find this amazing. I am new around here. I know it has been almost 6 years. I still consider myself new in the process. But late last night, early this morning, I get a notice of a supposed conference committee meeting, which I was totally unaware of, was unaware of the proposals they are putting on the other side. I would like to have time—I know on the other side they talk a lot about transparency and timeliness and making sure the public is aware of what they are doing. But, lo and behold, they just kind of snap together a meeting because they have an idea that they want to move forward.

I am all game for more ideas on how to solve the problems with our veterans. But the public demands—demands—us to solve this problem, and also demands it to be done in a transparent way, not in the dark of the night a meeting is called. The chairman of the other side, in this case the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Senate committee, is not even notified.

I recognize Senator MCCAIN's comments about the courtesy. It should be a courtesy. But on top of it, the basic understanding of compromise and working with each other—that is what has to happen. We are not seeing that. We had a conference committee. We all made 5-minute speeches, grand statements about how to help veterans. We all want to do that. But it also means sitting down, working with each other, putting proposals out. I think the way the chairman described it best is: Roll up your sleeves and solve this problem.

Think about this: What is the real issue here? You heard it from Senator MCCAIN, that we pretty much have agreement on a lot of the basic issues. It is the money.

What is so amazing to me—I was not here when the wars were decided to be funded or, excuse me, not funded—two trillion dollars, Afghanistan even more. But even if you use that $2 trillion number, what we are talking about today is about 1 percent, 1 percent to take care of the veterans and their families who put their lives on the line, have come back, some missing limbs, some having mental issues, a variety of services they need, they earned, they deserve.

You know, when you think about it, my simple statement—the chairman has heard me say this before: You are for veterans or you are not.

We are going to quibble and nickel-and-dime our veterans. I appreciate what the chairman has done trying to lower the costs, trying to find compromise. But this is, as Senator MCCAIN said, an emergency. We need to take care of these veterans. For the House to nickel-and-dime our veterans is absolutely obscene. It is outrageous. They served our country. We need to do what we can to take care of them. It does not mean having midnight emails to tell us about a meeting that is going to occur on a day 12 hours later when I have no idea what their proposal is. They have not shared it with me. It would be nice. They are all about transparency. Let's do it. Let's have transparency. Let's have a debate.

I know the chairman has been working on this for the last 6 weeks. Many of us met, as the chairman in the last week did, talking about—with the new potential Secretary, which I am very excited for. He already has a 90-day idea, a plan, which I was amazed to see that he is already moving forward. I met with him yesterday. I told him: Be bold. Start doing things. Get nominated, get approved, let's get some stuff going.

But for this body on the other side to just out of the blue decide they are going to have a conference—usually the way it works—maybe I am wrong—a conference committee usually means Senate and House. The two chairmen talk to each other, pick a time, everyone tells their Members, and we all attend. We see proposals. We see paperwork beforehand. It is transparent. The press is aware of it, the public is aware of it. It is open to the people.

This is like a midnight ride to, in my view, potentially shortchanging our veterans. I am outraged. The chairman probably got that sense when I sent an email to the chairman this morning. Within seconds we were on the phone, because this is not how we need to do this business. The veterans deserve the care; they earned it; we owe it to them. The bill is due. It is time to pay up and quit nickel-and-diming our veterans. Prepare the services they need. Give the VA the capacity they need in order to perform the many different services, from hiring people—the chairman is right—nurses, doctors, mental health providers. We need them all.

I am very proud of some of the work—you heard me talk about it before—in Alaska. But we are one State. There are 49 other States. We need to do everything we can. I came down here—I had something else going on right now, but I was very frustrated and outraged by this lack of transparency on the body that proclaims to always talk about transparency.

But again, I can go on a rant here. I am going to stop. I am going to say the last thing I will say is: This is an emergency. We know it. The American people know it. Quit nickel-and-diming our veterans. Quit complaining about: Is it $25 or $26 billion. It is an emergency. We did not complain about one dime when they wanted all of the money for the wars: $2 trillion, $3 trillion. Actually, as some remember those photos, we put cash on pallets—cash on pallets—and shipped it over there. Now it is time to take care of our veterans. It is time to put up or shut up. It is time to get the work done. You are for veterans or you are against veterans. It is a simple equation.

It is a simple equation.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator BEGICH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

HUMANE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there is no question that immigration is one of the toughest, most divisive issues we talk about in Washington, DC, perhaps because it is an economic issue, it involves cultural considerations, and it also includes security concerns. It is not just any one of those things; it is basically all of those wrapped into one.

At the same time, I have been impressed by the fact that the ongoing border crisis that is now occurring in South Texas has produced a moment of bipartisan consensus and clarity, which are rare when we talk about immigration. For example, we all agree that the United States must continue to uphold the rule of law, with which all of us are better off—including the people who want to come to the United States

as immigrants, if they can come through a legal system in an orderly way and not as a flood of humanity who have surrendered themselves to the tender mercies of the criminal organizations that funnel children and other immigrants from Central America through Mexico into South Texas.

We all agree that our policies should be one of not encouraging Central American children, and particularly their parents putting their lives at risk in the hands of these criminal organizations. We all agree that the present levels of chaos and confusion on our southern border are totally unacceptable. No one is arguing for the status quo, to my knowledge. They are unacceptable from both a security perspective and from a humanitarian perspective.

I said just a moment ago that no one is arguing that the status quo is acceptable, but I fear that unless we sit down and reason together, we are going to end with a status quo before we leave for the August recess. Unless we are successful in passing the needed policy changes that will actually address some of the causes of the current crisis—as well as appropriate money that is needed on an emergency basis to help build capacity to deal with it—the status quo is what we are going to get. That would be disappointing and it would be tragic.

So people may have good ideas, and I would love to hear them. But working together with my colleague HENRY CUELLAR from the House—HENRY likes to call himself a Blue Dog Democrat, but he is from Laredo, TX, lives on the border and understands it very well—he and I have come up with a bipartisan, bicameral proposal that would discourage illegal immigration from Central America and elsewhere by ending the de facto policy of catch-and-release.

What I mean by that is when people are coming into the country illegally, they are detained by the Border Patrol. But we know there is a policy of de facto release once they are detained because many of them are given a notice to appear for a future court hearing and they never show up.

I had one former head of the Drug Enforcement Administration who said: Everybody knows that a notice to appear should really be retitled a ''notice to disappear'' because that is what happens.

If people are successful in navigating this glitch in our enforcement system, then they are going to keep coming and the cartels and the people who make money off of transporting people through this perilous journey will continue—as I have spoken about numerous times—from Central America through Mexico—a journey in which women are routinely sexually assaulted, the migrants are routinely kidnapped and held for ransom, and some never make it because they die of injuries or exposure.

If we don't fix that by the time we leave for our August recess, we will have failed in some of our more basic responsibilities. But more specifically, our bill would reform a 2008 human trafficking law that actually passed, essentially, by unanimous consent. Nobody dreamed that it would be exploited as it has been in a way that weakened U.S. immigration enforcement and incentivized Central American children to risk everything they have to make this perilous journey from Central America to Mexico.

I have said earlier what I believe to be the fact—the cartels are smart. I mean, these are rich, wealthy criminal organizations with a lot of shrewd and inventive people. What they have figured out is a business model to exploit this vulnerability in the 2008 law that we need to address before we leave.

I will give one sense of the problem. On Tuesday of this week, 20 unaccompanied minors from Central America had hearings scheduled before a Federal immigration court in Dallas—20 scheduled; 18 failed to show up. So roughly 10 percent showed up, and the other 18 didn't show up. We currently don't have the resources through Immigration and Customs Enforcement to locate those children and make sure they actually do appear. What happens is they are part of that 40 percent of illegal immigration, people who enter the country, just simply melt into the landscape, and we don't hear from them again, but they are still here.

Given how few unaccompanied minors actually appear for their hearings, Members of both parties have expressed their view that the 2008 law needs to be changed.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, whom I talked to as recently as yesterday, said on Tuesday: The administration has asked for a change in the law, and we are in active discussions with Congress right now about doing that.

That is a little bit mysterious to me because the majority leader has said the border is secure and he is not interested in taking up any reforms such as the HUMANE Act Congressman CUELLAR and I have sponsored.

I would say to the majority leader, if you don't think that is the right solution, then where is yours? Are there other ideas that people have that are better ideas? I am game.

I think we ought to have that discussion, and we ought to be focused on trying to fix it as Secretary Johnson said is needed. I am sure there will be some differences, but that is what this place is for, to work out those differences and come up with the 80 percent solution, hopefully, and then get the job done.

But the irony of what Secretary Johnson has said is that the administration acknowledges that change is needed. But is any change forthcoming from the majority leader?

Well, apparently it is not, because he is in the process of having us vote on a so-called clean emergency appropriations bill without any reforms attached to it. I have called this a blank check, and indeed I believe it is, because it is not responsible just to spend the money without trying to fix the problem. Indeed, if history is any guide—and I think it is—we are seeing these numbers go up every year.

In other words, it is estimated that of the 57,000 unaccompanied minors that have been detained at our southwestern border since August, that number could grow as high as 90,000 this year. Next year, the estimate is it could be as many as 145,000.

I know the Presiding Officer has read, as I have, stories in the Washington Post, the New York Times, and elsewhere about the backlash that is occurring around the country as these children are being transported and warehoused in different locations around the country. This is going to do nothing but get worse, in my view, as the numbers continue to escalate and as we don't deal with the source of the problem.

This is a very dangerous situation where the American people are demanding we act on our best judgment, trying to work together in a bicameral, bipartisan way. But so far at least, the majority leader, the Democratic leader has rejected any changes in the 2008 law—even along the lines that Secretary Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security, has suggested.

I have actually heard there are proposals, legislative language that has been floated among our Democratic colleagues in the Senate. But under orders of the White House, none of that has been shared with anyone on this side of the aisle. I hope that changes because we need to be sharing ideas. We need to be working toward a consensus here because we have basically the rest of this week and next week, then we are out of here, and the problem is not going to get better. It is only going to get worse. We could use some help from the President, using some of his political capital—the power and the authority that only the resident of the White House has—to try to work together with Congress to get something done.

Seven weeks ago he called this an urgent, humanitarian crisis, but for some reason unknown to me, the President has still refused to go to the border himself to witness what is happening there. I worry he is living in a bubble—which I think all Presidents are prone to do unless they are careful and fight against it—that does not allow him to appreciate the seriousness of this situation and how bad it will continue to grow.

I was in McAllen, TX, last Friday, and I was pleased to see a number of

our colleagues had traveled down to the border: Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, Senator HIRONO of Hawaii, Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, and other Members of the House—from California, Colorado, and Texas. I am grateful to them for coming down to the site of this huge crisis and trying to help work with us to try to figure out what needs to be done in order to resolve it.

I wish the President would take the same opportunity to see with his own eyes what his fellow Democrats saw. When I was in McAllen and then in Mission, TX—which is close to McAllen—last Friday, they made crystal clear to me and Congressman CUELLAR that they didn't care if we were Republicans or Democrats. As a matter of fact, that part of our State is heavily Democratic. What they cared about is whether we were serious about offering a meaningful solution to this crisis.

Can you imagine what impact there is on the local communities and on the State of Texas? I mean, this isn't broadly spread along the entire border, this is concentrated on the Rio Grande Valley in South Texas. It is overwhelming the capacity of those local communities and of our State to deal with it.

This is why our Governor, in the absence of any Federal response, thought it was important to get more boots on the ground in the form of the National Guard. That is not a permanent solution by any means, but at least Governor Perry is willing to do something when the President is apparently not willing to use any political capital to get a meaningful response from Washington, DC.

I would say that it is obvious to any fairminded observer that the status quo along the border is unacceptable and unsustainable. But the response of the majority leader appears to be: Let's just spend some more money on an emergency basis. But I dare to say that if the majority leader wants us to spend $2.7 billion on an emergency basis now, we are going to be back at the end of the year doing it again. We are going to be back in 6 months doing it again. We are going to be back in another 6 months doing it again.

In other words, unless you are dealing with the source of the problem, we are going to continue to hemorrhage money to try to deal with this crisis when we should be all about deterring people from coming into our country when they have no realistic hope of being able to stay under our current laws.

As former Border Patrol Deputy Chief Ron Coburn recently reported: Not only has the Border Patrol's morale been lower than ever—we have Border Patrol who are being diverted from their law enforcement responsibilities in order to change diapers and to feed children. You can imagine what advantage the cartels and drug are taking when the Border Patrol is being relieved of their duties at the border and is busy trying to process these immigrant children through these various centers.

Well, they are having a field day. They are laughing at the Federal Government's ineptitude. Our current policies are emboldening transnational gangs, jeopardizing public safety, and making a mockery of United States sovereignty.

By contrast, the HUMANE Act that Congressman CUELLAR and I have offered would accelerate the removal process for unaccompanied minors who have no valid basis for staying. It would give those who have a valid basis for staying a timely hearing in front of an immigration judge so they can make their case. And if they can make their case under current law, then they will be able to stay. But it would strongly deter and discourage illegal migration, and it would help restore something that is sorely needed, which is some order in the rule of law in a situation that is characterized now by sheer chaos.

Just to clarify, this isn't about comprehensive immigration reform. We still have a lot of work we need to do beyond this. This is what we can do now together on a bipartisan basis that needs to be done on a timely basis. It is a narrowly targeted measure designed to alleviate a national crisis—nothing more, nothing less. I would think that would be something we would all agree is worth doing.

I would point out that some of the cosponsors of the HUMANE Act include Members who voted for the Gang of 8 immigration bill coming out of the Senate and Members who voted against it. So this is one of those rare points of bipartisanship and clarity as to what the problem is and what we need to do to fix it that is bringing people together on a bipartisan basis.

Our legislation transcends the typical left-right, Democratic-Republican immigration debate. It is a genuine bipartisan solution to a genuine emergency, and it deserves a vote. I hope the majority leader will reconsider his earlier position that all he wants us to do is write a blank check without any real reform.

The majority leader may not particularly like the legislation Congressman CUELLAR and I have introduced, but if he doesn't like it, doesn't it make sense that he would offer something different, something he thinks maybe would be a better solution? I would be glad to take a look at it.

If you don't like our plan, fine. But I would ask, Where is your plan? Because if you don't offer one and if you block a vote on sensible reforms, all you are doing is guaranteeing that the current border crisis will continue.

Again, I urge the President and the majority leader to come down to South Texas, like so many of our other colleagues have done, and take a look for themselves. The very least they could do is say thank you to the Border Patrol and other Federal officers, such as FEMA, who are trying to deal with this crisis. Unless we take action here in Washington, the problems are only going to get worse.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the current bill before this body, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

At a time when Washington is stuck in political gridlock, I believe Democrats and Republicans should work together on policies that will create jobs not only in Nevada but, of course, across this country.

I have filed five amendments on policies I have been working on here in the Senate of this Congress that will spur natural resources jobs throughout the West, and I stand before this body today to urge action on what I consider to be commonsense proposals.

As the Presiding Officer knows, roughly 85 percent of the land in Nevada is controlled by the Federal Government. Other Western States range somewhere between 50 percent and 80 percent. This situation presents our local and State governments with a lot of unique challenges.

Our communities' economic vitality is directly tied to the way the Federal Government manages our Federal lands. As a result, one of my top priorities in the Senate is to implement reforms that streamline bureaucratic redtape that gets in the way of natural resources job creation.

I have five amendments I have filed to deal with public land issues that specifically directly affect rural Nevada and rural America. I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to work with me so we can consider my amendments and other job-related amendments. If given the opportunity, we could spur natural resources-related economic development across this country and especially across the West.

My first amendment, the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act, is a Nevada-centric jobs bill which I have been focusing on for years which, to the disappointment of my constituents, has been held up through Senate gridlock.

The Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act could transform the local economy of the county in my State that is struggling the most during this current recession. The bill allows the city of Yerington to partner with Nevada Copper to develop roughly 12,500 acres of land surrounding the Nevada Copper Pumpkin Hollow project site. The intent of this legislation is economic growth, and the

land purchased by the city will be used for mining activities, industrial and renewable energy development, recreation, and open space. Enactment of this legislation is the last obstacle in the way of the company moving forward in the creation of over 1,000 jobs. For a rural county such as Lyon County, 1,000 jobs truly is a game changer.

My second amendment, the Public Lands Job Creation Act, will create jobs by streamlining the bureaucratic process, cutting redtape, and ensuring that the BLM reviews Federal Register notices in a timely manner.

The permitting and approval process for energy and mining projects on Federal lands takes several years, largely because of unnecessary delays, which costs businesses valuable time, resources, and jobs.

This amendment, which I have also introduced as stand-alone legislation, streamlines the process by holding these agencies accountable to work effectively and timely to limit the negative effects of bureaucratic delays. Specifically, if BLM does not review a Federal Register notice by 45 days, the notice will be considered to be approved and the State BLM office will immediately forward the notice to be published in the Federal Register. This type of work is basically the transfer of paperwork but a transfer that is consistently holding up important job-creating projects.

Earlier this year I facilitated a meeting between a local company going through the process to start a large hard rock mineral mine in Elko County and the local BLM to break this bureaucratic logjam. This mine will create hundreds of new jobs. While we were able to get the ball rolling in this particular instance—and I greatly appreciated the agency's work to move forward—it also shouldn't require congressional interaction to spur prompt action.

My legislation will provide certainty to our local job creators.

My third amendment, the Public Lands Renewable Energy Development Act, is an initiative we have been working on for many years. This legislation is a strong bipartisan proposal that will help create jobs, progress toward energy independence, and preserve our Nation's natural wonders by spurring renewable energy development on public lands.

Energy is one of Nevada's greatest assets, and I believe continuing to develop renewable and alternative sources is important for Nevada's economic future. Geothermal and solar production in my State is a major part of the U.S. ''all the above'' energy strategy. In 2013 Nevada ranked second in the Nation for geothermal energy production and third for solar production. Eighteen percent of our total electricity generated came from renewable, compared to the national average of 13 percent.

Our Nation's public lands can play a critical role in that mission, but uncertainty in the permitting process impedes or delays our ability to harness the renewable energy potential. Under current law, permits for wind and solar development are completed under the same process for other surface uses, such as pipelines, roads, and power lines. The BLM and Forest Service need a permitting process tailored to the unique characteristics and impacts of renewable energy projects. This initiative develops a straightforward process that will drive investment toward the highest quality renewable sources.

In addition, the legislation ensures a fair return for public lands communities. Since Federal lands are not taxable, State and local governments deserve a share of the revenues from the sales of energy production on public lands that are within their county or State borders. These resources will help local governments deliver critical services and develop much needed capital improvement projects—projects such as roadways, public safety, and, of course, law enforcement.

In my opinion, this proposal is a win-win situation. It is good for economic development while at the same time protecting the natural treasures out West that all of us value most.

My fourth amendment, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, gets the government out of the way of our private sector natural resources job creators.

Instead of advocating for policies that will put people back to work, this administration's EPA continues to develop rules that will increase Americans' utility bills, cause companies to lay off employees, and stifle economic growth.

My amendment will specifically require the EPA to be transparent when proposing and issuing energy-related regulations with an economic impact of more than $1 billion. Additionally, it prohibits the EPA from finalizing a rule if the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with other relevant agencies, determines the rule would cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

Finally, my final amendment, the Emergency Fuel Reduction Act, tackles a major problem many of our communities out West are facing right now; that is, catastrophic wildfires.

One of the greatest challenges facing our western forests and rangelands is the growing severity and length of the fire season. Nevada is one of a handful of Western States that seemingly keeps enduring recordbreaking fire seasons year after year. We are always going to have fires out West, but we must be proactive in treating our forests and rangelands so that we can reduce the size, the frequency, and the intensity of these forest fires.

My amendment streamlines the bureaucratic process for fire prevention projects, where a dangerous density of fuels threatens critical infrastructure such as power lines, schools, and water delivery canals, private property owners who live adjacent to Federal lands, and areas that threaten endangered species candidates such as the greater sage-grouse.

Every year I hear from ranchers who live in northern Nevada's rural counties, such as Humboldt County, where, through no fault of their own, fires on Federal lands spread onto their private property. The Federal agencies have to prioritize proactive preventive work in these areas. My constituents should not have to suffer because the Federal Government is simply not doing their job to properly manage our own lands.

I think nearly everyone can agree on a commonsense proposal such as the Emergency Fuel Reduction Act.

If this body adopts my five amendments, Congress could go a long way toward spurring economic development and job creation within the mining, energy development, ranching, timber, and outdoor recreational industries. These types of jobs are the bedrock of our Western way of life, and concurrently these fields are struggling the most under this administration's restrictive Federal land management policies. It is no coincidence that our western rural communities are suffering from unemployment rates well above the national average. Let's get the government off their backs and allow them to do what they do best; that is, create jobs.

At a time when the American public continues to lose faith in Congress, I hope the Senate can put partisan politics aside and restore order to the traditional amendment process this deliberative body has been known for over time. We should break through the political gridlock and have an open amendment process in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

HARRIS NOMINATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly we will have the opportunity to vote on a cloture motion on Pamela Harris for confirmation to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, which includes Maryland. I urge my colleagues not only to support the cloture motion but to support her confirmation as a judge in the Fourth Circuit.

Senator MIKULSKI and I have a process—and I thank the senior Senator from Maryland for that process—we use in screening recommendations to the President for judgeships. I am very proud of that process. It is very open. We think we have recruited the very best in the legal profession to serve as our judges, and I am proud to be part of it with Senator MIKULSKI.

Of all of the candidates I have interviewed for the appellate court, Pamela Harris has stood out as one of the most

qualified individuals we have in the legal community to sit on our appellate court. She is exceptional in her qualifications, well qualified. She is an excellent Supreme Court litigator, has clerked at the Federal appellate court, supervised policy initiatives at the Department of Justice, and she has dedicated her career and professional life to improving the administration of justice as a public servant.

A little bit of background about her—particularly her family. Her grandmother was a Polish Jewish immigrant to the United States who valued education and worked hard to overcome personal adversity. Her mom put herself through law school, with young children, after a divorce, and died from cancer a few years later. Ms. Harris relied in part on Pell grants to attend college at Yale. Her story represents the American dream and the American experience and the opportunity in this country coming from an immigrant family.

After graduating from public high school in Montgomery County, Walt Whitman High School, Ms. Harris received a B.A. summa cum laude from Yale College in 1985 and a J.D. from Yale Law School in 1990. After her graduation from law school, she clerked for Judge Harry T. Edwards of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and later clerked with Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States between 1992 and 1993.

She became associate professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Beginning in 2007, while she was still in private practice, Ms. Harris codirected Harvard Law School's Supreme Court and Appellate Practice Clinic and was a visiting professor at Georgetown University Law Center.

In 2009 Ms. Harris was named the executive director of the Supreme Court Institute at Georgetown, serving until 2010. Ms. Harris joined the Justice Department's Office of Legal Policy, where she served as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General until returning to Georgetown in 2012.

Ms. Harris is currently a visiting professor at Georgetown University Law Center and a senior advisor to the Supreme Court Institute.

It is not surprising that the American Bar Association has given her the highest rating of unanimously ''well qualified'' for this appointment. She has appeared as counsel or co-counsel in approximately 100 cases before the Federal courts of appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court. Her practice has been pretty evenly divided between criminal cases and civil cases.

When it comes to Supreme Court litigation, I must tell you I don't think Ms. Harris has an equal as far as her qualifications. Her clinic at Georgetown which she supervises prepares litigants for the Supreme Court. In other words, she provides experience for those who are going to be before the Supreme Court as to how to properly litigate those cases, and she takes them on a first-come, first-served basis. It is not ideological at all. It is to make sure the highest quality presentations are made in the highest Court of our land so we get the best decisions made by the highest Court of our land, the Supreme Court of the United States. That is the type of person we need on our court of appeals.

As I said, I don't know of a person whom I have interviewed who is more qualified to be an appellate court judge than Ms. Harris. She understands the different role of an advocate or someone writing an opinion or commentary column and a judge. I want to emphasize this. She is a person who brings—we all bring our views and our passion to life, but she understands what the judiciary is all about.

As is the practice of the Judiciary Committee—and I serve on the Judiciary Committee and I am proud of my service—I thank Senator LEAHY for his credible leadership. As you know, after the committee there are questions for the record that are submitted by the Senators. That is certainly true in Ms. Harris's case, and I have those answers here. I would like my colleagues to read these answers because I can imagine the people in the White House going through all the legal cites that Ms. Harris gave in each of the answers to the questions our colleagues requested. It is one of the most thorough answers I have ever seen and thoroughly vetted by the Supreme Court decisions. I mention that because it is exactly why I believe what she has told us is what she will do. She understands the role of a judge in our system.

Quoting from her answer:

I fully recognize that the role of a judge is entirely different from the role of an advocate. If confirmed as a judge, my role would be to apply governing law and precedent impartially to the facts of a particular case.

Pam Harris went on to state:

It is inappropriate for any judge or Justice to base his or her decision on their own personal views or on public opinion . . . If confirmed as a circuit judge, I would faithfully follow the methodological precedence of the Supreme Court and the Fourth Circuit, applying the interpretive approaches and only the interpretive approaches used by those courts.

Don't take my word for it. Don't take her qualifications for it. Look at the record. Look at the letters that have been sent in support of Ms. Harris to the Judiciary Committee. There are numerous letters.

I will quote from one that was signed by more than 80 of her professional peers, and I will tell you it includes individuals who were appointed by Republican Presidents to key positions, including Gregory Garre, the former Solicitor General for George W. Bush, but it includes many in that category, and I am reading from that letter. This letter is part of the record. It was made part of the record in the Judiciary Committee.

I would ask unanimous consent it and another letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 20, 2014.

Re Nomination of Pamela Harris as Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman.
Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We write in enthusiastic support of the nomination of Pamela Harris to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. We are lawyers from diverse backgrounds and varying affiliations, but we are united in our admiration for Pam's skills as a lawyer and our respect for her integrity, her intellect, her judgment, and her fair-mindedness.

Many of us have had the opportunity to work with Pam on appellate matters. She has been co-counsel to some of us, opposing counsel to others, and a valuable colleague to all. In her appellate work, Pam has demonstrated extraordinary skill. She is a quick study, careful listener, and acute judge of legal arguments. She knows the value of clarity, candor, vigor, and responsiveness. Of equal importance, she has always conducted herself with consummate professionalism, grace, and collegiality, and has a humble and down-to-earth approach to her work.

After 20-plus years devoted largely to federal appellate practice, Pam is naturally suited to serve as a federal appellate judge. She clerked, first, on the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit for Judge Harry Edwards and then on the U.S. Supreme Court for Associate Justice John Paul Stevens. In private practice, she represented a wide range of clients (both corporate and individual) before the U.S. Supreme Court and in the U.S. Courts of Appeals. She was Lecturer and Co-Director of the Supreme Court and Appellate Practice Clinic at Harvard Law School. She was then appointed as Executive Director of the highly regarded Supreme Court Institute at the Georgetown University Law Center, which is heavily involved in preparing advocates for their appearances before the United States Supreme Court. She served as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy at the United States Department of Justice. And she has taught Constitutional Law and Criminal Procedure at the University of Pennsylvania and at Georgetown. Her well-rounded experience makes her well prepared for the docket of a federal appellate court. Pam's substantive knowledge, intellect, and low-key temperament will be great assets for the position for which she has been nominated.

We expect that the Senate, after full inquiry, will see the strengths we know from firsthand experience with Pam. Pamela Harris has exceptional legal ability and personal character, and we urge the Senate to confirm her to be a Circuit Judge.

Sincerely,

Gregory G. Garre, Latham & Watkins LLP; Michael Kellogg, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd Evans & Figel, PLLC;

Carter Phillips, Sidley Austin LLP; Scott H. Angstreich, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Donald B. Ayer, Jones Day; Dori K. Bernstein, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard D. Bernstein, Willkie, Farr & Gallagher, LLP; Rebecca A. Beynon, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Lisa S. Blatt, Arnold & Porter LLP; Steven Gill Bradbury, Dechert LLP; Henk Brands; Richard P. Bress, Latham & Watkins LLP; Caroline M. Brown, Covington & Burling LLP; Don O. Burley, Partner, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP; Gregory A. Castanias, Jones Day; Adam H. Charnes, Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP; David D. Cole, Georgetown University Law Center; Brendan J. Crimmins, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Mark S. Davies, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP; Susan M. Davies, Kirkland & Ellis LLP; David W. DeBruin, Jenner & Block LLP; William S. Dodge, Hastings College of the Law; Scott M. Edson, O'Melveny & Myers LLP; Clifton S. Elgarten, Crowell & Moring LLP; Roy T. Englert, Jr., Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber LLP. Mark L. Evans (retired), Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Bartow Farr; James A. Feldman, University of Pennsylvania Law School; David C. Frederick, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Paul Gewirtz, Yale Law School; Lauren R. Goldman, Mayer Brown LLP; Thomas C. Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell, P.C.; Irving L. Gornstein, Georgetown University Law Center; Jeffrey T. Green, Sidley Austin LLP; Joseph R. Guerra, Sidley Austin LLP; Jonathan Hacker, O'Melveny & Myers LLP; Mark E. Haddad, Sidley Austin LLP; Mark C. Hansen, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Scott Blake Harris, Harris Wiltshire & Grannis LLP; Derek T. Ho, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Richard B. Katskee, Mayer Brown LLP; Stephen B. Kinnaird, Paul Hastings LLP; Wan J. Kim, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC.

Jeffrey A. Lamken, MoloLamken LLP; Christopher Landau, Kirkland & Ellis LLP; Richard J. Lazarus, Harvard Law School; Michael R. Lazerwitz, Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP; William F. Lee, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP; Sean A. Lev, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Maureen E. Mahoney, Latham & Watkins LLP; Jonathan S. Massey, Massey & Gail LLP; Brian R. Matsui, Morrison & Foerster LLP; Deanne E. Maynard, Morrison & Foerster LLP; Celestine McConnville, Chapman University Law School; Anton Metlitsky, O'Melveny & Myers LLP; Charles B. Molster, Winston & Strawn LLP; David G. Ogden, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP; Timothy P. O'Toole, Miller & Chevalier; Aaron M. Panner, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Richard C. Peppennan III, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; Mark A. Perry, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP; Andrew J. Pincus, Mayer Brown LLP; Stephen J. Pollak, Goodwin Proctor LLP; David A. Reiser, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP.

John A. Rogovin, Executive Vice President & General Counsel, Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.; E. Joshua Rosenkranz, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP; Charles A. Rothfeld, Mayer Brown LLP; John C. Rozendaal, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Stephen M. Shapiro, Mayer Brown LLP; William F. Sheehan, Goodwin Proctor; Paul M. Smith, Jenner & Block LLP; Mark T. Stancil, Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber LLP; Catherine E. Stetson, Hogan Lovells US LLP; John Thorne, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC; Laurence H. Tribe, Carl M. Loeb University Professor and Professor of Constitutional Law, Harvard Law School; Rebecca K. Troth, Sidley Austin LLP; Meaghan VerGow, O'Melveny & Myers LLP; Seth P. Waxman, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP; John M. West, Bredhoff & Kaiser, PLLC; Michael F. Williams, Kirkland & Ellis LLP; Paul R.Q. Wolfson, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP; Christopher J. Wright, Harris Wiltshire & Grannis LLP.

JUNE 23, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We write in strong support of Pamela Harris' nomination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. As current and former partners in the Washington, D.C., office of O'Melveny & Myers LLP, each of us practiced law with Pam and has witnessed firsthand her outstanding legal talent. Moreover, as former colleagues with Pam, we can attest to her collegiality, temperament, and judgment. We are confident that she possesses the professional and personal qualifications to be an excellent judge.

As a member of the firm's appellate practice, Pam enjoyed a reputation as one of the best brief writers and strategists in the firm. She was the principal author of well-written and important briefs on behalf of a range of clients.

On behalf of Circuit City, for example, Pam argued for enforcement of its employment arbitration agreements. On behalf of Mobil Corporation, Pam wrote a petition challenging the constitutionality of efforts to try thousands of individual asbestos cases through mass aggregation in state courts. Pam's brief argued that the contemplated mass adjudication of thousands of different claims against hundreds of defendants would violate the Due Process Clause by unduly hindering Mobil's right to defend itself. The brief also argued that pre-trial review was necessary because the potential for enormous liability imposed by unfair proceedings would pressure defendants like Mobil to settle even meritless claims, rendering post-trial review an impossibility.

Pam was also the primary author of an amicus brief on behalf of a bipartisan group of House members (Members Dingell and Tauzin were the lead amici) in defense of the Federal Trade Commission's ''do not call'' rule. And in Schaeffer v. Weast, 546 U.S. 49 (2005), Pam authored an amicus brief in the United States Supreme Court supporting the Montgomery County, Maryland, public school system. The case arose under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and concerned the status of the ''individualized education programs'' developed by public schools for each covered student. The Supreme Court agreed with Pam's position and ruled for the Montgomery County schools.

Appreciation for Pam's work extended beyond the firm's appellate practice and appellate clients. In fact, she was regularly sought after by partners across practice groups to think through briefing strategy and argument presentation in a range of cases, at earlier stages in litigation. Pam's work on behalf of Merck in class action litigation involving a former painkiller drug highlights this range in her practice beyond traditional appellate work. Working with trial teams from O'Melveny's D.C. and L.A. offices, Pam was active in pre-trial briefing and strategy on a range of discovery and evidentiary issues. Pam often found herself engaged in this type of cross-practice and inter-office collaboration, and the firm's clients were especially appreciative of the opportunity to have an appellate lawyer of Pam's caliber work on some of their most difficult problems.

Pam also found the time throughout her tenure at O'Melveny to maintain an active pro bono practice. As Co-Chair of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL) Amicus Committee, Pam helped to provide the Supreme Court and countless indigent defendants with high-quality briefing on issues affecting the administration of criminal justice throughout the country. Given the disparity in the quality of representation afforded to many defendants in criminal cases, Justices from across the ideological spectrum have come to rely on the excellent lawyering provided by NACDL. Pam also helped to establish and supervise a partnership between O'Melveny and the Maryland Office of the Public Defender, Appellate Division, under which the firm's lawyers handled appeals for the Public Defender on a pro bono basis. This program, which continues today, provides many of the firm's younger lawyers with an opportunity to get courtroom experience.

Pam approached all of her work with the utmost level of professionalism, objectivity, and dedication, and we believe she would bring these same qualities to the federal bench. Whether she was working on a brief for a criminal defendant or a major oil company, Pam's singular focus was ensuring that her client received first-rate legal representation. And she did so while also demonstrating many of the qualities that made her such an extraordinary colleague—from her willingness to mentor and support younger lawyers to her openness to helping her law partners with a section of their brief or mooting them for an upcoming argument.

We conclude by noting that the signatories of this letter span the political and jurisprudential spectrum. Some of us have served in Republican Administrations or worked for Republican Senators, while others have served in Democratic Administrations or worked for Democratic Senators. Some of us are members of the Federalist Society, while others are members of the American Constitution Society. Our ranks include a former White House Counsel to President Ronald Reagan, top Commerce Department and Justice Department officials to Presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton, and senior aides to President Barack Obama. Although we may not all share Pam's views on a range of legal and political issues, we are united in the belief that Pam possesses the

intellect, fair-mindedness, humility, and fundamental decency to make an excellent federal judge.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur B. Culvahouse, Jr., Walter Dellinger, K. Lee Blalack II, Brian Boyle, Brian Brooks, Danielle C. Gray, Jonathan Hacker, Theodore W. Kassinger, Jeffrey W. Kilduff, Ron Klain, Greta Lichtenbaum, Richard Parker.

It says in part:

We are lawyers from diverse backgrounds and varying affiliations, but we are united in our admiration for Pam's skills as a lawyer and our respect for her integrity, her intellect, her judgment, and her fair-mindedness.

The letter continues:

Many of us have had the opportunity to work with Pam on appellate matters. She has been co-counsel to some of us, opposing counsel to others, and a valuable colleague to all. In her appellate work, Pam has demonstrated extraordinary skill. She is a quick study, careful listener, and acute judge of legal arguments. She knows the value of clarity, candor, vigor, and responsiveness. Of equal importance, she has always conducted herself with consummate professionalism, grace, and congeniality, and has a humble and down-to-earth approach to her work.

The letter concludes:

Her well-rounded experience makes her well prepared for the docket of a federal appellate court. Pam's substantive knowledge, intellect, and low-key temperament will be great assets for the position for which she has been nominated.

She has the whole package. She has intellectual ability. She has the ability to communicate. She has the demeanor we would like to see on our Federal bench.

Let me just add one more characteristic before I yield the floor. I see the distinguished Republican leader of the Judiciary Committee is here and is going to be commenting.

She also has empathy for the importance of our legal system to all. She has volunteered her time to pro bono work in order to help address the growing access to the justice gap in our system for individuals who could not afford legal assistance as we still strive to provide equal justice under law. While in private practice she established a pro bono program in which the law firm where she works worked with the Maryland Office of the Public Defender to provide pro bono representation to defendants appealing criminal convictions in State courts and she supervised attorneys participating in the program, just another indication she understands the oath she takes to dispense justice without partiality to wealth, that everyone is entitled to access to our judicial system and our legal system and she has taken personal interest in doing that.

Senator MIKULSKI and I are proud that she is a long-time resident of Montgomery County, MD, we take great pride in the fact that she is a Marylander, and we urge our colleagues to support this nomination.

HARRIS NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we will vote to end the filibuster against the nomination of Pamela Harris to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. She is a highly accomplished lawyer with excellent legal credentials and has the strong support of her home State Senators, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN. Her nomination received the American Bar Association's highest rating of unanimously ''well qualified''.

Pam Harris is currently a visiting professor at my alma mater, Georgetown University Law Center. In her diverse career she has served in the Office of Legal Policy at the Department of Justice, as a partner in private practice, as a professor at University of Pennsylvania Law School, and the executive director of the Supreme Court Institute at Georgetown. After graduating from Yale Law School, she served as a law clerk to Judge Harry Edwards on the D.C. Circuit and Justice John Paul Stevens on the U.S. Supreme Court. She is beyond qualified—an experienced appellate practitioner with background in both criminal and civil litigation and a command of the law that rivals that of any lawyer in the United States.

Some partisans have tried to misrepresent her past statements in order to caricature her. This account of her record is simply unrecognizable to those individuals who actually know Pam Harris and who know that as a judge she would be committed to the rule of law. Many lawyers who have practiced with Pam Harris have written in support of her nomination, including many prominent Republicans who are respected in the legal community.

One letter, signed by more than 80 of her professional peers, including Gregory Garre, the former U.S. Solicitor General for President George W. Bush, reads, ''We are lawyers from diverse backgrounds and varying affiliations, but we are united in our admiration for Pam's skills as a lawyer and our respect for her integrity, her intellect, her judgment, and her fair-mindedness.''

Another letter of support from a number of current and former partners at O'Melveny and Myers LLP, including A.B. Culvahouse, who served as White House Counsel during the Reagan administration, and Walter Dellinger, who served as Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Legal Counsel and Acting U.S. Solicitor General during the Clinton administration, reads, ''Although we may not all share Pam's views on a range of legal and political issues, we are united in the belief that Pam possesses the intellect, fair-mindedness, humility, and fundamental decency to make an excellent federal judge.''

I ask that these and other letters of support received for Pam Harris' nomination be printed in the RECORD.

When asked about her judicial philosophy at her nomination hearing she testified that ''the role of a judge is to decide cases through impartial application of law and precedent. It is a limited role . . . they decide the concrete disputes in front of them with attention to particular facts, attention to the arguments of the parties and their briefs, and by applying law and precedent to those facts.''

Both her testimony and the letters of bipartisan support for her nomination demonstrate that Pam Harris has a clear understanding of the role of a judge and make clear her commitment to follow Supreme Court precedent and to uphold the Constitution. I believe Pam Harris will be an outstanding judge, and she has my full support. I urge all Senators to vote to end this filibuster and confirm Pam Harris to serve on the Fourth Circuit.

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

JUNE 20, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We write in strong support of the nomination of Pamela A. Harris to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and urge prompt consideration and confirmation of her nomination.

As her classmates in the Yale Law School Class of 1990, we have known Pam for more than 25 years. We all believe that Pam would be a tremendous asset to the appellate bench.

In law school, Pam stood out for her keen intellect, her grasp of legal issues, her intellectual curiosity, her integrity and her fair-mindedness. Because of those qualities, Pam was often able to forge bonds and build consensus among classmates with very different views.

Many of us have kept in touch with Pam since law school and are familiar with her outstanding legal career. Pam's breadth of experience makes her exceptionally well-suited to serve as a judge on the federal appeals court. After law school, Pam clerked for two distinguished jurists, Judge Harry. T. Edwards of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and Justice John Paul Stevens of the United States Supreme Court. Since then, Pam has served in the United States Department of Justice, represented businesses and other clients in private practice, taught such subjects as constitutional law and appellate practice as a law professor, and served on the boards of directors of both national and local legal and educational organizations.

Of particular relevance to the Court of Appeals, Pam is a recognized national expert in appellate advocacy, having served as Executive Director of the Georgetown Law Center's Supreme Court Institute and Co-Director of Harvard Law School's Supreme Court and Appellate Practice Clinic.

Pam has devoted a significant portion of her career to pro bono work. She has represented numerous nonprofit and public interest organizations as well as individuals. Pam served as Co-Chair of the Amicus Committee of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and she established a pro bono program at the law firm O'Melveny & Myers, focusing on Maryland cases, where she handled cases herself and supervised and mentored junior lawyers. Pam has mentored law students and junior lawyers throughout her career. She received a prestigious legal teaching award at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and has been recognized as a popular and highly respected professor at Penn, Georgetown and Harvard Law Schools. Pam grew up in Bethesda, Maryland, and graduated at the top of her class from Walt Whitman High School there. For the last 15 years, Pam and her family have lived in Potomac, Maryland, just a few miles away from her childhood home. Pam is as invested in her community as she is in appellate practice, serving in roles that range from membership on the Board of Trustees at the Norwood School to ''cookie mom'' for her daughter's Girl Scout troop.

We believe Pam to be exceptionally well-qualified and well-suited to serve on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. We urge the Judiciary Committee and the full Senate to promptly review and confirm Pamela Harris for a position on that Court.

Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

(SIGNED BY 82 INDIVIDUALS)

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2014.

Re Nomination of Pamela Harris to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND GRASSLEY: on behalf of the National Women's Law Center (the ''Center''), an organization that has worked since 1972 to advance and protect women's legal rights, we write in strong support of the nomination of Pamela Harris to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Ms. Harris is exceedingly well-qualified to serve on this important court. She graduated from Yale College and Yale Law School. She clerked for Judge Harry T. Edwards on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and for Associate Justice John Paul Stevens on the United States Supreme Court. Following her clerkships, Ms. Harris served as an Attorney-Advisor in the Office of Legal Counsel at the United States Department of Justice for two years before joining the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where she received the Harvey Levin Memorial Teaching Award in 1998. Ms. Harris then joined the law firm of O'Melveny & Myers LLP as counsel, becoming a partner in 2005. During her ten years with O'Melveny & Myers, Ms. Harris served as the Co-Director of the Harvard Law School Supreme Court and Appellate Practice Clinic, and taught at Georgetown University Law Center as a visiting professor. In 2009, she left O'Melveny & Myers and joined the Georgetown University Law Center as the Executive Director of the Supreme Court Institute. In 2010, she became the Principal Deputy to the Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy at the United States Department of Justice. She rejoined the Georgetown faculty as a visiting professor of law in 2012.

Ms. Harris' legal career reflects excellence, a dedication to public service, and the best contributions of the legal profession to the public interest. During her career, Ms. Harris has appeared in over 100 federal appellate cases, and argued before the Supreme Court. This record reflects her considerable experience, and the brilliant advocacy for which she is properly renowned. In addition to honing her skills as an exceptionally talented litigator in the private sector, Ms. Harris has spent a good part of her career in government service and in teaching aspiring lawyers. Further, Ms. Harris has shown her dedication to the public interest and to improving the administration of justice throughout her career. While at O'Melveny & Myers, she had a robust pro bono practice and established a cooperative program between O'Melveny and the Maryland Office of the Public Defender, through which the firm represents indigent criminal defendants appealing their convictions in state court. She also has worked to improve the quality of appellate advocacy as co-director of Harvard Law School's appellate advocacy clinic and as Director of Georgetown's Supreme Court Institute. In that latter capacity, she led the work of the Institute, which provides pro bono assistance preparing advocates for oral argument before the Supreme Court on a first-come, first-served basis, to elevate the quality of arguments heard by the Justices. In addition to her contributions to the legal profession in private practice, public service, and academia, Ms. Harris has served on the boards of directors of several nonprofit organizations, including the Norwood School in Potomac, Maryland. Ms. Harris' many accomplishments are reflected by the unanimous ''Well-Qualified'' rating she received from the ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary.

The Center has had several opportunities to work with Ms. Harris. In particular, Ms. Harris served as co-counsel with the Center in representing Mr. Roderick Jackson before the Supreme Court in 2005, in Jackson v. Birmingham Bd. of Ed., 544 U.S. 167 (2005). Mr. Jackson was a teacher and girls' basketball coach in Birmingham, Alabama. He described practice and game conditions for the girls' team that were inferior to those provided to the boys' team, and complained to school administrators. He was fired as a coach after doing so, costing him his coaching salary and full retirement. Ms. Harris was part of the legal team that litigated his case before the Supreme Court, successfully arguing that Title IX provided a cause of action for retaliation for those seeking to secure compliance with the law. Working with Ms. Harris in Jackson allows us to personally attest to her outstanding legal skills, judgment, and analytical thinking, as well as to her excellent temperament and collegiality.

Ms. Harris' litigation experience, commitment to improving the administration of justice, and dedication to the public interest make her exceedingly well-suited for the position to which she has been nominated. In addition, Ms. Harris' confirmation would increase the diversity on the Fourth Circuit, making her only the sixth female judge to ever sit on this court. For all of these reasons, the Center offers its strong support of Pamela A. Harris to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and urges you to support her nomination. If you have questions or if we can be of assistance, please contact us at (202) 588–5180.

Sincerely,

NANCY DUFF CAMPBELL,
Co-President.
MARCIA D. GREENBERGER,
Co-President.

JUNE 27, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: I write in strong support of Pamela Harris's nomination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

I served as the Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of The Hertz Corporation from 1998 to 2007. Although it may seem surprising that a car and equipment rental company would face issues with a constitutional dimension, that did indeed occasionally happen. When it did, I turned to Ms. Harris for advice and assistance. The views expressed in this letter regarding her qualifications to serve as a judge are informed by my interactions with her while at Hertz; I hasten to add that those views are my own and do not represent the views of my former employer, for which I cannot speak.

In my dealings with Ms. Harris, I found her to be highly intelligent, quick to grasp issues, creative in her approach to problems, fair in her judgments, and direct in her advice. When discussing legal matters, she was incisive, objective and principled; it surely helped that she knew the law so well and could speak with authority on the subjects at hand, without a hint of defensiveness or dogmatism. She also was an excellent writer, whose work exhibited the same clarity, honesty and force that she showed in conversation. (She was, moreover, able to write quickly and with little need for revision; she seems to be one of those people who gets things right the first time.) In short, Ms. Harris was a model of professionalism as a practicing lawyer—someone who engendered trust and respect. I note that all those qualities are also vital for a judge, and especially for a judge on a court as important as the Fourth Circuit.

Ms. Harris's academic achievements, meanwhile, speak for themselves. After graduating from Yale Law School, she served as a law clerk for Judge Harry T. Edwards on the D.C. Circuit and for Justice John Paul Stevens on the Supreme Court. Ms. Harris has also taught at Harvard Law School, the University of Pennsylvania School of Law, and at the Georgetown University Law Center, where she was the Executive Director of the Supreme Court Institute, a unique and respected project dedicated to improving advocacy before the Supreme Court.

In sum, I believe that Ms. Harris is an ideal candidate for an appellate court judge. As her academic credentials demonstrate, she has a first-rate intellect. Equally important, she is a mature and able lawyer with significant experience in practice, no small part of which consisted of high-quality advocacy for business enterprises. Beyond that, she conveys a sense of fundamental decency, without which her intellectual abilities and professional skills would be for naught. I have no doubt that she would bring to the important judicial seat for which she has been nominated the same qualities that have

made her an excellent lawyer, and that she would instill confidence in all litigants that their cases would be decided carefully and fairly. I urge you to confirm her nomination.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD E. ROLFE.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

CONFIRM PAMELA HARRIS TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, we write to express our strong support for the confirmation of Pamela Ann Harris to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. At every stage in her career, Pamela Harris has distinguished herself through her outstanding intellectual credentials, her independence of thought, and her strong respect for the rule of law, establishing herself beyond question as qualified and ready to serve on the court. In addition, she has demonstrated an unwavering integrity and an outstanding commitment to public service. We urge you to vote yes on cloture and yes to confirm her.

The Leadership Conference believes Pamela Harris will be an impartial, thoughtful, and highly-respected addition to the court. She graduated summa cum laude from Yale College in 1985 and received her J.D. from Yale Law School in 1990. After law school, she was a law clerk for Judge Harry T. Edwards of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. She spent one year as an associate at Shea & Gardner (now Goodwin Proctor LLP) before clerking for Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court. From 2010–2012, she served at the Department of Justice as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy.

Ms. Harris has devoted her career largely to academia and public service, excelling in both. She has demonstrated a commitment to improving the fair administration of justice and educating new lawyers. In 1996, she joined the faculty of the University Of Pennsylvania Law School, where she taught courses in criminal procedure and received the Harvey Levin Memorial Teaching Award in 1998. At O'Melveny & Myers LLP, where she was counsel, Harris specialized in appellate and Supreme Court litigation and was named partner in 2005. During her ten years in private practice, Harris has become a renowned Supreme Court and appellate advocate, appearing in approximately 100 federal appellate cases. In addition, Harris established a cooperative program between O'Melveny and the Maryland Office of Public Defender, through which the firm provides pro bono representation to indigent criminal defendants appealing their convictions in state court.

Notably, Harris has used her uniquely broad experience as an appellate litigator to prepare the next generation of legal advocates and improve the judiciary. She was a visiting professor at Georgetown University Law Center and executive director of the law school's Supreme Court Institute. As executive director, she managed and participated in a moot court program that prepares advocates for oral argument before the Supreme Court. During her tenure, she worked with lawyers representing a multitude of interests. For example she assisted both the offices of state attorneys general and lawyers for criminal defendants; helped to improve arguments by lawyers bringing civil rights actions and those defending against civil rights actions; and worked with attorneys representing both plaintiffs and defendant corporations. She has also served as lecturer and co-director of the Supreme Court and Appellate Practice Clinic at Harvard Law School.

The Leadership Conference believes that Pamela Harris is an extraordinarily gifted nominee, with the ability to make objective decisions on the multifaceted and prominent cases that will surely come before the court. Her impeccable credentials have garnered her the support of a diverse group of attorneys in the legal community and people across the political spectrum. Harris' rich diversity of experience makes her an excellent choice for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and we urge you to vote yes on cloture and yes to confirm her.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President, at Zirkin@civilrights.org or (202) 466–2880, or Sakira Cook, Counsel, at cook@civilrights.org or (202) 263–2894.

Sincerely.

WADE HENDERSON,
President & CEO.
NANCY ZIRKIN,
Executive Vice President.

CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We are writing on behalf of Constitutional Accountability Center, a think tank, law firm, and action center dedicated to the Constitution's text and history, to urge that Pamela Harris be reported favorably out of Committee and confirmed promptly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Pam is one of the country's leading appellate advocates, and her exceptional qualifications to serve as a federal judge are well known to us, as Pam has been a member of CAC's Board of Directors since 2012. After growing up in Maryland, Pam graduated summa cum laude from Yale College and received her J.D. from Yale Law School. She then held two prestigious clerkships, first for Judge Harry Edwards on the D.C. Circuit and then for Justice John Paul Stevens on the Supreme Court. Following her clerkships, Pam's distinguished legal career has included broad experience in private practice, government service, and teaching. Among other things, Pam has served as the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy at the Department of Justice and practiced as a partner at O'Melveny & Myers, where she focused on Supreme Court and appellate litigation. Throughout her career, Pam has dedicated herself to improving the quality of appellate advocacy before our courts, believing that the courts are best served when the advocates on both sides of a case present the strongest possible arguments.

Pam is currently a Visiting Professor at Georgetown University Law Center, where, in addition to teaching the next generation of lawyers, she has also served as the Executive Director of the Supreme Court Institute, working to prepare counsel for oral argument before our Nation's highest court. The Institute's ''moot court'' services are provided without charge, as a public service, on a first-come, first-served basis (the Institute will generally ''moot'' only one side of a case), and without regard to the nature of the case, the parties, the arguments being made, or the affiliation or identity of the lawyers. The expert assistance offered by Pam and her colleagues at the Institute to improve advocacy before the Supreme Court is so helpful and sought-after that the first call a lawyer often makes after learning that the Court has agreed to review her client's case is to the Institute, to reserve its moot court services before her opponent does.

Pam's intellect, temperament, integrity, and the breadth of her professional experience make her extremely well-qualified to serve on the Fourth Circuit. This conclusion is underscored by the ABA's rating of Pam as ''unanimously well qualified,'' as well as by the diversity of voices supporting Pam's confirmation. Those who have written to this Committee to express their support include Greg Garre, who served as Solicitor General in the George W. Bush Administration, Seth Waxman, who held the same position during the Clinton Administration, A.B. Culvahouse, White House Counsel for President Reagan, and Walter Dellinger, Acting United States Solicitor General during the Clinton Administration. Indeed, the letter signed by Mr. Culvahouse, Mr. Dellinger, and other ''current and former partners in the Washington, D.C. office of O'Melveny & Myers''—lawyers who have practiced with Pam and know her best—exemplifies the high praise she has received. These attorneys have written:

[E]ach of us practiced law with Pam and has witnessed firsthand her outstanding legal talent. Moreover, as former colleagues with Pam, we can attest to her collegiality, temperament, and judgment. We are confident that she possesses the professional and personal qualifications to be an excellent judge. . . .

[T]he signatories of this letter span the political and jurisprudential spectrum. Some of us have served in Republican Administrations or worked for Republican Senators, while others have served in Democratic Administrations or worked for Democratic Senators. Some of us are members of the Federalist Society, while others are members of the American Constitution Society. . . . Although we may not all share Pam's views on a range of legal and political issues, we are united in the belief that Pam possesses the intellect, fair-mindedness, humility, and fundamental decency to make an excellent federal judge.

In her testimony before this Committee on June 24, Pam demonstrated that she understands clearly the difference between the roles she has played in her career as an advocate representing clients and as an academic and an expert commentator on the courts, and the new role she would take on if confirmed as a judge. In particular, pointing among other things to her work ''running the Supreme Court Institute on an entirely nonpartisan basis,'' Pam testified that ''I have never let any personal views I have, political views I may have, affect the discharge of my professional responsibilities. And I would not do that if I were confirmed as a judge.''

In sum, Pam Harris clearly has the qualifications, experience, intellect and temperament to serve with great distinction on the Fourth Circuit. We urge every Senator to support her confirmation.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS T. KENDALL,

President.
JUDITH E. SCHAEFFER,
Vice President.

With that, I would yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, similar to my colleague from Maryland, I come to the floor to discuss the nomination of Professor Pamela Harris to the Fourth Circuit. I come for another reason, to give my reasons for opposition.

Contemplating my vote on this nominee has been a particularly memorable process. That is because as I reviewed the professor's writings, statements, and legal briefs, it seemed as though I was reviewing the record of not one but two nominees. The size of those two nominees' records was rather unequal. On the one hand, there is the record of the pre-nomination Professor Harris. That is the record reaching all the way back to her graduation from law school in 1990, a record rich in public statements and writings. It is a record long enough to develop a distinct and stridently left-wing philosophy. That is one record.

Then, on the other hand, there is the record of the post-nomination Professor Harris. It is a dramatically shorter record. That record only began a few weeks ago at the professor's confirmation hearing on June 24. It is a record that consists of the professor's testimony before the Judiciary Committee and of course her responses to questions for the record from my colleagues and from this Senator. It is a record of a jurist who will be faithful to the statutory text and constitutional precedents, a record with comments that could be mistaken for those of Justice Scalia or Justice Thomas.

But what is so unbelievable to me is how totally at odds the record of the pre-nomination professor is with the record of the post-nomination professor. As I said before, it is as if there were two entirely distinct nominees vying for this single seat on the Fourth Circuit.

So for the next few minutes I would like to share with my colleagues some excerpts from the record of the pre-nomination Professor Harris and some excerpts from the post-nomination professor. There is no question that the professor spent her entire legal career, before nomination to the Federal bench, that is, consistently and aggressively advocating for a liberal interpretation of the Constitution that is well outside the mainstream of constitutional jurisprudence. That is the pre-nomination record. But as I said, that all changed when she testified before the committee.

I would start with the professor's pre-nomination views on constitutional interpretation. She has spoken with unusual clarity and forthrightness on the topic. That is in part because she served for many years on the board of the left-wing American Constitution Society. That ironically named group spends a lot of time developing theories of interpretation that are designed to attack and redefine key constitutional principles. The professor was at the forefront of those discussions in many years. So how exactly did the pre-nomination Professor Harris view the sources of constitutional meaning?

Here is a statement she made before the American Constitution Society in 2008:

> I just don't think that any account of the Constitution that even seems to privilege the Constitution as it was originally ratified is consistent with the way we should think about the Constitution. Yes, the values, the principles, on some level of generality, are there at the beginning, but they take their meaning—and they should take their meaning—from what comes after.

We should pause for a moment because she said a lot in that quote. First, we hear how the professor rejects out of hand the idea that the Constitution as originally ratified should guide its interpretation. Instead she sees only ambiguous principles. Those principles, according to the professor, are more or less empty and meaningless by themselves. That is because those principles, as she formulates them, take their meaning primarily from subsequent developments. Then the professor goes on to specify exactly what subsequent developments she is talking about.

She explains that her interpretive ''source of legitimacy most particularly,'' is ''what the People do'' at what she calls ''critical junctures,'' including ''the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the gay rights movement.'' According to the professor, these movements ''reconstitute what it is we're talking about when we talk about American constitutional tradition, when we say words like equality and liberty, when we change what they mean.''

We need to pause and unpack that statement. First, the professor explicitly identifies for herself ''a source of legitimacy'' to be used in constitutional interpretation. That source of legitimacy is not the Constitution's text, nor its structure, nor its history, nor its original intent, nor any other established interpretive method. It is something outside the law altogether, and that happens to be social and political movements.

I will put it this way: They are the social and political movements that Professor Harris chooses for inspiration. They are the social and political movements Professor Harris has decided to raise all the way to constitutional status. It is these extralegal sources that she says change the scope of the Constitution's guarantees of equality and liberty.

I am sure you are going to say this sounds as though I am making it up, but I am not. The professor literally said, ''We change what they mean.'' Who is the ''we'' the professor is talking about? I suspect it is the people in social movements that Professor Harris finds particularly inspirational. I suspect it is also the people who share her view that the Constitution's original guarantees are merely empty vessels which can be filled with whatever political or social ideas a judge might ''privilege,'' as the professor puts it.

In other contexts, Professor Harris said the meaning of the Constitution changes based on things such as ''an evolving and changing public understanding,'' ''the consequences of constitutional rulings,'' and ''the circumstances on the ground.'' Note the absence of any legal standard on that list which seems to be the basis of the rule of law or the basis of stare decisis.

I will finish up with the professor's quote.

> I think that constitutional legitimacy comes, even in part, from the fact that it does reflect these social movements and what happens at these particular moments when the people come together and force this kind of change in the way we think about ourselves and what it means to be American. And I think there's something about originalism at least as it's commonly understood that's inconsistent with that. And that's why I'm not an originalist, even now.

Let's recap. The Constitution derives some of its legitimacy, as the professor put it, from social movements at particular moments. Again, how are we to know which particular moments rise to the level of constitutional significance? We will have to ask Professor Harris because there is absolutely no principled or objective way of making that kind of a decision. It is certainly not a legal decision. It happens to be a matter of personal preference.

What else can we take away from that quote? Well, we also learned the professor is definitely not an originalist. She literally says: ''I'm not an originalist.'' I want you to keep that in mind because what I have to say shows how quickly she can change her views.

Let's turn now to what the post-nomination professor thinks about constitutional interpretation. As I said before, the contrast is so striking that it is almost as if we are dealing with two different nominees for the single seat on the Fourth Circuit. Does the post-nomination professor still think constitutional principles change with the times?

In a response to my question for the record, Professor Harris wrote:

> I do not believe that the Constitution's provisions and principles change or evolve, other than by the amendment process in Article V. They are fixed and enduring and judges are not free to change them whether by incorporating public preferences or their own policy views.

That is astounding. It is like a night-and-day difference with the judicial

philosophy I have previously quoted from the pre-nomination Professor Harris, and it is totally incompatible with the philosophy which Professor Harris has developed over the decades. Now we suddenly hear that the professor believes in unchanging and in fixed—dare I say eternal—principles that cannot be changed except by an Article V amendment.

All of a sudden there are no more social movements. All of a sudden there are no more ''critical junctures.'' All of a sudden there is no more ''what the people do.'' All of a sudden there is no more ''privileging'' or ''reconstituting''—those are her words. So no more ''privileging'' or ''reconstituting'' constitutional meaning. All of a sudden the meanings are now fixed in our Constitution. All that other stuff she previously said happens to be in the rearview mirror.

Now judges are forbidden from incorporating public preferences to change constitutional principles. Public preferences as interpreted by the judge, of course. But just a few years ago that was at the very core of her interpretative philosophy.

I have another post-nomination quote.

> I would never suggest that a justice of the Supreme Court, or any judge, should change his or her opinions based on public opinion. That is not the way I view the role of a judge.

That happens to be the way I view the role of a judge, and now she says that is the way she sees the role of a judge, but it is completely contrary to what she had thought for decades before this nomination.

The post-nomination Professor Harris added that courts should be ''especially cautious on social issues when the political branches and political institutions are deeply and rapidly engaged in those issues'' and ''leave as much to the democratic process.'' That statement is also a massive sea-change.

For the pre-nomination professor, the democratic process went hand-in-glove with the judicial process. Now, however, with her confirmation on the line, the post-nomination professor sees a wall between politics and the courts.

Let's return to the pre-nomination professor for another quote on judicial decisionmaking. Here is what she candidly told a gathering of the American Constitution Society about that issue in 2009:

> I always feel unapologetically, you know, left to my own devices, my own best reading of the Constitution. It's pretty close to where I am.

Where exactly is the Constitution, in her view? She tells us flatly: ''I think the Constitution is a profoundly progressive document. I think it's born of a progressive impulse.'' Well, if that is where the Constitution is, where then is the professor? Again, there is no mystery here because she is very upfront with that answer: ''I'm a profoundly liberal person so we''—she is talking about herself and the Constitution as one—''we match up pretty well. I make no apologies for that.''

Think for a moment about what the professor is saying. I frankly cannot recall a judicial nominee who has actually expressed her belief that the Constitution embodies the nominee's personal political philosophy, but that is exactly what Professor Harris does in that statement.

Think about how she put it: The Constitution is pretty much where she is as a liberal. It is almost in sync with her views. That was a crystal-clear explanation of how the pre-nomination Professor Harris viewed her beliefs and the Constitution.

But what does the post-nomination Professor Harris have to say? At her hearing, she told our Judiciary Committee:

> I do not believe that it is the view of a judge ever to import his or her personal values into judicial decisionmaking.

Again, the post-nomination statement is strikingly at odds with the pre-nomination views. Or, perhaps we should actually take the post-nomination statement at face value. After all, Professor Harris doesn't need to import her own views when interpreting the Constitution. As she explained, it just happens to be almost as liberal as she is. So that is a fortunate coincidence, I suppose.

What about the professor's views on a particular judicial philosophy? Remember earlier her pre-nomination criticism of originalism and her assertion that she is definitely not an originalist.

That happens to be out the window as well.

Here is her post-nomination testimony: ''I do not reject originalism as an interpretive method.''

Those are just a few of the contradictory quotes from the pre- and post-nomination Professor Harris which strikingly illustrate almost unbelievable inconsistencies in her judicial philosophy and understanding of constitutional interpretation.

The quotations also point to issues that are deeply troubling about this nominee, and I'll discuss a few of them. First, this nominee has made many statements suggesting that if confirmed, she would pursue a results-oriented, whatever-it-takes approach to deciding cases. From this nominee's past commentary, we know that she is not only a devoted liberal, but she would also strive to move the courts leftward to suit her ideological preferences.

For example, in discussing the Warren Court, the professor said she wondered ''whether we almost have, by now, a stunted sense of what the legal choices really are, what really is a liberal legal outcome.''

Just listen to that phrasing again: ''liberal legal outcome.'' Is there any doubt this nominee views the courts as simply a third political branch?

I will quote again:

> If Chief Justice Warren came out a certain way, that must be as liberal as it gets. That's not right! I think that we've stunted the spectrum of legal thought in a way that removes the possibility that there could have been more progressive readings of the Fourth Amendment and the Fifth Amendment.

It seems Professor Harris doesn't think the Warren court was nearly liberal enough. That is a fairly astonishing view in itself.

I often hear liberals and some of our nominees talk about the so-called living Constitution. Well, it is clear to me this nominee sees not a living Constitution but a profoundly political Constitution. She said so herself. She sees judges as proxies engaged in a tug-of-war who use judicial power as an instrument of political control. Her statements, as I explained a few minutes ago, also are a clear indication of her belief that the role of a judge is to reflect those political and social forces.

For example, speaking about Justice Kennedy's stance on gay marriage, the professor said that the Justice ''should be changing the same way the whole country is changing.''

That is the language of politics, not the language of law.

She has said so many things to this effect that I find myself asking this question: Will this nominee even consider the law when deciding a case or is it all progressive outcomes, social movements, and critical junctures?

So it is clear there are two Professor Harrises: the pre-nomination professor and the post-nomination professor.

Let's not be naive about which Professor Harris will sit on the Federal bench—for life—if confirmed, because no one else is being naive about that question.

Take, for example, an article published last May in New Republic gushing that the professor is a ''champion of liberal jurisprudence'' and will be a ''sympathetic vote for liberal causes.'' We know that will be the case from the pre-nomination professor's long record of impassioned liberal advocacy.

The article also observes—accurately, in my view—that Professor Harris ''clearly has an interest in using her voice to project a liberal jurisprudence perspective.'' That quotation pretty much sums it up. All anyone needs to do to confirm that claim is to read the pre-nomination professor's public statements, because they are all out there. It is not a secret what this nominee thinks about the law and what she thinks about the courts. And it is no secret what kind of a judge this nominee will be if she takes the bench.

So it seems pretty clear to me that the timing of the vote on this nominee is not purely coincidental. We know

this because of this week's ObamaCare decisions handed down by the D.C. Circuit and the Fourth Circuit.

Last November, when the majority changed the cloture rule on judicial nominees, I told my colleagues the decision was a blatant attempt to stack the D.C. circuit with judges who would view sympathetically the administration's arguments in upcoming ObamaCare lawsuits.

The other side dismissed the notion that the rules change was designed to tilt the court in the President's direction and to salvage ObamaCare. Well, as we all know, a three-judge panel of the D.C. Circuit decided the Halbig case this week against the administration, and it only took the administration about an hour to announce that it would seek a rehearing by the en banc D.C. Circuit, which now includes four of the President's nominees.

As we all know, our distinguished majority leader rushed through three of those four nominees immediately after the rules change. And yesterday the distinguished majority leader finally admitted that the upcoming en banc panel on the Halbig ruling vindicated his decision to go nuclear. He said: ''I think if you look at simple math, it does.''

So the distinguished majority leader isn't even trying to disguise his intent, and that is exactly what happened with this nominee on her way to the Fourth Circuit.

This nomination is being considered ahead of other circuit nominees on the executive calendar. Why is this Fourth Circuit nomination being fast-tracked? Why fast-track one of the most liberal nominees we have considered to date? If history is any guide, the answer is simple. It is all about saving ObamaCare. The other side wants to stack the Fourth Circuit just like the D.C. Circuit, because the Fourth Circuit hears a disproportionate number of significant cases involving Federal law and regulations, as does the D.C. Circuit.

So my colleagues should understand a vote for this nominee is also a solid vote for the Affordable Care Act as the cases make their way through the court.

I am voting ''no'' on this nominee and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the confirmation vote on Executive Calendar No. 777, Disbrow, the Senate consider and vote on calendar No. 919, Mendez; No. 920, Rogoff; and No. 921, Andrews; further, that at a time to be determined by me, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, on Monday, July 28, the Senate consider Calendar Nos. 915, Kaye; 916, Kaye; 913, Mohorovic; and 744 McKeon; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations; further, if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, we expect nominations considered today to be confirmed by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

WASHINGTON WILDFIRES

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak for a few minutes about the absolutely devastating wildfires currently burning through the farms, communities, and public lands of our home State of Washington.

As a lifelong resident of Washington State and the Pacific Northwest, I have always been aware of the annual risks and dangers that wildfires pose to our region. Every summer, a combination of rising temperatures, months of dry weather, and our State's obvious abundance of forest and fields have resulted in wildfires capable of threatening homes and businesses across our State. Each summer we have worked to become better and better prepared to help protect our communities.

But one wildfire burning this year is the single largest we have seen in Washington State. Since last Tuesday, massive wildfires covering hundreds of thousands of acres have ravaged our farm lands, our agricultural areas, our cherished public lands, and, most importantly, communities throughout Chelan County, Okanogan County, and others across eastern Washington.

I am talking about a massive wave of flames that has burned an area now four times the size of Seattle, which is our State's largest city. Even for those of us who have lived our entire lives with the reality of wildfires, this is unprecedented. So while I am here in what we call ''the other Washington,'' today, my heart, my thoughts, and my prayers are in Central and Eastern Washington. Even here on the Senate floor, I can't help but think of the firefighters and first responders and everyone who is neglecting sleep and rest to protect their communities. Most of all, I can't stop thinking about the families who lost their homes and all they own to this horrific disaster.

If there is one thing I know about our State, it is that we don't turn away from hard times or hard work. Over the last several weeks I have talked with a number of the local leaders in the communities that are facing these fires, including Sheriff Frank Rogers in Okanogan County, Sheriff Brian Burnett in Chelan County, and Mayor Libby Harrison in the small town of Pateros, where dozens of homes, including hers, have been lost to this fire. Every one of them told me that while their community is facing hard times, nobody is giving up. They have been doing everything they can to protect each and every person in their rural communities, and so far they have been able to do that.

I wish to share one story that speaks to what is happening in my home State right now. As I mentioned, this small town of Pateros has been hit very hard. They haven't lost any lives, but they have lost more than 100 homes and buildings throughout their community. But one building they did not lose was their school, which has always been to them the central place of their community, and it is now the central staging area as these fires rage on. As in many other small communities, the school in Pateros serves kids in grades K through 12, and last week that fire came within just a few feet of that school.

Firefighters and responders were working elsewhere. So the school could easily have burned down, until a local man by the name of Augustine Morales decided to do something about it. He and a friend used hoses on the backs of their own trucks to fight back that fire and save their kids' school.

Augustine was interviewed by a local TV station and here is what he said:

> Everything was going through my mind because I have my kids and I have to take care of my kids, and I [was] just thinking . . . if you die, I don't know what's going to happen.

So that is what so many people just like Augustine are facing right now in Central and Eastern Washington, and I know they will not be giving up.

In addition to our thoughts and our prayers, we have to make sure we are working to have all of the Federal resources they need available. I am thrilled the Senate supplemental funding bill that was released yesterday actually includes $615 million for firefighting efforts in Western States—money I requested along with my colleague Senator CANTWELL and 10 other colleagues. But we know there is a lot more work to be done. We have to get that funding passed through the Senate and the House and to the President's desk right away.

I am really very pleased that early yesterday morning the President, in fact, made an emergency declaration that is going to help those communities fight these wildfires.

I know that I and Senator CANTWELL and all of us are going to be working with our local officials and Federal officials all the way up to the President to make sure those communities get what they need.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I join my colleague from Washington who was just on the floor to take a moment to recognize the heroic efforts that are underway in the State of Washington, battling wildfires with individuals who are trying to protect their homes and property. Our hearts go out to the family and friends of Robert Koczewski, a retired State trooper and veteran who suffered a heart attack and died while trying to save his own home.

I thank the local, State, and Federal agencies that are working together to meet the logistical needs of extinguishing these multiple fires and for the efforts they have already made to help save lives and minimize damage in what is the largest wildfire in our State's history.

I thank all of the community organizing individuals who have done so much work in their individual communities to support the efforts of the firefighters and to work with everybody in the community to make sure every aspect of security and safety is there for the families who have lost their homes.

I thank the individuals who have been working to provide shelter and to help their neighbors no matter what it takes.

There is a huge spirit alive in the Okanogan people who are working very hard to make sure they are also contributing. They have a great deal of self-reliance, spirit, and they want to make sure that, as FEMA and others are moving in, they are also responsible in helping with fighting the fires and to work to make sure as many people as possible in the community can be saved from this devastation.

We are hearing many moving stories of Washingtonians donating their time, volunteering goods, things everybody in the community needs.

So I thank the people of Washington and particularly in the central part of the State for everything they are doing to help battle this fire.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Madam President, I also come to the floor to talk about the Export-Import Bank and the fact that we still need to work out a deal on the Senate floor so we can move this legislation. Time is running out. We only have a few days before the August recess and literally only a few legislative days when we return to make sure we reauthorize this important credit agency that helps manufacturers export their products.

When you grow U.S. manufacturing, you grow U.S. jobs. What we want to do is make sure our manufacturers have a fair shot at getting their products sold overseas. So it makes no sense to me that the fate of an organization that is such an important tool to businesses and comes at no cost to the taxpayers cannot get reauthorized. In fact, I am sure there are colleagues in the House of Representatives who would, if they had a chance, just outright kill the credit agency altogether.

Last week 31 Governors signed a letter that basically called for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. That brings the total number of Governors to 37. I am proud my Governor, Jay Inslee, along with Governor Robert Bentley from Alabama, led an effort to say to the Congress: This is important to do. They see the result in their States as it relates to jobs, and they want to make sure we get this reauthorized.

There are Governors from all over the political spectrum—liberal Democrats, to moderate Democrats, to moderate Republicans, and even tea party Republicans—so there are Governors out there from Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii, to Governor Paul LePage of Maine, who want to get this important tool reauthorized. Even though they are from many different spectrums, they see that this creates jobs in their State.

I would like to point out that nine of those signatures come from Republican Governors, plus five Republican Governors sent their own letter. So that is 14 Republican Governors who joined a chorus of voices in the legislative body to make sure we are doing what is right for the economy and renew this charter for the important Export-Import Bank.

I wish to point out from the letter that it basically says that without the financing, U.S. firms would have lost sales to overseas competitors.

So this is what the Governors are trying to tell us. They are stewards in their States of jobs and the economy, and they are very concerned about the Export-Import Bank. So we want to make sure we continue to listen to those Governors and get their help in making sure their Members of Congress from their individual States support this legislation.

They also are talking to thousands of small business owners who are saying that failing to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank would lead to fewer exports and a loss of jobs in all 50 States. They are out there trying to make sure they are drumming up support in the congressional delegations of their States. That is because trade is a critically important aspect to our economy.

I just talked to one of my colleagues today who was telling me how much their State was recovering, but in the areas where they were doing the most exports, their State was really growing—that particular part.

In 2013, U.S. exports reached $2.3 trillion in goods and services. So exports across the Nation that are attributable to the Ex-Im Bank support about $37 billion worth of U.S. exports and about 205,000 related jobs. So you can see that the Export-Import Bank is a vital tool to creating jobs in our U.S. economy, and it does all of this returning $1 billion to the Federal Treasury. To me, it is a win-win for taxpayers and it is a good aspect for jobs. As I said, it is 205,000 export-related jobs and $37 billion in exports. That supports over 2,000 small businesses throughout our country. That is actually the direct impact of businesses that are exporting with the help of the Export-Import Bank. I say that because there are so many more people who are involved in the supply chain, and we talked about that last week.

I would like to address one issue today that I hear about from a lot of colleagues: Well, isn't this just something the private sector can do?

I guarantee you, if the private sector could just do it and would do it, we would be very happy. I am here to debunk that myth. In fact, in the words of the private sector, it is all about them needing the help of the bank to actually make deals work. Anyone who thinks they know what they are talking about, I want to make sure they understand.

First and foremost, in the bank's charter, it prohibits them from competing with private financing and requires that all financing have a reasonable chance of repayment. So literally in the bank's charter it says they are not there to compete with these banks. Yet I hear so many times my colleagues on the other side trying to say: Oh, well, this is just something that we, the government, should not be involved in.

I just pointed out that we actually make money off of it. So that part is really good for us because it helps us pay down the Federal deficit. And I just mentioned how banks want to partnership with this credit agency because it helps them, but it is actually in their charter that it prohibits them from doing so. Specifically, the charter says, in section 2, that the bank should ''supplement and encourage, and not compete with, private capital''—''not compete with, private capital.'' So there it is in their own charter, exactly how they are supposed to operate. So this is not a bank that is somehow competing with banks across America. They are partnering with financial institutions that see risks in overseas

markets that they think are undeveloped and do not have the banking and financing institutions in their organization to help get these things done, and so they want to partner with the Export-Import Bank.

It is helping businesses all across our country. In fact, 98 percent of the Export-Import Bank's transactions were involved with banks throughout 2013. So it is not taking business away from them; it is actually helping businesses throughout our country.

The Export-Import Bank is a leading indicator for U.S. companies in how to get business done in these developing markets, and it is often in the national and local banking interest to have a partner such as this because they see deals and opportunities that come through their local communities.

I know there are banks—the Presiding Officer's major banks in parts of the Midwest, KeyBank—and others have talked to me about how important it is because they have homegrown businesses that come to them, and they see the opportunity but they also see the risk, and having this credit agency be a partner with that local bank helps them secure the deal.

As we look at this chart, it basically shows that 98 percent of the Ex-Im Bank transactions are involving commercial banks. So, again, there is this notion that somehow this bank is competing with the private sector when, in fact, it is basically prohibited in their charter, and 98 percent of the deals are actually done with an individual bank, which shows that this is really a tool for our commercial banking.

So these are banks everywhere, from the Alaska Commercial Fishing and Agriculture Bank in Anchorage, to the Wallis State Bank in Texas, as well as national banks such as Wells Fargo and others. So they find it a very viable tool and something that is important to do.

According to a recent statement by the Bankers Association for Finance and Trade and the Financial Services Roundtable, the Export-Import Bank of the United States plays a critical role ''in international trade and US job creation by providing export financing products that help fill gaps in trade financing otherwise not provided by the private sector.''

So we are hearing from these individual banks that are saying this and basically articulating that this is a tool. In fact, one CEO, John Stumpf from Wells Fargo, recently talked about his work with a company called Air Tractor. Air Tractor is a Texas company that manufactures agricultural aircraft, with 50 percent of its business being overseas. He said how important it was that the Export-Import—I am going to quote him: Air Tractor would not be where they are today without the Export-Import Bank and there are certain things that would not have been done without them.

I want to go back to the fact that the banking industry really does believe the Export-Import Bank is a necessary tool. ''The Ex-Im Bank remains a vital partner for the lending community,'' according to the bankers association.

I think this shows there are people who are just not educated on the structure of the bank, how it works, how important it is to be an important tool for us. I want to make sure we understand why the private sector cannot do these loans.

If people understand how the bank works, some still want to come back and say: Well, they still should be doing it themselves.

I want to go to one chart that basically shows some of the challenges bankers face when they are dealing with this. They face bank balance sheet limitations; that is, the ability to hold all of those deals on their books over the period of the loan. They have the added risk of exporting to foreign markets, which can be challenging at best. And they have the lack of the financial sector presence in those emerging markets.

So as to all of those things, if you are, as I just mentioned, one of these banks—from the Wallis State Bank in Texas to the Alaska Commercial Fishing and Agriculture Bank—you can see that they want to help this business in their State export or like this company I mentioned—Air Tractor in Texas that manufactures aircraft for agricultural purposes. You can see they want to help them. But, again, is the Wallis State Bank going to be able to go out and assess all these international marketplaces and assess whether that end customer is going to be able to continue to pay on the life of this purchase? No. This bank is not figuring out how to do that. So basically they are just turning this business down. Yet we have a U.S. manufacturer that has figured out a great product, figured out how to make it, figured out how to get customers overseas, figured out how to compete with international competitors, and we have people here strangling the one tool they need—the credit agency that helps the local bank in their community finance the deal.

So I just want to say I hope we resolve this issue with the Export-Import Bank. I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle can come to terms with the amendments that are necessary to move this bill to the Senate floor. I know last time we had a similar debate and a lot of discussion, but in the end there were about 79 votes for the Export-Import Bank.

I guess I would ask all of my colleagues now to think about our economy and how much U.S. manufacturers need to sell in overseas markets. We are having an unbelievable growth in the middle class around the globe. It is going to double in the next 15 years. That is 2.7 billion more middle-class consumers who could buy U.S. products and U.S. services, but they will not if we hamstring the export-import credit agencies that help support banks in the financing of U.S. manufacturers' goods sold overseas.

I hope my colleagues will help us get this bill to the floor, get it reauthorized, and not for a short term, not for 3 months, not for more mischief to be had, but to give predictability and certainty to people who are actually growing jobs in the United States of America, our manufacturers.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation votes on Mendez, Rogoff, and Andrews occur following the vote to confirm the Disbrow nomination, and with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I have got a deal for you: Let's create American jobs, let's help American businesses find customers abroad, and let's do it at no cost to the American taxpayer. I rise to speak about exactly the point Chairwoman CANTWELL just spoke about, the chairwoman of our Small Business Committee, the importance of the Export-Import Bank, which expires on September 30 of this year.

The Senate and House need to act to continue the job so we can continue the bank, so we can create hundreds of thousands of jobs, so we can help American businesses find customers abroad, and do it at no cost to the American taxpayer. Chairwoman CANTWELL did a good job of explaining the bank and what it does. I will just spend a few minutes on that.

It is an independent, self-sustaining Federal governmental agency. It is one of the most important tools that U.S. companies have to boost exports to all the countries and all the customers abroad who want high-quality products produced in the United States. The bank assumes country and credit risks that other private sector lenders are unwilling or unable to do, at a reasonable cost. It helps level the playing field for U.S. businesses because so many of our global competitors have banks just like this that loan even more or support even more loans than we do. So this is about leveling the playing field for American businesses.

In fiscal year 2013, the Ex-Im Bank approved an all-time high 3,842 loan authorizations, with a total estimated export value of $37.4 billion. That is estimated to have created or sustained over 200,0000 export-related jobs right here in the United States. Countries such as China, France, Germany,

Korea, and India are extending multiple times as much financing as our Export-Import Bank. This is not the time to let international competitors eat our lunch. We have to be aggressive and we have to compete. That is why this bank needs to be reauthorized.

I am here today to talk about why it matters in Virginia, using Virginia as an example. I know the Presiding Officer will forgive me for being partial to the Commonwealth. But anyone can get up here and do exactly what I am going to do, talk about businesses in their States, to whom the Export-Import Bank is incredibly important.

In Virginia generally since 2007, the Ex-Im Bank has supported 98 companies in every congressional district. Fifty-nine are small businesses, ten are minority-owned, three are women-owned, more than $1 billion in exports supported in Virginia since 2007. I have heard from everybody in Virginia, from Governor McAuliffe to the Virginia Chamber of Commerce, to both the National and Virginia Association of Manufacturers saying: Whatever you do, find an agreement to authorize the continuation of this very important bank.

Let me tell you about four companies. They are very different companies: rockets, apples, compressors, and paper. It sounds like a rock-paper-scissors thing, right?

Orbital Sciences Corporation in Dulles, VA, right here close. Orbital manufactures small and medium-class space systems, mostly satellites and rockets. Their headquarters is in Dulles, 3,600 employees, high-paying jobs. They launch rockets from all over the country, including Wallops Island near Chincoteague on the eastern shore of Virginia. They build satellites for the U.S. Government but also sell commercial communications satellites to many international buyers.

This commercial business that Orbital has is faced with significant competition from European satellite manufacturers, EADS/Astrium and Thales/Alenia. So Orbital relies on the Export-Import Bank to level the playing field. These European manufacturers get assistance from their governments to go out and compete for this commercial business and Orbital does the same. This neutralizes the advantage that European governments try to give to their satellite industry. In the last few years, since 2012, Orbital has produced 38 satellites. Six of them relied on Export-Import Bank financing and would not have been done without the backstop the Ex-Im Bank provides.

For every commercial satellite that Orbital builds, 300 jobs are supported, direct and indirect, within the company, and then there is a supply chain, with suppliers all over the country. There are an additional 300 jobs in the supply chain. So the story of Orbital, manufacturing rockets and satellites, is illustrative of the contribution the Ex-Im Bank makes to U.S. small and medium-sized aerospace companies.

Let's switch from rockets and talk about apples for a minute. Turkey Knob Orchard in Timberville, VA. They grow apples on 3,500 acres in rural Virginia. It is a longstanding family-owned business that has produced apples in the Commonwealth since 1918. This family-owned business in Timberville uses the Export-Import Bank to protect deals made with companies in rapidly expanding markets such as West Africa and India, where the risks are high, and conventional lenders may be a little skittish.

Then it gives their partners peace of mind and a credible system for evaluating buyers abroad. The credit insurance is one of the most competitive and user-friendly products in the market for small growers such as Turkey Knob, who do not have a large international office or large international export offices around the globe. Without Ex-Im credit insurance, Turkey Knob would export less and their exports would be exposed to more risk, more potential liability.

Additionally, with the credit insurance program, small exporters are able to build these deals so they can build long-term relationships and expand business that otherwise would not be possible.

We want importers abroad to buy Virginia apples. We think our apples are every bit as good as Washington State's or any other State's apples. We are proud to market them, and other products from Virginia as well, especially at a time when the economy needs to be stronger. But we would not be able to find those clients for growers such as Turkey Knob without the Ex-Im Bank.

Compressors. Bristol Compressors in Bristol, VA, right on the border with Tennessee in the State's far southwestern corner. This is a manufacturing company, very cutting edge. They design and manufacture compressors for residential and commercial applications—air conditioning, heat pump, refrigeration. It is one of the largest compressor manufacturers in the world. They also serve manufacturers and distributors across six continents. I think Antarctica may be the exception. They have enough air conditioning there.

But Bristol has worked directly and indirectly with the Ex-Im Bank through their credit lenders for many years. Bristol would not be able to service the majority of its international business without the support of the Ex-Im Bank. I have been to this company. It is in a part of the State that needs more jobs, not less. Without the Ex-Im Bank, they would not be able to service their customers on six continents.

Bristol has told us that without the support, jobs at Bristol would be at risk, which would have a negative impact on the local economy. We want to promote American manufacturing, not shrink it.

Finally, paper. Eagle Paper International in Virginia Beach. This is an international paper manufacturer and distributor, been around since 1988. Virginia Beach is an important place, because we have an active port in Virginia Beach, one of the busiest ports on the east coast of the United States. So it is a great place to find exports and ship exports from.

Eagle Paper has succeeded in its 25 years in business in exporting paper worldwide. Eagle has told us very plainly:

> Ex-Im is a crucial part of our business. Without the export credit insurance we would not be able to support the customer base that we currently have. Without this customer base our sales would decrease and in turn we would have to eliminate employees in order to keep our business up and running.

Not often do we have such no-brainers present themselves on the floor. I will end where I started: Let's create American jobs. Let's help businesses find customers around the world. Let's do it at no cost to the American taxpayer. We do not make general fund applications to the Ex-Im Bank because they charge their customers for the services they provide. Not only do they break even, they actually raised $2 billion above the loans they put out in the last few years, which they then used to make more loans to more American businesses to create more jobs.

I have been heartened to see 50-plus months of private sector job growth. I know the Presiding Officer has as well. But we also know we are not where we need to be yet. GDP needs to be higher. More jobs need to be created. We need to create more skilled workers to fill those jobs. The Ex-Im Bank is one of the best tools we have to help move the economy forward. If it did not exist, we would have to create it. The good news is, it does exist. All we have to do is vote to reauthorize it before September 30.

It is my hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses will join in this very important and completely logical mission.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the legislation pending before the Senate, the so-called Bring Jobs Home Act. I oppose this bill because it is a political

stunt designed as an election-year campaign ploy that will have no meaningful impact on job creation or on economic growth. In fact, this bill is a carbon copy of a bill the Senate rejected 2 years ago when it was offered by another Democratic Senator who just happened to also be up for reelection.

Simply put, if there is a Democratic bill on the Senate floor supposedly about outsourcing, you can rest assured it must be election season. The bill before us purports to deal with the problem of companies relocating jobs from the United States to foreign countries by denying the deduction associated with doing so. This must be the tax benefit for shipping jobs overseas that we heard so much about from the Obama campaign in 2008 and again in 2012.

There is only one problem with repealing this special tax break for companies that ship jobs overseas. It does not exist. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, ''Under present law, there are no targeted tax credits or disallowances of deductions related to relocating business units inside or outside the United States.'' That is from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

This statement is not surprising, given that numerous independent fact checkers disputed the repeated claims in 2008 that companies were receiving tax breaks for shipping jobs overseas. These fact checkers called that statement ''false'' and ''misleading.'' But I guess the facts do not matter when it is an election year. What this bill will do is insert yet more complexity and uncertainty into our Tax Code.

The reality is the United States economy is a $17 trillion enterprise, with businesses all across this country constantly closing old operations and opening new ones. If this bill becomes law, companies that might want to close an old factory or open a new one would now have to worry if they will have to pay a tax penalty, even if their decisions are totally unrelated to any business decisions they might make outside of the United States.

The legislation also includes a new tax credit for companies that eliminate a business operation in a foreign country and move that operation to the United States. Well, that sounds like a good idea. But consider how this would tilt the playing field against companies here in America that have not opened operations overseas. A purely domestic company that opens a new factory in my State of South Dakota will not get a Federal tax credit for doing so, but a global company with jobs overseas will get a generous credit under this bill.

Consider what a coalition of leading business organizations made up of the Business Roundtable, the Information Technology Industry Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce had to say recently in a letter regarding the legislation that is pending before us.

Many of the major business organizations in this country said:

> While intended to promote U.S. job creation, the legislation actually would have the unintended consequence of making it even more difficult for American worldwide companies to compete at home and in world markets, thereby placing at risk jobs of American workers.

This is a letter from some of the major business organizations in this country.

If we want greater economic growth and more jobs, we need a Tax Code that creates a level playing field, not one that picks winners and losers based on the preferences of Members of Congress.

Even if we were to assume that a new tax credit for insourcing would be a good thing, the official estimate of the bill from the Joint Committee on Taxation tells us that this particular tax credit will have essentially no impact on our economy. According to this new estimate, the new insourcing credit will provide a tax credit to U.S. companies of $35 million a year. That is $35 million out of a $17 trillion economy or, put another way, this credit will equal .000002 percent of annual U.S. economic activity. Yes, that is a decimal point followed by five zeroes. This bill isn't a drop in the budget; it is more like a drop in the Pacific Ocean.

Yet despite the fact this legislation won't help our economy or create jobs or make America more competitive in the global economy, I voted with most of my colleagues to move forward with this debate because I believe we need to have a robust debate about those measures that will energize our economy.

As such, I filed a number of amendments that would have a meaningful, positive impact on our economy—unlike, I might add, the underlying bill. For example, I filed an amendment to make the small business expensing limits, which expired at the end of last year, permanent, something that I hear about consistently from farmers, ranchers, and small businesses in my State of South Dakota.

These limits allow small businesses, farmers, and ranchers to deduct up to $500,000 per year in expenses, making it easier for these businesses to grow and to hire new workers.

I filed an amendment to make the R&D tax credit permanent. This amendment would also strengthen the credit by raising the credit rate from 14 percent to 20 percent, thus making this credit more competitive with the research incentives offered by many European and Asian nations.

I have also filed an amendment to improve the tax treatment of S corporations if they convert into a C corporation, thus making this popular form of business operation more easily accessible. This amendment would also make it easier for S corporations to give appreciated property to charity.

I filed an amendment to make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which currently protects most Internet users in America from taxes on their Internet access. This law was first enacted in 1998. For more than 15 years it has helped our economy grow, and it has helped the digital economy flourish by keeping State and local taxes off of Internet access, regardless of consumers' access to the Internet via their home computers or by handheld device. Unfortunately, this law is scheduled to expire in just over 3 months on November 1 if we don't take action to prevent that.

Some may claim that my amendments are partisan amendments—that these tax relief measures are simply Republican priorities that can't muster support on the Democrat side of the aisle. The problem with this claim is that all the measures I have just mentioned have found Democratic support already—significant Democratic support.

Consider the R&D amendment I just mentioned. It is identical to the bill that passed the House of Representatives with 274 votes in favor, including 62 House Democrats. That is right, roughly one-third of House Democrats have already voted for this exact amendment.

The same is true for the small business expensing amendment I mentioned. An identical measure passed the House in June with 272 votes, including 53 House Democrats. Consider the S corporation improvements, which were passed by the House with 263 votes, including 42 House Democrats voting yes.

Consider my amendment to make the Internet tax moratorium permanent. My bill, with Finance Committee Chairman RON WYDEN, to make this law permanent has 52 Senate supporters.

In fact, this bill has so much support that an identical bill in the House, just last week, passed by a voice vote. This measure, supported by a majority of Senators, sponsored by the Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee, and approved by the House of Representatives by a voice vote isn't even scheduled for a vote in the Senate. What a shame.

Consider the medical device tax repeal, which is supported by 79 Senators, including 34 Democratic Senators.

Unlike the minuscule economic impact of the bill pending on the Senate floor before us now, repealing the medical device tax would remove an ObamaCare tax increase totaling $24 billion over 10 years on some of the most innovative companies in America. According to a survey by the trade

association AdvaMed, the medical device tax is estimated to destroy as many as 165,000 American jobs.

So let's be clear. It is not that there aren't reasonable measures to boost our economy that we could be considering. All of the measures I have mentioned have broad bipartisan support. The problem is simply that the Democratic majority refuses to allow their consideration.

The Senate majority would prefer we spend our time on inconsequential election-year gimmicks rather than any of the job-creating measures I have just mentioned.

In fact, Senate Democrats have chosen to block nearly all Republican amendments rather than risk having to take difficult votes. Consider that the Senate has had rollcall votes on only 12 Republican amendments since last July. House Democrats—the minority in the House of Representatives—in contrast have had 189 amendments voted on during that same period of time.

Put another way, House Democrats have been allowed, on average, more than one vote for each legislative day the House has been in session over the past year. In the Senate, Senate Republicans have been allowed just one vote per month.

Let me repeat that. The minority in the House is being allowed one vote per legislative day. The minority in the Senate is being allowed one vote per month.

The Senate used to be known as the world's greatest deliberative body. That description now sounds like a cruel joke, considering how few amendments we have been allowed to consider.

The other measure our economy desperately needs is comprehensive tax reform. If we really care about making America a more attractive place to do business so as to lure new business investment jobs, we need to have a much simpler Tax Code with tax rates that are competitive with our global competitors.

Let's consider the facts. When President Reagan signed the Tax Reform Act of 1986 into law, the United States had a corporate tax rate that was more than 5 percentage points below our major economic competitors.

The U.S. corporate tax rate has basically stayed the same since 1986. Yet today our tax rate is the highest in the developed world and is more than 14 percentage points higher than the average of developed economies.

Why? Look at what has happened. Unlike the United States, other nations decided they needed to lower their tax rates to spur economic growth and job creation. Unfortunately, today we are reaping the negative consequences of inaction as we see more and more investment and economic activities moving to those nations that have created a more favorable business environment.

If we want to keep the best, highest-paying jobs at home, we don't need new tax credits targeted at a narrow set of companies. We need a complete overhaul of our tax system with new, competitive tax rates and a modernized system for taxing the global revenues of American companies. Yes, it is going to be a difficult lift, but it is far from impossible.

Consider the United Kingdom, which as recently as 2010 had a 28 percent tax rate and an outdated system for taxing global income. The UK enacted tax reform that will result in a 20-percent tax rate by next year and has already resulted in a modernized system for taxing the income earned by global U.K. companies.

Over the past 5 years, Japan—another major economic competitor of the United States—has done something similar. Japan cut its corporate tax rate by 5 percentage points and has moved to a more competitive system for taxing global income.

If the UK, Japan, and other nations can modernize their Tax Code for competition in the 21st century global marketplace, certainly we in the United States can do it as well.

In closing, I hope the Senate Democrats will change course and allow for an open and robust amendment process to allow a wide variety of job-creating measures to be considered.

Our economy, still mired in the sluggish Obama economy, could certainly use it. But, if not, I look forward to a future Congress where the Senate can get back to real debate and real solutions.

I hope that once the campaigning is done, once the election-year slogans have been retired, we can get back to real, substantive legislating.

American families and workers deserve permanent tax and regulatory relief. They deserve a better economy than they have today, and they deserve a Senate that once again functions as the world's greatest deliberative body and puts their interests first, and their futures, their quality of life, and their standard of living where they should be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I request unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. REED. I wish to support the short-term reauthorization of our national surface transportation law. It is urgent that we keep the highway trust fund solvent to avoid a shutdown of work on our highways, bridges, and transit systems.

A recent letter from 62 national organizations, including the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Public Transportation Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Laborers' International Union, echoed the White House's warning: If we don't shore up the trust fund, we put at risk 100,000 construction projects that support more than 700,000 jobs, including 3,500 jobs in my home State of Rhode Island.

We have to save these jobs, but I have to say that the legislation before us is inadequate on two fronts.

First, instead of a short-term bill, we should be undertaking a long-term extension of transportation funding to provide certainty to the States and create much-needed jobs.

Second, the House version of this bill uses the very offsets that House Republican leaders rejected when they were included as part of my bipartisan legislation to extend jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. House leadership has used every excuse to deny these benefits to people who have been hurting for months, invoking increasingly problematic conditions.

I, for one, will not stop working to help people who, despite their best efforts, find themselves without the opportunity to find work.

We need this patch—even though it is not the preferred solution—to avoid a virtual shutdown of construction throughout the country and prevent further job losses. But the mere fact that the trust fund is so close to becoming bankrupt has already had an effect. Last month, Moody's downgraded the ratings on the GARVEE bonds for 26 transportation agencies.

In Rhode Island our Department of Transportation has about $67 million of projects on hold because of the uncertainty about the trust fund. These are projects that could put people to work in a State that unfortunately is tied for the highest unemployment rate in the Nation. There is more work the State wants to move forward on that would create more needed jobs, but we can only do that with a long-term reauthorization bill.

With only a few months of funding under this so-called patch, Rhode Island will be able to start little—if any—new construction. Instead, the trickle of Federal funding will pay back debt from projects that have already been finished and keep ongoing projects from stopping. It will support some design work that could help keep contract designers from going out of business, but it won't get much new construction started.

So my State and others across the country are forced to wait in a very costly holding pattern. Only a bill that invests significant resources over multiple years can provide this certainty for States and help get new projects underway.

That was the point made by Secretary Foxx and 11 former Secretaries

of Transportation in a letter just a few days ago, noting that we are more than a decade removed from the passage of the last long-term transportation reauthorization bill.

Another point the Secretaries make is this: While long-term certainty is essential, greater Federal investment is needed to ensure our transportation infrastructure meets the needs of our people.

As a nation, our transportation infrastructure system is in desperate need of improvement. The most recent report card from the American Society of Civil Engineers gave both our roads and transit systems a grade of D.

Our aging infrastructure doesn't get as much attention in the media as other issues until the worst happens, such as the collapse of major bridges in Minnesota in 2007 and Washington State last year. But there are structurally deficient roads and bridges in every State, bridges that millions of Americans drive across for work or travel, that companies use to transport products, and that our schoolbuses drive over with our children.

Aging infrastructure is a major challenge for Rhode Island, which has the highest percentage of roads that are in poor condition and the highest percentage of bridges that are deficient or obsolete according to the American Society of Civil Engineers and the U.S. Department of Transportation.

In the last 5 years, Rhode Island has had to act to replace two major bridges on the I–95 corridor. Luckily, the State has been able to take action to avert a disaster, but it hasn't been easy. One of these bridges, the Pawtucket River Bridge, was effectively closed to all large trucks for several years until it was replaced. The other, the Providence Viaduct, which is currently being replaced, has required boards to be placed beneath it in order to protect traffic and passersby below from falling concrete.

Each year, these kinds of deficiencies cost American families $120 billion in extra fuel and time, according to the White House. Businesses pay $27 billion annually in extra freight costs, which then get passed on to consumers. In Rhode Island, the poor road conditions cost $496 million each year in added vehicle repair and operating expenses, which is over $650 per year for each motorist.

To tackle the significant challenges to keep our roads, bridges, and transit in a state of good repair, States such as Rhode Island will need a strong Federal commitment. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, we need to increase our surface transportation funding at all levels of government by $846 billion by 2020 to restore our transportation system to a state of good repair and meet the demands for our growing population and economy. Without more investment, we increase the chance of another infrastructure failure and we create inefficiency in our economy.

Federal funding is critical for all our States in meeting that challenge, but it is especially important for States such as Rhode Island that struggle to generate their own funds for infrastructure. Indeed, stagnant Federal support will make it harder for States that are struggling economically to share in our national prosperity, running the risk of increasing economic inequality among States.

However, with added investments in infrastructure, we can improve freight, roads, and transit systems, meaning commuters will make it to their destinations more quickly and safely while businesses save on shipping goods.

Too many times in the past, the Republican leadership in the House has exploited deadlines like this to engage in brinkmanship, shutting down the Federal Government and bringing the country to the edge of default. In part because we haven't had a manufactured crisis in the last several months, we have seen some good signs in our economy, and so I am encouraged we will not see a shutdown of work on our roads and bridges this summer.

But again, averting disaster shouldn't be our goal. We need to press ahead with a multiyear reauthorization bill to create jobs and improve our economy. Unfortunately, when it comes to helping American workers and our economy, Republican leaders, particularly in the House, have stalled progress.

Indeed, we have seen Republicans block several measures that would help strengthen our economic recovery. As I discussed earlier, House Republicans refused to act on restoring emergency unemployment insurance, despite the fact that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that a year-long extension would generate 200,000 new jobs. Republicans have also blocked our efforts to raise the minimum wage, let borrowers refinance their student loans, pass a paycheck fairness bill or an energy efficiency bill. We need long-term solutions to all of these issues.

In my view, we should make this extension—the one we are considering now—as short as possible to increase the likelihood that we can pass a long-term bill that increases our investment in our transportation system. Regardless of the duration of this short-term bill, we should be working to address the issue before the end of the year. As Secretary Foxx and his predecessors admonished:

What America needs is to break this cycle of governing crisis-to-crisis, only to enact a stopgap measure at the last moment.

The Secretaries made another important point. They wrote this:

Until recently, Congress understood that, as America grows, so must our investments in transportation. And for more than half a century, they voted for that principle—and increased funding—with broad, bipartisan majorities in both houses. We believe they can, and should, do so again.

We should follow their advice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise again on the Senate floor to talk about the crisis at our southern border, and it is a crisis. I don't use that word lightly, but it is clearly a crisis on many levels.

This fiscal year alone, since October 1, 2013, over 381,000 illegal aliens have entered our country through that border. Of course, a big part of that crisis is unaccompanied alien children—58,000 of them. The Obama administration itself says that number will probably grow to 85,000 or 90,000 in just the next few months, by the end of this fiscal year.

We see on this chart that since 2008, sending these UACs back, deporting them, effectively has plummeted—absolutely plummeted. This is a key part of the problem.

Since this crisis came into clear focus, I have been doing several things. I have asked the administration, through a letter to the Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson, for facts, details about the impact of this crisis—the numbers, the particulars, and specifically what impact it can have on Louisiana, my home State. I haven't gotten any response. That is very disappointing. I am asking publicly again for a detailed response to those legitimate straightforward questions.

I have agreed with many others in the House and Senate to partner with the administration around strong action to change this trend, to change our policy, to deport illegal aliens effectively, to send a very new and different message to Central and South America to stem this growing crisis. Unfortunately, that plea has not gotten a positive response from the administration either.

In reaction to that, I have had to dig around wherever I can find credible sources and find out key information myself, particularly as it affects Louisiana. I have been making calls to military leaders, local ICE officials, anyone else with significant credible information.

Again, this should be able to come directly from the Department of Homeland Security. It has not. But this is what I am finding out: The Louisiana ICE office has a backlog of juvenile cases—cases involving minors. First of all, it already had about 2,000 of those cases in Louisiana alone before this wave upon wave of minor illegal aliens reached crisis proportions. Adding on to those 2,000 cases—1,956 to be exact—

there are now over 1,200 new juvenile cases in Louisiana. These are unaccompanied children coming into the country illegally and then being brought into Louisiana, in most cases turned over to the custody of a family member or a sponsor, and many of these family members are themselves illegal.

We are not a border State. We are not Texas, we are not Arizona or New Mexico. We are not one of the States most affected. Yet even Louisiana has this significant impact with very troubling numbers.

I talked to folks at the Hirsch Memorial Coliseum in Shreveport and found out that the International Association of Fairs and Expositions—a trade association for their sorts of facilities around the country—was contacted by the Department of Homeland Security about locating mass space for housing of illegal alien UACs. The Hirsch Memorial Coliseum in particular in Shreveport was contacted to see if they could be part of that, and they said they couldn't. It was not practical at all. But that inquiry was made.

On the military side, I talked to leadership at Fort Pope. They were contacted by the U.S. Army Installation Management Command Headquarters and asked if they could house between 400 and 500 unaccompanied alien children. They said they couldn't for very compelling practical reasons at Fort Pope.

Barksdale Air Force Base in Shreveport was asked via the Air Force Global Strike Command and the Department of Defense if they had capacity for the same mass housing operation. Their response was as follows:

Barksdale's answer has been consistent with our strategic mission and supporting base infrastructure for the nation's #1 mission (nuclear)—we would not support or participate.

But it is significant those inquiries were actively made.

Belle Chasse Naval Air Station in New Orleans, again on behalf of the Department of Homeland Security, was contacted about their capacity for this same sort of thing twice.

Again, it makes the point that even Louisiana—not a border State, not a State most affected—is fielding many inquiries and significant impacts—1,259 new juvenile cases being brought into the State, all of these inquiries.

I wish I could get this information directly from the Department of Homeland Security. I have asked for it. They have not been forthcoming.

Unfortunately, the administration likewise has not been forthcoming about real solutions, partnering with Congress to make changes in the law and anything else necessary to stem this tide and reverse the policy that continues to encourage this tide. We have seen no leadership there either.

While the President spent the first 10 days of focus on this crisis talking about various parts of Federal law that he said were tying his hands, when it came to sending a request to Congress, there was no request to change any of that law. There was no request to streamline any deportation procedures. There was no request to heighten the standard for asylum or anything else. The only request was to send him a huge amount of additional money, billions upon billions of dollars.

So in the absence of that leadership and partnership and information, I started to develop legislative ideas with many others myself, and I have introduced a legislative solution—S. 2632—to address this specific unaccompanied alien children crisis, and it has been introduced in the House by my Louisiana colleague, Congressman BILL CASSIDY.

Fundamentally, this legislation would reverse the policy we have in place which accepts these folks over and does nothing to quickly deport them to their home country. It would reverse that policy so we would have quick, effective, immediate deportations to send the message to Central and South America that this has to stop and to stem that tide.

Specifically, the legislation would do nine things:

No. 1, it would mandate detention of all unaccompanied alien children upon apprehension. No catch and release. No catch and then, yes, here. We will further the smuggling and give you to your family members or sponsors in this country.

No. 2, we would amend the law to bring parity between UACs from contiguous and noncontiguous countries. All UACs, regardless of country of origin, will be given the option to voluntarily depart. That is a practical solution, in the case of those coming from Mexico and Canada—obviously many more from Mexico.

No. 3, those UACs who do not voluntarily depart will be immediately placed in a streamlined removal process and detained by the Department of Homeland Security. Currently, they are transferred instead to Health and Human Service's Office of Refugee Resettlement, where they are basically resettled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. I have to object. I have no objection to having more time after the vote, but I object before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the cloture vote on the Harris nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I will consider objecting, but I would far prefer to amend the unanimous consent request so that I get the additional minute I was just denied and the Senator from Maryland gets her time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, my unanimous consent request was for me to finish my remarks in 1 minute and then have the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending unanimous consent request is from the Senator from Maryland.

Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I therefore call for the regular order. I ask unanimous consent that my full statement be included in the RECORD, to yield back whatever time we have, and that we move expeditiously to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

HARRIS NOMINATION

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am so proud to be here today in support of the nomination of Pamela Harris—a brilliant litigator, professor, and public servant—to serve on the Fourth Circuit.

Senator CARDIN and I recommended Ms. Harris to President Obama with the utmost confidence in her abilities, talent, and competence for the job. The ABA agreed—they gave her their highest rating of unanimously well-qualified.

I thank Senator REID for being so prompt in scheduling this vote. I also thank Senator LEAHY for his expeditious movement of her nomination through the Judiciary Committee.

I have had the opportunity to recommend several judicial nominees for our district and appellate courts. I take my ''advise and consent'' responsibilities very seriously. When I consider nominees for the Federal bench, I have four criteria: absolute integrity; judicial competence and temperament; a commitment to core constitutional principles; and a history of civic engagement in Maryland. I expect our recommendations to not only meet these criteria but to exceed them, as Ms. Harris surely does. She has dedicated her career to the rule of law, achieving equal justice under the law and the perfection of appellate advocacy. She is truly an outstanding nominee.

Ms. Harris's career spans academia, private practice, and government. But

there has always been a common thread of public service. We are proud to say that she is ''home-grown''—although born in Connecticut, she has called Maryland home since she was a child, eventually graduating from Walt Whitman High School in Bethesda, MD. She went on to Yale where she received her bachelor's degree summa cum laude as well as her law degree. After completing a clerkship on the D.C. Circuit, Ms. Harris went on to clerk for Justice Stevens on the Supreme Court. She has served at the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel and at the Office of Legal Policy under two different administrations. She also spent 10 years appearing regularly before the Supreme Court while counsel and then partner at O'Melveny & Myers, taking on some of the most complex issues of our time.

Ms. Harris also has a distinguished career in academia as a Professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, co-director of the Harvard Appellate Practice Clinic, and later, at Georgetown, where she is today. At Georgetown she serves as executive director of the Supreme Court Institute, preparing litigants—first come, first served—and regardless of their position—for arguments before the Court. But Ms. Harris remained connected to Maryland, whether it was a pro bono appellate clinic at O'Melveny to work with Maryland's public defender or an amicus brief in major litigation involving Montgomery County Public Schools.

Ms. Harris has a commitment to the legal profession that is unmatched. It shows in the students that she has taught, the litigants that she has prepared, the briefs that she has written, and the pro bono service that she has rendered. She has risen to the highest levels of her education and career. Yet she has seen people in her life confront adversity and she knows the impact that the law has on people's daily lives. I believe it is this which contributes to her very humble nature. She believes that the Court is a place for justice and not a stepping stone. Ms. Harris continues to give back to the community, serving on the board of trustees at her children's school, and also to legal scholarship, as a member of the board of directors for the American Constitution Society and the Constitutional Accountability Center.

So I am so honored to be here today to support her nomination. I ask that you all join me in doing the same. It is critical that we have judges with commitment to public service, civic engagement, and the rule of law. And we have that in none other than Pamela Harris.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I would just like to again ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 additional minute following the Senator from Maryland being recognized for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed to S. 2569.

The motion was agreed to.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Bernard Sanders, Dianne Feinstein, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Edward J. Markey, Tom Harkin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Brown	Coons
Begich	Cantwell	Donnelly
Bennet	Cardin	Durbin
Blumenthal	Carper	Feinstein
Booker	Casey	Franken
Boxer	Collins	Gillibrand
Hagan	McCaskill	Schatz
Harkin	Menendez	Schumer
Heinrich	Merkley	Shaheen
Heitkamp	Mikulski	Stabenow
Hirono	Murphy	Tester
Johnson (SD)	Murray	Udall (CO)
Kaine	Nelson	Udall (NM)
King	Pryor	Walsh
Klobuchar	Reed	Warner
Leahy	Reid	Warren
Levin	Rockefeller	Whitehouse
Markey	Sanders	Wyden

NAYS—41

Alexander	Graham	McConnell
Ayotte	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hatch	Paul
Blunt	Heller	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Landrieu	Toomey
Enzi	Lee	Vitter
Fischer	Manchin	Wicker
Flake	McCain	

NOT VOTING—5

Burr	Coburn	Roberts
Chambliss	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 41. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAMELA HARRIS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Harris nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

NOMINATION OF LISA S. DISBROW TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Disbrow nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Lisa S. Disbrow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Would it be appropriate at this time to yield back the 2 minutes of time? I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lisa S. Disbrow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF VICTOR M. MENDEZ TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Mendez nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Victor M. Mendez, of Arizona, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Victor M. Mendez, of Arizona, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF PETER M. ROGOFF TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Rogoff nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Peter M. Rogoff, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Peter M. Rogoff, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF BRUCE H. ANDREWS TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Andrews nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Bruce H. Andrews, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Bruce H. Andrews, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action with respect to each of these nominations.

NOMINATION OF PAMELA HARRIS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, we have an opportunity to address an issue of concern to foresting communities in Wisconsin and across the Nation in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill now pending before Congress.

The supplemental addresses a number of very urgent issues. The issue of unaccompanied minors who are crossing our southern border has rightly received much attention and there is, indeed, a crisis. I believe Congress must pass a supplemental appropriations bill to help address this humanitarian crisis.

This afternoon I wish to call attention to another emergency that Congress must address: extreme wildfires and the dysfunctional way the Federal Government manages our firefighting operations.

Devastating wildfires are raging in Washington and Oregon States, and many other States have felt the heartbreaking impact of major forest fire destruction. As I presided earlier today, I heard the two Senators from Washington State come to the floor and talk about the devastation the wildfires in their State are causing and the bravery of citizens who are facing these destructive fires. It is why I am pleased Appropriations Committee Chairwoman MIKULSKI has drafted an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that includes $615 million for wildfire suppression. I thank her for her tremendous leadership in putting together a strong bill, and I urge Congress to take up and pass this legislation without delay to provide much needed support to these suffering communities.

But it is not just Western States that feel the impact of wildfires. In fact, a State such as Wisconsin is hurt very significantly by a broken budget process called fire borrowing. It forces the U.S. Forest Service to take funding intended to manage our forests and instead use it for wildfire suppression. In fact, fire borrowing is a misnomer. The money is never paid back. This cripples the U.S. Forest Service and diverts critical funding from my home State and many others.

In Wisconsin, over 50,000 people are employed in the forest products industry, from jobs in forestry and logging to paper makers in the State's many mills. The industry pays over $3 billion in wages into the State's economy and ships products worth over $17 billion each year.

Unfortunately, fire borrowing has led to long project delays that are impacting this vital industry and jeopardizing the jobs which it supports.

The practice of fire borrowing has increased in recent years, triggered when we have a bad fire season and the Forest Service runs out of funds available for firefighting. When the firefighting funding is gone, the agency transfers funds from other parts of its budget and borrows them to pay for the fire suppression. When these funds are diverted, agency work is simply put on hold.

No business owner would select a supplier who couldn't provide a clear delivery schedule or who would routinely delay delivery of products for undetermined amounts of time. Loggers and other local businesses that partner with the Forest Service have to deal with just such uncertainty because of fire borrowing. Government can work better than this.

Fortunately, the Senate emergency supplemental appropriations bill would solve this broken process by treating the largest fires as other natural disasters such as hurricanes or tornadoes, and it would stabilize the rest of the Forest Service budget so that other essential work, ranging from timber sales to the management of forest health, can be completed on schedule.

Furthermore, the proposal is fiscally responsible, because it would help reduce long-term costs by allowing for increased fire prevention activities and because it would not increase the amount that Congress can spend on natural disasters.

Ending fire borrowing has strong bipartisan support. In fact, over 120 Members of the House and Senate, and more than 200 groups ranging from the timber industry to conservation groups, to the National Rifle Association, support the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act—the bipartisan bill that contains the fire borrowing fix included in the supplemental. The consensus is we need to get this fix done this year.

While there is strong bipartisan support for ending fire borrowing, it is unclear if the House of Representatives is going to support this fix in the supplemental appropriations bill that is being considered now. In fact, my friend, the House Budget Committee chairman PAUL RYAN, has consistently stood in the way of bipartisan solutions offered in both the House and the Senate. He has ignored the fact that the current budget structure is flawed and has resulted in the Forest Service taking the forest management funding Wisconsin's forests rely upon and instead using it to fight wildfires.

As his Republican House colleague Representative MIKE SIMPSON recently pointed out:

> Unfortunately, continuing the status quo, as Chairman Ryan advocates, prevents us from reducing the cost and severity of future fires by forcing agencies to rob the money that Congress has appropriated for these priorities to pay for increasingly unpredictable and costly suppression needs.

I urge my friend and fellow Wisconsinite to join us and support ending fire borrowing.

I thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI and subcommittee Chairman REED for including this important provision in the supplemental bill. I wish to also thank Senators WYDEN and CRAPO for their tireless leadership in the fight to end fire borrowing.

The proposal included in the emergency appropriations supplemental is a

fiscally responsible solution to a devastating problem with wide-ranging impacts. It will help us respond to wildfires and it will support businesses and thousands of jobs in the timber industry in Wisconsin as well as throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate and in the House to come together to solve this problem once and for all.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNREST IN ISRAEL

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, last week the Washington Post ran an opinion piece titled ''Moral clarity in Gaza.'' The thesis of the article states that Israel is not interested in cross-border violence; rather, the goal of the current military action is to establish peace. I believe the writer correctly suggests that Israel has been left with no choice but to act in order to defend herself from the terrorist organization Hamas.

The piece also made the important conclusion that Hamas wants to provoke a fight with Israel and that this group is willing to sacrifice their own people in order to win international support and ultimately undermine Israel's legitimacy and right to defend itself.

There is no question regarding Israel's legitimacy, and there is also no question regarding Israel's right to defend itself. The international community has affirmed this principle. Further, this body affirmed Israel's right to defend itself when the Senate recently passed Senator GRAHAM's resolution on this matter.

As a cosponsor, I believe this resolution speaks in clear terms: The Senate stands with Israel's right to defend itself, and it demands that Hamas immediately—immediately—stop attacking Israel.

While the Senate has made its position on this issue clear, Israel has been forced to take matters into its own hands. As we speak, Israeli defense forces are engaged in Operation Protective Edge, working to identify and destroy the infrastructure Hamas has used to execute attacks and move artillery underneath Gaza City.

Recent reports have stated that the IDF has destroyed more than 20 tunnels and identified many more as ground troops moved from building to building. They are utilizing air, ground, and sea to strike designated targets and provide support as IDF works its way through Gaza City.

The fighting will likely continue and more casualties on both sides will increase until either a cease-fire can be negotiated or Israel believes the tunnel system has been successfully negated.

I believe Israel has been left with no choice but to defend herself. Israel has faced a barrage of rocket attacks from Gaza Strip, and according to Secretary of State Kerry Hamas has attempted to sedate and kidnap Israelis through the network of tunnels used to stage cross-border raids.

Prime Minister Netanyahu cannot tolerate rocket attacks and cannot tolerate kidnappings aimed at Israelis. Their right to defend themselves is without question. But through the process, innocent Palestinians are being killed. This tragic loss of innocent life must not go unnoticed, but we must acknowledge Hamas's role in risking the lives of their own through their own actions.

Hamas stores and launches rockets from heavily populated areas. They do this because they know it will draw return fire from Israel, and even if some Palestinians are killed, the coverage aired worldwide will be favorable to Hamas and therefore well worth the loss. Hamas is sacrificing its own to win a media war against Israel. In contrast, in the lead-up to military action, Israel dropped thousands of leaflets explaining to Palestinians where they can go to be safe.

There is no clearer picture of right versus wrong than Israel fighting to protect its citizens against a terrorist operation operating underground and using Palestinians they live with as human shields.

Hamas is a terrorist organization willing to let women and children die if there is a possibility it advances international sympathy for them and underscores Israel in any way.

The footage of innocent Palestinians dying in Gaza is tragic, but the blame is not at the foot of Israel; it is on Hamas.

Over the next weeks and months, the military action in Gaza may escalate. If a cease-fire is not negotiated, the United States cannot turn its back on Israel. We must continue to stand with them and allow them to eradicate this terrorist threat and shut down these underground tunnels. It is their right as a nation, and the United States must stand with them.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his very cogent remarks. They are true, and I appreciate his leadership on this matter.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Madam President, the Senate is currently debating the so-called Bring Jobs Home Act—a bill supposedly aimed at preserving and creating jobs in the United States. However, as I noted here on the floor yesterday, the Bring Jobs Home Act is little more than political posturing and election-year messaging. It really does get old. We have gone through that over and over while we do not do what we ought to do for this country.

The Senate Democrats want to portray the Republicans as the party of outsourcing, which is a joke. So they have crafted a bill that will do nothing to actually address the problem of outsourcing but will provide them with a few days' worth of talking points on the subject. We went through precisely this same exercise in 2012. We voted on the exact same bill during the last election cycle. It was meaningless then, and it is meaningless now.

As I said, I went over this yesterday. I talked at some length about the shortcomings of this bill, and I do not want to rehash all of that again today. Instead, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about some things we could be doing to create and protect American jobs. I have filed some amendments to this bill that I think would actually do something along those lines. If we get a chance to offer amendments to this bill—which is, of course, doubtful under the way the Senate is currently being run—I think these are the types of amendments we should consider.

One of my amendments is a four-part tax amendment that would help businesses create jobs in the United States. If enacted, it would provide additional cash flow for businesses that would allow them to hire workers, increase wages, and invest in plant and equipment in the United States, among other things. It would do so by making four separate temporary tax provisions permanent.

The first of these provisions relates to section 179, small business expensing. My amendment would permanently increase the amount of equipment, certain real property, and software a business can deduct in a year to $500,000 and index that amount to inflation. That makes sense.

The second provision would make bonus depreciation permanent, allowing businesses to permanently deduct 50 percent of the cost of qualified property in the first year that property is placed in service.

My amendment would also make the research and development tax credit permanent, increasing the alternative simplified credit to 20 percent and eliminating the traditional research and development credit test.

Finally, the amendment would permanently provide for a full exclusion of capital gains income derived from the sale of stock of certain small subchapter C corporations held on a long-term basis.

All of these would be tremendous amendments and would really create jobs. They ought to be allowed on this bill. Together, these four provisions would provide much needed certainty for job-creating businesses and allow companies to more effectively plan for the future.

If we are going to amend the Tax Code in the name of creating jobs, this

is a far better approach, as it removes uncertainty and simplifies elements of the code. The Bring Jobs Home Act would actually do the opposite.

I have also filed two health-related amendments to this bill.

The first of these amendments would repeal the medical device tax that was included as part of the so-called Affordable Care Act. ObamaCare's $24 billion tax on lifesaving and life-improving medical devices is reducing U.S. employment.

A recent study by industry group AdvaMed estimated that the tax has cost as many as 165,000 jobs. That is 165,000 American jobs eliminated by this misguided tax. Ten percent of respondents to that survey have relocated manufacturing outside of the country or expanded manufacturing abroad rather than in the United States.

This would help solve the inversion problem, but our colleagues on the other side will not do anything about it. Yet they are trying to blame the Republicans for the inversion? Give me a break.

The tax is also curbing American innovation. Thirty percent of AdvaMed survey respondents have reduced their investments in research and development—30 percent.

If we really want to keep companies from moving American jobs offshore, this is a far better approach. It is far more substantial, and, as the survey data shows, it will have an immediate, real-world impact on jobs in the United States.

It is bipartisan. Republicans and Democrats support repeal of the medical device tax. Last year 79 Senators on this floor—including 34 Democrats—voted to repeal the tax. It really is a no-brainer. I hope we can finally get a vote on it. But sooner or later, we are going to get a vote on it, and it is going to be on a bill that will pass both Houses.

My other health care amendment would repeal ObamaCare's job-killing employer mandate. As we all know, the so-called Affordable Care Act requires employers with 50 or more employees to provide health coverage to their workers or pay a $2,000 tax per employee. This deters business growth as it discourages small businesses from hiring more than 50 employees and has led many employers to cut workers' hours to keep from going over the mandate's threshold. How stupid can we be? Even the administration has acknowledged that the employer mandate is harmful. They have already delayed it several times in hopes of delaying its harmful impact during an election year. Isn't that nice?

If we really want to keep people in their jobs and encourage businesses to hire more American workers, repealing the employer mandate would go a long way.

My last amendment would advance U.S. trade policy by renewing trade promotion authority. Specifically, the amendment contains the text of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014, a bill I introduced in January along with Chairman CAMP of the House Ways and Means Committee and former chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator Max Baucus of Montana.

This bill establishes 21st-century congressional negotiating objectives and rules for the administration to follow when engaged in trade talks, including strict requirements for congressional consultations and access to information. If the administration follows these rules, the bill provides special procedures to more quickly move a negotiated deal through Congress.

Renewing TPA, which expired in 2007, is necessary to successfully conclude ongoing trade negotiations, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP, negotiations as well as free-trade agreement talks with the European Union, often referred as T-TIP, involving 28 nations, including ours. These are two landmark trade deals with the potential to greatly boost U.S. exports and create jobs here.

The TPP countries—which represent many of the fastest growing economies in the world—accounted for 40 percent of total U.S. goods exports in 2012. Think of the jobs that would be created.

Another, the EU, the European Union, purchased close to $460 billion—with a ''b''—in U.S. goods and services that same year, supporting 2.4 million American jobs.

In addition, the United States is negotiating the Trade in Services Agreement, or TISA, with 50 countries, covering about 50 percent of global GDP and over 70 percent of global services trade. This agreement would create many opportunities for U.S. jobs in this critical sector.

It is vital that we get these trade agreements over the finish line, and the only way we are going to be able to do that is to renew trade promotion authority. My amendment provides a reasonable, bipartisan path forward on renewing TPA and would do far more to create jobs and grow our economy than the legislation before us today, which is minuscule in effort. As with other amendments, I hope we can vote on this TPA amendment.

Of course, I am not the only Senator who has offered reasonable job-creating amendments to the Bring Jobs Home Act. Numerous amendments have already been offered, and I am sure more are on the way—or should I say filed because we have been prohibited from really offering amendments on these bills and really having a robust debate for a long time now because of the actions of the current leadership of the Senate. The Senate is hardly operating as the Senate always has in the past; that is, in an effective, let's-be-positive way.

Sadly, if the recent past is any indication, there will not be any votes on amendments to this bill. The Bring Jobs Home Act is not designed to create jobs. It is not even designed to pass the Senate. Once again, the entire purpose of this bill is to give Democrats some political talking points as the August recess approaches. Having an open and fair debate on amendments would distract from this partisan goal. We understand that everything is partisan around here. Everything is political right now. But my gosh, when are we going to start acting as the Senate?

That being the case, it is doubtful that any amendments are going to be considered on this legislation, which is, of course, a crying shame. The stated purpose of this bill is to create and protect American jobs. The Republicans have amendments that would do just that and more. I mentioned a few such amendments that would have a far greater impact on American workers and businesses than the bill before us today—most of which are bipartisan amendments.

That is what is amazing to me. This is just a game that is being played. It is really an irritating game to me. If we are serious about the idea of creating jobs in the United States, let's have a real debate about it. Let's discuss some alternative approaches. I know my friends on the other side will have great ideas on some of these, if they would be allowed to act like legislators for a change.

Let's talk about the real problems that are hampering job growth. Let's set votes on some of the ideas we have proposed. I hope we can do that this time around. But of course I am not under any illusions that the Democratic leadership here in the Senate is about to change course and let this body function the way it is supposed to. They are not about to let the Senate be the Senate. They are not about to let both sides have a full-fledged opportunity to improve these bills. They are not about to allow full and fair debate on both sides.

To me, it is mind-boggling in the case of this bill. I hope I am wrong. I hope we can get amendments up that would make this bill a real bill about jobs, instead of just politics. But, sadly, I do not think I am wrong. My experience has been that politics is triumphant around here and getting the people's work done is secondary.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the child refugee crisis on America's border is a human tragedy.

Two weeks ago in Chicago I met 70 of these children. It was a meeting I won't forget. These are children, some are infants. How they ever made it to the United States is nothing short of a miracle, and many who tried didn't.

Those who made it—some of them—come scarred from the journey—young women who were assaulted, children who were beaten. Some lost their lives on the way, but these were the survivors. They made it. They were in a transitional shelter in Chicago that has been there for 19 years, and 70 of them were getting physical exams and meals. As one person there said, for the first time in their lives, many of them, were free to be children.

These children are in the United States and they are testing us. It is a test for the United States as to whether we care. I believe we are a caring nation. We proved it over and over. How many times in far-flung places in the world have we rallied—politically to stand behind 300 girls who were kidnapped in Nigeria, to be there during the Haitian earthquake to make sure the families and children would at least have shelter, medicine, and food. The list goes on and on for this caring nation.

But this is different. This is not about a problem over there. This is about a challenge here. What President Obama has said to us is we must rise to this challenge. As we have in so many places in this world, we must rise to the challenges at home. When it comes to these children, we can be humane and caring and do the right thing.

He sent us a bill to pay for the services they need. It is expensive. Some people argue it is too expensive. Well, we can argue about the exact amount of money, but I hope we aren't arguing about the value and the principle that is being tested. I hope we are not arguing about whether the United States is a caring and compassionate nation.

I just left a meeting with the Presidents from the three Central American countries which are responsible for 80 percent of these refugees: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Yesterday we met with their Ambassadors.

It is easy to understand what is happening. It is easy to understand when the economies are so poor in this area that families cannot feed their children. It is easy to understand when the drug gangs are so powerful that these children are being threatened, exploited, raped, and killed. It is only then that in desperation some member of the family says: There is only one chance. We send you to the United States—putting these children in the hands of coyotes and smugglers who take them on a journey that doesn't last hours but days and is 2,000 miles. Imagine. Imagine a mother taking her child to the freight train—this 12-year-old boy—watching him climb up the ladder on the side and hang on. She says: You will be there in 4 days.

Can you imagine that. Can you imagine the family in Honduras, who before they send their young girl on this journey with the coyote, giving her birth control pills in anticipation that she will likely be sexually assaulted during the course of that journey? How desperate must that family be? That is the reality of this human child refugee crisis that we face.

The President has said we need to do several things. First, we need to tell these countries: Don't send these children. It is too dangerous, and when they have arrived, they have no special legal rights to be citizens or to stay. We need to get that message through loudly and clearly: Do not send your children. The countries involved—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—are joining us now in getting that message out.

Secondly, we need to start apprehending and prosecuting these coyotes, these smugglers. They extort from these families 1 year of wages to try to bring children into this country.

Some of these children are teenagers—most of them are—but many of them are babies and infants.

Five women walked into the dining room at the shelter carrying newborn babies. All of these women are from Honduras and all are victims of rape. They had gone on these buses for 8 days to bring these newborn infants to a safer place so that they might survive.

I am heartened by the fact that religious groups all around the United States have rallied behind these children. I am proud the Catholic Church—which I associate with; occasionally they associate with me—I am proud the Catholic Church and the bishops have spoken. Evangelicals are one of the first groups to come forward and say: We have to do something for these children.

Even some of the most conservative political commentators have said: First, America, show your heart that you care for these children.

That is what the President is asking us to do.

So let us take care, when we consider the supplemental appropriations bill, that we don't lose sight of our values. To those who politically disagree and sometimes even despise the President, I urge them not to try to show how tough they are with this President at the expense of these small children. Let's show how big we are as a nation first. The political debate can be saved for another day.

I support this legislation. I think it is the right thing to do.

I want history to write this chapter about America, and I want it to be a chapter of which we are proud. I want a future generation to look back to this year and say that in this year, when the United States was presented with this border crisis with children, America showed its heart; America stood and did what was right for these children, as we have so many times in the past.

IRON DOME

There are other parts of this bill. One of them is a section I have worked on in my capacity as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. This is called Iron Dome, and it is much different than a debate about children or refugees.

Over the past 3 weeks, more than 2,000 rockets have been fired from Gaza into Israel. According to press reports, civilian casualties have been limited—maybe even only 2 out of 2,000 rockets. There are two reasons for the low number of injuries from this barrage.

First, many of these rockets land in uninhabited areas. Second, these rockets are headed for cities and towns, but these rockets are stopped and destroyed before they strike their targets. The reason? The Iron Dome missile defense system, a joint effort by the United States and Israel to protect against just such an attack. The United States and Israel have deep ties on this program. Of the 10 Iron Dome batteries that have been fielded, the United States provided funding for 8 of them. I am pleased we have because this system has saved innocent lives.

Our country has been asked for additional assistance to ensure that the Israeli stockpile of Iron Dome interceptors is adequate to the challenge. We don't know when this crisis will end. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel endorsed an additional $225 million in funding for Iron Dome in a recent letter.

The requested funds are in addition to next year's appropriations. It may be some time before the appropriations bills are enacted, and that is why the President has asked to include in this supplemental appropriation $225 million to speed up the production of Iron Dome missiles.

The Senate simply has too little time. There is next week, and then we are gone for 5 or 6 weeks, return for perhaps 2, and then we are gone until November. So we have to act and act now.

This supplemental appropriations bill with the Iron Dome money needs to pass. I am going to be supporting it. This is an emergency which is front and center.

The Ambassador from Israel to the United States came to see me last week. He said at one time two-thirds of the population of Israel was in bomb shelters during these attacks. It is a serious threat to them.

Let me add too that all of us are praying this violence and war between Gaza and Israel will come to an end

soon, that they will institute a cease-fire, sit at a table and resolve their differences.

But we cannot expect any country—not Israel, not the United States—any country—to sit and take 2,000 incoming rockets and not respond. This saves lives—the Iron Dome.

But now we need to take the next step, bringing peace to this region so that innocent people on both sides of the border are going to be spared.

Hamas, a group which we have characterized as terrorist since the late 1990s, is leading this attack on Israel. This terrorist group is politically popular in some parts of Gaza. How do they protect their rocket launchers? They place them in homes, they put them in crowded areas, and they build tunnels under Gaza streets for their weapons and to escape when they are attacked.

The latest report is they were building these tunnels under hospitals, knowing that Israel and other countries would spare these hospitals. Meanwhile, the hospitals are covering tunnels, which is just the source of much more violence in the area.

CHILD REFUGEE CRISIS

I wish to close on the issue about the child refugees. I see Senator PORTMAN of Ohio is on the floor. I will close and yield in a moment for him.

One of the questions I asked of the Ambassadors from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala was this: We believe the children who come into the United States once given a chance to state why they are here—we believe that half of them or maybe more will be returned to their countries.

I asked the Ambassadors from these countries: Can we have confidence that if these children, who have come to our border, are returned back to their countries, they will be safe. A simple question, Will they be safe. Do you have people, charities, agencies of government to guarantee that when they return, when they get off the plane or the bus, they will be safe?

The Ambassador from Guatemala said: Yes, we do. The Ambassador from Honduras said: No, we don't. The Ambassador from El Salvador said: Neither do we.

Let us think about this for a moment. Let us reflect on this for a moment. Let us make sure we do everything in our power to hand these children over to a safe situation.

Let us work with these countries to stop the flow into this country, but to make certain that when they return, they are returned to a safe setting.

Can you believe that in Chicago a brother and a sister—a 6 year-old and a 3-year-old brother and sister—came to one of these shelters? I could see from the bruises on their bodies they had been through something on their way here. It took 2 months before these children—the 6-year-old—finally talked about what she can remember from this horrendous journey. I won't recount the details, but it is heartbreaking to think that a child of 6 years would have endured this experience.

Let's do right by these children. Let's make sure at the end of the day America has proven again we are a caring nation and that for those children who come to our shores, come to our borders, we will treat them humanely and compassionately, as we would want our own children to be treated if they were ever in such a desperate circumstance.

Let's set the politics aside. Let's put these children front and center.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, earlier today the Senate voted to proceed to debate on legislation called the Bring Jobs Home Act. It is about tax reform. It is about the tax system in this country.

I am glad we are having the debate. I voted to proceed to the debate. I think it is important we talk about it.

I had a reporter come to me earlier today who said: I hear that Democrats are going to talk about inversions. That means when a company of the United States goes overseas and buys a company—usually smaller than they are—and then inverts, they become a foreign corporation.

They said: Are you concerned about that?

I said: No. I think that is great. I think we need to talk about it. I think it is a hidden problem that no one is talking about, and I think it is terrific that we are talking about it.

So I hope what will happen over the next week on the floor of the Senate is we will have an honest conversation about what is happening in our great country, where we have more and more American companies saying, because of the Tax Code they are saddled with, they cannot compete around the globe.

So what do they do? Having a responsibility to their shareholders, they go and find either a foreign company to become part of and become foreign—or they make themselves a foreign company by being acquired by a foreign company. Some of them are simply not growing because they can't compete with other companies from other countries that are buying some of their assets.

A company recently came to me from Ohio, my home State, and said: We do work in Korea. We were in South Korea. We wanted to buy this subsidiary there so we could expand what we are doing in Korea and push more of our product there, more of our exports there. We finished the negotiation with the Korean company, and a company from Germany stepped up and said: Do you know what. Whatever you guys have negotiated, we will take it, but we will pay 18 percent more.

The reason the German company could pay 18 percent more is their after-tax profits were higher, because the German tax code treats the German company better than the American Tax Code treats the American company. That is the reality, and it is happening.

Over the last 5 years, they say there have been 35 American companies that have gone overseas through these inversions, but there are also a lot of American companies that have become foreign entities.

I am a beer drinker, and it is hard to find an American company that can sell you a beer these days. Why? Because they are almost all foreign companies. The two largest American beer companies each have about a 1.4-percent market share—Sam Adams and Yuengling. Great beers, by the way. But this is sad to me.

It doesn't mean these companies have all left the United States. A lot of them still have production here, breweries here, and so on. But by headquartering somewhere else for tax purposes we lose something as Americans. We lose executive jobs over time, but we lose this intangible thing—which is, companies that are willing to invest in our communities—in hometowns, like in my hometown, probably everything we are involved with on the charitable side, some local company has been involved with and helped with. A lot of them tend to be international companies that do a lot to help make our cities a better place to live and to work. But they do it partly because it is where their headquarters is. This is where their towns are. If they are not here—if they are in Dublin, Ireland, or if they are in London, England, or if they are in Beijing or in Rio, Brazil, or somewhere else, they are not going to be making those investments. So this is a big deal.

It is also a big deal because it is not just about the inversion. I see that as kind of the tip of the iceberg. It is also about all these companies that are losing right now in foreign competition because, again, they can't compete. They have to pay more in terms of taxes than their foreign competitors. So their foreign competitors can afford to broaden their market share, get more customers, can afford to buy a company when one comes up for acquisition.

I had a fellow come up recently from the Boston area. Boston does a lot of biopharmaceutical research, as the Presiding Officer knows. It is very exciting what is going on there, and throughout our country. We are still doing top-notch research. They showed me the list of companies that have been purchased in the last 4 or 5 years. Unfortunately, the majority of those

companies were purchased by a foreign company. It wasn't by a U.S. company coming in and consolidating. It was by a company under different tax laws—a Swiss company, a French company, a German company, or a Japanese company—that had bought an American company, the majority of them—by far the majority. This is happening all over the country, and it is happening under our noses.

We are sitting here in Washington, allowing this to happen because we are abdicating our responsibility to reform the Tax Code so that it is competitive.

By the way, we are the only country that is not waking up to this. Every single one of the other developed countries in the world—the countries that are members of what is called the OECD, which is all the developed countries—every single one of them is reforming their tax code, except us.

In the 1980s, we established the rate we have now, which is 35 now—then it was 34 percent. When we add the State tax rates for the companies, it is about 39 percent on average in America. We are the highest rate in the world.

So at the time we set our rate in the mid-thirties, that was just below the average. It was done deliberately, and it was done as part of the 1986 tax reform. We said: Let's set the business rate at something below the average so we can be competitive.

But since that time, we have become the highest rate, and every single one of our developed country competitors—all of them—have reformed their tax code and lowered their rate.

But they haven't just lowered their rate to make us No. 1 in the world—which is not a No. 1 you want to be if you want to compete and develop jobs—they have also reformed their tax code to make it more competitive internationally. We haven't done that. We have been bystanders in this effort to attract jobs and investment opportunities.

We still have what is called the worldwide system, where we don't tax income where it is earned. That has created a real problem.

So I am glad we are having this debate on the floor. I am glad there is an opportunity to talk about this. I must say that, unfortunately, the bill before us, the Bring Jobs Home Act, is not going to help because it doesn't get at this underlying problem we have been talking about today. It does nothing about lowering the rate. It does nothing about changing the international system of taxation. It tinkers around the edges with one issue, and that is to remove deductions and tax credits that, according to the authors of the bill, incentivizes companies to move overseas.

There is a group here in Washington called the Joint Committee on Taxation. They are nonpartisan, and they tell us in Congress what tax policy means, how much it costs, and what the effects are going to be. Here is what they say:

> Under present law, there are no targeted tax credits or disallowances of deductions related to relocating business units inside or outside the United States.

So why are we having this debate? Why aren't we debating the core issue—the real problem? I guess because this is the better political debate and it is easier to do. But it is not going to help. It would be nice if there were these targeted tax credits that some of the authors claim, because then we could get rid of those and that might help some. But, as the Joint Committee on Taxation has said, that doesn't exist.

Let's take a look at the numbers.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the very small tweaks this legislation will make to the Tax Code by disallowing some of these deductions will amount to around $143 million over 10 years. So they say $143 million over 10 years, because even though there is no targeted allowance or targeted tax credits, they think this legislation will have some effect on the way the IRS will interpret it. By the way, it is left up to the IRS to interpret it, and it is a subjective decision by the IRS since it is not targeted.

But let's say that $143 million over 10 years is the right number. That is what the Joint Committee says. So $143 million over 10 years. Let me give one example.

There is a company in Ohio that is about a Fortune 200 or Fortune 300 company. So it is a big company—not the biggest company, but it is a big company in Ohio. They decided a year or so ago to do an inversion. They bought a company that was one-quarter their size overseas and they became a foreign company. Based on the public filings, we know this year that company will save $160 million on its taxes because it chose to become a foreign company. That is wrong. Our tax system should be fair, it should be competitive. It shouldn't be driving these companies to do this on behalf of their shareholders and under their fiduciary responsibility.

That is $160 million a year versus this bill that, even if it works as the folks are talking about, is intended to be a $143 million impact over 10 years. See what I mean about this not being a serious proposal? Let's get at the core problem.

The other problem is, if we continue to make it harder to be a U.S. company—whether it is to take away a tax credit, whether it is to take away a deduction, whether it is to do something else, to try to block inversion, what will happen? What happens every time we try to put up a wall to stop something but don't deal with the underlying problem? These companies will continue to look overseas, and they will be targets for acquisition.

We talked about the fact that there are no American beer companies anymore, except ones that have less than 2 percent market share. These companies didn't invert. They were bought by foreign companies. That is happening right and left in America, and that is what would happen even more if we make it even more disadvantageous to be an American company because we are trying to block this.

We have to get at the core issue. We can't have the highest tax in the world, and we can't have an international system that is not competitive and hope to have these companies stay American companies. So let's deal with the underlying problem.

Thirty-five companies over the past 5 years have chosen to invert, but so many others have done other things to try to be competitive, including to sell to foreign companies, or not to grow, not to be able to compete with acquisitions, because their after-tax profits are not as high as their foreign competitors.

It is not going to be easy to do tax reform. I understand that. It is never easy. That is not what we were hired to do, the easy things. We are on the floor right now debating this proposal called the Bring the Jobs Home Act, which I think is a misnomer, unfortunately. I guess that would be easy. It wouldn't help, but it would seem easy.

Tax reform is going to be hard, because we do have to lower the rate and broaden the base and get rid of some of these deductions and credits and exemptions and so on that are out there. The Tax Code is now riddled with them. Everybody likes their special provisions. But it is an effort well worth undertaking, because it is about our economy, it is about our future, it is about our kids having jobs here. It is about keeping American companies here. We simply have to do it.

By the way, Congress has done this before. We did it back in 1986. It was led by a Republican, Ronald Reagan, and a Democrat here in the Senate, Bill Bradley; and in the House, Dan Rostenkowski, Tip O'Neill. This was a bipartisan effort. It should be again. There is no reason it shouldn't be bipartisan.

The President has talked about it as a big problem right now in our economy, that our Tax Code is so inefficient, antiquated, needs to be updated. He has talked about lowering the rate, broadening the base. I agree with him, let's do it. Unfortunately, we haven't seen a proposal from the administration.

We had a hearing on this recently and I asked the administration: Where is the proposal?

They said: Well, we are interested in working with you.

Great. I am, too. All of us are.

Some Republicans, including DAVE CAMP, have put out very specific proposals in the House Ways and Means Committee.

We have to move forward on this. And we have done this before. We can do hard things. It is our job to do hard things. We did welfare reform a year before an election—actually, months before election day, with President Clinton, working with Republicans, including Newt Gingrich.

This seems to be the kind of thing that is harder and harder to do around here, and yet there is more and more urgency to do it.

People call it corporate tax reform or business tax reform and think: It must be about the boardroom and about the executives. It is not. They will be fine either way. We don't need to worry about them. We need to worry about the workers. CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the group that analyzes legislation, has looked at this and said: Do you know who is hurt more by these high corporate taxes we have? It is the workers, of course. More than 70 percent of the burden, they said, is borne by the workers in the form of lower pay, lower benefits, and fewer job opportunities.

So we need to do this not because we are looking to help the boardroom but because we are looking to help the American worker at a time when it is already tough.

Over the last 5 years, they say, average take-home pay has gone down about $3,500 for a typical family. So pay is not going up, it has gone down. Health care costs have gone up. In fact, they are skyrocketing.

I talked to some folks in Ohio last weekend who asked: Why aren't you doing more to get health care costs down?

I said: Well, I didn't support the ObamaCare proposal. It was promised that the costs would go down, and they are now going up. That is why we need real health care reform.

This is a middle-class squeeze. Health care costs are up, and wages are down, now stagnant. This is an opportunity, not through a sideshow like we are going to see on the floor here talking about how to do these tweaks that aren't going to make any difference, but to really get at the problem is the way to get payback. That is what the Congressional Budget Office tells us.

Our Tax Code should draw companies to our shores, should bring investment here and bring jobs here instead of pushing companies away. All we are looking for is a level playing field. If Americans have a level playing field here, we will be able to be competitive, and we will be able to bring back jobs. We have the greatest innovators in the world, we have the greatest resources, and we have incredible infrastructure in this country. We have a lot of advantages. Our energy advantage now, thanks to what we are doing now on private lands—we should do more on public lands, but what we are doing on private lands is really giving us an advantage in terms of a stable supply of relatively low-cost natural gas, particularly for manufacturing. We see this in Ohio. It is a great opportunity, but to take advantage of that opportunity, we have to reform and improve these basic institutions of our economy, including the Tax Code.

By the way, it is not just the Tax Code, it is about regulatory relief to ensure that American companies are not being saddled, as they are now, with higher and higher costs and more and more regulations that make it harder for them to compete, make it harder for them to create jobs.

It is also about being assured that we have a trade policy that actually works to expand exports. That is a huge issue in my home State of Ohio. We do a lot of exporting. We could do a whole lot more. Twenty-five percent of our factory jobs are now export trade jobs. One in every three acres planted in Ohio is now exported. We want to do more. That gets the prices up for farmers. That is adding more jobs and creating more opportunity for good-paying jobs. These great jobs tend to pay more and have better benefits. We are sitting on the sidelines there too.

Congress could move quickly to provide this President with the negotiating authority every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has had. Since FDR, every President has also asked for it. This President has now asked for it. You heard him in his State of the Union earlier this year. He hadn't asked for it earlier in his term, but now he has asked for it. Let's provide it to him. Let's give him the ability to knock down the barriers of trade for our workers, our service providers, and our farmers to get this economy moving, along with tax reform and regulatory reform. These are things that would actually make it better for the American people.

On the regulatory side, I am offering amendments in the context of this legislation, and they are bipartisan amendments. One has to do with ensuring that we do allow companies to permit something more quickly. Right now it can take years to permit a project in the United States of America. We have a bipartisan bill. Senator MCCASKILL and I are the two lead sponsors, but we have other Democrats and Republicans onboard saying this is just common sense. Let's make one agency accountable. Let's be sure there is a way for everybody to transparently look at a windshield and see what the status of the project is and move it forward. Let's reduce some of the legal liability in some of these projects.

What people tell me—whether it is the solar companies I talked to yesterday or whether it is some of the oil and gas producers or whether it is some of the wind companies or whether it is the hydro people who brought this to my attention initially a few years ago—they cannot get foreign investors because it takes so long to permit something in America.

We used to be at the top of the heap, by the way, and now in the annual ease-of-doing-business surveys that are done, America has fallen behind. America is now something like 34th in the world in terms of the ease of doing business on permitting because more and more regulations have been added. For an energy project, there are sometimes up to 34 Federal regulations. Usually it is one after the other because there is no coordination and accountability.

That is what this bill does. It is very simple. It is common sense. It already passed the House. It is the kind of bill that, if passed, would create jobs and good construction jobs, which is why the building trades support it.

By the way, the labor unions, building trades, and others who support this kind of legislation do so because they figured out that America cannot be competitive unless we have these basic institutions of our economy—whether it is regulatory reform or whether it is a smarter energy policy or whether it is the ability to have a tax code that works, they want to be sure we are expanding opportunities for their members. So I appreciate the building trades stepping forward.

The other one is simply to make sure regulations are accountable, make sure there is a cost-benefit analysis, make sure we use the least burdensome alternative in Washington, DC, to get to a policy that is passed by the Congress—commonsense stuff. Again, that has passed the House, too, with bipartisan support.

I am offering these because I do think it is important for us to have this debate on tax reform, and I look forward to further debate on Monday and Tuesday of next week. I think this is a great opportunity for us to talk about the real problems.

I am not going to support this solution because I don't think it will help, but I welcome the debate, and I am glad we have proceeded to this debate. I am glad my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are raising this issue.

To the reporter who asked the question I got today—Are you concerned that Democrats are talking about inversions?—no, I am really happy they are talking about it. We should all be talking about it—Republicans, Democrats, Independents alike. As Americans, we should be focused on this issue and the broader issue that by our companies not being competitive, we are hurting American workers. If we don't turn this around—not by show votes, not by something that looks good politically but doesn't make any difference, but by actually getting at the root of the problem—the highest rate in the developed world, an international system that doesn't let us be

competitive globally because people cannot move around their assets to find the best, most efficient use for them—those two issues, if addressed, will unlock all kinds of opportunities. That is the potential we have. There is a better day ahead, right around the corner, if we do some of these basic things.

I was also asked today at a press conference we do every week with Ohio reporters: How would you grade this Congress? Are they doing the things they ought to be doing?

I have to tell you there are small things that have been done, but, no, Congress is not doing the work of the people. And the work of the people at its core means that the laws, the Federal laws that this place alone—the House and the Senate and the President—have control over, those laws need to help the American people to be successful. It needs to be an environment for success, an environment for people to be able to say: Hey, my kids and grandkids could have it better than I have it because we see America on the upswing.

That is not what we see today—the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression. I talked about wages going down, not up. I talked about the higher cost of health care. I talked about the fact that we have now in this country a lot of people who are discouraged about the future.

CNN did a poll recently, and normally when people are asked in a poll whether they think their kids or grandkids are better off, they say: Yes. That is the American dream. The next generation will be better off.

That is what my grandparents believed, and that is what my parents believed. That is not what today's generation believes. Sixty-three percent of the people said: No, I don't believe that is going to happen.

What is even more troubling is that 63 percent of young people do not believe that. They don't believe their lives are better off than their parents'. We can change that.

I hope we get a vote on these amendments I talked about. I hope we will have a good discussion and debate on these issues. We owe it to the people we represent to solve these big problems.

I thank you for the time, Madam President, and I yield the floor.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in remembering Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John N. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask to be recognized as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

ISRAELI-GAZA CONFLICT

Mr. RUBIO. Thank you, Madam President.

I come to the floor today to discuss the ongoing situation in Israel. We all watch with great concern the images of the loss of life, young children, innocents who have lost their lives over the last few days, and also the men and women who served in the defense forces of Israel who have lost their lives in this operation. Our hearts also go out to the men and women who live in the nation of Israel who are living under the constant threat of rockets that are coming over from Gaza.

I came to the Senate floor a week ago to express not simply my concerns with this but also my solidarity—and I believe that of almost everyone in this body—with our ally Israel, and I received a response, a pretty heated letter from the Palestinian Ambassador in Washington, DC. He expressed outrage that I and my colleagues had not expressed the same level of concern for Palestinians as we had for the Israelis. He particularly pointed to the case of the three murdered Israelis but said we had not expressed similar feelings for the young Palestinian who lost his life.

I responded to his letter by pointing out a number of things. The first is that I believe that I and all my colleagues wish and pray and will do all we can to further the ideal that the Palestinian people could live peacefully side-by-side with their Israeli neighbors. It is a sentiment I expressed when I visited the Palestinian officials in the West Bank a year and a half ago.

But I also expressed that there was a significant difference between the way Israel and the Palestinians reacted to these two horrible incidents. The Palestinian Authority had to be basically nudged into expressing any sentiment about the three young people who were missing at the time. In fact, when the bodies were discovered, it led to street demonstrations. It led to celebrations on the streets of the West Bank and Gaza.

In Israel, the discovery of the death of the young Palestinian led to strong statements by the Prime Minister and condemnation. It led to a phone call from the Prime Minister to the family of the Palestinian. It led to visits by Israelis to the family of the Palestinian. It led to real outrage. There was a difference there, although both are horrible tragedies.

But I think there is something now emerging that is not being talked about. We have all seen the images of people being killed, civilians who are losing their lives in Gaza, and some are beginning to say that this is all Israel's fault, that this is Israel's fault. In fact, earlier today—or maybe it was last night—the Prime Minister of Turkey said that what the Israelis are doing in Gaza is worse than what Adolf Hitler did to the Jews. It is, of course, a ridiculous statement, but it gives an indication of where this is headed.

There is a story here that is not being told and that the Palestinian Ambassador himself has ignored, as I point to in my response to him. The first thing he ignores is that we have never in the modern history of the world seen any organization use human shields like Hamas is using human shields today. In fact, the reality behind it is unbelievable.

I would like to read from some press accounts with regards to this.

Washington Post correspondent William Booth, reporting from Gaza, wrote in an article on the 15th of July:

> At the Shifa Hospital in Gaza City, crowds gathered to throw shoes and eggs at the Palestinian Authority's health minister, who represents the crumbling ''unity government'' in the West Bank city of Ramallah. The minister was turned away before he reached the hospital, which has become a de facto headquarters for Hamas leaders, who can be seen in the hallways and offices.

Another report by the Washington Post on July 17 recounts:

> During the lull—
>
> I imagine in the action—

a group of men at a mosque in northern Gaza said they had returned to clean up the green glass from windows shattered in the previous day's bombardment. But they could be seen moving small rockets into the mosque.

The Japanese Mainichi Daily's correspondent in Gaza reported on July 21:

> Hamas criticizes that ''Israel massacres civilians.'' On the other hand, it tries to use evacuating civilians and journalists by stopping them and turning them into ''human shields,'' counteracting thoroughly with its guerilla tactics . . .

It doesn't end there. A Globe and Mail correspondent in Gaza, Patrick Martin, wrote on July 20:

> The presence of militant fighters in the Shejaia became clear Sunday afternoon when, under the cover of a humanitarian truce intended to allow both sides to remove the dead and wounded, several armed Palestinians scurried from the scene.
>
> Some bore their weapons openly, slung over their shoulder, but at least two, disguised as women, were seen walking off with weapons partly concealed under their robes. Another had his weapon wrapped in a baby blanket and held on his chest as if it were an infant.

If you think that is bad, it gets worse. I obviously cannot play a video on the floor of the Senate, so instead I will read a statement from Hamas spokesperson Sami Abu Zuhri. This is a quote on television in Gaza:

> The people oppose the Israeli fighter planes with their bodies alone . . . I think this method has proven effective against the occupation. It also reflects the nature of our heroic and brave people, and we, the [Hamas] movement, call on our people to adopt this method in order to protect the Palestinian homes.

The response to this is, Israel drops fliers and sends text messages and makes phone calls telling people—civilians—we are going to undertake a military operation, you should leave the

area. What does Hamas do? I will tell you what they do.

This is from the Facebook page of their Interior Ministry spokesperson:

An important and urgent message: The [Hamas] Ministry of the Interior and National Security calls on our honorable people in all parts of the [Gaza] Strip to ignore the warnings [to vacate areas near rocket launching sites before Israel bombs them] that are being disseminated by the Israeli occupation through manifestos and phone messages, as these are part of a psychological war meant to sow confusion on the [Palestinian] home front, in light of the [Israeli] enemy's security failure and its confusion and bewilderment.

This next statement was on television on July 14:

We call on our Palestinian people, particularly the residents of northwest Gaza, not to obey what is written in the pamphlets distributed by the Israeli occupation army. We call on them to remain in their homes and disregard the demands to leave, however serious the threat may be.

This is evidence that Hamas is using its own people as human shields.

It doesn't stop there, Mr. Ambassador. Ask yourself: Why did your organization—why did your government—unify with this terrorist organization that uses its own people as a human shield? You didn't mention that in your letter. You didn't mention in your letter that you aligned yourself with an organization that calls for the destruction of the Jewish state. You left that out of your letter as well, Mr. Ambassador.

What has been the international reaction to this? Well, I already told you about what came out of Turkey. Just yesterday the so-called United Nations Human Rights Council—and I say so-called because it has such distinguished human rights beacons as Cuba and China on its membership—voted unanimously, except for the United States, to condemn Israel and to call for an investigation into war crimes against Israel. There is a 700-page document that briefly mentions rockets and does not mention Hamas or human shields whatsoever. Meanwhile, this crisis continues.

What do we see coming out of Hamas? Have they stopped what they are doing beyond the human shields? No. What we discovered—and what has been discovered now—is an intricate web of underground tunnels designed to bring killers into the Israeli territory. They attempted, by the way, to carry out a massacre at a kibbutz near the border with Gaza. Luckily they were intercepted by Israeli defense forces. They discovered tranquilizers in their possession, the purpose of which, of course, was to use them to abduct and kidnap Israelis and take them back to Gaza for ransom or worse. The rockets continue to rain down as well.

You also didn't mention in your letter, Mr. Ambassador, the cease-fire, which, by the way, Israel agreed to even though it was extremely unpopular in Israel. Why? Because three times in the last 5 years they had to face this.

I want you to imagine for a moment that you lived in a country with a neighbor that blitzed you three times in the last 5 years with rockets, trying to kill your children and destroy your cities and disrupt and paralyze your economy. There comes a point where you say enough is enough, we have to put an end to this. So you can just imagine how unpopular that cease-fire must have been among some elements of the cabinet and the unity government in Israel, and certainly among the population. Yet the Prime Minister went ahead with it because they desire peace, and in just a few hours Hamas violated the cease-fire.

So please don't come to me and say that both sides are to blame here. That is not true. This crisis would end tomorrow if Hamas would turn over its rockets and stop bombarding people. This would end tomorrow, by the way, if the Hamas commanders were not such cowards. I will tell you why they are cowards. While they are on TV asking these people to go to the rooftops of these buildings, you know where they are? They are hiding in their basement command center, which, by the way, is located in the basement underneath a hospital.

This would end tomorrow—the civilian deaths could end tomorrow—if they stopped storing rockets in schools, including a U.N. school. By the way, when the U.N. discovered these rockets, do you know what they did with them? They turned them back over to Hamas. Don't tell me both sides are to blame here because it is not true. It is not true. This is the result of one thing and one thing alone: Hamas has decided to launch rockets against Israel, Hamas has decided to build this extensive network of underground tunnels so that in a moment of conflict they can get these commandos into Israel and kill Israelis.

What is Israel doing? What any country would do. Of course this is not an excellent example, but imagine for a moment if one of our neighboring countries decided to start hitting us with rockets. What would the United States do? Would we sit there and say: We really have to be restrained and hold back here? We would not tolerate that. Imagine that every night and every morning sirens were going off in your city because rockets were on their way in and you spent the better part of the day running in and out of shelters and taking cover. What would you say? You would say: Take care of this problem once and for all.

Why would we ever ask Israel to do anything less than we would do if we were in the same situation? And that is what they are doing.

In the process of taking care of the situation, tragically, civilians are dying, and do you know why? Because Hamas is deliberately putting them in the way. I just read the quotes. Hamas is asking their people to do what their leaders won't do. They are asking their own people to get in harm's way and act as human shields because they want these images to be spread around the world. They are willing to sacrifice their own people to win a PR war.

I think it is absolutely outrageous that some in the press corps domestically and most of the press corps internationally are falling for this game. So please don't tell me that both sides are to blame here, and please don't tell me this was caused by Israel.

In my time here in the Senate, I had the opportunity to visit multiple countries. I have never met a people more desirous of peace than the people in Israel. But peace cannot mean your destruction, and that is what they are facing here—an enemy force that wants to destroy them and wipe them out as a country. It is impossible to reach any sort of peace agreement with an organization like that. That is what Israel is facing here.

Mr. Ambassador, I ask that you go back to your government and ask them to separate completely from Hamas, condemn what Hamas is doing to your own people—condemn the use of human shields. That is what I ask you to do. Stop writing letters to Senators and being angry at us when, by the way—although we should not be doing it because the law says no money should be going toward any organization linked with Hamas—the United States has been helping you to stand up your security forces in the West Bank through our taxpayer money. Don't write letters to the U.S. Congress complaining to us about what Israel is doing when the people you just created a unity government with are launching rockets against civilians in Israel and using its own people as human shields.

I think you need to take responsibility for your own people and your own part of the world. If you truly want peace, peace begins with laying down your arms and stopping these attacks and condemning those who are conducting these attacks and using innocent civilians as human shields. If you want peace, that is what you should spend your time doing and not trying to rally public support around the world for the idea that Israel is responsible for war crimes.

From our perspective, I hope the United States continues to be firmly on the side of Israel because there is no moral equivalency here. What is happening between Israel and Hamas is totally 100 percent the fault of Hamas. There is no moral equivalency here. All of the blame lies on Hamas.

For this crisis to end, Hamas must either be eliminated as an organization or they must lay down their weapons and adhere to the true precepts of

peace, which is the desire to live peacefully side by side with our neighbors in Israel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Alabama.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are dealing with a very disturbing crisis on our borders. The situation that has developed is unbelievable. It is unbelievable how rapidly it has developed, but it has, indeed, been building up for more than a year. It is a direct and predictable result of the President's policies and not enforcing the laws of the United States when it comes to immigration. It is a very sad day, and it can only end when the President stops suspending laws and starts enforcing laws.

The President is the chief law enforcement officer in America. Every Border Patrol officer, every ICE officer, every Coast Guard officer, every military officer, every Department of Justice employee, and FBI employee works for him. He supervises them and directs them. He has been directing them not to enforce the law rather than to enforce the law. The evidence of that is undeniable.

The law enforcement officers—the ICE officers, Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers—sued their supervisor directly appointed by President Obama for blocking them from fulfilling their oath to enforce the laws of the United States of America. There is a Federal court case that is still ongoing, and the judge found, at least at one point in his order, that the President has no right to direct officers not to comply with the law.

We now know that we are facing an exceedingly grave threat of an unbelievable expansion of his unilateral Executive orders of amnesty that go beyond anything we have ever seen in this country and which threatens the very constitutional framework of our Republic and the very ability of this Nation to even have borders, it seems to me, and certainly to create a lawful, equitable, consistent enforcement in our country.

The respected newspaper National Journal, which is here in Washington, a nonpartisan and respected organization, reported on July 3—and a lot of people have missed this, and we need to know what this is saying. We need to know what it means, and we need, as Members of Congress and this Senate, to resist it. We cannot allow it to happen. We will not allow it to happen. The American people, when they find out what is being discussed, will not allow it to happen, in my opinion. Congress needs to be directed by the people—I hate to say—to resist it. It says:

Obama made it clear he would press his executive powers to the limit. He gave quiet credence to recommendations from La Raza and other immigration groups that between 5 million to 6 million adult illegal immigrants could be spared deportation under a similar form of deferred adjudication he ordered for the so-called Dreamers in June 2012.

The DREAMers being the young people. Five to 6 million would be given legal status in the United States of America when they have entered contrary to law or are in the country contrary to law and are not entitled to work in America.

The article goes on to say:

Obama has now ordered the Homeland Security and Justice departments to find executive authorities that could enlarge that non-prosecutorial umbrella by a factor of 10. Senior officials also tell me Obama wants to see what he can do with Executive power to provide temporary legal status to undocumented adults.

What we know is with the children's group, they were provided with an ID card that at the top of it, in big print, says, ''employee authorization card.'' This is exactly what is being talked about here, what the President of the United States is saying.

Remember, the Congress has been asked by activist groups and certain business interests to provide an amnesty for people who are here. The Congress has declined to do so. It has been fully and openly debated and has not passed into law. That is the decision of the Congress. That is the decision we have made—the duly elected body that passes laws. As such, they not having been given amnesty, the President of the United States is not entitled to do so. By declaration of duly passed law, people aren't entitled to come to America unlawfully, to come to America and stay unlawfully. They are not entitled to do that. How simple is this? They are not entitled to be able to take jobs if they do. They are not entitled to certain government benefits if they come illegally. Of course they are not. Of course they are not able to work and take jobs and get benefits if they came into the country illegally.

So when this first got talked about in more general terms, 22 Members of the Senate wrote President Obama and questioned what we are hearing. The Senators wrote this:

These policies have operated as an effective repeal of duly enacted federal immigration law and exceed the bounds of the Executive Branch's prosecutorial discretion. It is not the province of the Executive to nullify the laws that the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, have chosen to enact. To the contrary, it is the duty of the Executive to take care that these laws are faithfully executed. Congress has not passed laws permitting people to illegally enter the country or to ignore their visa expiration dates, so long as they do not have a felony conviction or other severe offense on their record. Your actions demonstrate an astonishing disregard for the Constitution, the rule of law, and the rights of American citizens and legal residents.

Our entire constitutional system—

The letter goes on to say—

is threatened when the Executive Branch suspends the law at its whim and our nation's sovereignty is imperiled when the commander-in-chief refuses to defend the integrity of its borders.

You swore an oath—

The letter says to the President—

to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. We therefore ask you to uphold that oath and to carry out the duties required by the Constitution and entrusted to you by the American people.

The President is limited. He is not all-powerful. He is entrusted with certain limited powers by the people of the United States of America.

Now we understand he intends to go even further. In the response we got back, he never addressed it at all, except for his Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Jeh Johnson. He announced that, yes, he is indeed, at the order of the President of the United States, conducting a review of how many other people he can provide this amnesty for and work authorization for.

So last week one of our able colleagues, Senator TED CRUZ—a former solicitor general for the attorney general's office in Texas who has argued cases in appellate courts in the country—identified this problem and proposed I think a legislative fix that every Member of this body should sign. Some may say, Well, the President, I don't think he is going to do this. OK. Why not bar him from doing it? Some say, I don't think we should sign it. Why not? He basically said he has already done it with the younger group, and he said it is going to be a tenfold increase in the 5 million to 6 million people who are suggested to be legalized by the President's unilateral Executive order; represents about 10 times the number of people who have already been given lawful status, in effect, by the President's unlawful Executive order.

At this time perhaps it would be appropriate, and I would appreciate it, if the Senator from Texas would explain his analysis of this issue and how his legislation would be effective in ensuring that we don't go down this illegal road any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the junior Senator from Alabama, for his very kind comments and for his relentless leadership in defense of the rule of law and standing against amnesty.

What I wish to speak about this afternoon is the humanitarian crisis that is playing out on our southern border right now and the abdication of responsibility that is playing out in Washington, DC.

A couple of weeks ago President Obama was in my home State of Texas. He found time to go to two Democratic Party fundraisers, to pal around with some Democratic Party fat cats, to collect a whole bunch of checks. Yet somehow he didn't have time to make it down to our southern border.

The day before he was in Colorado and he found time to play a game of pool with the Governor there. I am glad he enjoyed himself playing pool. Yet somehow he didn't have time to go visit Lackland Air Force Base and see the 1,200 children who are being held there who are paying the price for the failure of the Obama immigration policy. In the coming weeks he is headed to Martha's Vineyard. He is, I am sure, going to enjoy himself paling around with swells. Yet the people held in detention facilities up and down the border are not going to see the Commander in Chief because he cannot be bothered to address the human suffering.

He was just in California, in Hollywood, where the producer of ''Scandal'' hosted him. That is kind of fitting because it is scandalous that the President has more time to be ''Fundraiser in Chief'' than he does to do his basic job as Commander in Chief in securing our borders.

Let me tell my colleagues, while the President was running around collecting checks from Democratic Party fat cats, I was back home in Texas. I was on the border this weekend down in McAllen. I sat down with the chief of the Border Patrol in McAllen. I sat down with the line officers of the Border Patrol in McAllen. I visited the detention facilities that are being constructed to hold these children. I saw a remarkable facility. It used to be a gigantic warehouse, and in 18 days the Border Patrol had to stand up a facility to house 1,000 children because that is the volume coming through there every couple of days.

The President is right in one regard. He has publicly stated we are seeing a humanitarian crisis, and that is correct, but it is a crisis of his own creation. This humanitarian crisis is the direct consequence of President Obama's lawlessness. I will note he cannot even be bothered to cast his eyes on the people who are suffering because of it.

If we want to know what is causing this crisis, a simple examination of the numbers will suffice. Just 3 years ago, in 2011, the number of unaccompanied children entering this country was roughly 6,000. Then, in June of 2012, just a few months before the election, President Obama unilaterally granted amnesty to some 800,000 people who were here illegally in this country who entered as children. He did so, presumably, because he thought there would be a political benefit. It was a few months before an election and he thought there was good politics in ignoring the law and granting amnesty. But the foreseeable consequence of that amnesty—the predictable and the predicted consequence of that amnesty—if we tell people across the globe that if they enter as children, they get amnesty, suddenly we create an incredible incentive for more and more children to come and more and more children to come alone.

This year, the Department of Homeland Security estimates that 90,000 unaccompanied children will enter this country illegally. Next year they estimate 145,000. I want my colleagues to compare those numbers for a second. Three years ago, it was 6,000. Now it is 90,000, and next year we expect 145,000. The direct and proximate cause was President Obama's amnesty.

There are some in this body who might not believe what a Member of the opposite party says on this. There is a whole lot of partisanship in Washington. It truly has shut down the ability of this body to deal with real challenges facing this country.

If people don't believe what a Member of the opposite party says, perhaps they will believe the Border Patrol. Just a few weeks ago the Border Patrol conducted a confidential study that was given to members of the Senate Judiciary Committee by a whistleblower in the Border Patrol, where they interviewed over 200 people who had entered the country recently illegally, and they asked them the question: Why are you coming? Ninety-five percent said we are coming because we believe we will get amnesty; that if we just get here, we will be allowed to stay.

The administration has been giving lots of supposed causes for this humanitarian crisis. One of their favorites is the violence in Central America. It is true. Tragically, there is a great deal of violence in Central America and it has been increasing, but I would note violence is not new to the human condition. There have always been countries across the globe that are racked by violence, racked by civil war, and we have always seen when violence rises, the immigration from a particular country goes up. We see legal immigration from that country go up and we see illegal immigration from that country go up. What we haven't seen in the past is the explosion of children.

The violence in Central America is a reasonable cause to explain the increase in immigrants from Central America, the increase in families coming up to get away from the violence. What it doesn't explain is this new phenomenon: 90,000 unaccompanied children. That is a new phenomenon. There is no reason violence would dictate saying, I am going to take my little boy, I am going to take my little girl, and send them alone. That instead is a direct response to what President Obama did by granting amnesty that was targeted to those who entered as kids. Why are kids entering? Because the President has said, if you enter as a kid, I will grant you amnesty.

Several weeks ago I visited Lackland Air Force Base where roughly 1,200 of these children are being held. I visited with the senior officials there. It is worth understanding that there are many victims of the President's refusal to enforce the law, but some of the most direct victims are these little boys and little girls because the coyotes who are bringing these children in are not well-meaning social workers. They do not have beards and Birkenstocks, and they are not there out of love. These coyotes are hardened, vicious transnational drug cartels, and these children are being subjected to horrific physical and sexual abuse.

When I was at Lackland Air Force Base, a senior official there described to me how these coyotes get custody of these kids to smuggle them illegally into this country, and then sometimes they will decide to hold the children for ransom, to get even more money from the families. If the families cannot or will not pay, horribly, what these coyotes are doing is severing body parts of these children and sending them back to the families.

The senior official at Lackland described coyotes putting machine guns to the back of the head of a little boy or a little girl and ordering them to cut off the fingers or the ears of another little boy or little girl. If the child refuses, they shoot that child and move on to the next one. They described how on our end we are seeing children come into this country—some of whom have been horribly maimed by these violent coyotes and drug cartels, others of whom have enormous psychological damage—from a little boy or a little girl forced to commit such atrocities upon pain of death.

I asked the officials at Lackland: How many of these children have been victimized? The answer: All of them. That was from the senior official at Lackland. By the way, one of the things we hear reports of is these families with the girls, before they send them up, they give them birth control because the expectations are that the risks of sexual assault and rape are so high. That risk is being undertaken because of the promise of amnesty.

When I was down in McAllen this weekend, I asked the line agents—I said: Listen. Every day you guys are on the river, you are in the helicopter, you are securing the border. Why are they coming? What has changed? Just 3 years ago it was 6,000 kids. Now it is 90,000. What has changed? Every single one of the Border Patrol agents gave the exact same answer. They said they are coming because they believe they will get amnesty.

It is important to understand, by the way, the coyotes smuggle them across the border, and as soon as they get across the border, they actively look for the Border Patrol. They are not being captured. They are not being caught. They go look for someone in

uniform. They may have ragged clothes falling off their back, they may not have food or water, but they have their papers. They have their papers with them. They cross the border illegally with a coyote and they endure the physical and sexual abuse and then they look for the Border Patrol to hand their papers to. Why? Because they believe once they get here and hand their papers over, they get amnesty.

If we want to solve this crisis, there is one, and only one, way to solve this crisis; that is, to eliminate the promise of amnesty. I mentioned a few moments ago that I wanted to talk about this humanitarian crisis and talk about the abdication of responsibility because Washington has always been lousy at taking responsibility for the suffering our policies create. But the response of this President, and I am sorry to say the Democratic majority in this body, has been particularly callous.

President Obama proposed a $3.7 billion supplemental plan. Mind you, he did not have time to visit the border, to visit the children, to see the suffering, but he proposed yet more spending. The $3.7 billion supplemental is an HHS social services bill. It spends a whole bunch of money. By the way, to give you a sense of just how much $3.7 billion is, for $3.7 billion we could purchase a first-class airplane ticket for each one of these 90,000 children to return them home—first class—sitting in the front row of a commercial airline. After doing so, we could deposit $3.6 billion back in the Federal Treasury. It is a massive amount of money he has asked for, and what is striking, less than 5 percent of it goes to border security.

Here is the cynical part. Here is the sad part. Nothing in the President's proposal does anything to solve the underlying problem. Nothing does anything to eliminate the promise of amnesty. Nothing does anything to solve the problem. What the President is saying is he is perfectly content for this crisis to continue in perpetuity. Under the President's bill, next year we can expect 145,000—DHS expects—to come. We can expect tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of little boys and little girls to be physically assaulted and sexually assaulted by coyotes.

That is not humane. That is not compassionate. Any system that continues to have children in the custody of these vicious drug cartels is the very opposite of humane and compassionate. As my friend the junior Senator from Alabama pointed out, the magnet of amnesty has been significantly exacerbated in recent months. Why? Because President Obama, in a very high-profile way, met with far-left activists and made a promise. He said: I am going to study how to expand amnesty and to grant amnesty to another 5 or 6 million people here illegally.

Let's be clear. There is nothing—zero—in U.S. immigration law that gives the President the power to grant amnesty. It is open lawlessness and contempt for rule of law, but yet that promise is heard. That promise is heard throughout Central America. That promise is heard by those mothers and dads who make the heart-wrenching decision to hand their sons and daughters over to these coyotes. They do so because they love their kids and they believe, as terrible as the journey will be, that if they get here, they get a permiso, they get to stay in the ''promised land.'' That promise of amnesty is why this crisis has happened.

So I have introduced legislation to solve the problem. Last week I introduced a very simple bill that puts into law that President Obama has no authority to grant any additional amnesty. It is a very simple bill. It prevents the President from taking the DACA Program that he unilaterally and illegally implemented in 2012 and expanding it to cover any new immigrants.

It is interesting. Representatives from the administration go on television and they say: These children are not eligible for amnesty. If that is their position, the administration should support my bill. If that is their position, all this bill does is put into law what they say their position is; that these children are not eligible for amnesty.

Have they supported the bill? They have not. Instead the majority leader of this body took it upon himself to go out and hold a press conference. What is the top priority for the majority leader of this body? To come after and attack the legislation I introduced, to personally come after the freshman Senator from Texas. The majority leader is welcome to impugn any Member of this body. Sadly, that happens all too often. But yet nowhere in the majority leader's comments was a word said about solving this problem. Nowhere in the majority leader's comments was a word said about changing it so little boys and little girls are not physically and sexually assaulted so we do not have tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of kids coming illegally into this country.

Look, we all understand politics in this town. It is an election year. The election is a few months away. Scaring people and demagoguing, unfortunately, is not new to Washington. But the cynicism that is reflected in President Obama's and the majority leader's approach to this issue is a new level for this town.

This week I am introducing broader legislation that not only includes what was included last week—a prohibition on the President granting amnesty—but includes two other elements: a reform of the 2008 law to expedite the humane return of these children to their families and a provision to reimburse the cost for the States calling up the National Guard to secure their borders.

I would like to say a word about the 2008 law. That has actually been discussed a lot in this body. Indeed, the Obama administration has two talking points. If we ask the administration what has caused this crisis, the first one is violence in Central America. There is something convenient about that talking point because if it is violence in Central America, it is not President Obama's fault. It is not anything they have done. It is something else extrinsic. But the second talking point that sometimes the administration will say is that the cause of this crisis is the 2008 law.

There is a reason they point to that. Because it seems there is nothing President Obama enjoys more than blaming everything bad on this planet on George W. Bush. The 2008 law was signed by George W. Bush. So if this crisis was caused by the 2008 law, then mirabile dictu, it is not this administration's fault.

But John Adams famously said: Facts are stubborn things. If someone is going to make a claim that a crisis is caused by the 2008 law, they have to be willing to take at least a moment to look to the facts.

The 2008 law was passed, unsurprisingly, in 2008. The number of children entering unaccompanied did not spike in 2008. It did not spike in 2009. It did not spike in 2010. It did not spike in 2011. In 2011 it was roughly 6,000. If the 2008 law were the cause of this crisis, we would have seen the numbers spike in 2008 or 2009 or 2010 or 2011. No, they did not spike until 2012—June of 2012—when the President pulled out his pen and granted amnesty. That is the cause—the direct cause—the cause that the Border Patrol tells us these immigrants are telling us is why they are coming.

Once the crisis was created, the 2008 law has had unintended consequences. The 2008 law allowed expedited removal for unaccompanied children from Mexico and Canada—our immediate contiguous countries—but created slow, delayed, bureaucratized removal for children from more distant countries.

That did not create significant problems in 2008 or 2009 or 2010 or 2011 because we did not have a massive influx of kids from those countries. But once the President illegally granted amnesty and we started getting—as we are expected to this year—90,000 unaccompanied children—most of whom are from Central American countries—now we are seeing the 2008 law cause real problems because returning these children home is delayed, often delayed indefinitely.

When I was in the McAllen meeting with the line Border Patrol agents, I asked them another question. I said: Listen. Washington is dysfunctional.

Partisan politics rips the town apart. If you could ignore the politics, what do you say on the frontlines? How do we actually secure the borders? How do we solve this problem? Every single one of the Border Patrol agents answered the same way. They said: We have to send them home.

We treat them humanely. We treat them compassionately—because that is who we are as Americans; those are our values—but humanely and compassionately we need to expeditiously return them to their families back home. Why? Because if the children are allowed to stay—and, mark my words, President Obama wants these children to stay and he wants to grant amnesty to the next children and the next children, which means that promise of amnesty will cause tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of children to continue to be physically assaulted and sexually assaulted in perpetuity.

If we grant amnesty, all it will do is incite yet more kids to be victimized. The only way to solve this problem—this is coming from the Border Patrol agents—is to humanely and expeditiously send them home, reunite them with their families.

The legislation I am introducing this week changes the 2008 law so the policies for sending them home are the same as the policies for Mexico and Canada. We treat Mexico and Canada with great friendship and compassion. There is no reason the very same procedures cannot apply to children from Central America.

The final element of this bill is dealing with the real security crisis that is occurring.

Just today the junior Senator from Alabama and I both heard a briefing from one of our senior military leaders on the national security threats caused by our porous borders, by the same avenues that are taking those kids in and that are also being used to smuggle vast quantities of drugs. The same corridors that are taking those kids in are also being used to smuggle in thousands of aliens from special interest countries, from the Middle East, aliens from countries that face serious issues of radical Islamic terrorists.

A number of our border Governors have stepped forward to respond to this crisis. I commend the Governor of my home State of Texas, Rick Perry, for showing leadership and calling up the National Guard in Texas. It was the right thing to do. He should not have to do it. The Constitution gives that responsibility to the Federal Government. The Governor should not have to step in and fill the breach. They are doing so because the President and the Federal Government are refusing to do their job. But I commend the Governors for doing so. The legislation I am introducing simply provides that when a State steps up and does the job that is our responsibility, the Federal Government will reimburse the costs.

In all likelihood, next week we are going to have a vote on a bill that is denominated a ''border security'' bill. It is a bill the majority leader wants us to vote on that is a version of the President's HHS social services bill and spends a whole bunch of money and does nothing, zero, nada, to solve the problem.

The majority leader knows that. The President knows that. The intention is to have it voted down. One of the incredible things about where we are right now is this Democratic Senate is a do-nothing Senate. We do not pass any legislation of consequence. There is a reason for that. The majority leader has decided we are not going to pass any legislation of consequence. So instead what do we have? We have a series of show votes, every one of which is designed to fail, every one of which the majority leader knows will fail, and every one of which is poll tested or focus-group tested to allow Democrats running for reelection to campaign based on those votes.

It is not legislating. It is not doing the job the Senate was meant to do. This border security bill that we will likely vote on next week will do nothing for border security. It is not designed to. Even if it were to pass, it is not designed to. It is not designed to do anything to stop President Obama's amnesty. It is not designed to do anything to expedite reuniting these kids with their families back home. It is simply designed to be a fig leaf, to say: The Democrats have responded to this crisis. The evil, mean, nasty Republicans did not go along.

That is a political narrative that is not new. It is common in partisan politics. It just happens not to be true. Unfortunately, the Democratic majority in this body has demonstrated no interest in actually solving this problem. You want to know just how cynical the majority leader's strategy is? They have added to this border bill a provision that would replenish the Iron Dome missiles for the nation of Israel.

I would note that has nothing to do with the crisis at our southern border. It is a policy that is unambiguously good. Every Member on the Republican side of this Chamber supports replenishing the Iron Dome missiles that are right now keeping Israel safe from the Hamas terrorist rocket fire. So why has the majority leader stuck that onto a bill that he knows will fail and is designed to fail?

Well, it is called partisan politics. Because when it fails, the talking points will come out. The majority leader will come out and say: The Republicans do not want to solve the problem on the border. The Republicans are unwilling to stand with our friend and ally Israel. Let me tell you right now, every Republican on this side of the Chamber would vote right now, this afternoon, to replenish the Iron Dome missiles. To be honest, we should be voting. You know, in most parts of the country, Thursday afternoon, 4:30, people who actually have an honest job are still at work. Not in the Senate. The Senate people head on home. People are out campaigning. How about we actually have Senators show up on this floor more than one or two at a time and debate these issues? How about we actually see Senators stand, debate the issues, and resolve the problems?

The majority leader went on television and said: The border is secure. I find that an astonishing assertion. I recognized how from the perch of Washington, DC, it might seem that way. Perhaps the DC/Virginia border is secure. But I would invite the majority leader and I would invite any Member of the Chamber: Come down to Texas. Come to McAllen. Come visit the border. When I was in McAllen on Saturday, the Border Patrol agents told me the day before they had apprehended 622 people.

I went to the processing center. They had 10 holding centers with 600 or 700 people there. One holding room had little girls below age 14, unaccompanied. Another holding room had little boys under age 14, unaccompanied. The third holding room had girls ages 14 to 19, unaccompanied. The fourth room had boys ages 14 to 19, unaccompanied. The fifth and sixth rooms had family units, mothers and fathers and little bitty babies, including tiny infants needing diapers and formula. Then the final four holding areas held adults.

That was one day. That was not a week. That was not a month. That was one day. Ninety thousand unaccompanied children are expected to enter the country this year. The majority leader of the Senate says the border is secure. I would invite the majority leader to say that to those little boys and little girls who have just been victimized that the border is secure. That sure would surprise them. I would invite the majority leader to say that to the farmers and ranchers and the citizens in South Texas because that sure would surprise them.

By the way, when you get outside of Washington this issue is not partisan. When you go down to South Texas and you visit with the elected leaders there, many of whom—most of whom—are elected Democrats and often Hispanic Democrats, and you ask: What is your top priority? Among Hispanic Democrats on the border, they say: Border security—because the border is so far from secure that their communities are paying the price.

I would invite the majority leader to come to Brooks County, TX. In Brooks County, TX, hundreds of men, women, and children are found dead from crossing illegally. I would invite the majority leader to look, as I have, at the photographs of these bodies. Pregnant

women are abandoned and left to die. Those are vicious cartels and coyotes. This is the face of amnesty. Ninety thousand children being victimized, being physically assaulted and sexually assaulted. This is the face of amnesty: Children held in detention centers with chain-link fences going up 18 feet, separating them in separate pens. This is the face of amnesty. Our heart breaks for these kids. But if it really breaks for those kids, we should do something about it. The only way to stop this humanitarian crisis is to stop President Obama's amnesty. As long as the President continues to promise amnesty, these children will keep coming, and they will keep being victimized.

Sadly, as long as Senate Democrats are unwilling to stand up to their President and say, let's actually show some leadership and fix this problem, then the Senate will continue to be the Democratic do-nothing Senate. We will not solve those problems. We will fail in the fundamental obligation all of us owe to the men and women who elected us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas because it, indeed, is the face of amnesty. He has documented for us, I think indisputably, that this surge of immigration was a result of the amnesty provided for these children by the President of the United States. I think that has been shown. I think we have never had a clearer analysis of it.

I am reading now further in the National Journal article about what the President plans to do next. The concern we have is about the future. I am not making this up, colleagues. This is a very real action the President is considering, as I read from that chart on amnesty. He would execute, contrary to law, what would give legal status and work status to 5 to 6 million people, 10 times the number that he has been provided for in this action.

What did the National Journal report? Well, I am quoting here.

> The President also told a group—This is the group of La Raza and other activist groups that are demanding amnesty and, really, open borders. He told them that Boehner, the Speaker of the House ''urged him not to press ahead with executive actions because that would make legislating more difficult next year.''

In other words, Speaker BOEHNER said: Do not use this executive amnesty in the future, Mr. President. So now the President is talking to the group, these activists that have been pushing him and demanding things. This is what the article says.

> Obama told the group, according to those present, his response to Boehner was: 'Sorry about that. I'm going to keep my promise and move forward with executive action soon.'

It makes the hair stand up on the back of my neck as a former Federal prosecutor in Federal court for almost 15 years to have the President say this. The article went on to say:

> In the room, there was something of a collective, electric gasp. The assembled immigration-rights groups had been leaning hard on Obama for months to use executive action to sidestep Congress and privately mocked what they regarded as Pollyanna hopes that House Republicans would budge . . . Obama told the groups what they had been dying to hear—that he was going to condemn House Republicans for inaction and . . . provide legal status to millions of undocumented workers—all by himself.

Mr. CRUZ. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would be pleased.

Mr. CRUZ. The junior Senator from Alabama has just described President Obama's stated intention to grant amnesty to an additional 5 to 6 million people here illegally in the months preceding this next election. As the junior Senator from Alabama is certainly aware, there are a number of Senators up for reelection, including a number of Democrats in bright red States where the constituents of those States, whether in Louisiana or Arkansas or North Carolina or many other States, do not support amnesty for another 5 to 6 million people here illegally.

The question I would ask my friend from Alabama: Is he aware of any Democrat in this Chamber, including those Democrats running for reelection in conservative States where the citizens strongly oppose amnesty—is he aware of any Democrat in this Chamber who has had the courage to stand with him in standing up to President Obama and saying: Do not grant amnesty illegally? Is he aware of any Democrat who has joined the two of us in our legislation to prohibit President Obama from illegally granting amnesty to 5 to 6 million people?

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, I am not. One of the things I think the American people do need to understand is when Majority Leader REID, in conjunction with the President of the United States, blocks even amendments up for a vote, where does he get his power? He gets his power from every Member of his conference.

None of them are breaking in and saying: This is not right.

Senator CRUZ's bill would deal with this future danger, that the President might do this again. I think—and we have looked at it hard, our Judiciary staff—we both serve on that committee—and have said this will actually work to ensure that we don't have another rogue action, unlawful, by the President of the United States, directly contrary to deciding the will of the American people and congressional action.

The President is happy that Congress doesn't pass his law, and he says: They won't act, so I will.

But, colleagues, when we don't act, we act. That is an act. It is a decision as sure as if we had passed a law. A decision not to act is a decision. The President of the United States can't simply go around and say: I can do anything I want because Congress won't act. How ridiculous is that? A National Journal article calls this policy explosive, and I believe that is a direct action.

One more question. Senator CRUZ, I know, is a student of the Constitution, and Professor Turley at George Washington University has testified numerous times before Congress. I think he considers himself a Democrat, a liberal, but he is deeply concerned about the future of our Republic because of the President's overreach and exceeding the lawful powers given to the President.

Is some other President going to expand it further and very soon Congress becomes nothing? I would ask if the Senator shares this concern, because he was very active in the attorney general's office in Texas. Professor Turley said:

> The President's pledge to effectively govern alone is alarming, and what is most alarming is his ability to fulfill that pledge. When a president can govern alone, he can become a government unto himself, which is precisely the danger the framers sought to avoid . . .
>
> What we're witnessing today is one of the greatest crises that members of this body will face. . . . It has reached a constitutional tipping point that threatens a fundamental change in how our country is governed.

Does that cause the Senator concern and does he have any thoughts about that?

Mr. CRUZ. Senator SESSIONS, it causes me great concern. One of the most troubling aspects of the Obama Presidency has been the persistent pattern of lawlessness from this President. We have never seen a President who, if he disagrees with a particular law, so frequently and so brazenly refuses to enforce it, refuses to comply with it, and asserts the power to unilaterally change it.

The President famously said: I have a pen and I have a phone, and he seems to confuse his pen and his phone for the constitutional process of lawmaking our country was built on.

Rule of law does not mean you have a country with a whole lot of laws. Most countries have laws, and many totalitarian countries have a whole lot of laws. Rule of law means no man is above the law. It means that everyone, everyone, everyone, and especially the President, is bound by the law.

President Obama openly defies his constitutional obligation under article 2 of the Constitution to take care that the laws will be faithfully executed.

I would note that Professor Turley, as the junior Senator from Alabama quoted, is a liberal Democrat who in 2008 voted for President Obama. Professor Turley also testified before the House that President Obama has become the embodiment of the imperial

President. Barack Obama has become the President Richard Nixon always wished he could be.

Those are the words of a liberal Democratic constitutional law professor who voted for Barack Obama.

But my friend the junior Senator from Alabama is learned and experienced in the ways of the Senate. He has seen lions of the Senate walk this floor. It is unprecedented to have a President so brazenly defy the rule of law, but I state what is equally unprecedented, to have the Senate lie down and meow like kitty cats.

Abuse of power by the President is not a new phenomenon. Presidents of both parties have abused their power. That is a job, sadly, where that tendency has been significant. But in the past, when Presidents have abused their power, Members of their own party stood and called them to account for it. When Richard Nixon abused his power, Members of both parties rightfully decried his abuse of power, so much so that he was forced to resign.

I can state when George W. Bush was President, he signed a two-paragraph order that purported to order the State courts to obey the World Court. I know this because I was at the time serving as the solicitor general of Texas, and it was our State courts that the President's order purported to bind.

George W. Bush is a good man. He is a former Governor of Texas, he is a Republican, and he was a friend and is a friend. Yet I was proud that the State of Texas did not hesitate to stand up to that abuse of power. I went before the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of the State of Texas and argued that President George W. Bush's order was unconstitutional, that no President has the authority to give up U.S. sovereignty. I am pleased to say the U.S. Supreme Court agreed and struck down the President's order by a vote of 6 to 3.

What is unprecedented today is that on the left side of the Chamber it is both literally and figuratively empty.

We had, not too long ago, the President abuse his power with recess appointments. One of the important checks and balances the Constitution creates on Presidential authority is it gives this body, the Senate, the power of confirmation. President Obama apparently didn't like any checks and balances on his power, so he made a series of recess appointments when the Senate wasn't in recess. It was brazen, it was naked. The President simply asserted: I say the Senate is in recess. Mind you, the Senate didn't say we were in recess, but the President claimed the power to declare us in recess when we weren't.

Do you want to know how extreme that was? Do you want to know how brazen that was? Do you want to know how extraordinary that was?

Just a few weeks ago the Supreme Court unanimously struck it down as unconstitutional.

It is important to underscore that. There is a lot of coverage in the newspaper that suggests we have liberal Justices, conservative Justices, and on any close issue it is going to be 5 to 4. This wasn't 5 to 4, it wasn't 6 to 3, it wasn't 7 to 2, and it wasn't even 8 to 1—9 to 0. Every Democratic appointee on the Court—both of President Obama's appointees on the Court. They looked at the substantive issue and they said: This ain't hard. The President doesn't get to say when the Senate is in recess, the Senate gets to say when the Senate is in recess. And if the Senate isn't in recess, the President has to respect the checks and balances of confirmation.

So we have an easy, no-brainier layup of a constitutional law question about the President usurping the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate, and how many Senate Democrats stood up to their party's President? Not a single one. Not the majority leader of the Senate, who we would think might have some interest in the credibility of this institution and, I am sorry to say, not a lone Democratic Senator. It wasn't that long ago there were lions of the Senate on the Democratic side who prided themselves on defending this institution: Robert Byrd, who stood for years defending this institution; Ted Kennedy.

I would say to my friend the junior Senator from Alabama, what is truly unprecedented is that there are no Senate Democrats who say: Enough is enough.

I am hopeful at some point we will see a Senate Democrat listen to their constituents, listen to the Constitution, and listen to the rule of law.

I can assume the reason why Senate Democrats don't do it and why our friends in the press often don't report on this. I can assume their reasoning goes something such as: Well, I basically agree with the policies of President Obama. I like the policies. I agree with what he is doing, and he is our guy. We kind of have to back our guy.

I am guessing that is a reason, but I will note, as the Scriptures say: There came a pharaoh who knew not Joseph and his children.

President Barack Obama will not always be President of the United States. There will be another President. And even to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle—I must say something shocking and terrifying to you—there will come another Republican President.

If the President has the authority to do what President Obama is claiming, with ObamaCare—28 times—he simply unilaterally changed the text of the law, said: It doesn't matter what the law says, I say it is something different. If the President has that power, a Republican President has that power too.

So I would encourage all of my friends on the left who like these policy issues—well, imagine some of the policy issues you don't like, whether on labor law or environmental law or tort reform or let's take tax law. I will give an example.

Imagine a subsequent Republican President who stood up and stated quite sensibly the economy might do much better if we move to a flat tax, so I am therefore instructing the IRS: Do not collect any tax above 20 percent.

Now one might say, well, that sounds extreme. That sounds radical. As a policy matter, that would be a terrific policy.

But could the President instruct the IRS not to enforce tax laws? Fifty-five Members of this body are already on record saying yes. Do you know why? Because when the President suspended the employer mandate for big business, the text for ObamaCare says the employer mandate kicks in on January 1, 2014. The President said: I am suspending that provision of law. I am granting my buddies in big business a waiver. That was a tax law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I think what he is saying is reflected in what Professor Turley said. It is almost like a plea to his colleague, maybe his Democratic colleague, his friend. He said: ''The President's pledge to effectively govern alone is alarming, and what is most alarming is his ability to fulfill that pledge.''

In other words, his ability to get away with it; that Congress acquiesces in it. Let me say this the President is not going to get away with a unilateral amnesty. We are going to take this to the American people, and at some point this Congress will be held to account if he does so. Remember, every Member is going to have to vote and be responsible for allowing a President to run roughshod over the law of this country, the people's representatives, and, in effect, the people of the United States.

His plan for amnesty, under the circumstances he advocated them, has been rejected.

Congress is always available to consider any issue and make any decision it chooses, but it has, under the circumstances driven in this body, been rejected.

He has no power to go forward and beyond that, and we are not going to allow it to happen. It is wrong. Whether we agree or disagree about how amnesty should be given, it is wrong for the President to unilaterally execute such a policy, as Professor Turley said and as the Senator from Texas has said, the former solicitor general of the State of Texas. He understands it is law, and this matter is not over. We will continue to advocate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HARKIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2658 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Madam President. This is my 75th ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, something of a minor benchmark, I suppose. I come here urging my colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change. I do this every week we are in session, hoping someday a spark will hit tinder. But even as the evidence of climate change deepens, the dialogue in Washington remains one-sided.

Climate change was once a bipartisan concern. In recent years something changed. I think I know what changed, and I will get to that. First, let's reminisce about the bipartisanship. As we take a look back in this body, we have Republican colleagues who once openly acknowledged the existence of carbon-driven climate change and who called for real legislative action to cut carbon emissions. Imagine that. It wasn't that long ago.

We have a former Republican Presidential nominee amongst us who campaigned for the Presidency on addressing climate change. We have Republicans here who have spoken favorably about charging a fee on carbon, including an original Republican cosponsor of a bipartisan Senate carbon-fee bill. We have a Republican colleague who cosponsored carbon fee legislation in the House and another who voted for the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill when he was in the House. For years—for years—there was a steady, healthy heartbeat of Republican support for major U.S. legislation to address carbon pollution.

Let me be specific. In 2003, Senator JOHN MCCAIN was the lead cosponsor of Democrat Joe Lieberman's Climate Stewardship Act, which would have created a market-based emissions cap-and-trading program to reduce carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping pollutants from the biggest U.S. sources.

Here is what Senator MCCAIN said at the time:

> While we cannot say with 100 percent confidence what will happen in the future, we do know the emission of greenhouse gases is not healthy for the environment. As many of the top scientists through the world have stated, the sooner we start to reduce these emissions the better off we will be in the future.

His Climate Stewardship Act actually got a vote. Imagine that. When it did not prevail, Senator MCCAIN reintroduced the measure himself in the following Congress. Republican Senators Olympia Snowe of Maine and Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island, my predecessor, were among that bill's cosponsors. Other Republicans got behind other cap-and-trade proposals. Senator TOM CARPER's Clean Air Planning Act at one time or another counted Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, and Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine among its supporters.

In 2007, Republican Senator Olympia Snowe was a lead cosponsor of then-Senator Kerry's Global Warming Pollution Reduction Act. Senators MURKOWSKI and Stevens from Alaska and Senator Specter of Pennsylvania, then a Republican, were original cosponsors of the Bingaman Low Carbon Economy Act. That same year Senator ALEXANDER introduced the Clean Air/Climate Change Act of 2007. Each of these bills sought to reduce carbon emissions through a cap-and-trade mechanism.

Said Senator ALEXANDER:

> It is also time to acknowledge that climate change is real. Human activity is a big part of the problem and it is up to us to act.

That bipartisan heartbeat remained strong in 2009. Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois, while he served in the House of Representatives, was one of eight Republicans to vote for the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade proposal. In that same year, 2009, Senator JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, then representing Arizona in the House, was an original cosponsor of the Raise Wages, Cut Carbon Act to reduce payroll taxes for employers and employees in exchange for equal revenue from a carbon tax. On the House floor then-Representative FLAKE argued the virtues of this approach. He said:

> If we want to be honest about helping the environment, then just impose a carbon tax and make it revenue neutral. Give commensurate tax relief on the other side. Myself and another Republican colleague have introduced that legislation to do just that. Let's have an honest debate about whether or not we want to help the environment by actually having something that is revenue neutral where you tax consumption as opposed to income.

It was a good idea then and it is still a good idea now. Senator FLAKE's words were echoed that year in the Senate by Senator COLLINS, a lead cosponsor of the Carbon Limits and Energy for America's Renewal Act, Senator CANTWELL's carbon fee bill.

''In the United States alone,'' said Senator COLLINS, ''emissions of the primary greenhouse gas carbon dioxide have risen more than 20 percent since 1990. Clearly climate change is a daunting environmental challenge,'' she said, ''but we must develop solutions that do not impose a heavy burden on our economy, particularly during these difficult economic times.''

Madam President, 2009—think of it. There was once not too long ago a clear and forceful acknowledgment from leading Republican voices of the real danger posed by climate change and of Congress's responsibility to act.

What happened? Why did the steady heartbeat of Republican climate action suddenly flatline?

I believe we lost the ability to address climate change in a bipartisan way because of the evils of the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision. Our present failure to address climate change is a symptom of things gone awry in our democracy due to Citizens United. That decision did not enhance speech in our democracy. It has allowed bullying, wealthy special interests to suppress real debate. I have spoken before on the Senate floor about the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision, one of the most disgraceful decisions by any Supreme Court, destined ultimately, I believe, to follow cases such as Lochner v. New York onto the ash heap of judicial infamy, but we are stuck with it for now. In a nutshell the Citizens United decision says this: Corporations are people. Money is speech. So there can be no limit to corporate money influencing American elections.

If that doesn't seem right, it is because it is not. Phony and improper fact-finding by the five conservative activists on the Supreme Court concluded that corporate spending could not ever corrupt elections—just couldn't do it. By some magic it is pure. That is a bad enough finding on its face, but they also didn't get that limitless, untraceable political money doesn't have to be spent to damage our democracy.

Unlimited corporate spending in politics can corrupt not just through floods of anonymous attack advertisements, it can corrupt secretly and more dangerously through the mere threat of that spending through private threats and promises. The Presiding Officer was the attorney general of her State, and she well knows how much mischief can be done in back rooms by threats and promises. That is what attorneys general see when they go out and investigate.

As we are evaluating the effect of Citizens United on our climate change debate, let's remember this: A lot of this special interest money has been spent against Republicans. I have had Republican friends tell me, ''What are you complaining about? They are spending more against us than against you.'' There have been times when that has been true.

When the Koch brothers' polluter money can come in and bombard you in a small primary election, that is pretty scary. When the paid-for rightwing attack machine can be cranked up against you in your Republican primary, that is pretty scary too. What the polluters can do with political spending, they can threaten or promise to do in ways that the public will never see or know, but the candidate will

know. The candidate will know for sure.

So I wrote a friend-of-the-court brief to the Supreme Court with Senator JOHN MCCAIN to highlight for the Justices some of the failings and pitfalls of their shameful Citizens United decision. ''The dominating influence of super PACs,'' we wrote, ''makes it all the easier for those seeking legislative favors and results to discreetly threaten such expenditures if Members of Congress do not accede to their demands.'' I think we were right.

How does this bear on climate change? All that bipartisan activity I talked about preceded Citizens United. After that, polluter attacks funded by Citizens United money and the threat of those polluter attacks—perhaps promises not to make those attacks if you behave—cast a dark shadow over Republicans who might work with Democrats on curbing carbon pollution. Tens, perhaps even hundreds of millions of dark-money dollars are being spent by polluters and their front organizations, and God only knows what private threats and promises have been made.

The timing is telling. Before Citizens United, there was an active heartbeat of Republican activity on climate change. Since then, the evidence has only become stronger. But after Citizens United uncorked all that big, dark money and allowed it to cast its bullying shadow of intimidation over our democracy, Republicans—other than those few who parrot the polluter party line that climate change is a big old hoax—have all walked back from any major climate legislation.

We have Senators here who represent historic native villages that are now washing into the sea and needing relocation because of climate change and sea-level rise. We have Senators here who represent great American coastal cities that are now overwashed by high tides because of climate change. We have Senators representing States swept by drought and wildfire. We have Senators whose home State forests by the hundreds of square miles are being killed by the marauding pine beetle. We have Senators whose home State glaciers are disappearing before their very eyes. We have Senators whose States are having to raise offshore bridges and highways before rising seas. We have Senators whose emblematic home State species are dying off, such as the New Hampshire moose, for instance, swarmed by ticks by the tens of thousands that snows no longer kill. Yet none will work on a major climate bill. It is not safe to, ever since Citizens United allowed the bullying, polluting special interests to bombard our elections, and threaten and promise to bombard our elections with their attack ads.

Despite all the dark money, despite the threats and intimidation, I still believe this can be a courageous time. We simply need conscientious Republicans and Democrats to work together in good faith on a common platform of facts and common sense to protect the American people and the American economy from the looming effects of climate change in our atmosphere, on our lands, and in our oceans. We simply need to shed the shackles of corrupting influence and rise to our duty.

In courageous times, Americans have done far more than that. It is not asking much to ask this generation to stand up to a pack of polluters just because they have big checkbooks. In previous generations, Americans have put their very lives, fortunes, and sacred honor at risk to serve the higher interests of this great Republic. We know it can be done because it has been done.

We do not have to be the generation that failed at our duty. We are headed down a road to infamy now, but it doesn't have to be that way. We can leave a legacy that will echo down the corridors of history so that those who follow us will be proud of our efforts. But sitting here doing nothing, yielding to the special interest bullies and their Citizens United money, pretending that the problem isn't real, will not accomplish that.

As I have said before, 74 times, and as I say tonight for the 75th time, it is time for us to wake up.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORTING ISRAEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel wrote to the majority leader seeking $225 million in additional U.S. funding for the production of Iron Dome components in Israel so they can maintain adequate stockpiles and defend their population. Republicans are united in support of our ally Israel. We have legislation that would allow Congress to meet the Secretary's request, and we hope our friends on the other side will join us in coming to a sensible, bipartisan solution that can be passed quickly.

As most Senators know, the Iron Dome missile defense system has played a critical role in defending Israel's population from rocket attacks launched by Hamas from within the Gaza Strip.

While our friends in Egypt are working to bring Hamas to a cease-fire and end this mirage of rocket attacks—attacks that indiscriminately target the civilian population of Israel—the Iron Dome system will remain critical to Israel's security until a true cease-fire is achieved. It will remain vital afterwards as well, because this defensive system helps blunt the impact of one of Hamas's preferred tools of terror.

By passing a bipartisan measure to meet the Secretary's request, we can send a message to Hamas that its terrorist tactics and its attempts to terrorize Israel's populace will not succeed. And we can help Israel defend its civilian population against indiscriminate attacks as it continues its campaign—Operation Protective Edge—to destroy the often Iranian-supplied weapons stockpiled within Gaza, as well as to eliminate the tunnels that allow terrorists to infiltrate into Israel and smuggle arms into Gaza.

BURMA

Now, on a different matter in a different part of the world. For more than two decades I have been coming to the Senate floor to discuss the latest events in Burma. Typically, in the spring, I would introduce legislation to renew the import sanctions on the then-Burmese junta contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. In addition to pressuring the junta, the annual renewal of the import sanctions provided a useful forum to focus public attention on Burma.

After much deliberation, last summer Members of Congress chose not to renew these sanctions for another year as Burma had demonstrated progress toward implementing governmental reform. That said, Burma's path to reform is far from complete. Much work remains to be done. As such, it is important to continue focusing attention on the country in a regular fashion. That is what I wish to do today, to highlight an important, immediate, intuitive step that the country can take to reassure those who wish the country well, that it remains on the path to reform.

In many ways the Burma of 2014 scarcely resembles the nation that existed in 2003 when Congress first enacted the BFDA against the Burmese junta. Beginning about 3 years ago, Burma began to make significant strides forward in several key areas.

Under President U Thein Sein, the Burmese Government began to institute reforms that surprised virtually all of the onlookers. In the following years, the government granted numerous amnesties and political pardons to political prisoners and has released more than 1,100 political prisoners to date.

As a result of the new government's actions, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Peace Prize laureate, was released from house arrest after spending 15—15—of the previous 21 years in detention. Since her release from House arrest, Daw Suu has been permitted to travel abroad. Moreover, a by-election

was held in April 2012 and she was elected as a member of Parliament along with a number of her National League for Democracy colleagues. In fact, when she did travel abroad back in 2012, at my invitation she came to Louisville, KY. It was an incredible experience to have her in our State and in our country.

In light of these democratic reforms—many of which I witnessed firsthand when I visited the country in January of 2012—I believe that to no small degree Burma has been a remarkable story among many dark developments in the world today.

However, even though the country has made incredible progress in a relatively short period of time, to many Burma of late appears stalled amidst a score of pressing challenges. These include continued conflict between the government and ethnic minorities, governmental restrictions on civil liberties, and ongoing humanitarian issues in Rakhine State. All are serious concerns that command close attention. And related to all of these issues is the need for Burma to continue to bring the military under civilian control if it is to evolve into a more representative government.

With the by-election in Burma scheduled for late this year and a parliamentary election scheduled for late 2015, reformers in the Burmese Government have an opportunity to regain their momentum. To my view, the time between now and the end of 2015 is pivotal—pivotal—for Burma. The elections will help demonstrate whether the country will continue on the reformist path.

With that in mind, the Burmese Government should understand that the United States, and the Senate specifically, will watch very closely at how Burmese authorities conduct the 2015 parliamentary elections as a critical marker of the sincerity and the sustainability of democratic reform in Burma.

President U Thein Sein has made public assurances that the upcoming parliamentary election will be ''free and transparent.'' However, his pledge has already been challenged by several campaign restrictions.

One of those restrictions is a simple one. It involves who can be chosen for the most important civilian office in Burma: The Presidency.

Burma has several requirements governing who can hold this highest office. Some of them make sense. For instance, like the United States, Burma has a minimum age requirement for its highest office. Its President must be at least 45 years old. I suppose that helps assure that only someone with a fair amount of life experience can be President.

In addition, the Burmese constitution stipulates that the President must be a citizen who is ''well acquainted'' with the country's ''political, administrative, economic, and military'' affairs, and is ''loyal to the union and its citizens.'' This requirement helps ensure that a president is knowledgeable about public affairs and has a vested interest in serving in Burma's executive office.

However, Burma's constitution also includes a deeply disconcerting limitation on Presidential eligibility. Section 59 stipulates that the Burmese President may not be a foreign national and may not have any immediate family members who are foreign nationals.

This limitation on the home nation of a candidate's immediate family has no bearing on an individual's fitness for office. This restriction prevents many, including Daw Suu herself, from even being considered for Burma's highest office. Daw Suu, for example, would not be permitted to run because her deceased husband was, and her two sons are, British nationals. To think that the nationalities of family members have relevance for fitness to hold office or allegiance to Burma is dubious at best.

Not only is Daw Suu discriminated against but so are the Burmese who fled or were exiled from the country during the junta's rule. Many of them were out of Burma for years—not by choice, I would add—and during this time many became naturalized citizens in another country out of necessity. These men and women are also ineligible to be President.

Deciding who will be the next Burmese President is obviously up to the people of Burma through their elected representatives and not up to the international community. But, at a minimum, I believe that otherwise qualified candidates should be permitted to stand for office.

More important than the provision's unfairness for certain Presidential candidates is that this provision restricts the ability of the people of Burma, through their representatives, to have a choice in who can hold their highest office. This is profoundly undemocratic, and it is profoundly undemocratic at a time when Burma's commitment to democracy is actually open to question.

It is notable that one apparent roadblock to amending the Presidential eligibility requirement is the fact that the military holds de facto veto power over constitutional amendments. Under the constitution, the military controls a block of 25 percent of the parliamentary seats and in excess of a 75-percent vote is required for a constitutional amendment to go forward. The military controls 25 percent of the Parliament; they need over 75 percent of the Parliament to change the constitution. It becomes clear what this is about.

I understand the Burmese parliamentary committee is in the process of finalizing plans for the implementation of constitutional reform, but I am concerned that eligibility changes will apparently not—not—include amending the narrow restrictions of the constitution that limit who can run for President. To me, it will be a missed opportunity if this provision is not revisited before the 2015 parliamentary elections.

Modifying this provision is one way the Burmese Government can display to the world, in an immediate and clearly recognizable way, that it remains fully committed to reform. Permitting a broad array of candidates to run for President is an unmistakable symbol to the world—even to those who do not follow Burma closely—that Burmese reformers actually mean business; otherwise, such a restriction will quite simply cast a pall over the legitimacy of the election in the eyes of the international community and certainly to Members of the U.S. Senate.

While Congress did not renew the BFDA's import ban last year and there is little appetite to renew the measure this year, several U.S. sanctions toward Burma remain on the books. They include restrictions on the importation of jade and rubies into the United States and sanctions on individuals who continue to hinder reform efforts. It is hard to see how those provisions get lifted without there being progress on the constitutional eligibility issue and the closely related issue of the legitimacy of the 2015 elections.

As the 2015 elections approach, I urge the country's leadership—its President, Parliament and military—to remain resolute in confronting the considerable obstacles to a more representative government that Burma faces. That is the only way the existing sanctions are going to get removed—the only way.

I wanted to highlight the eligibility issue as an example of an important step Burma could take to continue its reformist momentum. Such a step is of course necessary but not sufficient. As I noted, undergirding many of Burma's problems is the need to enhance civilian control over the military. This concern manifests itself in many ways, including the need to clarify that the commander in chief serves under the President and the importance of removing the military's de facto veto authority over constitutional amendments.

One tool the United States could use to help reform Burma's armed forces is through military-to-military contacts. I believe that exposure to the most professional military in the world—our own—will help Burma develop a force that is responsive to civilian control and to professional standards. Security assistance and professional military education are not simply rewards to partnering countries, as some view such programs. They are tools with which we advance our foreign policy

objectives. Helping the Burmese military to reform is in our interest but it cannot be done through mere exhortation; it needs to be done through training and regular contact with the highest professional military standards. Only then, I believe, will the Burmese military see that being under civilian control is not—not—inimical to its interests.

This realization by the Burmese military, coupled with a successful 2015 election that is open to all otherwise qualified Presidential aspirants, will greatly enhance the cause for reform and peaceful reconciliation in Burma.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JEREMY HOLBROOK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Jeremy Holbrook a Marine from my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Jeremy hails from Magoffin County, and graduated from Magoffin County High School in 2004. The attacks of September 11, 2001, had a profound impact on Jeremy, and inspired him to enlist in the Marine Corps after graduating at the age of 18.

After completing basic training, combat training, and tank school, Jeremy was deployed to Ramadi as a part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Despite being wounded on this first tour, for which he received the Purple Heart, he remained determined to serve his country. Jeremy returned to Iraq for a second tour, this time in Fallujah and, as in his previous tour, participated in counter-insurgency missions.

Both Jeremy's uncle and grandfather served in the U.S. Army, and for Jeremy it just made sense to continue that legacy of service. As he puts it—''pretty much whenever I saw our Nation needed people to defend our Nation, I felt I needed to take the call, and that's what I did.''

Jeremy's honorable service to this country is deserving of the praise of this body. Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Jeremy Holbrook.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Holbrook's two tours in Iraq. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

HOLBROOK INSPIRED BY 9/11 TO JOIN MARINES

(By Heather Oney)

The attacks of 9/11 inspired Jeremy Holbrook to join the Marines, which took him on two tours of Iraq.

At 18 years old in 2004, Holbrook enlisted with the Marines, making his family sad, but proud, he said. Since his grandfather and uncle had both been in the Army, he said it just seemed like the right thing to do.

''Pretty much, whenever I saw our nation needed people to defend our nation, I felt I needed to take the call and that's what I did,'' Holbrook said.

The Magoffin County High School grad went to boot camp at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island in South Carolina in July 2004, graduating from there in October 2004. He had his combat training at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, then tank school in Fort Knox, Kentucky, assigned to the M1A1 Abrams Tank Crew. He trained for Operation Iraqi Freedom at Twentynine Palms, California.

Holbrook did two combat tours in Iraq, the first time in Ramadi, Iraq, running counter-insurgency missions, and the second time to Fallujah, Iraq, where he continued counter-insurgency missions and route clearing.

Based in an old Iraqi Army barracks, Holbrook said the living conditions were dingy and rundown, with no running water or toilets. With temperatures climbing upward of 150 degrees during the day and 110 degrees at night, he said they would actually get cold at night.

In a normal day he said they would go into a city and look for insurgents. If found, they would try to eliminate them, all while trying to protect and liberate the Iraqi people, Holbrook said.

''We slept when we could, ate when we could, and there wasn't much time for a bath,'' Holbrook remembers.

Even though he was wounded in his first tour, receiving the Purple Heart, he still went back for the second tour, deployed for seven months each time. In addition to the Purple Heart, he also received the National Defense Medal, Iraqi Freedom Medal, Combat Action Medal, Sea Service Deployment Ribbon and Global War on Terrorism Medal.

Holbrook said the hardest thing he had to deal with when he returned to the States was coping with the loss of a friend, who was killed during their first tour together.

Holbrook is married to Britani Holbrook, and has three kids, Gavin, Austin and Bentley.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MORTIMER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Jim Mortimer. Mortimer hails from Magoffin County, KY, and served his country honorably over the course of his career with the Kentucky National Guard.

After graduating from Castle Heights Military Academy in Tennessee, Mortimer enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserves. Only 22 at the time, it would be 30 years before he retired from the military.

In 1960, 2 years after enlisting, he was transferred to the Kentucky National Guard. His experiences in the Guard ran the gamut from clearing out swamps in southern Georgia to riot control on the University of Kentucky campus during the Vietnam war to responding to natural disasters. It is this diverse range of service to our country that epitomizes the National Guard motto—''Always Ready, Always There.''

Mortimer retired from the Guard in 1988 with the rank of command sergeant major. In addition to his military service, he also took the time to substitute teach in Lexington high schools and obtain his masters from Georgetown College.

His service to this country is worthy of our praise here in the Senate—so, I ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to Mr. Jim Mortimer.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Mortimer's military career. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

MORTIMER RETIRES FROM THE GUARD

(By Heather Oney)

Geared up early for a career in the military, Magoffin native Jim Mortimer left Magoffin when he was 14 years old and attended Castle Heights Military Academy, in Lebanon, Tennessee. When he was 22 years old and with the draft imminent, Mortimer joined the U.S. Army Reserves in Sistersville, West Virginia, in 1958.

In 1960 he was transferred to the Kentucky National Guard and was called to active duty during the Berlin Crisis in 1962.

Mortimer's unit replaced another unit that had been deployed to Germany, taking their place at Fort Stewart, Georgia, in charge of repairing vehicles and armament, as well as various National Guard functions, he said, such as riots and natural disasters.

While he was never sent overseas, he said the year he spent in southern Georgia preparing to be deployed was his strongest memory of his service.

For a year Mortimer said they lived in Quonset huts and were tasked with clearing out swamps with saws and rakes, cutting trees and brush along the way.

Also while he was at Fort Stewart, Mortimer said they had a tornado and all the men got in their vehicles armored much like tanks, while he and two other sergeants laid in the ditch.

''It was maybe a mile away,'' Mortimer laughed. ''Just lots of wind.''

With an extremely flat terrain, he said lightning was a problem there, with two of their soldiers hit. He remembers one was near a radio and the lightning hit the antenna, knocking him out of his boots.

During Desert Storm, Mortimer was sent to Frankfort, working as a liaison aiding the dependents of the men at war.

During his 30 years of service, he worked at Fort Knox, Kentucky; Fort Campbell, Kentucky-Tennessee border; Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Fort Hood, Texas; and Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Mortimer was involved in rifle marksmanship on the Kentucky State Rifle Team, winning several awards. He had a scout troop sponsored by the National Guard, as well.

In North Little Rock, Arkansas, he attended National Guard matches, where Guards from all over sent teams to compete.

During active duty, Mortimer taught second lieutenants in Officer Candidate School (OCS), as well as many other courses, such as marksmanship and all weapons.

In 1965 he was called to deal with Vietnam War riots on the University of Kentucky's campus, where students had burned down the ROTC building.

Mortimer obtained the rank of command sergeant major in 1980, retiring from his employment with the Kentucky National Guard and as a part-time soldier in 1988.

While in the Guard, Mortimer went to school, receiving a degree in 1980. He began substitute teaching in Lexington high schools while still in the service.

In 1973 he returned to Magoffin and started substitute teaching in 1977 at the middle school and high school, where he eventually retired from in 2000. In the meantime, he received his masters from Georgetown College in 1982.

Mortimer is presently a member of the Salyersville Kiwanis and works part-time with the Magoffin County Sheriff's Office. He has a daughter and two sons, as well as six grandchildren. His wife of 53 years, June, passed away in 2011. In 2013, he married Gail King Mortimer and the two sons still live in Magoffin.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETHTOWN COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Elizabethtown Community and Technical College, ECTC, a comprehensive community and technical college that has been serving the central Kentucky region since 1964. ECTC provides education and training to all types of Kentuckians to prepare them to succeed in a constantly changing world.

ECTC is a member of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System. It provides accessible and affordable education and training through academic and technical associate degrees; diploma and certificate programs in occupational fields; pre-baccalaureate education; adult, continuing and developmental education; customized training for business and industry; and distance learning.

ECTC has its roots in the founding of the Elizabethtown Community College, which first opened its doors in 1964 to 355 students from 11 counties. Meanwhile, Elizabethtown Technical College was founded in 1965 through a bond issue by the Elizabethtown Independent School Board. ECTC was formed by the consolidation of the two schools in 2004, following historic legislation in 1997 that established the Kentucky Community and Technical College System.

For five decades, ECTC has enriched the lives of citizens by providing access to quality, affordable academic, technical and community education programs, and by partnering with communities to enhance the economic vitality of the region. A comprehensive college with regional reach, ECTC now offers certificates, diplomas and associate degrees through 34 academic and technical programs on the Elizabethtown, Springfield, Leitchfield and Fort Knox campuses, and at extended campus sites throughout its 12-county service area.

Enrollment has grown steadily from 355 students in 1964 to 7,000 today, and thousands of alumni have distinguished themselves through service to their professions and communities.

During the 2014–2015 academic year, the college will celebrate 50 years of educational excellence and service to Kentuckians. I want to be among the many who congratulate ECTC for 50 years of outstanding service in education to the central Kentucky region. I want to commend the school for 50 years of educating Kentuckians, and thank its president/CEO, Dr. Thelma J. White, for her extraordinary leadership of the institution.

REMEMBERING GERALDINE FERRARO

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 30th anniversary of Geraldine Ferraro's nomination as the Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States.

On the night of July 19, 1984, Gerry gave her acceptance speech as the first woman to be nominated for U.S. Vice President by a majority party. I was there, experiencing the thrill, excitement, and turbo energy as 10,000 people jammed the Mosconi Center. Male delegates gave their tickets to female alternate delegates and their daughters. Gerry's walk on stage was electrifying. We gave her a 10-minute resounding ovation and wouldn't sit down. That night, a barrier was broken. That night, they took down the ''men only'' sign on the White House. For Gerry and all American women there was no turning back—only going forward.

Some people only knew Gerry as a political phenomenon, but I first knew her in Congress. She was a born fighter—for New York and every little guy and gal. She was an advocate for women, fighting for our status and giving us a new stature. Long after the campaign was over, she continued to be a source of inspiration and empowerment.

When Gerry was chosen for the Vice Presidential nomination, she showed modern American women what we had become and what we could be. Women felt that if Gerry could go for the White House, we could go for anything. For some of us women, that meant going to Congress to make a difference. Today, I know Gerry would be so proud of all we have accomplished. Back when we met in the House, we were the early birds. We weren't afraid to ruffle some feathers, but we were in the minority. In 1979, there were 16 women in the House: 11 Democrats and 5 Republicans, and 2 women of color. Today, there are 79 women in the House: 60 Democrats, 19 Republicans, and 30 women of color. As the Dean of the Senate Women, I am proud we are 20 women strong in the Senate: 16 Democrats and 4 Republicans. Together, we are changing the tide and changing the tone.

We have had some amazing victories along the way. We increased breast cancer research funding at NIH by 750 percent to $657 million in fiscal year 13. We increased childcare funding by 75 percent—$2.2 billion in fiscal year 14. We made sure good science included women by founding the NIH Office of Research on Women's Health. The research from that office has changed medical practices, reduced breast cancer by 15 percent, and saved lives a million at a time. This year, we celebrated the fifth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Act, which kept the courthouse doors open for women to sue for discrimination. Last October, women on both sides of the aisle created the climate for compromise that was crucial to ending the disastrous government shutdown.

We have had some amazing victories, but we still have more to do. The Senate women are fighting for women across America. We know women need a raise to raise their families. That is why we are fighting for equal pay for equal work and to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. We are fighting for a better minimum wage because we know that a full-time job shouldn't mean full-time poverty. We are fighting for education that helps our kids every step of the way. We want to give working families peace of mind and give children quality care for a brighter future. Passing my bipartisan child care and development block grant bill will bring affordable, accessible childcare to working families.

Women need a social safety net they can count on, at every age and in every stage. That is why we are fighting so hard for seniors by saving Medicare from becoming a coupon and a promise. We are ensuring Social Security remains guaranteed, lifetime and inflation proof. We are also fighting for health care that is affordable and accessible, by passing the Affordable Care Act to end gender discrimination in health care. I was so proud when we passed my Mikulski preventive health amendment, so simply being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition. We are taking a stand against the Supreme

Court decision that denies women contraception and family planning, while valuing employer rights over employee rights. And we are fighting to ensure the safety and education of women and girls around the world—whether they are in Nigeria, Central America, or Afghanistan.

When Gerry took the stage at the 1984 Democratic Convention, she forever altered the course of history. For the rest of her life, she remained dedicated to empowering thousands of women in the United States and around the world. Today, we honor her lasting legacy and her impact on generations of women with a dream—and a desire to make a difference.

STENNIS CENTER PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, 2014 is the 12th year in which summer interns working in congressional offices have benefited from a program run by the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership. This 6-week program is designed to enhance their internship experience by providing an inside look at how Congress works and a deeper appreciation for the role that Congress plays in our democracy. Each week, the interns meet with senior congressional staff and other experts to discuss issues such as the legislative process, power of the purse, separation of powers, the media and lobbying, foreign affairs, and more.

Interns are selected for this program based on their college record, community service experience, and interest in a career in public service. This year, 27 outstanding interns have taken part in the program. Most of the participants are juniors and seniors in college who are working in Republican and Democratic offices in the House or Senate, including two interns in my office, MaryBeth Cox and James Moody.

I congratulate the interns for their participation in this valuable program and I thank the Stennis Center and the Senior Stennis Fellows for providing such a meaningful experience for these interns and for encouraging them to consider a future career in public service.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of 2014 Stennis Congressional Interns and the offices in which they work be printed in the RECORD.

Brennen Bergdahl, attending the University of North Dakota, interning in the office of Representative Kevin Cramer;

Samantha Bisogno, attending the University of Minnesota Duluth, interning in the office of Representative Rick Nolan;

Ariel Lee Bothen, attending the University of Maine, interning in the office of Senator Angus King;

Tyler Brown, attending The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, interning in the office of Representative Erik Paulsen;

Paul Bruins, attending the University of Illinois, interning in the office of Representative Rodney Davis;

Molly Cain, attending Stanford University, interning in the office of Senator Chris Coons;

Simon Cardenas, attending the University of the Incarnate Word, interning in the office of Representative Rubén Hinojosa;

Sarah Carnes, attending the University of Georgia, interning in the office of Representative Sanford Bishop;

MaryBeth Cox, attending Mississippi State University, interning in the office of Senator Thad Cochran;

Will Giles, attending Duke University, interning in the office of Representative Ralph Hall;

Sophia Herzlinger, attending Tufts University, interning in the office of Representative Alan Lowenthal;

Ben Hutterer, attending The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, interning in the office of Senator Al Franken;

Natasha Jensen, attending Northern Illinois University, interning in the office of Representative Robin Kelly;

Kaitlyn Kline, attending South Dakota State University, interning in the office of Representative Kevin Cramer;

Namrata Kolla, attending the Georgia Institute of Technology, interning in the office of Representative Sanford Bishop;

Adam Lewis, attending Willamette University, interning in the office of Representative Peter DeFazio;

Emily Madden, attending the University of Dallas, interning in the office of Senator Mike Enzi;

James Moody, attending Louisiana State University, interning in the office of Senator Thad Cochran;

Mackenzie Muirhead, attending the University of Wyoming, interning in the office of Senator Mike Enzi;

Harnek Neelam, attending the University of Michigan, interning in the office of Representative John Conyers, Jr.;

Meghan Oakes, attending Virginia Tech University, interning on the House Committee on Ways and Means;

Caleb Orr, attending Abilene Christian University, interning in the office of Representative Ralph Hall;

Meg Richardson, attending Smith College, interning in the office of Senator Angus King;

Sapna Sharma, attending Carnegie Mellon University, interning in the office of Senator Debbie Stabenow;

Rachel Shields, attending Wake Forest University School of Law, interning in the office of the Speaker of the House;

Julia Winfield, attending the University of Michigan, interning in the office of Senator Debbie Stabenow; and

Shannel Wise, attending Howard University, interning in the office of Representative John Conyers, Jr.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST DENNIS J. PRATT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to a true American hero, Army SPC Dennis J. Pratt, who died on July 20, 2009, serving our Nation in Maydan Shahr, Afghanistan. Specialist Pratt, SPC Anthony M. Lightfoot, SPC Andrew J. Roughton, and SGT Gregory Owens, Jr., died of wounds sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near their vehicle followed by an attack from enemy forces using small arms and rocket-propelled grenades.

Dennis was born January 7, 1975, in Waterbury, CT. After graduating high school in Southington, CT, he moved to Arizona, Oklahoma, and then Texas, where he joined the military. He married Michelle Bryant on May 9, 2008 in Lawton, OK.

After completing basic training at Fort Sill, OK, Dennis was assigned to 4th Battalion, 25th Field Artillery (Strike), 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division (Light Infantry), Fort Drum, NY. A third-generation soldier and a 34-year-old father of three, Dennis was called ''the old man'' among comrades in his unit.

On January 6, 2009, he was deployed to Afghanistan as a field artillery automated tactical data systems specialist and reenlisted while there. ''Dennis wasn't supposed to be at that place at that time, but he always told us that the Army and serving his country was where he wanted to be. He had found his niche in life in the military,'' said his mother.

Funeral services were held July 31, 2009, at the Fort Sill chapel, and he was laid to rest in Fort Sill National Cemetery, Elgin, OK.

Dennis is survived by his wife Michelle, three children, Collin Kessler, Gabrielle Pratt, and Caden Bryant, parents, Jim and Sinammon Pratt, mother and father-in-law, Fred and Margaret Bryant, two brothers, Jim Pratt and wife Staci and their children Miranda, D.J. and Morgan and Kyle Hansan and wife Nicole and their daughter CaLista, one stepsister, Leanna Pratt, and a host of other relatives and friends.

Today we remember Army SPC Dennis J. Pratt, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS TONY M. RANDOLPH

Madam President, I would also like to remember the life and sacrifices of PO2 Tony M. Randolph, who died on July 6, 2009, of injuries sustained when insurgents utilized improvised explosive devices to attack his convoy in Zabul province, Afghanistan.

Tony was born on September 27, 1986, in Santa Rosa, CA. Growing up in Oklahoma, he was a 2005 graduate of Henryetta High School in Henryetta, OK, where he was a star athlete earning all-district honors in football.

''Tony was a leader. I truly believe he was a natural born leader,'' said Henryetta football coach Kenny Speer. He was known for his toughness. In high school one day, Coach Speer made him run lap after lap. All Tony had to do was say ''yes sir'' for the punishment to end. ''I said, Tony, you say the two magic words to make you stop running. So he looks at me and goes, 'Si Senor,' '' said Coach Kenny Speer.

Tony joined the Navy on September 28, 2005, and graduated from boot camp

at Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes, IL, in December 2005. Other military assignments include Joint Forces Staff College in Norfolk, VA; Naval Dive and Salvage Training Center in Panama City, FL; Naval Explosive Ordnance Device School at Eglin Air Force Base, FL; and Explosive Ordnance Device Training and Evaluation Unit 1 in San Diego, CA.

He reported to Explosive Ordnance Disposal Mobile Unit Eight, Sigonella, Sicily, in March 2008 and deployed to Afghanistan in March 2009.

''Petty Officer Randolph brought an incredible sense of youthful spirit, professionalism and dedication to this unit,'' said CDR Todd Siddall, commanding officer of EODMU 8. ''He will forever be remembered by his fellow Sailors as an example of true service to country and selfless sacrifice.''

Funeral services were held July 15, 2009, at First Baptist Church in Henryetta, OK, and he was laid to rest in Hillcrest Cemetery, Weleetka, OK.

''He loved his friends. He loved his family. He loved his country. That was Tony,'' said his mother, Peggy Randolph.

Tony is survived by his parents, Fred and Peggy Sue Randolph, his brothers, Shawn and Richard, and his sisters, Susan and Kelly.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Tony's family and friends. He lived a life of love for his family and country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom.

LANCE CORPORAL JONATHAN F. STROUD

Madam President, I also wish to remember Marine LCpl Jonathan F. Stroud, who died on July 31, 2009, of injuries sustained when his unit was attacked by insurgents with small arms fire while on foot patrol in Garmsir District, Afghanistan.

Jonathan was born on October 10, 1988, in North Richland Hills, TX. He attended Cashion High School in Cashion, OK, where teachers remember him as exceptionally intelligent. Fellow students remember him as the class clown—goofy, gangly, dorky, the most honest, and one of the nicest guys you could ever meet.

After graduating from high school in 2007 he joined the Marines on April 14, 2008. He was assigned to 2nd Combat Engineer Battalion, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, NC, as a combat engineer.

Funeral services were held on August 8, 2009, and he was laid to rest in Cashion Cemetery, Cashion, OK.

While many tears were shed, there was a brief moment of laughter when Jonathan's final request was played, ''Another One Bites the Dust'' by Queen. The song is to let everybody know that he's still with us and he's still trying to make us happy even after he's gone,'' a friend of his said.

Jonathan is survived by his wife Lacie E. Stroud of Jacksonville, NC, mother Mavis Stroud and Thomas ''Smokey'' Longan of Cashion, OK, sister Marissa L. Stroud of Oklahoma City, OK, father Bill R. Stroud of Bedford, TX, grandparents Virginia Crawford Light and Jim Light of Weatherford, TX, grandparents Bo and Helen Stroud of Hobbs, NM, and numerous aunts, uncles, cousins, and friends.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Jonathan's family and friends. He lived a life of love for his family and country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom.

LEGAL SERVICE CORPORATION'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, LSC. In 1974, Congress—with bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon—established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

It is LSC-funded attorneys who help parents obtain and keep custody of their children, assist parents in enforcing child support payments and help women who are victims of domestic violence. In fact, three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities.

I know firsthand the important work of the Legal Services Corporation. Before I was elected to Congress, I worked as a legal aid attorney in Polk County, IA. I experienced the challenges—and also the rewards—of representing people who otherwise would not have the legal assistance they deserve. And I developed a deep appreciation for the role that legal aid attorneys play within our system of justice.

Investing in civil legal aid helps ensure that we have equal justice under the law. That is a fundamental American value, and it is reflected both in the first line of our Constitution and in the closing words of our Pledge of Allegiance. As former Justice Lewis Powell said: ''Equal justice under law is not merely a caption on the facade of the Supreme Court building. It is perhaps the most inspiring ideal of our society . . . it is fundamental that justice should be the same, in substance and availability, without regard to economic status.''

Given the vital role played by LSC-funded attorneys, it is disturbing to note that more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance continue to be turned away because of lack of LSC program resources. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this Nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, LSC, which falls on Friday, July 25.

Established with bipartisan support in 1974, LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation funded by Congress that aims to provide access to civil legal assistance to Americans who would otherwise be unable to afford it. LSC is a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country and distributes over 90 percent of its annual Federal appropriation to over 130 local legal aid programs and close to 800 offices across every congressional district and territory.

Millions of Americans rely upon LSC-funded programs each year for help with their most basic civil legal needs. Every day, LSC-funded programs help low-income individuals and families fight illegal evictions, safeguard their financial health, and secure their veterans benefits. In my home State of Washington, LSC-backed programs have been helping survivors of

the Oso mudslide get back up on their feet and rebuild their lives.

LSC-funded services are especially important for women across the country. Over 70 percent of legal aid clients are women and one-third of LSC-eligible cases involve family law issues such as domestic abuse, child support, and child custody.

Today, the need for LSC-supported programs and attorneys has never been greater. According to the Census Bureau, nearly one in five Americans qualifies for LSC-funded services. Yet recent studies show that due to financial constraints legal aid offices are forced to turn away more than half of the eligible individuals coming to them for help. As we mark this anniversary, I applaud the efforts of LSC, the programs and services funded by the corporation, and ask that we commit ourselves to ensuring that Americans of all backgrounds have access to adequate legal services. LSC is essential to protecting the lives and liberty of the most vulnerable Americans. We are a better nation for its 40 years of service and advocacy on their behalf.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, July 25, 2014, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). With bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon, LSC was established in 1974 as a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs and has nearly 800 offices that serve each of the 435 congressional districts and the U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as helping women get protection from abuse, mothers to obtain child support, families from unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, defending seniors against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits. In my home State, more than 25 percent of the population is eligible for LSC-funded legal services. The three programs funded by LSC served nearly 40,000 Louisianians and closed nearly 16,000 cases last year.

On this 40th anniversary, I congratulate and commend the Legal Services Corporation for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security, and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this Nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

Mr. KING. Madam President, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In 1974, Congress—with bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon—established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

It is LSC-funded attorneys who help parents obtain and keep custody of their children, assist parents in enforcing child support payments and help women who are victims of domestic violence. In fact, three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities. LSC-funded attorneys provide critical legal services that would otherwise be unavailable.

In fact, I began my career as one of these attorneys. Beginning in 1969, I worked in Skowhegan, ME for a legal services provider called Pine Tree Legal Assistance. Although my time predated LSC, today Pine Tree is funded by LSC and continues to provide high-quality legal services to those in most need. I learned firsthand during this period that the work of LSC attorneys is a critical element of making real the promise of our country to our disadvantaged and disenfranchised citizens.

Given the vital role played by LSC-funded attorneys, we need to do better than turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance because of lack of LSC program resources. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security, and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this Nation closer to living up to its commitment—chiseled in stone above the entrance to the Supreme Court building here in Washington, DC—''Equal Justice Under Law.''

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding military service of a group of incredible Coloradans. At critical times in our Nation's history, these veterans each played a role in defending the world from tyranny, truly earning their reputation as guardians of peace and democracy through their service and sacrifice. Now, thanks to Honor Flight, these combat veterans came to Washington, DC to visit the national memorials built to honor those who served and those who fell. They've also come to share their experiences with later generations and to pay tribute to those who gave their lives. I am proud to welcome them here, and I join with all Coloradans in thanking them for all they have done for us.

I also want to thank the volunteers from Honor Flight of Northern Colorado who made this trip possible. These volunteers are great Coloradans in their own right, and their mission to bring our veterans to Washington, DC is truly commendable.

I wish to publicly recognize the veterans who visited our Nation's capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials built as a tribute to their selfless service. Today, I honor these Colorado veterans on their visit to Washington, DC, and I join them in paying tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of liberty.

Veterans from World War II include: Norlin Akers, Joseph Arthur, Donald Carlstrom, William Culp, Robert Davidson, Victor Ebel, Reginold Edwards, Arthur Engler, John Eschbaugh, Daniel Flanagan, Anthony Gance, Robert Gittinger, Paul Glasgow, Gene Hansen, Dean Hecker, Henry Jesse, Benjamin Jones, Robert King, Virgil Kiser, Fred Knipschild, James McIver, Richard Minges, Jack Moss, Ronald Reidy, Robert Ryan, Herbert Shelton, J Spaulding, William Spearman, Charles Sutter, Howard Swartz, Arpad Szallar, Eugene Turnbull, William Worth, and George Zuniga.

Veterans from the Korean war include: Dean Amdahl, Alfred Apodaca, Jennings Barr, Earl Bartlow, Elmer Bartlow, James Beach, John Bergquist, Eugene Burmester, Larry Carpenter,

Glenn Chapman, William Chrismer, Harl Clark, Leonard Cooper, Sr., LaVerne Dietz, Alfred Duchene, Emanuel Eckas, Thelma Eckas, Donald Eckert, Jessie Ellis, Edwin Ellstrom, Samuel Evans, Jr., Herman Friesenhahn, Henry Geisert, Paul Gill, Lloyd Gould, George Hare, Eugene Hemmerle, William Hock, Milton Hunholz, Willis Janssen, William King, Dean Kingcade, Wallace Kirchhoff, Lawrence Kopecky, Richard Kounovsky, John Kreman, Kenneth Lamp, Robert Larsen, Dennis Larson, Lawrence Lawler, James Lee, William Leppert, Murdo MacLennan, Philip Mahoney, Charles Markesbery, Gene Mitchell, Robert Nagel, Dale Nelson, George Niedermayr, Willard Nordick, Richard Ochsner, Gerald Pearson, Donald Piermattei, Reid Pope, Paul Shapard, Howard Smallwood, Richard Spaulding, Donald Sterling, Harold Sulzbach, Robert Swanstrom, Betty Taylor, John Waddell, Donald Webb, Louie Wells, Russel White, Norman Wikler, Egbert Womack, Jr., George Woodman, and James Yenter.

Veterans from the Vietnam war include: Jon Ackerman, Isidro Arroyo, Ronald Britton, Steven Drake, Vearlon Forbes, James Freeland, Jimmie Garcia, Kenneth Hedger, Kenneth Hollingshead, Kenneth Jacobsen, Mark Kauffman, Terry Keating, Robert Klausner, William Miller, William Ortega, Marvin Pruitt, Robert Taylor, and Gene Thim.

Our Nation asked a great deal of these individuals—to leave their families to fight in unknown lands and put their lives on the line. Each one of these Coloradans bravely answered the call. They served our country with courage, and in return, let us ensure they are shown the honor and appreciation they deserve. Please join me in thanking these Colorado veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Northern Colorado for their tremendous service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. MINKLER

● Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I wish to recognize Thomas J. Minkler of Keene, NH, as he nears the end of his term as the 109th chairman of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, also known as the Big ''I.'' Tom was installed as chairman of the Big ''I'' in September 2013, and he has been a strong and thoughtful leader for independent insurance agents across the country.

Tom is president of the Clark-Mortenson Agency, which is headquartered in Keene. Previously, he served as chairman of the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of New Hampshire, as New Hampshire director on the Big ''I'' national board, and as president of the Massachusetts Association of Insurance Agents.

As I recognize Tom, I would also like to acknowledge his wife Heather Minkler. She serves as chief executive officer of the Clark-Mortenson Agency in Keene. Together, Tom and Heather are a truly dynamic team. They always find time to give back to the community, serving as members of numerous charitable organizations and civic boards when they aren't managing their agency, which has 52 employees in five office locations in New Hampshire and Vermont.

I am pleased to join Tom's colleagues from across New Hampshire and the Nation in congratulating him as he finishes his term as chairman.●

CONGRATULATING REBECCA ESPINOZA

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to congratulate one of Nevada's brightest students—Rebecca Espinoza—for being chosen to participate in the United Health Foundation's Diverse Scholars Forum in Washington, DC.

The United Health Foundation named scholars from 28 States throughout the Nation this year, and I am proud that Rebecca Espinoza, who attends the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is among them. The Diverse Scholars Initiative serves to improve our Nation's health care system by increasing the number of health care professionals from multicultural backgrounds. Rebecca's academic achievements thus far and her continued commitment to serving her community have made her a qualified candidate for the forum.

In an effort to continue her dedication and service to her community, Rebecca is currently majoring in social work at UNLV and hopes to one day become a clinical social worker operating a non-profit to help disadvantaged youth in the community. I commend Rebecca for her mission and recognize that professional social workers provide valuable mental health therapy, caregiver and family counseling, health education, program coordination, and case management services. They also seek to ensure full participation of all members of society by working with millions of individuals, their families, and communities to combat a range of social problems so that we may improve our Nation's health and potential. Rebecca has been presented with the opportunity to pursue her career as a health care professional, and I am confident that great things will come from her in all of her future endeavors.

On behalf of the residents of the Silver State, I am proud to recognize Rebecca for her accomplishments and contributions to our State. She undoubtedly represents Nevada's best and brightest. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this exceptional young Nevadan.●

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS JAEGER

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to recognize and honor the public service of Mr. Dennis Jaeger as the deputy forest supervisor for the Black Hills National Forest. He has been asked to serve as the new forest supervisor with the Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest and will shortly be assuming those duties. I want to recognize him for the exceptional service and leadership he has provided in working for the Black Hills of my Home State of South Dakota.

A graduate of St. Mary's High School, Bismarck, ND, Jaeger earned a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from the United States Military Academy at West Point, NY, in 1982. He served 7 years Active Duty in the U.S. Army and retired from the South Dakota Army National Guard in 2010 as a lieutenant colonel.

Jaeger started his Forest Service career as a civil engineer on the Rio Grande National Forest in Monte Vista, CO, followed by working as district engineer on the Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests and Thunder Basin National Grasslands on the Douglas Ranger District in Wyoming. In 1996 he became the works program officer for the Angell Job Corps in Yachats, OR, and in 1998 was selected as the center director of the Boxelder Job Corps Center in Nemo, SD. In 2007 Mr. Jaeger assumed the duties as the deputy forest supervisor for the Black Hills National Forest of South Dakota and Wyoming.

Jaeger is an avid skier, hiker, and enjoys mountain biking. He and his wife Carole have three wonderful children.

There have been a number of key accomplishments on the Black Hills National Forest that Jaeger has helped facilitate, including guiding the successful merger of the Tribal Youth Natural Resources Crew with the Boxelder Job Corps Center Crew to become the Youth Natural Resources, YNR, Crew. The YNR Crew is much better organized, provides unique work training and education, remains very diverse and productive, and improves the land. The YNR Crew received a Regional Forester's Honor Award in 2013. Dennis, as a key member of the Forest Leadership Team, helps guide one of the largest forest restoration programs in the United States. The Black Hills Forest received the Regional Forester's Honor Award for its timber program in 2013 and the Chief's Honor Award in 2013 for its Mountain Pine Beetle Response Project.

Dennis has served as the Agency Administrator on two very large and complex fires in 2012, White Draw and Myrtle. Dennis interacted professionally with several Federal, State, and county cooperators and the National Guard and private citizens under very difficult circumstances.

Dennis is known for his positive, ''can do'' attitude, his outstanding customer service, and his passion for the Forest Service mission and the well-being of employees and the public he serves. He is highly visible and respected by the Federal delegation, tribes, the National Forest Advisory Board, State officials and many stakeholders.

I am proud to recognize and honor Dennis' service to the U.S. Forest Service and am delighted to join with his family and friends in congratulating him on this promotion to forest supervisor.●

REMEMBERING LANCE HOWARD TURNER

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great Utahn and patriot, Lance Howard Turner. Lance passed from this life on Monday last, and his family and friends will dearly miss him.

There is a beautiful painting hanging on the wall of the Rex E. Lee conference room in my office. It is a painting of a majestic landscape in the Southwestern portion of United States painted by Lance Turner. This painting shows the beauty of the land that he loved so dearly and demonstrates the mastery developed over a lifetime of hard work.

During his career, Lance was able to take part in and lead many successful programs. One such program, well known to all, involves a talking bear that helps campers keep our forests safe. In 2009, KSL, a Utah news station, ran a story on Lance, who was the art director at Foote, Cone & Belding in the 1950s. Lance was tasked with marketing the newly created Smokey Bear, whose mission was to reduce manmade forest fires. The campaign was a success and remains the longest running PSA campaign in our country's history. Smokey Bear also remains a highly recognized American character and continues his original mission of encouraging fire safety.

More important than any success in his professional life, Lance was a good husband and father who, according to his children, was always willing to share the wisdom he had gained through a life of service. He was a faithful member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and made sure to always take care of those in need. He loved to hunt pheasants and had a deep love for this country.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to his children, Heidi, Josh, Chip, and Matt, and his 14 grandchildren and 22 grandchildren. I know his legacy will shine brightly through their examples of faith and patriotism. Happily, Lance leaves this life to reunite with his sweetheart Marilyn. The thought of such a joyous reunion reminds me of an old but dear hymn by Katharina von Schlegel. I close with touching words of the third verse: ''Be still, my soul: The hour is hast'ning on, When we shall be forever with the Lord, When disappointment, grief, and fear are gone, Sorrow forgot, love's purest joys restored.

Be still, my soul: When change and tears are past, All safe and blessed we shall meet at last.''●

REMEMBERING MELVIN SANTIAGO

● Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, it is with a heavy heart that I pay tribute to a young New Jersey police officer who gave his life in the line of duty on Sunday, July 13.

Officer Melvin Santiago was born and raised in Jersey City, New Jersey's second largest city. As a child, he dreamed of following in the footsteps of his uncle, an officer in the city's police department. That dream came true last December, when he graduated from the police academy, and it ended tragically early Sunday morning, when he was ambushed and killed in the line of duty while responding to a call. He was only 23 years old.

Officer Santiago is described by his friends and family as having been full of life, with an easy smile and a gift for making others laugh. He is a source of pride for his parents, mother Cathy and stepfather Alex, and a role model for his younger brother and cousins. Officer Santiago was committed to being the best police officer he could be, and he quickly earned the respect of his fellow officers by volunteering to work in the West District—one of Jersey City's toughest neighborhoods—because he wanted to serve where he was most needed. According to his family, he savored every moment of the last 7 months, thrilled to be doing what he loved.

Officer Santiago's courage, spirit of service, and commitment to his community will be long remembered by those he protected and for whom he gave his life. As we recognize Officer Santiago's tremendous sacrifice, I ask that the Senate join with this courageous officer's family, friends, fellow Jersey City Police Department personnel, the Jersey City community, and the State of New Jersey in mourning the loss of this extraordinary young man.●

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER GOODELL

● Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, it is with great sadness that I pay tribute to a New Jersey police officer who tragically lost his life in the line of duty last week.

Officer Christopher Goodell, a lifelong resident of the Borough of Waldwick, NJ, was killed when his patrol car was struck by a tractor-trailer early Thursday morning, July 17. He was 32 years old and will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

Officer Goodell is described by friends and colleagues as having been friendly to everyone he met, with a gift for comedy and a kind heart. He was also long-committed to serving others. He joined the Marine Corps in the wake of September 11, 2001, earning several medals and commendations for his service in Iraq, including the Air Medal and two Humanitarian Service Medals. Upon his return, Officer Goodell never stopped serving—first as a dispatcher for the Waldwick Police Department, and later as a police officer.

Officer Goodell embraced the responsibilities that came with being a police officer, and he cherished the opportunity to protect and serve the town that helped raise him. He was a role model for children in the community, and he always took the time to speak with students at the local high school about staying on the right track. Officer Goodell was eager to help others, from working to make our streets safer to once assisting a man who had collapsed at his gym. Simply put, his dedication saved lives.

Officer Goodell is mourned by his father Mark, his mother Patricia, his fiancée Jillian, his sister Nicole, his niece and nephew, a large extended family, many friends and neighbors, fellow Waldwick Police Department personnel, the Borough of Waldwick, and the entire State of New Jersey. His spirit of service and his dedication to his community and to our Nation will be long remembered by those he protected and served. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to please join me in honoring this remarkable young police officer and marine, and in recognizing his tremendous service.●

RECOGNIZING VETERANS SUPPORT NETWORK

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to recognize a veterans education program within Las Vegas known as Veterans Support Network for its continued dedication to helping its fellow servicemembers gain training and certifications that will assist them in becoming self-sufficient. This unique program works to improve the lives of disabled, visually impaired, and homeless veterans by providing educational classes and trainings, funding for on-the-job training, as well as professional talking books and Braille books to assist those with disabilities.

The brave men and women who served the United States and fought to protect our freedom have often come home to a struggling economy. A number of veterans are unable to find a job or afford to buy or rent a home. As the demographics of our Armed Forces have changed throughout the years, so too have the needs of homeless veterans. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, this is an

issue I have been personally involved with and have introduced legislation to address. Organizations like the Veterans Support Network serve to help those in need in the Las Vegas community. This organization is a shining example of the kind of initiatives that will help to get our veterans off of the streets.

There is no way to adequately thank the men and women that lay down their lives for our freedoms, but the founders and volunteers at the Veterans Support Network are working to assist our Nation's veterans by giving them the opportunity to start a new career. The organization was founded by Ed Manley, a brave veteran who has selflessly been working toward the betterment of the homeless veteran community by teaching certification classes and working tirelessly to find funds to assist the homeless and wounded veterans within the community. This organization's continued dedication to serving veterans needing to learn new skills, build resume experience and earn wages through work assistance programs is commendable.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know the struggles that our veterans face after returning home from the battlefield. Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals, but to ensure they receive the quality care they have earned and deserve. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. I am very pleased that veterans service organizations like the Veterans Support Network are committed to ensuring that the needs of our veterans are being met.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing the Veterans Support Network, an organization whose mission is both noble and charitable. I am both humbled and honored to recognize the Veteran's Support Network's mission of providing veterans with the skills that will allow them the opportunity to change their circumstances. This organization's commitment to helping struggling veterans get back on their feet is admirable, and I wish them the best of luck in all of their future endeavors.●

TEXT OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES OF JULY 3, 1958, AS AMENDED—PM 51

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to section 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the text of an amendment (the ''Amendment'') to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958, as amended (the ''1958 Agreement''). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Amendment. The joint unclassified letter submitted to me by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy providing a summary position on the unclassified portions of the Amendment is also enclosed. The joint classified letter and classified portions of the Amendment are being transmitted separately via appropriate channels.

The Amendment extends for 10 years (until December 31, 2024), provisions of the 1958 Agreement that permit the transfer between the United States and the United Kingdom of classified information concerning atomic weapons; nuclear technology and controlled nuclear information; material and equipment for the development of defense plans; training of personnel; evaluation of potential enemy capability; development of delivery systems; and the research, development, and design of military reactors. Additional revisions to portions of the Amendment and Annexes have been made to ensure consistency with current United States and United Kingdom policies and practice regarding nuclear threat reduction, naval nuclear propulsion, and personnel security.

In my judgment, the Amendment meets all statutory requirements. The United Kingdom intends to continue to maintain viable nuclear forces into the foreseeable future. Based on our previous close cooperation, and the fact that the United Kingdom continues to commit its nuclear forces to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have concluded it is in the United States national interest to continue to assist the United Kingdom in maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent.

I have approved the Amendment, authorized its execution, and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 24, 2014.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2283. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3136. An act to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education.

H.R. 4449. An act to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4980. An act to prevent and address sex trafficking of children in foster care, to extend and improve adoption incentives, and to improve international child support recovery.

H.R. 4983. An act to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5076. An act to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

H.R. 5116. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5134. An act to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

H.R. 5135. An act to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2283. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3136. An act to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4449. An act to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4983. An act to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5076. An act to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5116. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5134. An act to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5135. An act to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2648. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2666. A bill to prohibit future consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals or work authorization for aliens who are not in lawful status, to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border, and to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse States for National Guard deployments in response to large-scale border crossings of unaccompanied alien children from noncontiguous countries.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6600. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Stability Oversight Council 2014 annual report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6601. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014–0084—2014–0089); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6602. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program; Qualifying Life Event Amendments'' (RIN3206–AM57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6603. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions, Clark County Department of Air Quality'' (FRL No. 9914–17–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6604. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Bellefontaine Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard'' (FRL No. 9914–22–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6605. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Locally Enforced Motor Vehicle Idling Limitations'' (FRL No. 9914–31–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6606. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Solvent Degreasing Operations Rule'' (FRL No. 9914–24–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6607. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Illinois'' (FRL No. 9913–15–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6608. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation and Apportionment of Interest Expense'' ((RIN1545–BJ59) (TD 9676)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6609. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Foreign Tax Credit Guidance Under Section 901(m)'' (Notice 2014–44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6610. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities'' ((RIN1545–BL60) (TD 9677)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6611. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Research Expenditures'' ((RIN1545–BE64) (TD 9680)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6612. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mixed Straddles; Straddle-by-Straddle Identification Under Section 1092'' ((RIN1545–BK99) (TD 9678)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6613. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Obtaining Evidence Beyond the Current 'Special Arrangement Sources' '' (RIN0960–AH44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6614. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Corrections to Regulations'' (RIN0960–AH55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6615. A communication from the Acting Assistant Deputy for Regulatory Services, Office of Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priorities, Requirements, and Definitions—Charter Schools Program (CSP) Grants for National Leadership Activities'' (CFDA No. 84.282N) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6616. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Department of Education Acquisition Regulation'' (RIN1890–AA18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6617. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report for 2013 on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 2508. A bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–219).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1353. A bill to provide for an ongoing, voluntary public-private partnership to improve cybersecurity, and to strengthen cybersecurity research and development, workforce development and education, and public awareness and preparedness, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2651. A bill to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2652. A bill to improve the design-build process in Federal contracting; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2653. A bill to amend the definition of ''homeless person'' under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 2654. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct outreach to veterans regarding the effect of certain delayed payments by the Secretary, to require the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report regarding such delayed payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 2655. A bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2656. A bill to provide for the regulation of persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic chemical substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2657. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2658. A bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2659. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the special rules for accident and health plans of certain governmental entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2661. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the ''National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2662. A bill to promote and expand the application of telehealth under Medicare and other Federal health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2663. A bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2664. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to modernize the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2665. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2666. A bill to prohibit future consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals or work authorization for aliens who are not in lawful status, to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border, and to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse States for National Guard deployments in response to large-scale border crossings of unaccompanied alien children from noncontiguous countries; read the first time.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2667. A bill to prohibit the exercise of any waiver of the imposition of certain sanctions with respect to Iran unless the President certifies to Congress that the waiver will not result in the provision of funds to the Government of Iran for activities in support of international terrorism, to develop nuclear weapons, or to violate the human rights of the people of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2668. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2669. A bill to ensure funding for certain payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 517. A resolution expressing support for Israel's right to defend itself and calling on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 518. A resolution designating the week of October 12 through October 18, 2014, as ''National Case Management Week'' to recognize the role of case management in improving health care outcomes for patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WALSH):

S. Res. 519. A resolution designating August 16, 2014, as ''National Airborne Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. Res. 520. A resolution condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 521. A resolution designating July 26, 2014, as ''United States Intelligence Professionals Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CORKER):

S. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to be held in Washington, D.C., from August 4 through 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 523. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the importance of the United States-India strategic partnership and the continued deepening of bilateral ties with India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Con. Res. 41. A concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster

more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 620

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 620, a bill to withhold the salary of the Director of OMB upon failure to submit the President's budget to Congress as required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and make permanent certain tax provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2406

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2406, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2449, a bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 2471

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2471, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to provide bankruptcy protections for medically distressed debtors, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2488

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2488, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to the exclusive use requirement for home offices if the other use involves care of a qualifying child of the taxpayer, and for other purposes.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to extend and modify the pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes.

S. 2622

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2622, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 2635

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2635, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 2650

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2650, a bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 39

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 39, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding support for voluntary, incentive-based, private land conservation implemented through cooperation with local soil and water conservation districts.

S. RES. 462

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 462, a resolution recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 513, a resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

AMENDMENT NO. 3594

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3594 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3598

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3598 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill

to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3599

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3599 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3601

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3601 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2653. A bill to amend the definition of ''homeless person'' under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleagues Senator PORTMAN and Senator BEGICH that would expand the definition of ''homeless'' used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to ensure all homeless children and families are eligible for existing Federal homeless assistance programs.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 1.1 million children were homeless during the 2011–2012 school year; this is a 24 percent increase from the 939,903 homeless students enrolled in the 2009–2010 school year.

In California, nearly 250,000 children experienced homelessness last year, up from 220,000 in 2010 and nearly four times the 65,000 homeless children in the State in 2003.

Unfortunately, the numbers reported by the HUD ''Point-in-Time Count'' fail to reflect these increasing numbers.

According to the 2012 HUD ''Point-in-Time Count,'' there were only 247,178 people counted as homeless in households that included children, a fraction of the true number.

This is important because only those children counted by HUD are eligible for vital homeless assistance programs. The rest of these children and families are simply out of luck.

The Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2014 would expand the homeless definition to allow HUD homeless assistance programs to serve extremely vulnerable children and families, specifically those staying in motels or in doubled up situations because they have nowhere else to go.

These families are especially susceptible to abuse and trafficking because they are often not served by a case manager, and thus remain hidden from potential social service providers.

As a result of the current narrow HUD definition, communities that receive federal funding through the competitive application process are unable to prioritize or direct resources to help these children and families.

This bill would provide communities with the flexibility to use federal funds to meet local priorities.

I would note that the bill comes at no cost to taxpayers and does not impose any new mandates on service providers.

Finally, this legislation improves data collection transparency by requiring HUD to report data on homeless individuals and families currently recorded under the existing Homeless Management Information System survey.

I am pleased that Senators ROB PORTMAN and MARK BEGICH have joined me as original cosponsors on this bill.

Homelessness continues to plague our nation. If we fail to address the needs of these children and families today, they will remain stuck in a cycle of poverty and chronic homelessness.

It is our moral obligation to ensure that we do not erect more barriers for these children and families to access services when they are experiencing extreme hardship. I believe this bill is a commonsense solution that will ensure that homeless families and children can receive the help they need.

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

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

S. 2653

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(I) by striking ''are sharing'' and all that follows through ''charitable organizations,'';

(II) by striking ''14 days'' each place that term appears and inserting ''30 days'';

(III) in clause (i), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(IV) by striking clause (ii); and

(V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

''(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—

''(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or

''(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—

''(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

''(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'other Federal statute' has the meaning given that term in section 401; and

''(2) the term 'public housing agency' means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).'';

(2) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi);

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking ''Federal statute other than this subtitle'' and inserting ''other Federal statute''; and

(ii) by inserting ''of'' before ''this Act'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by adding after paragraph (13) the following:

''(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term 'other Federal statute' includes—

''(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

''(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

''(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

''(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

''(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

''(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

''(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.'';

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

''SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(f)(3) shall be made publically available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

''(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publically available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

''(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

''(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C for the each geographic area involved; and

''(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.'';

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

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

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless

populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

''(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

''(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.''; and

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

''SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

''(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

''(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

''(A) data required to be made publically available in the report under section 409; and

''(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute, as such term is defined in section 401.

''(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year.''.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2658. A bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, last year, 2013, marked the 10-year anniversary of the completion of the historic campaign to double funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Beginning in fiscal year 1998, I worked with Congressman John Porter and Senator Arlen Specter in our leadership roles on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. In that year, 1998, funding for the National Institutes of Health was $13 billion. By fiscal year 2003, we had increased NIH funding to $27 billion. We doubled funding in 5 years. We said we were, and we laid out a plan under both Republican and Democratic administrations and we got it done. That was a historic milestone for biomedical research in the United States.

Truly, increasing our Nation's investment in NIH was a bold statement of our Nation's commitment to retaining our standing as the undisputed world leader in biomedical research, and we have reaped extraordinary benefits from that investment. We reaped benefits in terms of new treatments, new diagnostics, and the new jobs and economic growth that biomedical research brings.

But where does NIH stand today, 10 years after the historic doubling of funding for biomedical research, which did so much to advance America's economy and our standing in the world? Where are we today? Sadly, as this chart illustrates, we have been falling behind.

So here we are. We got back up to where we should be by doubling the funding. Since that time, it has basically leveled off. We are now short about $8 billion below where we would be if we had just kept up with inflation. So NIH has lost about 20 percent of its purchasing power from that time. Success rates for applicants fell from the traditional range of 25 to 35 percent to just 16 percent last year, 2013. Promising research was not funded, and many young scientists had no choice but to find other occupations. This has had profoundly negative consequences. Our biomedical pipeline is clearly showing the negative effects.

So today I am introducing a bill that allows us to find common ground, on a bipartisan basis, to jump-start our reinvestment in the National Institutes of Health and ensure America's leadership in biomedical research.

Republicans and Democrats may disagree on what level of revenue is appropriate. We disagree about the value of investing in education in order to build a stronger workforce. But I have yet to hear any Senator who disagrees with my view that Federal investments in biomedical research are good for the economy and good for our country.

As the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that funds NIH, I get letters from Senators every year requesting support for research programs, so I can speak with authority when I say the majority of Senators—from both parties—believe we should be investing more strongly in NIH. That is exactly the aim of the bill I am introducing today. The Accelerating Biomedical Research Act makes NIH a priority in our national budget process by creating a budget cap adjustment for the National Institutes of Health. This bill will put a plan in place for the Appropriations Committee to reverse the 10-year retrenchment in biomedical research funding over the remaining years of the Budget Control Act.

Importantly, the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act is not an appropriation. It is not a mandatory trust fund. It is not a tax credit. The bill that I am introducing does not score for CBO purposes because it does not spend any money now. I am always hearing that we should have a robust debate on the budget and our spending priorities as a country. So this bill starts that debate. I invite Senators to cosponsor this bill if they believe, as I do, that we should change our budget to allow for biomedical research to grow in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the organizations who have endorsed this bill be entered into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I believe we must do this. I believe we must do this to save lives and to improve the health of the American people. I also believe we must do it because we know that investing in biomedical research creates jobs and spurs the economy.

Some may say that changing the budget allows for more spending so it should be offset by cuts to other programs. Well, to that I say there can be little doubt that NIH funding abundantly pays for itself in expanded economic activity. Respected economists have studied this, and they have estimated that each dollar of investment in the National Institutes of Health generates anywhere from $1.80 to $3.20 in economic output.

Let me take just one vivid example of the payoffs from our Federal investments in biomedical research.

In 2003 NIH completed the Human Genome Project started about 13 years earlier. In total, the Federal Government invested $3.4 billion of taxpayers' money in sequencing the human genome. That project has had a truly staggering economic impact. As of 2012, it had generated $965 billion in economic activity, personal income exceeding $293 billion, and more than 4.3 million job-years of employment. For every dollar our government spent on the Human Genome Project, America has reaped $178 in economic benefits—for every dollar we invest. And this is just the economic impact. The positive impact in terms of cures discovered and lives saved is incalculable.

But research doesn't have to launch an entire industry to contribute significantly to our economy as the Human Genome Project did. I will give an example from my home State.

Dr. Joseph Walder, a researcher at the University of Iowa, received a $5.7 million research grant many years ago from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. In the course of his research, he developed synthetic DNA and RNA technology. Realizing that this was a valuable research tool, Dr. Walder launched a company called Integrated DNA Technologies in 1987. Out of a $5.7 million Federal investment came a company with $100 million in annual sales, employing 650 people.

Now, if the creation of all of these companies and products and jobs isn't enough of a reason to expect that this bill will boost the economy and lower the Federal deficit, I have another reason. One of the principal missions of biomedical research is to reduce and improve chronic diseases and health conditions that are a major factor in driving deficit spending. In 2006, economists found that a future 1-percent reduction in mortality rates from cancer would save $500 billion to current and future Americans. A cure for cancer was estimated to save $50 trillion to Americans in future expenditures.

Recent estimates indicate the economic cost of Alzheimer's disease is over $200 billion a year. That is going to rise to over $1 trillion a year by 2050 unless a prevention or cure is found. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that annual costs from undiagnosed diabetes are about $245 billion a year. And a recent study projects that, by 2030, nearly 45 percent of the United States population will face some form of cardiovascular disease, costing a total of $1.2 trillion between now and 2030.

I could go on and on with examples and studies, but no matter what I say, some will say we can't afford this bill. But we can't afford not to do this. The status quo confronts our Nation with what those in the military call a ''clear and present danger.''

The United States has been the global leader in research, but that standing is now in jeopardy. While the United States has been retrenching in biomedical research, other countries, including China, India, and Singapore, have been redoubling their investments and surging forward. Of the 10 leading countries in the field of scientific research, the United States is the only one that has reduced its investment in scientific research.

Let me repeat that. Of the 10 leading countries in the world in the field of scientific research, the United States is the only one that has reduced its investment in scientific research.

According to an NIH study:

Other countries are investing more in biomedical research relative to the size of their economies. When it comes to government funding for pharmaceutical industry-performed research, Korea's government provides seven times more funding as a share of GDP than does the United States, while Singapore and Taiwan provide five and three times as much, respectively. France and the United Kingdom also provide more than the US, as a share of their economies.

This chart here vividly shows what has been happening in research investment just since 2011 as a percent of GDP: China, Brazil, South Korea, India, UK, France, Japan, Germany, and Russia are increasing. In the United States we are going in the wrong direction.

Dr. Francis Collins, Director of NIH, testified before my subcommittee about the ambitious investments of America's rivals. He said this:

China has made policy changes to invest heavily in the life sciences industry, moving [China] closer to becoming a world leader in science and technology by the end of the decade. Over the past decade, Singapore has also pursued a prominent role as a global leader in the life sciences. For example, their pharmaceutical industry R&D funding was five times greater than that of the United States in 2009 as a share of GDP.

I will say one more thing about China's ambitious plans. China has identified biotechnology as one of seven key ''strategic and emerging pillar'' industries. They have pledged to invest $308.5 billion in biotechnology over the next 5 years. By contrast, the U.S. investment over the same period of time will be roughly $160 billion, just about half of what China is doing.

It is a shocking and disturbing fact that, if current trends continue, the U.S. Government's investment in life sciences research as a share of GDP will soon be about one quarter of what China is doing.

According to the NIH, China already has more gene sequencing capacity than the entire United States, and they have about one third of global capacity.

Imagine that. We are the ones that mapped and sequenced the entire human genome. We are the ones that put the $3.6 billion into that. We reaped some rewards and benefits—as I just said—but right now China has more gene sequencing capacity than we do. That, again, illustrates my point that they are moving ahead and we have sort of slowed down and stopped, resting on our laurels, so to speak.

The budget caps enacted by Congress are forcing disinvestments in a whole range of priorities that are the key to our Nation's prosperity. These disinvestments are having devastating impacts across our economy—lower growth and fewer jobs.

Again, I appreciate there are honest disagreements about the appropriate levels of investment in education, job training, and other domestic priorities. But from countless conversations with Senators from both parties, there seems to be one area of broad agreement, and that is that we should invest robustly in the National Institutes of Health. And that is why I have introduced this bill today. It is time for us on a bipartisan basis to reverse this erosion of support for biomedical research to ensure America's standing as a world leader in this field. This is what we are talking about, a discretionary cap adjustment. That is what our bill would do to allow NIH to make up for lost ground.

Here is what is happening. We are about $8 billion behind. By providing a budget cap adjustment we can close this gap by 2021 and bring it up to where it should be if we could allow for increases due to inflation. Quite frankly, I guess I could argue we have to do even more than that, but this is the minimum we ought to do, a minimum to close the gap in biomedical research.

We have to do this for the health of our people, our economy, and our Federal budget. So I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act.

I yield the floor.

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

NATIONAL GROUPS SUPPORTING THE BILL

AcademyHealth, Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research, Alliance for Aging Research, Alzheimer's Association, Alzheimers North Carolina, American Academy of Neurology, American Aging Association, American Association for Cancer Research, American Association for Long Term Care Nursing, American Federation for Aging Research, American Geriatrics Society, American Lung Association, American Thoracic Society, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, American College of Cardiology, American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, American Society for Pharmacology & Experimental Therapeutics, American Society of Clinical Oncology, amfAR, The Foundation for AIDS Research.

Association for Clinical and Translational Science, Association of American Cancer Institutes, Association of American Medical Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of Independent Research Institutes, Association of Public and Landgrant Universities, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation, The Clinical Research Forum, Coalition for Clinical and Translational Science, College on Problems of Drug Dependence, Cure Alliance for Mental Illness, Cure Alzheimer's Fund, Dystonia Medical Research Foundation, Epilepsy Foundation, Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), Friends of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, GBS/CIDP Foundation International, Gerontological Society of America, Huntington's Disease Society of America.

Inspire, Interstitial Cystitis Association, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Keep Memory Alive, LuMind Foundation (formerly the Down Syndrome Research and Treatment Foundation), Lupus Research Institute, The Marfan Foundation, Melanoma Research Foundation, Memory Training Centers of America, Mended Hearts, National Alliance on Mental Illness, National Alopecia Areata Foundation, National Brain Tumor Society, National Coalition for Cancer Research, National Coalition for Heart and Stroke Research, National Down Syndrome Society, NHLBI Constituency Group, National Stroke Association.

National Task Group on Intellectual Disabilities and Dementia Practices, NephCure Foundation, Neurofibromatosis Network, in particular: Neurofibromatosis Inc., California; Neurofibromatosis, Michigan; Neurofibromatosis Midwest; Neurofibromatosis, Northeast; Texas Neurofibromatosis Foundation; and Washington State Neurofibromatosis Families, One Voice Against Cancer, OWL-The Voice of Women 40+, Parkinson's Action Network, Pediatric Stroke Network, Pulmonary Hypertension Association, ResearchAmerica!, Scleroderma Foundation, Sleep Research Society, Society for Neuroscience, Society of Toxicology, Sudden Arrhythmia Death Syndromes Foundation, United for Medical Research, USAgainstAlzheimer's.

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS SUPPORTING THE BILL

Arizona: Banner Alzheimer's Institute, Biodesign Research Institute of Arizona.

California: Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Salk Institute for Biological Studies, Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute, UC San Diego Moores Cancer Center, UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center.

Delaware: Yale University and Yale Cancer Center.

District of Columbia: The GW Cancer Institute.

Florida: Moffitt Cancer Center.

Georgia: Emory University Winship Cancer Institute.

Illinois: University of Chicago Medicine Comprehensive Cancer Center.

Iowa: University of Iowa Health Care.

Kansas: University of Kansas Cancer Center.

Louisiana: Tulane University School of Medicine.

Maryland: Johns Hopkins University and the Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center.

Massachusetts: Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Northeastern University, Tufts University.

Michigan: Karmanos Cancer Center, University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center.

Minnesota: Mayo Clinic, University of Minnesota Masonic Cancer Center.

Nebraska: Fred & Pamela Buffett Cancer Center.

New Jersey: North Shore-LIJ Health System and its Feinstein Institute for Medical Research.

New Mexico: Taos Health Systems, Inc., University of New Mexico Cancer Center.

New York: Associated Medical Schools of New York, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York Academy of Sciences, The NYU Langone Medical Center, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, The State University of New York System.

North Carolina: Duke Cancer Institute, UNC Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center.

Ohio: Cleveland Clinic Foundation, The Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center, James Cancer Hospital, and the Solove Cancer Institute, The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, University of Cincinnati.

Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, The Wistar Institute.

South Carolina: Hollings Cancer Center.

Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Medical Center and Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center.

Virginia: University of Virginia.

Washington: Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

Utah: Huntsman Cancer Institute.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 517—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF AND CALLING ON HAMAS TO IMMEDIATELY CEASE ALL ROCKET AND OTHER ATTACKS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 517

Whereas, on July 17, 2014, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution supporting Israel's absolute right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel, condemning the actions of Hamas, and calling for the President of the Palestinian Authority to dissolve the unity government with Hamas;

Whereas, since June 2014, Hamas has fired over 1,800 rockets at Israel;

Whereas Hamas has used a system of tunnels to smuggle weapons and launch attacks on Israel;

Whereas, since ground operations in Gaza began, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) have discovered 28 of these tunnels whose only purpose is to kill and kidnap Israelis;

Whereas Hamas' weapons arsenal includes approximately 12,000 rockets that vary in range;

Whereas innocent Israeli civilians are indiscriminately targeted by Hamas rocket attacks;

Whereas 5,000,000 Israelis are currently living under the threat of rocket attacks from Gaza;

Whereas the Iron Dome system has saved countless lives inside Israel;

Whereas, consistent with Article 51 of the United Nations charter, which recognizes a nation's right to self-defense, Israel must be allowed to take any actions necessary to remove those threats;

Whereas the IDF has used text messages, leaflet drops, phone calls, and other methods to clear out areas and avoid unnecessary civilian casualties;

Whereas Hamas uses civilians in Gaza as human shields by placing missile launchers next to schools, hospitals, mosques, and private homes;

Whereas Hamas' interior ministry has called on residents of Gaza to ignore IDF warning to get out of harm's way; and

Whereas any effort to broker a ceasefire agreement that does not eliminate those threats cannot be sustained in the long run and will leave Israel vulnerable to future attacks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel;

(2) calls on the United Nations Secretary General to immediately condemn the terrorist attacks by Hamas on Israel;

(3) urges the international community to condemn the unprovoked rocket fire at Israel;

(4) recognizes that the Government of Israel must be allowed to take actions necessary to remove the present and future threats posed by Hamas' rockets and tunnels;

(5) calls on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel;

(6) opposes any efforts to impose a cease fire that does not allow for the Government of Israel to protect its citizens from threats posed by Hamas rockets and tunnels; and

(7) calls on Hamas to stop using residents of Gaza as human shields.

SENATE RESOLUTION 518—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 12 THROUGH OCTOBER 18, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK'' TO RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF CASE MANAGEMENT IN IMPROVING HEALTH CARE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS

Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 518

Whereas case management is a collaborative process of assessment, education, planning, facilitation, care coordination, evaluation, and advocacy;

Whereas the goal of case management is to meet the health needs of the patient and the family of the patient, while respecting and assuring the right of the patient to self-determination through communication and other available resources in order to promote high-quality, cost-effective outcomes;

Whereas case managers are advocates who help patients understand their current health status, guide patients on ways to improve their health, and provide cohesion with other professionals on the health care delivery team;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America work diligently to raise awareness about the broad range of services case managers offer and to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers on the improved patient outcomes that case management services can provide;

Whereas through National Case Management Week, the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America aim to continue to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers about how vital case managers are to the successful delivery of health care;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America will celebrate National Case Management Week during the week of October 12 through October 18, 2014, in order to recognize case managers as an essential link to patients receiving quality health care; and

Whereas it is appropriate to recognize the many achievements of case managers in improving health care outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 12 through October 18, 2014, as ''National Case Management Week'';

(2) recognizes the role of case management in providing successful and cost-effective health care; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Case Management Week and learn about the field of case management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 519—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY''

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr.

TESTER, and Mr. WALSH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 519

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the experiment of the United States with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump, which took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas, included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider troops;

Whereas individuals from every State of the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2014, as ''National Airborne Day''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 520—CONDEMNING THE DOWNING OF MALAYSIA AIRLINES FLIGHT 17 AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 520

Whereas, on July 17, 2014, Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 tragically crashed in eastern Ukraine, killing all 298 passengers and crew, including 80 children;

Whereas President Barack Obama has offered President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko all possible assistance to determine the cause of the crash, including the services of the Federal Bureau of Investigations and the National Transportation Safety Board;

Whereas intelligence analysis shows that the plane was shot down by an antiaircraft missile fired from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists;

Whereas separatists have shot down 10 additional aircraft and took credit for shooting down another aircraft at approximately the same time as Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 crashed in eastern Ukraine;

Whereas separatists blocked international experts from accessing the crash site in the first 72 hours, preventing the proper care of the victims' bodies and allowing evidence from the crash to be removed and mishandled;

Whereas weapons and fighters have continued to flow across the border from the Russian Federation to eastern Ukraine, and there is evidence that the Government of the Russian Federation has been providing training to separatists fighters, including training on air defense systems;

Whereas this tragic incident has demonstrated that European and other foreign citizens are at risk from dangerous instability in Ukraine;

Whereas, on July 21, 2014, the United Nations Security Council condemned in the strongest terms the downing of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 and demanded that those responsible be held to account and that all states fully cooperate with efforts to establish accountability;

Whereas British Prime Minister David Cameron asserted, ''Russia cannot expect to continue enjoying access to European markets, European capital and European knowledge and technical expertise while she fuels conflict in one of Europe's neighbors.''; and

Whereas the United States Government has continued to implement sanctions against Russian and Ukrainian individuals responsible for destabilizing Ukraine and failing to end the violence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the shooting down of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 in Eastern Ukraine that resulted in the deaths of all 298 passengers and crew;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the families of the victims and the people of the Netherlands, Malaysia, Australia, Indonesia, Great Britain, Germany, Belgium, the Philippines, Canada, and New Zealand;

(3) supports the ongoing international investigation into the attack on Malaysian Airlines Flight 17, including unobstructed access to the crash site;

(4) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately stop the flow of weapons and fighters across the border with Ukraine, allow an Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) monitoring mission on the border, and fully cooperate with the international investigation currently underway; and

(5) urges the European Union to join the United States Government in holding the Government of the Russian Federation accountable for its destabilizing actions in Ukraine through the use of increased sanctions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 521—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2014, AS ''UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY''

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 521

Whereas on July 26, 1908, Attorney General Charles Bonaparte ordered newly-hired Federal investigators to report to the Office of the Chief Examiner of the Department of Justice, which subsequently was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas on July 26, 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), creating the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thereby laying the foundation for today's intelligence community;

Whereas the National Security Act of 1947, which appears in title 50 of the United States Code, governs the definition, composition, responsibilities, authorities, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas the intelligence community is defined by section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) to include the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the

National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, other offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national intelligence through reconnaissance programs, the intelligence elements of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the elements of the Department of Homeland Security concerned with the analysis of intelligence information, and other elements as may be designated;

Whereas July 26, 2012, was the 65th anniversary of the signing of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

Whereas the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3638) created the position of the Director of National Intelligence to serve as the head of the intelligence community and to ensure that national intelligence be timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based upon all sources available;

Whereas Congress has previously passed joint resolutions, signed by the President, to designate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15, Patriot Day on September 11, and other commemorative occasions, to honor the sacrifices of law enforcement officers and of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States has increasingly relied upon the men and women of the intelligence community to protect and defend the security of the United States in the decade since the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community, both civilian and military, have been increasingly called upon to deploy to theaters of war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere since September 11, 2001;

Whereas numerous intelligence officers of the elements of the intelligence community have been injured or killed in the line of duty;

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States are routinely called upon to accept personal hardship and sacrifice in the furtherance of their mission to protect the United States, to undertake dangerous assignments in the defense of the interests of the United States, to collect reliable information within prescribed legal authorities upon which the leaders of the United States rely in life-and-death situations, and to ''speak truth to power.'' by providing their best assessments to decision makers, regardless of political and policy considerations;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community have on numerous occasions succeeded in preventing attacks upon the United States and allies of the United States, saving numerous innocent lives; and

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States must of necessity often remain unknown and unrecognized for their substantial achievements and successes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2014, as ''United States Intelligence Professionals Day'';

(2) acknowledges the courage, fidelity, sacrifice, and professionalism of the men and women of the intelligence community of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 522—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING THE U.S.-AFRICA LEADERS SUMMIT TO BE HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FROM AUGUST 4 THROUGH 6, 2014

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CORKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 522

Whereas the United States will convene the first U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit from August 4 through August 6, 2014, featuring a congressional reception welcoming African heads of state, the U.S.-Africa Business Forum, the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) Forum, and dialogue sessions between Africa leaders and President Barack Obama on investing in Africa's future, promoting peace and regional stability, and governing for the next generation;

Whereas the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit will be the largest event held between the United States Government and African heads of state and governments;

Whereas the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit will build on the President's trip to Africa in the summer of 2013 and will strengthen ties between the United States and one of the most dynamic and fastest growing regions in the world;

Whereas the United States Government has built strong and enduring partnerships with African heads of state bilaterally and through the United Nations, African Union, and African regional institutions;

Whereas the United States Government has demonstrated its commitment to Africa's development and growth through resources, legislation, economic relationships, and initiatives, including the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), Power Africa, Feed the Future, Millennium Challenge Corporation compacts, and other efforts led by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Department of Commerce, and other agencies of the United States Government;

Whereas there are 10 authorized United Nations peacekeeping operations in Africa with over 94,000 United Nations peacekeepers working to promote peace and stability for over 131,000,000 people across the continent, in addition to additional missions led by the African Union, with United States and international support and training;

Whereas the United States has served as the global leader in investments and innovations in health across Africa, contributing significant resources to improvements in health over the past two decades through United States-led programs such as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI), and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI);

Whereas, through its investments in health across 16 priority countries in Africa over the last two decades, the United States Government has contributed to the reduction of child mortality rates by 44 percent and the reduction of maternal mortality rates by 39 percent;

Whereas the majority of the fastest growing economies in the world are in Africa, and the continent's steady annual economic growth rate of 5 percent has exceeded that of other regions in the world;

Whereas there are currently 1,000,000,000 Africans representing the fastest growing population in the world, and by 2035, the African continent will have the world's largest workforce;

Whereas individual nations in Africa and the African Union have made significant achievements and remarkable progress since the inception of the African Union 51 years ago and its transition from the Organization of African Unity;

Whereas the United States Government, recognizing the importance of Africa's youth and future generations, has invested in the next generation of African entrepreneurs, educators, civic leaders, and innovators, including through the United States-led Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI), helping them develop skills and networks to build brighter futures for their communities and countries; and

Whereas the United States Government is looking forward to hosting 50 heads of state and the Chair of the African Union at the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to demonstrate the United States commitment to Africa, deepen partnerships, and determine concrete ways that the United States can support African-led efforts to further peace and regional security, advance democracy and good governance, improve health and education services, increase trade and investment, address environmental issues, improve resilience and food security, combat wildlife trafficking, invest in women, and support the next generation of African leaders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) deeply values the historic United States commitment to Africa;

(2) affirms a future commitment to increased economic partnership with Africa;

(3) supports innovations in development and an expanded partnership with the private sector, including in the areas of energy, food security, and health;

(4) supports efforts to facilitate increased trade and investment between the United States and Africa, as well as amongst African countries;

(5) supports ongoing African-led efforts to improve peacekeeping, prevent atrocities, and combat violent extremism and terrorism;

(6) affirms the enduring partnership of the people and Government of the United States with the African people, including the youth, and urges African leaders to invest in this generation of young people, as well as the next generation;

(7) encourages leaders in Africa to make efforts toward strengthening good governance, the rule of law, and democracy, including respecting constitutional term limits, human rights, and ensuring that civil society organizations are able to function freely in their countries;

(8) supports ongoing efforts to protect and promote women and children, including through investments in education and maternal, newborn, and child health;

(9) reaffirms the strong United States investment in health in Africa, and anticipates leaders in Africa making greater and sustainable investments in healthcare;

(10) commends African investments in preventing wildlife trafficking and supports further investments, including training and equipping enforcement teams in Africa;

(11) urges African heads of state to take concrete steps to implement reforms that will further economic growth, good governance, democracy, peace, security, rule of law, and development; and

(12) expresses support for the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit from August 4 through August 6, 2014.

SENATE RESOLUTION 523—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES-INDIA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP AND THE CONTINUED DEEPENING OF BILATERAL TIES WITH INDIA

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 523

Whereas the United States-India relationship is built on mutual respect for common values, including democracy, the rule of law, a market economy, and ethnic and religious diversity, and bolstered by strong people-to-people ties, including a 3,000,000 strong Indian American diaspora;

Whereas the Senate places tremendous value on the relationship with India, and the bipartisan Senate India Caucus comprises 40 Senators and is the largest bilateral caucus in the Senate;

Whereas the United States and India have a unique opportunity, in the early days of the new administration in India, to refresh the United States-India relationship and work cooperatively to make progress that will benefit both of our countries in a broad range of areas, including education, skills development, infrastructure, and energy;

Whereas a strong economic partnership between India and the United States requires a mutual respect for innovation;

Whereas an investment environment that fosters continued research and development and the bilateral relationship between the United States and India has resulted in almost $100,000,000,000 in trade of goods and services in 2013;

Whereas the United States-India relationship is vital to promoting stability, democracy, and economic prosperity in the 21st century;

Whereas defense and security ties have led to nearly $10,000,000,000 in defense trade, and the United States-India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative has facilitated greater cooperation on joint development of defense platforms;

Whereas counterterrorism cooperation is a growing and important aspect of the partnership given the terrorist threats faced by both countries, including from groups such as al Qaeda and Lashkar-e-Taiba;

Whereas the United States values India's role as a net security provider in the Indian Ocean Region and promoter of regional stability and maritime security in the Asian Pacific region; and

Whereas India is a close partner of the United States in Afghanistan, has committed over $2,000,000,000 in development assistance, and shares the United States' goal of a stable, democratic, and prosperous Afghanistan; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Prime Minister Narenda Modi should be able to address the United States Congress at the earliest opportunity;

(2) the United States Government should develop a clear strategic plan for its relationship with India and hold a robust strategic dialogue in New Delhi that lays out clear objectives and deliverables to set a positive trajectory for the relationship and moves from dialogue to action to build a path forward for more ambitious cooperation;

(3) the United States nominate and confirm an Ambassador to India as soon as possible;

(4) the United States and India should continue to expand economic engagement, including finalizing a bilateral investment treaty and reviving the Trade Policy Forum;

(5) the United States Government should urge the Government of India to continue with its economic liberalization reforms, including lifting the caps on foreign direct investment and taking steps to enhance protections for intellectual property, and consider discussions with other Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum nations about Indian membership in APEC;

(6) the United States and India should expand energy cooperation, by India fully implementing the 2008 civil nuclear pact, and the United States pursuing increased export of liquefied natural gas to India;

(7) the United States and India should continue to deepen defense and security cooperation, to include expanded joint exercises and training, sales and co-production, holding a ''2+2'' meeting of senior defense and foreign affairs officials, and reestablishing the Defense Policy Group; and

(8) the United States Government should urge the Government of India to modify its offset regime so funds can flow to a second tier of Indian priorities such as education, skills development, or manufacturing.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41—DENOUNCING THE USE OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS BY HAMAS AND OTHER TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS IN VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 41

Whereas the term ''human shields'' refers to the use of civilians, prisoners of war, or other noncombatants whose mere presence is designed to protect combatants and objects from attack;

Whereas the use of human shields violates international humanitarian law (also referred to as the Law of War or Law of Armed Conflict);

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 50(1) to the Geneva Convention defines ''civilian'' as, ''[a]ny person who does not belong to one of the categories of persons referred to in Article 4(A)(1), (2), (3), and (6) of the Third Convention and in Article 43 of this Protocol. In the case of doubt whether a person is a civilian, that person shall be considered a civilian.'';

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 51(7) to the Geneva Convention states, ''[T]he presence or movement of the civilian population or individual civilians shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular in attempts to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield, favour or impede military operations. The Parties to the conflict shall not direct the movement of the civilian population or individual civilians in order to attempt to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield military operations.'';

Whereas, since June 15, 2014, there have been over 2,000 rockets fired by Hamas and other terrorist organizations from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Hamas uses civilian populations as human shields by placing its underground tunnel network and missile batteries in densely populated areas, and in and around schools, hospitals, and mosques;

Whereas Israel drops leaflets, makes announcements, places phone calls and sends text messages to the Palestinian people in Gaza warning them in advance that an attack is imminent, and goes to extraordinary lengths to target only terrorist actors;

Whereas Hamas has urged the residents of Gaza to ignore the Israeli warnings and to remain in their houses and has encouraged Palestinians to gather on the roofs of their homes to act as human shields; and

Whereas Hamas, al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Al-Shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and other foreign terrorist organizations typically use innocent civilians as human shields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the brutal and illegal tactic by Hamas and other terrorist organizations of using innocent civilians as human shields;

(2) calls on the international community to recognize the grave breaches of international law committed by Hamas in using human shields;

(3) places responsibility for launching the rocket attacks on Hamas and other terrorist organizations, such as Islamic Jihad, in Gaza;

(4) supports the sovereign right of the Government of Israel to defend its territory and stop the rocket attacks on its citizens;

(5) expresses condolences to the families of the innocent victims on both sides of the conflict;

(6) supports Palestinian civilians who reject Hamas and all forms of terrorism, desiring to live in peace with their Israeli neighbors; and

(7) calls on Mahmoud Abbas to condemn the use of innocent civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3626. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3627. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3628. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3629. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3630. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3631. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3632. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3633. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3634. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3635. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3636. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3637. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3638. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3639. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3640. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3641. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3642. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3643. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3644. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3645. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3646. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3647. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3648. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3649. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3650. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3651. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3652. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3653. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3654. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3655. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3656. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3657. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3658. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3659. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3608 submitted by Mr. PAUL and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3660. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3661. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3662. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3663. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3664. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3665. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3666. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3667. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3668. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3669. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3670. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3671. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3672. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3673. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3674. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3675. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3676. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3677. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3678. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3679. Mr. JOHANNS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3680. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3681. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3682. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3683. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3684. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3685. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3686. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3687. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3688. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3689. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3690. Mr. REID (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 462, recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3626. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EMPLOYEES WITH HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) EXEMPTION FOR HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph for any month, an employer may elect not to take into account for a month as an employee any individual who, for such month, has medical coverage under—

''(i) chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, including coverage under the TRICARE program, or

''(ii) under a health care program under chapter 17 or 18 of title 38, United States Code, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3627. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''under this section to a taxpayer'' and all that follows and inserting ''under this section to any taxpayer unless—

''(1) such taxpayer includes the taxpayer's valid identification number (as defined in section 6428(h)(2)) on the return of tax for the taxable year, and

''(2) with respect to any qualifying child, the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on such return of tax.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3628. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF INCENTIVES FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL.

(a) CREDITS FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL USED AS FUEL.—Subsection (g) of section 40A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(b) EXCISE TAX CREDITS AND OUTLAY PAYMENTS FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL FUEL MIXTURES.—

(1) Paragraph (6) of section 6426(c) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 6427(e)(6) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after December 31, 2013.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN PERIODS DURING 2014.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any biodiesel mixture credit properly determined under section 6426(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for periods after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, such credit shall be allowed, and any refund or payment attributable to such credit (including any payment under section 6427(e) of such Code) shall be made, only in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall provide. Such Secretary shall issue guidance within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act providing for a one-time submission of claims covering periods described in the preceding sentence. Such guidance shall provide for a 180-day period for the submission of such claims (in such manner as prescribed by such Secretary) to begin not later than 30 days after such guidance is issued. Such claims shall be paid by such Secretary not later than 60 days after receipt. If such Secretary has not paid pursuant to a claim filed under this subsection within 60 days after the date of the filing of such claim, the claim shall be paid with interest from such date determined by using the overpayment rate and method under section 6621 of such Code.

SA 3629. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 3630. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. FEDERALISM IN MEDICAL MARIJUANA.

(a) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term ''State'' has the meaning given that term under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(b) STATE MEDICAL MARIJUANA LAWS.—Notwithstanding section 708 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 903) or any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enact and implement a law that authorizes the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of marijuana for medical use.

(c) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN PROSECUTIONS.—No prosecution may be commenced or maintained against any physician or patient for a violation of any Federal law (including regulations) that prohibits the conduct described in subsection (b) if the State in which the violation occurred has in effect a law described in subsection (b) before, on, or after the date on which the violation occurred, including—

(1) Alabama;

(2) Alaska;

(3) Arizona;

(4) California;

(5) Colorado;

(6) Connecticut;
(7) Delaware;
(8) the District of Columbia;
(9) Florida;
(10) Hawaii;
(11) Illinois;
(12) Iowa;
(13) Kentucky;
(14) Maine;
(15) Maryland;
(16) Massachusetts;
(17) Michigan;
(18) Minnesota;
(19) Mississippi;
(20) Missouri;
(21) Montana;
(22) Nevada;
(23) New Hampshire;
(24) New Jersey;
(25) New Mexico;
(26) Oregon;
(27) Rhode Island;
(28) South Carolina;
(29) Tennessee;
(30) Utah;
(31) Vermont;
(32) Washington; and
(33) Wisconsin.

SA 3631. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTING PATIENTS FROM HIGHER PREMIUMS.

Section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), as amended by section 10905 of such Act and by section 1406 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), is repealed.

SA 3632. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PERMANENT MORATORIUM ON INTERNET ACCESS TAXES AND MULTIPLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Internet has continued to drive economic growth, productivity and innovation since the Internet Tax Freedom Act was first enacted in 1998.

(2) The Internet promotes a nationwide economic environment that facilitates innovation, promotes efficiency, and empowers people to broadly share their ideas.

(3) According to the National Broadband Plan, cost remains the biggest barrier to consumer broadband adoption. Keeping Internet access affordable promotes consumer access to this critical gateway to jobs, education, healthcare, and entrepreneurial opportunities, regardless of race, income, or neighborhood.

(4) Small business owners rely heavily on affordable Internet access, providing them with access to new markets, additional consumers, and an opportunity to compete in the global economy.

(5) Economists have recognized that excessive taxation of innovative communications technologies reduces economic welfare more than taxes on other sectors of the economy.

(6) The provision of affordable access to the Internet is fundamental to the American economy and access to it must be protected from multiple and discriminatory taxes at the State and local level.

(7) As a massive global network that spans political boundaries, the Internet is inherently a matter of interstate and foreign commerce within the jurisdiction of the United States Congress under article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note) is amended by striking '' during the period beginning November 1, 2003, and ending November 1, 2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxes imposed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3633. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAXES.

(a) ESTATE TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2210. TERMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter shall not apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act.

''(b) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED DOMESTIC TRUSTS.—In applying section 2056A with respect to the surviving spouse of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act—

''(1) section 2056A(b)(1)(A) shall not apply to distributions made after the 10-year period beginning on such date, and

''(2) section 2056A(b)(1)(B) shall not apply on or after such date.''.

(b) GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter G of chapter 13 of subtitle B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2664. TERMINATION.

''This chapter shall not apply to generation-skipping transfers on or after the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2210. Termination.''.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 13 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2664. Termination.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and generation-skipping transfers, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. _____. MODIFICATIONS OF GIFT TAX.

(a) COMPUTATION OF GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(A) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

''(B) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for each of the preceding calendar periods.

''(2) RATE SCHEDULE.—

''If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:.	**The tentative tax is:**
Not over $10,000	18% of such amount.
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,800, plus 20% of the excess over $10,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $40,000.	$3,800, plus 22% of the excess over $20,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $60,000.	$8,200, plus 24% of the excess over $40,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $80,000.	$13,000, plus 26% of the excess over $60,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $100,000.	$18,200, plus 28% of the excess over $80,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$23,800, plus 30% of the excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $250,000.	$38,800, plus 32% of the excess of $150,000.
Over $250,000 but not over $500,000.	$70,800, plus 34% of the excess over $250,000.
Over $500,000	$155,800, plus 35% of the excess of $500,000.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Section 2511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and except as provided in regulations, a transfer in trust shall be treated as a taxable gift under section 2503, unless the trust is treated as wholly owned by the donor or the donor's spouse under subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1.''.

(c) LIFETIME GIFT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2502(a)(2) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were $5,000,000, reduced by''.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 2505 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year after 2011, the dollar amount in subsection (a)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2010' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2505(a) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) The heading for section 2505 of such Code is amended by striking ''**UNIFIED**''.

(3) The item in the table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 of such Code relating to section 2505 is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 2505. Credit against gift tax.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to gifts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying sections 1015(d), 2502, and 2505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as 2 separate calendar years one of which ends on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and the other of which begins on such date of enactment.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 2504(b).—For purposes of applying section 2504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as one preceding calendar period.

SA 3634. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PERMANENT RULE REGARDING BASIS ADJUSTMENT TO STOCK OF S CORPORATIONS MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1367(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. _____. REDUCED RECOGNITION PERIOD FOR BUILT-IN GAINS OF S CORPORATIONS MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (7) of section 1374(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(7) RECOGNITION PERIOD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term recognition period means the 5-year period beginning with the 1st day of the 1st taxable year for which the corporation was an S corporation. For purposes of applying this section to any amount includible in income by reason of distributions to shareholders pursuant to section 593(e), the preceding sentence shall be applied without regard to the phrase 5-year.

''(B) INSTALLMENT SALES.—If an S corporation sells an asset and reports the income from the sale using the installment method under section 453, the treatment of all payments received shall be governed by the provisions of this paragraph applicable to the taxable year in which such sale was made.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3635. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESEARCH CREDIT SIMPLIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

''(1) 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined,

''(2) 20 percent of so much of the basic research payments for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average basic research payments for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, plus

''(3) 20 percent of the amounts paid or incurred by the taxpayer in carrying on any trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year (including as contributions) to an energy research consortium for energy research.''.

(b) REPEAL OF TERMINATION.—Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 41 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE RESEARCH EXPENSES FOR PRIOR YEARS.—

''(1) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—In any case in which the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses in any one of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the amount determined under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.

''(2) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding whether the period for filing a claim for credit or refund has expired for any taxable year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses, or average basic research payments, taken into account under subsection (a), the qualified research expenses and basic research payments taken into account in determining such averages shall be determined on a basis consistent with the determination of qualified research expenses and basic research payments, respectively, for the credit year.

''(B) PREVENTION OF DISTORTIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations to prevent distortions in calculating a taxpayer's qualified research expenses or basic research payments caused by a change in accounting methods used by such taxpayer between the current year and a year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses or average basic research payments taken into account under subsection (a).''.

(2) Section 41(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking all that precedes paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(e) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'basic research payment' means, with respect to any taxable year, any amount paid in cash during such taxable year by a corporation to any qualified organization for basic research but only if—

''(A) such payment is pursuant to a written agreement between such corporation and such qualified organization, and

''(B) such basic research is to be performed by such qualified organization.

''(2) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT THAT RESEARCH BE PERFORMED BY THE ORGANIZATION.—In the case of a qualified organization described in subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (3), subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.'',

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and

(C) in paragraph (4) as so redesignated, by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(3) Section 41(f)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A)(i) by striking '', and the gross receipts'' in subparagraph (A)(i) and all that follows through ''determined under clause (iii)'',

(ii) by striking clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) and redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), thereof, as clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively,

(iii) by striking ''and (iv)'' each place it appears in subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated) and inserting ''and (iii)'',

(iv) by striking subclause (IV) of subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated), by striking '', and'' at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(III) (as so redesignated) and inserting a period, and by adding ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated),

(v) by striking ''(A)(vi)'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''(A)(v)'', and

(vi) by striking ''(A)(iv)(II)'' in subparagraph (B)(i)(II) and inserting ''(A)(iii)(II)'',

(B) by striking '', and the gross receipts of the predecessor,'' in subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated),

(C) by striking '', and the gross receipts of,'' in subparagraph (B),

(D) by striking '', or gross receipts of,'' in subparagraph (B)(i)(I), and

(E) by striking subparagraph (C).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2013.

SA 3636. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF EXPENSING CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed—'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $500,000.''.

(2) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds—'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $2,000,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Clause (ii) of section 179(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking '', to which section 167 applies, and which is placed in service in a taxable

year beginning after 2002 and before 2014'' and inserting ''and to which section 167 applies''.

(c) ELECTION.—Paragraph (2) of section 179(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''may not be revoked'' and all that follows through ''and before 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''IRREVOCABLE'' in the heading thereof.

(d) AIR CONDITIONING AND HEATING UNITS.—Paragraph (1) of section 179(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''and shall not include air conditioning or heating units''.

(e) QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—Subsection (f) of section 179 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' in paragraph (1), and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(c)(2)(A) for such calendar year, determined by substituting calendar year 2013 for calendar year 2012 in clause (ii) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under subparagraph (A) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3637. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. CANCELLATION CEILINGS FOR STEWARDSHIP END RESULT AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 604(d) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) CANCELLATION CEILINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief and the Director may obligate funds to cover any potential cancellation or termination costs for an agreement or contract under subsection (b) in stages that are economically or programmatically viable.

''(B) NOTICE.—

''(i) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before entering into a multiyear agreement or contract under subsection (b) that includes a cancellation ceiling in excess of $25,000,000, but does not include proposed funding for the costs of cancelling the agreement or contract up to the cancellation ceiling established in the agreement or contract, the Chief and the Director shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a written notice that includes—

''(I)(aa) the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed for each program year in the agreement or contract; and

''(bb) the reasons for the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed under item (aa);

''(II) the extent to which the costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the agreement or contract; and

''(III) a financial risk assessment of not including budgeting for the costs of agreement or contract cancellation.

''(ii) TRANSMITTAL TO OMB.—At least 14 days before the date on which the Chief and Director enter into an agreement or contract under subsection (b), the Chief and Director shall transmit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a copy of the written notice submitted under clause (i).''.

SA 3638. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL WRITTEN PRIVACY NOTICE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT.

Section 503 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL WRITTEN NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—A financial institution that—

''(1) provides nonpublic personal information in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b)(2) or (e) of section 502 or regulations prescribed under section 504(b);

''(2) has not changed its policies and practices with respect to disclosing nonpublic personal information from the policies and practices that were disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers in accordance with this section; and

''(3) otherwise provides customers access to such most recent disclosure in electronic or other form permitted by regulations prescribed under section 504,

shall not be required to provide an annual written disclosure under this section, until such time as the financial institution fails to comply with paragraph (1), (2), or (3).''.

SA 3639. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON LAND MANAGEMENT MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall not implement or limit any modification to a public or private land-related policy or subsurface mineral right-related policy or practice that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act relating to the listing of the Lesser Prairie Chicken as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 3640. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENHANCEMENT OF THE DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.

(a) INCREASE IN DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.—

(1) INCREASE IN INCOMES ELIGIBLE FOR FULL CREDIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 21(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable percentage' means 20 percent reduced (but not below zero) by 1 percentage point for each $5,000 (or fraction thereof) by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds $200,000.''.

(2) INCREASE IN DOLLAR LIMIT ON AMOUNT CREDITABLE.—Subsection (c) of section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''$3,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$8,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$6,000'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$16,000''.

(3) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2015, the $200,000 amount in subsection (a)(2) and each of the dollar amounts in subsection (c) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '2014' for '1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under paragraph (1) shall be rounded—

''(A) for purposes of the dollar amount in subsection (a)(2), the nearest multiple of $1,000, and

''(B) for purposes of the dollar amounts in subsection (c), the nearest multiple of $100.''.

(b) DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT TO BE REFUNDABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 21, as amended by subsection (a), as section 36C, and

(B) by moving section 36C, as so redesignated, from subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 to the location immediately before section 37 in subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 23(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''21(e)'' and inserting ''36C(e)''.

(B) Paragraph (6) of section 35(g) of such Code is amended by striking ''21(e)'' and inserting ''36C(e)''.

(C) Paragraph (1) of section 36C(a) of such Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) is amended by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this subtitle''.

(D) Subparagraph (C) of section 129(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(e)'' and inserting ''section 36C(e)''.

(E) Paragraph (2) of section 129(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(d)(2)'' and inserting ''section 36C(d)(2)''.

(F) Paragraph (1) of section 129(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(b)(2)'' and inserting ''section 36C(b)(2)''.

(G) Subsection (e) of section 213 of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21'' and inserting ''section 36C''.

(H) Subparagraph (A) of section 6211(b)(4) of such Code is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(I) Subparagraph (H) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21'' and inserting ''section 36C''.

(J) Subparagraph (L) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21, 24, 32,'' and inserting ''section 24, 32, 36C,''.

(K) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(L) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following:

''Sec. 36C. Expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment.''.

(M) The table of sections for subpart A of such part IV of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 21.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 3641. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SMALL BUSINESS ACCESS TO CAPITAL.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014''.

(b) NEW TRANCHES OF CAPITAL FOR SUCCESSFUL STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 3003 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5702) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION AND COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'eligible participating State' means a participating State that has certified to the Secretary that the State has expended, transferred, or obligated not less than 80 percent of the second ⅓ of the 2010 allocation transferred to the State under subsection (c)(1)(A)(iii); and

''(B) the term 'unused funds' means—

''(i) amounts made available to the Secretary under clause (i)(II) or (ii)(II) of paragraph (2)(E); and

''(ii) amounts made available to the Secretary under paragraph (4)(B)(ii).

''(2) ALLOCATION FOR 2010 PARTICIPATING STATES.—

''(A) ALLOCATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (6)(D), the Secretary shall allocate a total of $500,000,000 among eligible participating States in the same ratio as funds were allocated under the 2010 allocation under subsection (b)(1) among participating States.

''(B) APPLICATION.—An eligible participating State desiring to receive funds allocated under this paragraph shall submit an application—

''(i) not later than the later of—

''(I) June 30, 2015; or

''(II) the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014; and

''(ii) in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(C) AVAILABILITY OF ALLOCATED AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding subsection (c)(1), after an eligible participating State approved by the Secretary to receive an allocation under this paragraph has certified to the Secretary that the eligible participating State has expended, transferred, or obligated not less than 80 percent of the last ⅓ of the 2010 allocation to the eligible participating State, the Secretary shall transfer to the eligible participating State the funds allocated to the eligible participating State under this paragraph.

''(D) USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—An eligible participating State may use funds transferred under this paragraph for any purpose authorized under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (c)(3).

''(E) TERMINATION OF AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible participating State has not certified to the Secretary that the State has expended, transferred, or obligated not less than 80 percent of the last ⅓ of the 2010 allocation as of the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary approves the eligible participating State to receive an allocation under this paragraph, any amounts allocated to the eligible participating State under this paragraph—

''(I) may not be transferred to the eligible participating State under this paragraph; and

''(II) shall be available to the Secretary to make awards under paragraph (4).

''(ii) OTHER AMOUNTS.—Effective on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014, any amounts allocated under this paragraph to a participating State that, as of such date, is not an eligible participating State or to an eligible participating State that did not submit an application under subparagraph (B) or was not approved by the Secretary to receive an allocation under this paragraph—

''(I) may not be transferred to an eligible participating State under this paragraph; and

''(II) shall be available to the Secretary to make awards under paragraph (4).

''(3) COMPETITIVE FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (6)(D), the Secretary may award, on a competitive basis, not more than a total of $1,000,000,000 to participating States and consortiums of participating States for use for any purpose authorized under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (c)(3).

''(B) APPLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A participating State or consortium of participating States desiring to receive an award under this paragraph shall submit an application—

''(I) not later than the date established by the Secretary, which shall be not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014; and

''(II) in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(ii) NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS.—A participating State may submit not more than 1 application on behalf of the participating State and not more than 1 application as part of a consortium of participating States.

''(iii) STATES THAT DID NOT PARTICIPATE.—A State that is not a participating State may apply to the Secretary for approval to be a participating State for purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (4), in accordance with section 3004.

''(C) FACTORS.—In determining whether to make an award to a participating State or consortium of participating States under this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider—

''(i) how the participating State or consortium of participating States plan to use amounts provided under the award under the approved State program to—

''(I) leverage private sector capital;

''(II) create and retain jobs during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the award;

''(III) serve businesses that have been incorporated or in operation for not more than 5 years; and

''(IV) serve low-or-moderate-income communities;

''(ii) the extent to which the participating State or consortium of participating States will establish or continue a robust self-evaluation of the activities of the participating State or consortium of participating States using amounts made available under this title;

''(iii) the extent to which the participating State or consortium of participating States will provide non-Federal funds in excess of the amount required under subparagraph (E); and

''(iv) the extent to which the participating State expended, obligated, or transferred the 2010 allocation to the State.

''(D) AWARD OF FUNDS.—

''(i) FIRST TRANCHE.—Notwithstanding subsection (c)(1), and not later than 30 days after making an award under this paragraph to a participating State or consortium of participating States, the Secretary shall transfer 50 percent of the amount of the award to the participating State or consortium of participating States.

''(ii) SECOND TRANCHE.—After a participating State or consortium of participating States has certified to the Secretary that the participating State or consortium of participating States has expended, transferred, or obligated not less than 80 percent of the amount transferred under clause (i), the Secretary shall transfer to the participating State or consortium of participating States the remaining amount of the award.

''(E) STATE SHARE.—The State share of the cost of the activities, excluding administrative expenses, carried out using an award under this paragraph shall be not less than 10 percent. The Secretary may determine what contributions by a State qualify as part of the State share of the cost for purposes of this subparagraph.

''(4) AWARD OF UNUSED FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award, on a competitive basis, unused funds to participating States for use for any purpose authorized under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (c)(3).

''(B) UNUSED 2010 FUNDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine whether any amounts allocated to a participating State under subsection (b) shall be deemed no longer allocated and no longer available if a participating State has not certified to the Secretary that the State has expended, transferred, or obligated 80 percent of the second ⅓ of the 2010 allocation by December 31, 2016.

''(ii) AVAILABILITY.—Effective on the date of the determination under clause (i), any amounts identified in the determination that were deemed no longer allocated and no longer available to the participating State shall be available to the Secretary to make awards under this paragraph.

''(C) APPLICATION.—A participating State desiring to receive an award under this paragraph shall submit an application—

''(i) not later than 3 months after the date on which funds are deemed no longer allocated and no longer available to any participating State; and

''(ii) in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(D) FACTORS.—In determining whether to make an award to a participating State under this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider the factors described in paragraph (3)(C).

''(E) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—The Secretary may not make an award of less than $5,000,000 under this paragraph.

''(5) EXTENSION OF COMPLIANCE AND REPORTING.—Notwithstanding section 3007(d), a participating State that receives funds under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) shall submit quarterly and annual reports containing the information described in section 3007 until the end of the 8-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014.

''(6) ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES FOR PARTICIPATING STATES.—A participating State may use not more than 3 percent of the amount made available to the participating State under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) for administrative expenses incurred by the participating State in implementing an approved State program.

''(B) CONTRACTING.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014, and notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to public contracting, the Secretary may enter into contracts to carry out this subsection.

''(C) AMOUNTS NOT ASSISTANCE.—Any amounts transferred to a participating State under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) shall not be considered assistance for purposes of subtitle V of title 31, United States Code.

''(D) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated to the Secretary, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,500,000,000 to carry out this subsection, including to pay reasonable costs of administering the programs under this subsection, to remain available until expended.

''(E) TERMINATION OF SECRETARY'S PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS.—The authorities and duties of the Secretary to implement and administer the program under this subsection shall terminate at the end of the 8-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Small Business Access to Capital Act of 2014.''.

SA 3642. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EMPLOYEE PAYROLL TAX HOLIDAY FOR NEWLY HIRED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(d) SPECIAL EXEMPTION FOR ELIGIBLE VETERANS HIRED DURING CERTAIN CALENDAR QUARTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to 50 percent of the wages paid by the employer with respect to employment during the holiday period of any eligible veteran for services performed—

''(A) in a trade or business of the employer, or

''(B) in the case of an employer exempt from tax under section 501(a), in furtherance of the activities related to the purpose or function constituting the basis of the employer's exemption under such section.

''(2) HOLIDAY PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'holiday period' means the period of 4 consecutive calendar quarters beginning with the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act.

''(3) ELIGIBLE VETERAN.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible veteran' means a veteran who—

''(i) begins work for the employer during the holiday period,

''(ii) was discharged or released from the Armed Forces of the United States under conditions other than dishonorable, and

''(iii) is not an individual described in section 51(i)(1) (applied by substituting 'employer' for 'taxpayer' each place it appears).

''(B) VETERAN.—The term 'veteran' means any individual who—

''(i) has served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than 180 days, or has been discharged or released from active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a service-connected disability (within the meaning of section 101 of title 38, United States Code),

''(ii) has not served on extended active duty (as such term is used in section 51(d)(3)(B)) in the Armed Forces of the United States on any day during the 60-day period ending on the hiring date, and

''(iii) provides to the employer a copy of the individual's DD Form 214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty, that includes the nature and type of discharge.

''(4) ELECTION.—An employer may elect not to have this subsection apply. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary may require.

''(5) COORDINATION WITH WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT.—For coordination with the work opportunity credit, see section 51(3)(D).''.

(b) COORDINATION WITH WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) DENIAL OF CREDIT FOR VETERANS SUBJECT TO 50 PERCENT PAYROLL TAX HOLIDAY.—If section 3111(d)(1) (as amended by the Bring Jobs Home Act) applies to any wages paid by an employer, the term 'qualified veteran' does not include any individual who begins work for the employer during the holiday period (as defined in section 3111(d)(2)) unless the employer makes an election not to have section 3111(d) apply.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 51 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (5).

SA 3643. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 317. REPORT FOR ENERGY-REMOTE MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, in conjunction with the assistant secretaries responsible for installations and environment for the military services, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the current cost and sources of energy at each military installation in States with energy-remote military installations, and viable and feasible options for achieving energy efficiency and cost savings at those military installations.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A comprehensive, installation-specific assessment of feasible and mission-appropriate energy initiatives supporting energy production and consumption at energy-remote military installations.

(B) An assessment of current sources of energy in States with energy-remote military installations and potential future sources that are technologically feasible, cost-effective, and mission-appropriate.

(C) A comprehensive implementation strategy to include required investment for feasible energy efficiency options determined to be the most beneficial and cost-effective, where appropriate, and consistent with Department of Defense priorities.

(D) An explanation on how military services are working collaboratively in order to leverage lessons learned on potential energy efficiency solutions.

(E) An assessment of State and local partnership opportunities that could achieve efficiency and cost savings, and any legislative authorities required to carry out such partnerships or agreements.

(3) UTILIZATION OF OTHER EFFORTS.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary shall take into consideration completed and ongoing efforts by agencies of the Federal Government to analyze and develop energy-efficient solutions in States with energy-remote military installations, including the Department of Defense information available in the Annual Energy Management Report.

(4) COORDINATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AND OTHER ENTITIES.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary may work in conjunction and coordinate with the States containing energy-remote military installations, local communities, and other Federal departments and agencies.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''energy-remote military installation'' means military installations in the United States not connected to an extensive electrical energy grid.

SA 3644. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 354. CLARIFICATION THAT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES PAID USING NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS ARE SUBJECT TO THE SAME COST-COMPARISON REVIEW PROCEDURES AS OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

Section 2461(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(1) by inserting '', including nonappropriated functions,'' after ''No function''; and

(2) by inserting '', including civilian employees who perform nonappropriated functions,'' after ''Department of Defense civilian employees''.

SA 3645. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. CREDIT FOR SHRIMP PRODUCTION AND EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45S. CREDIT FOR SHRIMP PRODUCTION AND EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of a shrimp harvester or shrimp processor, the shrimp production and efficiency improvements credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to $0.50 per pound of wild-caught shrimp lawfully harvested or processed by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section

''(1) SHRIMP HARVESTER.—The term 'shrimp harvester' means any vessel with a valid commercial license issued by any State or territory of the United States to harvest shrimp from a wild fishery.

''(2) SHRIMP PROCESSOR.—The term 'shrimp processor' means any facility located within the United States with a valid processing license for processing shrimp.

''(3) POUND.—The term 'pound' means, with respect to wild-caught shrimp, the round (whole) weight by pound of the wild-caught shrimp, or if such shrimp is not in whole form, the weight by pound of such shrimp equivalent to the round (whole) weight of such shrimp, based on the conversion factors used by the National Marine Fisheries Service. In the case of a shrimp processor, the weight of wild-caught shrimp shall be determined before processing operations are undertaken.

''(4) WILD-CAUGHT SHRIMP.—The term 'wild-caught shrimp' means shrimp that qualifies as 'wild fish' according to section 281(9) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638(9)).

''(c) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply to wild-caught shrimp harvested or processed after December 31, 2019.''.

(2) CREDIT TO BE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of such Code is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (35), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) the shrimp production and efficiency improvements credit determined under section 45S(a).''.

(B) CREDIT ALLOWABLE AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (B) of section 38(c)(4) of such Code is amended by redesignating clauses (vii) through (ix) as clauses (viii) through (x), respectively, and by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

''(vii) the credit determined under section 45S,''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45S. Credit for shrimp production and efficiency improvements.''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to wild-caught shrimp (as defined in section 45S(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section) harvested or processed after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

(b) MODIFICATION TO CHILD TAX CREDIT REQUIRING PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP OR RESIDENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding ''and includes with such return information (in such form and manner as the Secretary prescribes) which establishes that the qualifying child is a citizen, national, or resident of the United States'' before the period at the end thereof.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3646. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.

Section 9(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(b)) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''In each case, prior to an election, the Board shall determine, in order to ensure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this Act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining. Unless otherwise stated in this Act, excluding acute health care facilities, the unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining shall consist of employees that share a sufficient community of interest. In determining whether employees share a sufficient community of interest, the Board shall consider (1) similarity of wages, benefits, and working conditions; (2) similarity of skills and training; (3) centrality of management and common supervision; (4) extent of interchange and frequency of contact between employees; (5) integration of the work flow and interrelationship of the production process; (6) the consistency of the unit with the employer's organizational structure; (7) similarity of job functions and work; and (8) the bargaining history in the particular unit and the industry. To avoid the proliferation or fragmentation of bargaining units, employees shall not be excluded from the unit unless the interests of the group sought are sufficiently distinct from those of other employees to warrant the establishment of a separate unit. Whether additional employees should be included in a proposed unit shall be based on whether such additional employees and proposed unit members share a sufficient community of interest, with the exception of proposed accretions to an existing unit, in which the inclusion of additional employees shall be based on whether such additional employees and existing unit members share an overwhelming community of interest and the additional employees have little or no separate identity.''.

SA 3647. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EQUAL ACCESS TO DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS FOR ORGANIZATIONS SEEKING TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 7428(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) with respect to the initial qualification or continuing qualification of an organization as an organization described in section 501(c) or 501(d) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or as an organization described in section 170(c)(2),''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to pleadings filed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3648. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NOTICE REQUIRED BEFORE REVOCATION OF TAX EXEMPT STATUE FOR FAILURE TO FILE RETURN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6033(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) REQUIREMENT OF NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date an organization described in paragraph (1) fails to file the annual return or notice referenced in paragraph (1) for 2 consecutive years, the Secretary shall notify the organization—

''(i) that the Internal Revenue Service has no record of such a return or notice from such organization for 2 consecutive years, and

''(ii) about the penalty that will occur under this subsection if the organization fails to file such a return or notice by the date of the next filing deadline.

The notification under the preceding sentence shall include information about how to comply with the filing requirements under subsection (a)(1) and (i).''.

(b) REINSTATEMENT WITHOUT APPLICATION.—Paragraph (3) of section 6033(j) of such Code, as redesignated under subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Any organization'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any organization'', and

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

''(B) RETROACTIVE REINSTATEMENT WITHOUT APPLICATION IF ACTUAL NOTICE NOT PROVIDED.—If an organization described in paragraph (1)—

''(i) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the organization did not receive the notice required under paragraph (2), and

''(ii) files an annual return or notice referenced in paragraph (1) for the current year,

then the Secretary may reinstate the organization's exempt status effective from the date of the revocation under paragraph (1) without the need for an application.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to notices and returns required to be filed after December 31, 2014.

SA 3649. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact comprehensive pro-growth tax reform that lowers corporate and individual tax rates and modernizes the international tax system of the United States in order to promote American jobs and competitiveness and help families be more financially secure.

SA 3650. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SOUND REGULATION ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Sound Regulation Act of 2014''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Growing Federal regulation that is highly prescriptive in nature burdens and impairs the international competitiveness of industry in the United States.

(2) Prescriptive regulation takes away flexibility, is adversarial in nature, leads to unintended consequences, and, especially as it proliferates, slows economic growth and job creation.

(3) Despite evidence of increasing regulatory costs, Federal agencies hold fast to the presumption that their rules are in the public interest.

(4) Some statutes prohibit agencies from considering costs and benefits in rulemaking, although no statutes prohibit agencies from analyzing the costs and benefits of rules for informative purposes.

(5)(A) Cost-benefit analysis is not institutionalized for independent regulatory agencies.

(B) Executive agencies perform cost-benefit analysis pursuant to Executive order and under the purview of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (commonly referred to as ''OIRA''), which takes direction from the President.

(C) Peer review is not required for cost-benefit analysis by independent regulatory agencies or executive agencies.

(6) There are no—

(A) statutory standards for cost-benefit analysis in Federal rulemaking; or

(B) consistent, material consequences when rules are based on faulty or inadequate analysis.

(7) Agencies—

(A) conduct their own regulatory impact analysis—

(i) largely by methods of their own choosing; and

(ii) only on a small fraction of the rules they issue; and

(B) use regulatory cost-benefit analysis mainly in support of favored, preconceived rules rather than as a decision tool.

(8) Common deficiencies in the regulatory analysis used by agencies include—

(A) lack of a coherent theory by which to—

(i) define a problem;

(ii) determine why the problem occurs; and

(iii) guide the agency to the most efficient response;

(B) lack of objective evidence that an actionable problem actually exists, what its dimensions are, and how they differ from acceptable norms;

(C) lack of comprehensive analysis to—

(i) determine whether a market malfunction exists; and

(ii) orient rulemaking to the causes, not the symptoms, of the market malfunction;

(D) failure to set clear and realistic objectives whose benefits justify the cost of achieving the objectives;

(E) objectives that—

(i) are disconnected from costs; and

(ii) may be expansive and vague so that any regulation can be made to appear beneficial;

(F) agencies increasingly claiming—

(i) incidental benefits (also know as ''co-benefits'') that are not in furtherance of the stated objective; and

(ii) even private, as opposed to public, benefits for rules;

(G) failure to—

(i) develop regulatory options in light of market analysis; and

(ii) rank regulatory options by how efficiently they will improve the market process;

(H) inconsistent assumptions and methodologies across agencies;

(I) invalid baselines for gauging regulatory effects;

(J) the omission of important impacts, such as the impact on employment and on the international competitiveness of United States firms;

(K) failure to reevaluate regulations after implementation; and

(L) failure to consider the cumulative costs of regulation by the various Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies.

(9)(A) Despite continually changing market conditions, agencies do not—

(i) regularly review their existing regulations and regulatory regimes; or

(ii) review the division of functions—

(I) among different Federal agencies; or

(II) among Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies.

(B) Regulations lose their purpose, yet linger and accumulate, imposing unnecessary costs and slowing economic growth to the detriment of—

(i) material living standards; and,

(ii) to some extent, the very social conditions that are the objects of regulation.

(10)(A) Agencies typically do not—

(i) proactively conduct regulatory cost studies; and

(ii) report to Congress on unnecessary costs that are not under the control of the agencies because of the way laws are written.

(B) Agency recommendations on how to improve the efficiency of regulation by modifying an existing statute could be helpful to Congress.

(c) UNIFORM USE OF COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) Before an agency publishes or otherwise provides notice of a notice of proposed rulemaking under this section, the agency shall comply with the following requirements with respect to the proposed rule:

''(A) The agency shall identify, in the context of a coherent conceptual framework and supported with objective data—

''(i) the nature and significance of the market failure, regulatory failure, or other problem that necessitates regulatory action;

''(ii) the reasons why national economic and income growth, advancing technology, and other market developments will not obviate the need for the rulemaking;

''(iii) the reasons why regulation at the State, local, or tribal level could not address the problem better than at the Federal level;

''(iv) the reasons why reducing rather than increasing the extent or stringency of existing Federal regulation would not address the problem better; and

''(v) the particular authority under which the agency may take action.

''(B) Before the agency increases the extent or stringency of regulation based on its determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A), the agency shall—

''(i) set an achievable objective for its regulatory action and identify the metrics by which the agency will measure progress toward the objective;

''(ii) issue a notice of inquiry seeking public comment on the identification of a new objective under clause (i); and

''(iii) give notice to the committees of Congress with jurisdiction over the subject matter of the rule.

''(C) If the agency is not seeking to repeal a rule, the agency shall develop not less than 3 distinct regulatory options, in addition to not regulating, that the agency estimates will provide the greatest benefits for the least cost in meeting the regulatory objective set under subparagraph (B) and, in developing such regulatory options, shall apply the following principles:

''(i) The agency shall, to the extent practicable—

''(I) attempt to engage private incentives to solve a problem; and

''(II) not supplant private incentives any more than necessary.

''(ii) The agency shall consider the adverse effects that mandates and prohibitions may have on innovation, economic growth, and employment.

''(iii)(I) The agency's risk assessment shall be confined to the jurisdiction of the agency, subject to specific regulatory authority.

''(II) Agency assessments of the risks of adverse health and environmental effects shall follow standardized parameters, assumptions, and methodologies.

''(III) The agency shall provide analyses of increases in risks, whatever their nature, produced by the regulatory options under consideration.

''(iv) The agency shall avoid incongruities and duplication in regulation at the Federal, State, local, and tribal levels.

''(v) The agency shall compare and contrast the regulatory options developed and explain how each would meet the regulatory objective set pursuant to subparagraph (B).

''(D) The agency shall estimate the costs and benefits of each regulatory option developed, notwithstanding any provision of law that prohibits the agency from using costs in rulemaking, at least to the extent that the agency is able to—

''(i) exclude options whose costs exceed their benefits;

''(ii) rank the options by cost from lowest to highest;

''(iii) estimate the monetary cost of any adverse effects on private property rights, identify the categories of persons who experience a net loss from a regulatory option, and explain why the negative effects cannot be lessened or avoided;

''(iv) establish whether the cost of an option exceeds $50,000,000 for any 12-month period, except that the dollar amount shall be adjusted annually for inflation based on the GDP deflator, and the President may order that a lower dollar amount be used for a particular period;

''(v) identify the key uncertainties and assumptions that drive the results of the analysis under clause (iv); and

''(vi) provide an analysis of how the ranking of the options and the threshold determination under clause (iv) may change if key assumptions are changed.

''(E) The estimates pursuant to subparagraph (D) shall—

''(i) follow the methodology established pursuant to paragraph (2)(A);

''(ii) to the maximum extent practicable, comply with any guidelines issued by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs pertaining to cost-benefit analysis; and

''(iii) include, at a minimum—

''(I) agency administrative costs;

''(II) United States private sector compliance costs;

''(III) Federal, State, local, and tribal compliance costs;

''(IV) Federal, State, local, and tribal revenue impacts;

''(V) impacts from the regulatory options developed on United States industries in the role of suppliers and consumers to each industry substantially affected, especially in terms of employment, costs, volume and quality of output, and prices;

''(VI) nationwide impacts on overall economic output, productivity, and consumer and producer prices;

''(VII) international competitiveness of United States companies; and

''(VIII) distortions in incentives and markets, including an estimate of the resulting loss to the United States economy.

''(F) The agency shall—

''(i) publish for public comment all analyses, documentation, and data under subparagraphs (A) through (D) for a public comment period of not less than 30 days (subject to applicable limitations under law, including laws protecting privacy, trade secrets, and intellectual property); and

''(ii) correct deficiencies or omissions that the agency becomes aware of before choosing a rule to propose.

''(2)(A)(i) Beginning not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of the Sound Regulation Act of 2014, each agency shall, by rule—

''(I) establish and maintain a specific cost-benefit analysis methodology appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the agency; and

''(II) establish an appropriate period for review of new rules to assess the cost effectiveness of each such new rule at achieving the objective that the new rule was intended to address, as identified under paragraph (1)(B)(i).

''(ii) The methodology established by an agency under clause (i) shall—

''(I) include the standardized parameters, assumptions, and methodologies for agency assessments of risk under paragraph (1)(C)(iii);

''(II) comply, to the maximum extent practicable, with technical standards for methodologies and assumptions issued by the Administrator for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs;

''(III) include the scope of benefits and costs consistent with the framework used and the metrics identified in the establishment of the regulatory objective under paragraph (1);

''(IV) not include consideration of incidental benefits but only those benefits that were considered in the establishment of the regulatory objective under paragraph (1);

''(V) limit consideration of costs and benefits to costs and benefits that accrue to the population of the United States;

''(VI) constrain the agency from presuming that continued augmentation or tightening of mandates and additional prohibitions cause benefits and costs to change linearly but instead determine at what point benefits will rise less than, and costs will rise more than, proportionally;

''(VII) include comparison of incremental benefits to incremental costs from any action the agency considers taking and refrain from actions whose incremental benefits do not exceed their incremental costs; and

''(VIII) include analysis of effects on private incentives and possible unintended consequences.

''(iii) Each agency shall adhere to the methodology established by the agency under this subparagraph in all rulemakings.

''(B) If an agency does not select the least-cost regulatory option as its proposed rule, the agency shall justify its selection, explaining—

''(i) how that selection furthers other goals or requirements relevant to regulating matters within the jurisdiction of the agency and why these should override cost savings; and

''(ii) why each of the other regulatory options not chosen would not sufficiently further such other goals or requirements.

''(C) Any person may petition an agency to amend an existing rule made prior to the establishment of methodology under this paragraph, and, if the agency denies such a petition, that denial shall be subject to review under chapter 7 of this title.

''(3) If an agency makes a determination under paragraph (1)(D) that the monetized cost of a rule exceeds the applicable monetary limit under clause (iv) of such paragraph for any 12-month period—

''(A) the head of the agency shall—

''(i) first issue an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking;

''(ii) provide notice to the appropriate Congressional committees; and

''(iii) keep the committees described in clause (ii) informed of the status of the rulemaking;

''(B) the agency shall—

''(i) notify—

''(I) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Administrator');

''(II) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Director'); and

''(III) affected parties; and

''(ii) provide each person described in clause (i) with information on—

''(I) the potential effects of the proposed rule on affected parties; and

''(II) the type of affected parties that might be affected;

''(C) not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of the information described in subparagraph (B)(ii), the Director, in consultation with the Administrator, shall—

''(i) identify representatives of affected parties, not less than 25 percent of which shall, when possible, represent small business concerns (as such term is defined in section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 623(a)); and

''(ii) provide each major stakeholder with the opportunity to obtain advice and recommendations about the potential effects of the proposed rule;

''(D) the agency shall convene a review panel that consists wholly of—

''(i) full-time Federal officers, employees, and contractors in the agency;

''(ii) the Director;

''(iii) the Administrator; and

''(iv) the representatives of affected parties identified under subparagraph (C)(i);

''(E) the agency shall—

''(i) conduct a detailed analysis of the costs and benefits of the regulatory option that the agency is advancing; and

''(ii) in conducting the detailed analysis under clause (i)—

''(I) consider the cumulative and interactive costs of regulatory requirements of Federal, State, local, tribal, and, where applicable, international regulations;

''(II) identify the key uncertainties and assumptions that drive the results of the analysis; and

''(III) provide an analysis of how the ranking of the regulatory options changes if the key assumptions identified under subclause (II) are changed;

''(F) the review panel convened under subparagraph (D) shall review—

''(i) all agency material prepared in connection with this subsection, including any draft proposed rule; and

''(ii) the advice and recommendations of each representative of an affected party identified under subparagraph (C)(i);

''(G) not later than 60 days after the date on which the agency convenes the review panel under subparagraph (D)—

''(i) the review panel shall report on—

''(I) the comments of each representative of an affected party identified under subparagraph (C)(i); and

''(II) the findings of the review panel as to issues related to the provisions of this subsection; and

''(ii) the report under clause (i) shall be made public as part of the rulemaking record;

''(H) if appropriate, the agency shall modify the proposed rule or the cost-benefit analysis under subparagraph (E) based on the report under subparagraph (G);

''(I) subject to applicable limitations under law, including laws protecting privacy, trade secrets, and intellectual property, the agency shall—

''(i) publish for comment all analyses, documentation, and data under this subsection for a public comment period of not less than 30 days; and

''(ii) correct deficiencies or omissions that the agency becomes aware of before adopting a proposed rule; and

''(J) the agency shall ensure that affected parties, including State, local, or tribal governments, and other stakeholders, may participate in the rulemaking, by means such as—

''(i) the publication of advanced and general notices of proposed rulemaking in publications likely to be obtained by affected parties;

''(ii) the direct notification of interested affected parties;

''(iii) the conduct of open conferences or public hearings, including soliciting and receiving comments over computer networks; and

''(iv) reducing the cost or complexity of procedural rules to ease participation in the rulemaking.

''(4) Every 4 years, each agency shall—

''(A) conduct a review of all rules of the agency that are in effect; and

''(B) determine based on objective data whether the rules are—

''(i) working as intended;

''(ii) furthering their objectives;

''(iii) imposing unanticipated costs; or

''(iv) generating a net benefit or not;

''(C) amend the rules if appropriate; and

''(D) report to Congress the findings of the review conducted under this paragraph.

''(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any provision of law that explicitly prohibits the use of cost-benefit analysis in rulemaking, an agency shall conduct cost-benefit analyses and report to Congress the findings with specific recommendations for how to lower regulatory costs by amending the statutes prohibiting the use thereof.

''(6) For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'regulatory options' means any action an agency may take to address an objective identified under paragraph (1)(B)(i), including the option not to act;

''(B) the term 'private incentives'—

''(i) means financial gains or losses that motivate actions by private individuals and businesses; and

''(ii) does not include any law or regulation that prescribes private actions or outcomes; and

''(C) the term 'incidental benefit' means a claimed benefit outside the specific regulatory objective or objectives that a rule is intended to address, as identified under paragraph (1)(B)(i).

''(7) All determinations made under this subsection shall be subject to review under chapter 7.''.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—Section 801(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) The Comptroller General shall—

''(i) examine the cost-benefit analysis for compliance with the requirements of section 553(f), including the agency methodology established under section 553(f)(2)(A);

''(ii) examine any risk analysis under section 553(f)(1)(C)(iii) pertaining to the cost-benefit analysis for compliance with the requirements under section 553(f); and

''(iii)(I) examine the agencies' quadrennial regulatory reviews conducted under section 553(f)(4) for consistency with the requirements under section 553(f); and

''(II) report to Congress on the results of the examination under subclause (I).''.

SA 3651. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS STRATEGIC PLAN.

Section 102 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) develop and update a national manufacturing competitiveness strategic plan in accordance with subsection (c).''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) NATIONAL MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS STRATEGIC PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Bring Jobs Home Act, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, the strategic plan developed under paragraph (2).

''(2) DEVELOPMENT.—The Committee shall develop (and update as required under paragraph (8)), in coordination with the National Economic Council, a strategic plan to improve Government coordination and provide long-term guidance for Federal programs and activities in support of United States manufacturing competitiveness, including advanced manufacturing research and development.

''(3) COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON.—In developing and updating the strategic plan, the Secretary of Commerce, or a designee of the Secretary, shall serve as the chairperson of the Committee.

''(4) GOALS.—The goals of such strategic plan shall be to—

''(A) promote growth, job creation, sustainability, and competitiveness in the United States manufacturing sector;

''(B) support the development of a skilled manufacturing workforce;

''(C) enable innovation and investment in domestic manufacturing; and

''(D) support national security.

''(5) CONTENTS.—Such strategic plan shall—

''(A) specify and prioritize near-term and long-term objectives to meet the goals of the plan, including research and development objectives, the anticipated timeframe for achieving the objectives, and the metrics for use in assessing progress toward the objectives;

''(B) describe the progress made in achieving the objectives from prior strategic plans, including a discussion of why specific objectives were not met;

''(C) specify the role, including the programs and activities, of each relevant Federal agency in meeting the objectives of the strategic plan;

''(D) describe how the Federal agencies and federally funded research and development centers supporting advanced manufacturing research and development will foster the transfer of research and development results into new manufacturing technologies and United States based manufacturing of new products and processes for the benefit of society to ensure national, energy, and economic security;

''(E) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will strengthen all levels of manufacturing education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce;

''(F) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will assist small- and medium-sized manufacturers in developing and implementing new products and processes;

''(G) take into consideration and include a discussion of the analysis conducted under paragraph (6); and

''(H) solicit public input (which may be accomplished through the establishment of an advisory panel under paragraph (7)), including the views of a wide range of stakeholders, and consider relevant recommendations of Federal advisory committees.

''(6) PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—As part of developing such strategic plan, the Committee, in collaboration with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by manufacturing, shall conduct an analysis of factors that impact the competitiveness and growth of the United States manufacturing sector, including—

''(i) research, development, innovation, transfer of technologies to the marketplace, and commercialization activities in the United States;

''(ii) the adequacy of the industrial base for maintaining national security;

''(iii) the state and capabilities of the domestic manufacturing workforce;

''(iv) export opportunities and domestic trade enforcement policies;

''(v) financing, investment, and taxation policies and practices;

''(vi) the state of emerging technologies and markets; and

''(vii) efforts and policies related to manufacturing promotion undertaken by competing nations.

''(B) RELIANCE ON EXISTING INFORMATION.—To the extent practicable, in completing the analysis under subparagraph (A), the Committee shall use existing information and the results of previous studies and reports.

''(7) ADVISORY PANEL.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The chairperson of the Committee may appoint an advisory panel of private sector and nonprofit leaders to provide input, perspective, and recommendations to assist in the development of the strategic plan under this subsection.

''(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The panel shall have no more than 15 members, and shall include representatives of manufacturing businesses, labor representatives of the manufacturing workforce, academia, and groups representing interests affected by manufacturing activities.

''(C) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), other than section 14 of such Act, shall apply to the Advisory Panel.

''(8) UPDATES.—Not later than May 1, 2018, and not less frequently than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, an update of the strategic plan transmitted under paragraph (1). Such updates shall be developed in accordance with the procedures set forth under this subsection.

''(9) REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER STRATEGY IN THE BUDGET.—In preparing the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall include information regarding the consistency of the budget with the goals and recommendations included in the strategic plan developed under this subsection applying to that fiscal year.''.

SA 3652. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR EXERCISE OF CERTAIN WAIVERS OF PROVISIONS OF LAW IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may not exercise a waiver specified in subsection (b) in connection with the extension of the terms of the Joint Plan of Action beyond July 20, 2014, unless the President certifies to Congress before the waiver takes effect and every 60 days thereafter that any funds made available to the Government of Iran as a result of the waiver will not facilitate the ability of that Government—

(1) to provide support for—

(A) any individual or entity designated for the imposition of sanctions for activities relating to international terrorism pursuant to an Executive order or by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury before July 22, 2014;

(B) any organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)) before July 22, 2014; or

(C) any other terrorist organization, including Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria;

(2) to advance the efforts of Iran or any other country to develop nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles overtly or covertly; or

(3) to commit any violation of the human rights of the people of Iran.

(b) WAIVERS SPECIFIED.—A waiver specified in this subsection is any of the following:

(1) A waiver provided for under section 4(c) or 9(c) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) to the imposition of sanctions under section 5(a)(7) of that Act.

(2) A waiver provided for under paragraph (5) of section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)) to the imposition of sanctions under paragraph (1) of that section.

(3) A waiver provided for under subsection (e) of section 302 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8742) to the identification of foreign persons under subsection (a) of that section.

(4) A waiver provided for under subsection (i) of section 1244 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8803) to the imposition of sanctions under subsection (c) of that section.

(c) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Joint Plan of Action'' means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

SA 3653. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. NATIONAL PARK ACCESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) during the period in October 2013 in which there was a lapse in appropriations (referred to in this subsection as the ''Government shutdown''), the National Park Service entered into agreements with the States of Arizona, Colorado, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Utah to temporarily reopen iconic national treasures in the National Park System, such as the Grand Canyon, Mount Rushmore, and the Statue of Liberty;

(2) pursuant to the agreements described in paragraph (1), the States listed in paragraph (1) advanced approximately $2,000,000 to the National Park Service to pay for park operations during the Government shutdown;

(3) the units of the National Park System that were temporarily reopened using State funds also collected gate entry fees;

(4) the Government shutdown ended when Congress passed the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–46), which retroactively funded Federal agencies and Federal employee salaries for the period of time during which the Government was shut down;

(5) by virtue of the retroactive appropriation made by Congress, the National Park Service retained an unintended shutdown windfall from the States listed in paragraph (1) of approximately $2,000,000; and

(6) the States listed in paragraph (1) that entered into agreements described in paragraph (1) with the National Park Service should be fully reimbursed for advancing funds to maintain public access to iconic national treasures in the National Park System during the Government shutdown.

(b) REFUND OF FUNDS USED BY STATES TO OPERATE NATIONAL PARKS DURING SHUTDOWN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Park Service shall refund to each State all funds of the State that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the period in October 2013 in which there was a lapse in appropriations for the unit.

(2) FUNDING.—Funds of the National Park Service that are appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act shall be used to carry out this subsection.

SA 3654. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. PUBLIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC LAND GUARANTEE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) public land in the United States is managed and administered for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations;

(2) the National Park System (including National Parks, National Monuments, and National Recreation Areas) is managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States;

(3) the National Wildlife Refuge System is administered for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States, with priority consideration for compatible wildlife-dependent general public uses of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

(4) the National Forest System is dedicated to the long-term benefit of present and future generations; and

(5) the reopening and temporary operation and management of public land, the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System, and the National Forest System using funds from States and political subdivisions of States during periods in which the Federal Government is unable to operate and manage the areas at normal levels due to a lapse in appropriations is consistent with the values and purposes for which those areas were established.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED UNIT.—The term ''covered unit'' means—

(A) public land;

(B) units of the National Park System;

(C) units of the National Wildlife Refuge System; or

(D) units of the National Forest System.

(2) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; or

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) AGREEMENT TO KEEP PUBLIC LAND OPEN DURING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if a State or political subdivision of the State offers, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the State or political subdivision of the State under which the United States may accept funds from the State or political subdivision of the State to reopen, in whole or in part, any covered unit within the State or political subdivision of the State during any period in which there is a lapse in appropriations for the covered unit.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The authority under paragraph (1) shall only be in effect during any period in which the Secretary is unable to operate and manage covered units at normal levels, as determined in accordance with the terms of agreement entered into under paragraph (1).

(3) REFUND.—The Secretary shall refund to the State or political subdivision of the State all amounts provided to the United States under an agreement entered into under paragraph (1)—

(A) on the date of enactment of an Act retroactively appropriating amounts sufficient to maintain normal operating levels at the covered unit reopened under an agreement entered into under paragraph (1); or

(B) on the date on which the State or political subdivision establishes, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, that, during the period in which the agreement was in effect, fees for entrance to, or use of, the covered units were collected by the Secretary.

(4) VOLUNTARY REIMBURSEMENT.—If the requirements for a refund under paragraph (3) are not met, the Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, reimburse the State and political subdivision of the State for any amounts provided to the United States by the State or political subdivision under an agreement entered into under paragraph (1).

SA 3655. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2016'':

(1) Paragraph (1).

(2) Paragraph (2)(A).

(3) Paragraph (3)(A).
(4) Paragraph (4)(B).
(5) Paragraph (6).
(6) Paragraph (7).
(7) Paragraph (9).
(8) Paragraph (11)(B).

(b) EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO TREAT QUALIFIED FACILITIES AS ENERGY PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2016''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014.

SA 3656. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapter for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item related to subchapter E.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3657. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE.

Sections 1513 and 1514 and subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 10106 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (and the amendments made by such sections and subsections) are repealed and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if such provisions and amendments had never been enacted.

SA 3658. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP BANK

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''United States Employee Ownership Bank Act''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) between January 2000 and June 2014, the manufacturing sector lost 5,162,000 jobs;

(2) as of June 2014, only 12,121,000 workers in the United States were employed in the manufacturing sector, lower than June 1941;

(3) at the end of 2013, the United States had a trade deficit of $474,864,000,000, including a record-breaking $318,417,200,000 trade deficit with China;

(4) preserving and increasing decent paying jobs must be a top priority of Congress;

(5) providing loan guarantees, direct loans, and technical assistance to employees to buy their own companies will preserve and increase employment in the United States; and

(6) the time has come to establish the United States Employee Ownership Bank to preserve and expand jobs in the United States through Employee Stock Ownership Plans and worker-owned cooperatives.

SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''Bank'' means the United States Employee Ownership Bank, established under section 204;

(2) the term ''eligible worker-owned cooperative'' has the same meaning as in section 1042(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(3) the term ''employee stock ownership plan'' has the same meaning as in section 4975(e)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(4) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 204. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP BANK WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF BANK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary shall establish the United States Employee Ownership Bank, to foster increased employee ownership of United States companies and greater employee participation in company decision-making throughout the United States.

(2) ORGANIZATION OF THE BANK.—

(A) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint a Director to serve as the head of the Bank, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

(B) STAFF.—The Director may select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of such employees as are necessary to carry out the functions of the Bank.

(b) DUTIES OF BANK.—The Bank is authorized to provide loans, on a direct or guaranteed basis, which may be subordinated to the interests of all other creditors—

(1) to purchase a company through an employee stock ownership plan or an eligible worker-owned cooperative, which shall be at least 51 percent employee owned, or will become at least 51 percent employee owned as a result of financial assistance from the Bank;

(2) to allow a company that is less than 51 percent employee owned to become at least 51 percent employee owned;

(3) to allow a company that is already at least 51 percent employee owned to increase the level of employee ownership at the company; and

(4) to allow a company that is already at least 51 percent employee owned to expand operations and increase or preserve employment.

(c) PRECONDITIONS.—Before the Bank makes any subordinated loan or guarantees a loan under subsection (b)(1), a business plan shall be submitted to the bank that—

(1) shows that—

(A) not less than 51 percent of all interests in the company is or will be owned or controlled by an employee stock ownership plan or eligible worker-owned cooperative;

(B) the board of directors of the company is or will be elected by shareholders on a one share to one vote basis or by members of the eligible worker-owned cooperative on a one member to one vote basis, except that shares held by the employee stock ownership plan will be voted according to section 409(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with participants providing voting instructions to the trustee of the employee stock ownership plan in accordance with the terms of the employee stock ownership plan and the requirements of that section 409(e); and

(C) all employees will receive basic information about company progress and have the opportunity to participate in day-to-day operations; and

(2) includes a feasibility study from an objective third party with a positive determination that the employee stock ownership plan or eligible worker-owned cooperative will generate enough of a margin to pay back any loan, subordinated loan, or loan guarantee that was made possible through the Bank.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a loan that is provided or guaranteed under this section shall—

(1) bear interest at an annual rate, as determined by the Secretary—

(A) in the case of a direct loan under this title—

(i) sufficient to cover the cost of borrowing to the Department of the Treasury for obligations of comparable maturity; or

(ii) of 4 percent; and

(B) in the case of a loan guaranteed under this section, in an amount that is equal to the current applicable market rate for a loan of comparable maturity; and

(2) have a term not to exceed 12 years.

SEC. 205. EMPLOYEE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL BEFORE PLANT OR FACILITY CLOSING.

Section 3 of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2102) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: ''**; EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS OR ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES**''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS AND ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—If an employer orders a plant or facility closing in connection with the termination of its operations at such plant or facility, the employer shall offer its employees an opportunity to purchase such plant or facility through an employee stock ownership plan (as that term is defined in section 4975(e)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) or an eligible worker-owned cooperative (as that term is defined in section

1042(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that is at least 51 percent employee owned. The value of the company which is to be the subject of such plan or cooperative shall be the fair market value of the plant or facility, as determined by an appraisal by an independent third party jointly selected by the employer and the employees. The cost of the appraisal may be shared evenly between the employer and the employees.

''(2) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply—

''(A) if an employer orders a plant closing, but will retain the assets of such plant to continue or begin a business within the United States; or

''(B) if an employer orders a plant closing and such employer intends to continue the business conducted at such plant at another plant within the United States.''.

SEC. 206. REGULATIONS ON SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS AND PREVENTING COMPETITION WITH COMMERCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to implement this title and the amendments made by this title, including—

(1) regulations to ensure the safety and soundness of the Bank; and

(2) regulations to ensure that the Bank will not compete with commercial financial institutions.

SEC. 207. COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT CREDIT.

Section 804 of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2903) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS AND ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES.—In assessing and taking into account, under subsection (a), the record of a financial institution, the appropriate Federal financial supervisory agency may consider as a factor capital investments, loans, loan participation, technical assistance, financial advice, grants, and other ventures undertaken by the institution to support or enable employees to establish employee stock ownership plans or eligible worker-owned cooperatives (as those terms are defined in sections 4975(e)(7) and 1042(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, respectively), that are at least 51 percent employee-owned plans or cooperatives.''.

SEC. 208. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

SA 3659. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3608 submitted by Mr. PAUL and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4 of the amendment, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ENDING CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In October 2011, the Government Accountability Office found that—

(A) allowing members of the banking industry to both elect and serve on the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks poses reputational risks to the Federal Reserve System;

(B) 18 former and current members of the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks were affiliated with banks and companies that received emergency loans from the Federal Reserve System during the financial crisis;

(C) many of the members of the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks own stock or work directly for banks that are supervised and regulated by the Federal Reserve System. These board members oversee the operations of the Federal reserve banks, including salary and personnel decisions;

(D) under current regulations, members of a board of directors of a Federal reserve bank who are employed by the banking industry or own stock in financial institutions can participate in decisions involving how much interest to charge to financial institutions receiving loans from the Federal Reserve System, and the approval or disapproval of Federal Reserve credit to healthy banks and banks in ''hazardous'' condition;

(E) 21 members of the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks were involved in making personnel decisions in the division of supervision and regulation under the Federal Reserve System; and

(F) the Federal Reserve System does not publicly disclose when it grants a waiver to its conflict of interest regulations.

(2) Allowing currently employed banking industry executives to serve as directors on the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks is a clear conflict of interest that must be eliminated.

(3) No one who works for or invests in a firm receiving direct financial assistance from the Federal Reserve System should be allowed to sit on any board of directors of a Federal reserve bank or be employed by the Federal Reserve System.

(b) CLASS A MEMBERS.—The tenth undesignated paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 302) (relating to Class A) is amended by striking ''chosen by and be representative of the stockholding banks'' and inserting ''designated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, from among persons who are not employed in any capacity by a stockholding bank''.

(c) CLASS B.—The eleventh undesignated paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 302) (relating to Class B) is amended by striking ''be elected'' and inserting ''be designated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System''.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON BOARDS OF DIRECTORS.—The fourteenth and fifteenth undesignated paragraphs of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 303) (relating to Class B and Class C, respectively) are amended to read as follows:

''No employee of a bank holding company or other entity regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may serve on the board of directors of any Federal reserve bank.

''No employee of the Federal Reserve System or board member of a Federal reserve bank may own any stock or invest in any company that is regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, without exception.''.

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall report annually to Congress beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act to make sure that the provisions of this section are followed.

SA 3660. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. WORKER OWNERSHIP, READINESS, AND KNOWLEDGE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Worker Ownership, Readiness, and Knowledge Act'' or the ''WORK Act''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXISTING PROGRAM.—The term ''existing program'' means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that exists on the date the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized by this section.

(2) INITIATIVE.—The term ''Initiative'' means the Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative established under subsection (c).

(3) NEW PROGRAM.—The term ''new program'' means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that does not exist on the date the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized by this section.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any of the 50 States within the United States of America.

(c) EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish within the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall—

(A) support within the States existing programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking; and

(B) facilitate within the States the formation of new programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(3) DUTIES.—To carry out the functions enumerated in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) support new programs and existing programs by—

(i) making Federal grants authorized under subsection (e); and

(ii)(I) acting as a clearinghouse on techniques employed by new programs and existing programs within the States, and disseminating information relating to those techniques to the programs; or

(II) funding projects for information gathering on those techniques, and dissemination of that information to the programs, by groups outside the Employment and Training Administration; and

(B) facilitate the formation of new programs, in ways that include holding or funding an annual conference of representatives from States with existing programs, representatives from States developing new programs, and representatives from States without existing programs.

(d) PROGRAMS REGARDING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of

this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to encourage new and existing programs within the States, designed to foster employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking throughout the United States.

(2) PURPOSE OF PROGRAM.—The purpose of the program established under paragraph (1) is to encourage new and existing programs within the States that focus on—

(A) providing education and outreach to inform employees and employers about the possibilities and benefits of employee ownership, business ownership succession planning, and employee participation in business decisionmaking, including providing information about financial education, employee teams, open-book management, and other tools that enable employees to share ideas and information about how their businesses can succeed;

(B) providing technical assistance to assist employee efforts to become business owners, to enable employers and employees to explore and assess the feasibility of transferring full or partial ownership to employees, and to encourage employees and employers to start new employee-owned businesses;

(C) training employees and employers with respect to methods of employee participation in open-book management, work teams, committees, and other approaches for seeking greater employee input; and

(D) training other entities to apply for funding under this subsection, to establish new programs, and to carry out program activities.

(3) PROGRAM DETAILS.—The Secretary may include, in the program established under paragraph (1), provisions that—

(A) in the case of activities under paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) target key groups such as retiring business owners, senior managers, unions, trade associations, community organizations, and economic development organizations;

(ii) encourage cooperation in the organization of workshops and conferences; and

(iii) prepare and distribute materials concerning employee ownership and participation, and business ownership succession planning;

(B) in the case of activities under paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) provide preliminary technical assistance to employee groups, managers, and retiring owners exploring the possibility of employee ownership;

(ii) provide for the performance of preliminary feasibility assessments;

(iii) assist in the funding of objective third-party feasibility studies and preliminary business valuations, and in selecting and monitoring professionals qualified to conduct such studies; and

(iv) provide a data bank to help employees find legal, financial, and technical advice in connection with business ownership;

(C) in the case of activities under paragraph (2)(C)—

(i) provide for courses on employee participation; and

(ii) provide for the development and fostering of networks of employee-owned companies to spread the use of successful participation techniques; and

(D) in the case of training under paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) provide for visits to existing programs by staff from new programs receiving funding under this section; and

(ii) provide materials to be used for such training.

(4) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue formal guidance, for recipients of grants awarded under subsection (e) and one-stop partners affiliated with the statewide workforce investment systems described in section 106 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2881), proposing that programs and other activities funded under this section be—

(A) proactive in encouraging actions and activities that promote employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses; and

(B) comprehensive in emphasizing both employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses so as to increase productivity and broaden capital ownership.

(e) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (d), the Secretary may make grants for use in connection with new programs and existing programs within a State for any of the following activities:

(A) Education and outreach as provided in subsection (d)(2)(A).

(B) Technical assistance as provided in subsection (d)(2)(B).

(C) Training activities for employees and employers as provided in subsection (d)(2)(C).

(D) Activities facilitating cooperation among employee-owned firms.

(E) Training as provided in subsection (d)(2)(D) for new programs provided by participants in existing programs dedicated to the objectives of this section, except that, for each fiscal year, the amount of the grants made for such training shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of the grants made under this section.

(2) AMOUNTS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall determine the amount and any conditions for a grant made under this subsection. The amount of the grant shall be subject to paragraph (6), and shall reflect the capacity of the applicant for the grant.

(3) APPLICATIONS.—Each entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(4) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Each State may sponsor and submit an application under paragraph (3) on behalf of any local entity consisting of a unit of State or local government, State-supported institution of higher education, or nonprofit organization, meeting the requirements of this section.

(5) APPLICATIONS BY ENTITIES.—

(A) ENTITY APPLICATIONS.—If a State fails to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in the subsequent fiscal years, allow local entities described in paragraph (4) from that State to make applications for grants under paragraph (3) on their own initiative.

(B) APPLICATION SCREENING.—Any State failing to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year may submit applications under paragraph (3) in the subsequent fiscal years but may not screen applications by local entities described in paragraph (4) before submitting the applications to the Secretary.

(6) LIMITATIONS.—A recipient of a grant made under this subsection shall not receive, during a fiscal year, in the aggregate, more than the following amounts:

(A) For fiscal year 2015, $300,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2016, $330,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2017, $363,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2018, $399,300.

(E) For fiscal year 2019, $439,200.

(7) ANNUAL REPORT.—For each year, each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary a report describing how grant funds allocated pursuant to this subsection were expended during the 12-month period preceding the date of the submission of the report.

(f) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section, for the purposes of conducting evaluations of the grant programs identified in subsection (e) and to provide related technical assistance.

(g) REPORTING.—Not later than the expiration of the 36-month period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report—

(1) on progress related to employee ownership and participation in businesses in the United States; and

(2) containing an analysis of critical costs and benefits of activities carried out under this section.

(h) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants pursuant to subsection (e) the following:

(A) For fiscal year 2015, $3,850,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2016, $6,050,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2017, $8,800,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2018, $11,550,000.

(E) For fiscal year 2019, $14,850,000.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of funding the administrative expenses related to the Initiative, for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, an amount not in excess of—

(A) $350,000; or

(B) 5.0 percent of the maximum amount available under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year.

SA 3661. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 384, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

PART III—AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE UNIFORMED AND OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT

SEC. 1078A. PRE-ELECTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT ON TRANSMISSION OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(c)) is amended by striking ''Not later than 90 days'' and inserting the following:

''(1) PRE-ELECTION REPORT ON ABSENTEE BALLOTS TRANSMITTED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 43 days before any election for Federal office held in a State, the chief State election official of such State shall submit a report containing the information in subparagraph (B) to the Attorney General and the Presidential designee, and make that report publicly available that same day.

''(B) INFORMATION REPORTED.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall consist of the following:

''(i) The total number of absentee ballots validly requested by absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters whose requests were received by the 47th day before the election.

''(ii) The total number of ballots transmitted to such voters by the 46th day before the election by each unit of local government within the State that will administer the election.

''(iii) If the chief State election official has incomplete information on any items required to be included in the report, an explanation of what information is incomplete information and efforts made to acquire such information, including the identity of any unit of local government that failed to provide required information to the State.

''(C) REQUIREMENT TO SUPPLEMENT INCOMPLETE INFORMATION.—If the report under subparagraph (A) has incomplete information on any items required to be included in the report, the chief State election official shall make all reasonable efforts to expeditiously supplement the report with complete information.

''(D) FORMAT.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall be in a format prescribed by the Attorney General in consultation with the chief State election officials of each State.

''(2) POST ELECTION REPORT ON NUMBER OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS TRANSMITTED AND RECEIVED.—Not later than 90 days''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for subsection (c) of section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(c)) is amended by striking ''REPORT ON NUMBER OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS TRANSMITTED AND RECEIVED'' and inserting ''REPORTS ON ABSENTEE BALLOTS''.

SEC. 1078B. TRANSMISSION REQUIREMENTS; REPEAL OF WAIVER PROVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (8) of section 102(a) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) transmit a validly requested absentee ballot to an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter by the date and in the manner determined under subsection (g);''.

(b) BALLOT TRANSMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND REPEAL OF WAIVER PROVISION.—Subsection (g) of section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(g)) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) BALLOT TRANSMISSION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(8), in the case in which a valid request for an absentee ballot is received at least 47 days before an election for Federal office, the following rules shall apply:

''(A) TRANSMISSION DEADLINE.—The State shall transmit the absentee ballot not later than 46 days before the election.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES IN CASE OF FAILURE TO TRANSMIT ON TIME.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the State fails to transmit any absentee ballot by the 46th day before the election as required by subparagraph (A) and the absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter did not request electronic ballot transmission pursuant to subsection (f), the State shall transmit such ballot by express delivery.

''(ii) EXTENDED FAILURE.—If the State fails to transmit any absentee ballot by the 41st day before the election, in addition to transmitting the ballot as provided in clause (i), the State shall—

''(I) in the case of absentee ballots requested by absent uniformed services voters with respect to regularly scheduled general elections, notify such voters of the procedures established under section 103A for the collection and delivery of marked absentee ballots; and

''(II) in any other case, provide for the return of such ballot by express delivery.

''(iii) COST OF EXPRESS DELIVERY.—In any case in which express delivery is required under this subparagraph, the cost of such express delivery—

''(I) shall not be paid by the voter, and

''(II) may be required by the State to be paid by a local jurisdiction if the State determines that election officials in such jurisdiction are responsible for the failure to transmit the ballot by any date required under this paragraph.

''(iv) EXCEPTION.—Clause (ii)(II) shall not apply when an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter indicates the preference to return the late sent absentee ballot by electronic transmission in a State that permits return of an absentee ballot by electronic transmission.

''(v) ENFORCEMENT.—A State's compliance with this subparagraph does not bar the Attorney General from seeking additional remedies necessary to fully resolve or prevent ongoing, future, or systematic violations of this provision.

''(C) SPECIAL PROCEDURE IN EVENT OF DISASTER.—If a disaster (hurricane, tornado, earthquake, storm, volcanic eruption, landslide, fire, flood, or explosion), or an act of terrorism prevents the State from transmitting any absentee ballot by the 46th day before the election as required by subparagraph (A), it shall notify the Attorney General as soon as practicable and take all actions necessary, including seeking any necessary judicial relief, to ensure that affected absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters are provided a reasonable opportunity to receive and return their absentee ballots in time to be counted.

''(2) REQUESTS RECEIVED AFTER 47TH DAY BEFORE ELECTION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(8), in the case in which a valid request for an absentee ballot is received less than 47 days but not less than 30 days before an election for Federal office, the State shall transmit the absentee ballot not later than 3 business days after such request is received.''.

SEC. 1078C. TECHNICAL CLARIFICATIONS TO CONFORM TO 2009 MOVE ACT AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE FEDERAL WRITE-IN ABSENTEE BALLOT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(a)(3) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''general elections'' and inserting ''general, special, primary, and runoff elections''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 103 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking ''general'', and

(2) in the heading thereof, by striking ''**GENERAL**''.

SEC. 1078D. TREATMENT OF POST CARD REGISTRATION REQUESTS.

Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) TREATMENT OF POST CARD REGISTRATIONS.—A State shall not remove any voter who has registered to vote using the official post card form (prescribed under section 101) except in accordance with subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(a)(3) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(a)).''.

SEC. 1078E. TREATMENT OF BALLOT REQUESTS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION OF REFUSAL OF APPLICATIONS ON GROUNDS OF EARLY SUBMISSION TO OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 104 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–3) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or overseas voter'' after ''submitted by an absent uniformed services voter''; and

(2) by striking ''members of the uniformed services'' and inserting ''absent uniformed services voters or overseas voters''.

(b) USE OF SINGLE APPLICATION FOR SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 104 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–3) is amended—

(A) by striking ''A State'' and inserting the following:

''(a) PROHIBITION OF REFUSAL OF APPLICATIONS ON GROUNDS OF EARLY SUBMISSION.—A State'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(b) APPLICATION TREATED AS VALID FOR SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a State accepts and processes a request for an absentee ballot by an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter and the voter requests that the application be considered an application for an absentee ballot for each subsequent election for Federal office held in the State through the next regularly scheduled general election for Federal office (including any runoff elections which may occur as a result of the outcome of such general election), the State shall provide an absentee ballot to the voter for each such subsequent election.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to either of the following:

''(A) VOTERS CHANGING REGISTRATION.—A voter removed from the list of official eligible voters in accordance with subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(a)(3) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(a)).

''(B) UNDELIVERABLE BALLOTS.—A voter whose ballot is returned by mail to the State or local election officials as undeliverable or, in the case of a ballot delivered electronically, if the email sent to the voter was undeliverable or rejected due to an invalid email address.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 104 of such Act is amended by striking ''**PROHIBITION OF REFUSAL OF APPLICATIONS ON GROUNDS OF EARLY SUBMISSION**'' and inserting ''**TREATMENT OF BALLOT REQUESTS**''.

(3) REVISION TO POSTCARD FORM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Presidential designee shall ensure that the official postcard form prescribed under section 101(b)(2) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff(b)(2)) enables a voter using the form to—

(i) request an absentee ballot for each election for Federal office held in a State through the next regularly scheduled general election for Federal office (including any runoff elections which may occur as a result of the outcome of such general election); or

(ii) request an absentee ballot for a specific election or elections for Federal office held in a State during the period described in paragraph (1).

(B) PRESIDENTIAL DESIGNEE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''Presidential designee'' means the individual designated under section 101(a) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff(a)).

SEC. 1078F. APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Paragraphs (6) and (8) of section 107 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–6(6)) are each amended by striking ''and American Samoa'' and inserting ''American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands''.

SEC. 1078G. BIENNIAL REPORT ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105A(b) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–4a(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''March 31 of each year'' and inserting ''June 30 of each odd-numbered year''; and

(B) by striking ''the following information'' and inserting ''the following information with respect to the Federal elections held during the 2 preceding calendar years'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''separate assessment'' each place it appears and inserting ''separate assessment and statistical analysis''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''section 1566a'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''sections 1566a and 1566b'';

(B) by striking ''such section'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting ''such sections''; and

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

''(C) The number of completed official postcard forms prescribed under section 101(b)(2) that were completed by absent uniformed services members and accepted and transmitted.''.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEWS.—Section 105A of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–4a) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a review of any reports submitted by the Presidential designee under subsection (b) with respect to elections occurring in calendar years 2014 through 2020.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after a report is submitted by the Presidential designee under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant committees of Congress a report containing the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(2) MATTERS REVIEWED.—A review conducted under paragraph (1) shall assess—

''(A) the methodology used by the Presidential designee to prepare the report and to develop the data presented in the report, including the approach for designing, implementing, and analyzing the results of any surveys,

''(B) the effectiveness of any voting assistance covered in the report provided under subsection (b) and provided by the Presidential designee to absent overseas uniformed services voters and overseas voters who are not members of the uniformed services, including an assessment of—

''(i) any steps taken toward improving the implementation of such voting assistance; and

''(ii) the extent of collaboration between the Presidential designee and the States in providing such voting assistance; and

''(C) any other information the Comptroller General considers relevant to the review.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 101(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively.

(2) Section 102(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''101(b)(7)'' and inserting ''101(b)(6)''; and

(B) in paragraph (11), by striking ''101(b)(11)'' and inserting ''101(b)(10)''.

(3) Section 105A(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–4a(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''ANNUAL REPORT'' in the subsection heading and inserting ''BIENNIAL REPORT''; and

(B) by striking ''In the case of'' in paragraph (3) and all that follows through ''a description'' and inserting ''A description''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to reports required to be issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1078H. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 1078G(d), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 3662. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Regulatory Accountability Act of 2014''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 551 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) 'guidance' means an agency statement of general applicability, other than a rule, that is not intended to have the force and effect of law but that sets forth a policy on a statutory, regulatory, or technical issue or an interpretation of a statutory or regulatory issue;

''(16) 'high-impact rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose a cost on the economy in any 1 year of $1,000,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

''(17) 'major rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose—

''(A) a cost on the economy in any 1 year of $100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local, or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

''(18) 'major guidance' means guidance that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs finds is likely to lead to—

''(A) a cost on the economy in any 1 year of $100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; and

''(19) 'Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs' means the office established under section 3503 of title 44 and any successor to that office.''.

(c) RULEMAKING.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) This section applies'' and inserting ''(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies''; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

''(b) RULEMAKING CONSIDERATIONS.—In a rulemaking, an agency shall consider, in addition to other applicable considerations, the following:

''(1) The legal authority under which a rule may be proposed, including whether rulemaking is required by statute or is within the discretion of the agency.

''(2) The nature and significance of the problem the agency intends to address with a rule.

''(3) Whether existing Federal laws or rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency may address with a rule and, if so, whether those Federal laws or rules could be amended or rescinded to address the problem in whole or in part.

''(4) A reasonable number of alternatives for a new rule, including any substantial alternatives or other responses identified by interested persons.

''(5) For any major rule or high-impact rule, the potential costs and benefits associated with potential alternative rules and other responses considered under paragraph (4), including an analysis of—

''(A) the nature and degree of risks addressed by the rule and the countervailing risks that might be posed by agency action;

''(B) direct, indirect, and cumulative costs and benefits; and

''(C) estimated impacts on jobs, competitiveness, and productivity.

''(c) INITIATION OF RULEMAKING.—

''(1) NOTICE FOR MAJOR AND HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—When an agency determines to initiate a rulemaking that may result in a major rule or high-impact rule, the agency shall—

''(A) establish an electronic docket for that rulemaking, which may have a physical counterpart; and

''(B) publish a notice of initiation of rulemaking in the Federal Register, which shall—

''(i) briefly describe the subject, the problem to be solved, and the objectives of the rule;

''(ii) reference the legal authority under which the rule would be proposed;

''(iii) invite interested persons to propose alternatives for accomplishing the objectives of the agency in the most effective manner and with the lowest cost; and

''(iv) indicate how interested persons may submit written material for the docket.

''(2) ACCESSIBILITY.—All information provided to the agency under paragraph (1) shall be promptly placed in the docket and made accessible to the public.

''(d) NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an agency determines that the objectives of the agency require the agency to issue a rule, the agency shall notify the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and publish a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register, which shall include—

''(A) a statement of the time, place, and nature of any public rulemaking proceedings;

''(B) reference to the legal authority under which the rule is proposed;

''(C) the text of the proposed rule;

''(D) a summary of information known to the agency concerning the considerations specified in subsection (b); and

''(E) for any major rule or high impact-rule—

''(i) a reasoned preliminary determination that the benefits of the proposed rule justify the costs of the proposed rule; and

''(ii) a discussion of—

''(I) the costs and benefits of alternatives considered by the agency under subsection (b), as determined by the agency at its discretion or provided under subsection (c) by a proponent of an alternative;

''(II) whether those alternatives meet relevant statutory objectives; and

''(III) the reasons why the agency did not propose any of those alternatives.

''(2) ACCESSIBILITY.—Not later than the date of publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking by an agency under paragraph (1), all data, studies, models, and other information considered by the agency, and actions by the agency to obtain information, in connection with the determination of the agency to propose the rule, shall be placed in the docket for the proposed rule and made accessible to the public.

''(3) PUBLIC COMMENT.—

''(A) After publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency shall provide interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rulemaking through the submission of written material, data, views, or arguments with or without opportunity for oral presentation, except that—

''(i) if a public hearing is convened under subsection (e), reasonable opportunity for oral presentation shall be provided at the public hearing under the requirements of subsection (e); and

''(ii) when, other than under subsection (e), a rule is required by statute or at the discretion of the agency to be made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, sections 556 and 557 shall apply, and the petition procedures of subsection (e) shall not apply.

''(B) The agency shall provide not less than 60 days, or 90 days in the case of a proposed major rule or proposed high-impact rule, for interested persons to submit written material, data, views, or arguments.

''(4) EXPIRATION OF NOTICE.—

''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a notice of proposed rulemaking shall, 2 years after the date on which the notice is published in the Federal Register, be considered as expired and may not be used to satisfy the requirements of subsection (d).

''(B) An agency may, at the sole discretion of the agency, extend the expiration of a notice of proposed rulemaking under subparagraph (A) for a 1-year period by publishing a supplemental notice in the Federal Register explaining why the agency requires additional time to complete the rulemaking.

''(e) PUBLIC HEARING FOR HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—

''(1) PETITION FOR PUBLIC HEARING.—

''(A)(i) Before the close of the comment period for any proposed high-impact rule, any interested person may petition the agency to hold a public hearing in accordance with this subsection.

''(ii) Not later than 30 days after receipt of a petition made pursuant to clause (i), the agency shall grant the petition if the petition shows that—

''(I) the proposed rule is based on conclusions with respect to one or more specific scientific, technical, economic or other complex factual issues that are genuinely disputed; and

''(II) the resolution of those disputed factual issues would likely have an effect on the costs and benefits of the proposed rule.

''(B) If the agency denies a petition under this subsection in whole or in part, it shall include in the rulemaking record an explanation for the denial sufficient for judicial review, including—

''(i) findings by the agency that there is no genuine dispute as to the factual issues raised by the petition; or

''(ii) a reasoned determination by the agency that the factual issues raised by the petition, even if subject to genuine dispute, will not have an effect on the costs and benefits of the proposed rule.

''(2) NOTICE OF HEARING.—Not later than 45 days before any hearing held under this subsection, the agency shall publish in the Federal Register a notice specifying the proposed rule to be considered at the hearing and the factual issues to be considered at the hearing.

''(3) HEARING PROCEDURE.—

''(A) A hearing held under this subsection shall be limited to the specific factual issues raised in the petition or petitions granted in whole or in part under paragraph (1) and any other factual issues the resolution of which the agency, in its discretion, determines will advance its consideration of the proposed rule.

''(B)(i) Except as otherwise provided by statute, the proponent of the rule has the burden of proof in a hearing held under this subsection. Any documentary or oral evidence may be received, but the agency as a matter of policy shall provide for the exclusion of immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence.

''(ii) To govern hearings held under this subsection, each agency shall adopt rules that provide for—

''(I) the appointment of an agency official or administrative law judge to preside at the hearing;

''(II) the presentation by interested parties of relevant documentary or oral evidence, unless the evidence is immaterial or unduly repetitious;

''(III) a reasonable and adequate opportunity for cross-examination by interested parties concerning genuinely disputed factual issues raised by the petition, provided that in the case of multiple interested parties with the same or similar interests, the agency may require the use of common counsel where the common counsel may adequately represent the interests that will be significantly affected by the proposed rule; and

''(IV) the provision of fees and costs under the circumstances described in section 6(c)(4) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(c)(4)).

''(C) The transcript of testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the hearing, shall constitute the exclusive record for decision of the factual issues addressed in a hearing held under this subsection.

''(4) PETITION FOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAJOR RULES.—In the case of any major rule, any interested person may petition for a hearing under this subsection on the grounds and within the time limitation set forth in paragraph (1). The agency may deny the petition if the agency reasonably determines that a hearing would not advance the consideration of the proposed rule by the agency or would, in light of the need for agency action, unreasonably delay completion of the rulemaking. The petition and the decision of the agency with respect to the petition shall be included in the rulemaking record.

''(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(A) Failure to petition for a hearing under this subsection shall not preclude judicial review of any claim that could have been raised in the hearing petition or at the hearing.

''(B) There shall be no judicial review of the disposition of a petition by an agency under this subsection until judicial review of the final action of the agency.

''(f) FINAL RULES.—

''(1) COST OF MAJOR OR HIGH-IMPACT RULE.—

''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in a rulemaking for a major rule or high-impact rule, the agency shall adopt the least costly rule considered during the rulemaking that meets relevant statutory objectives.

''(B) The agency may adopt a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives only if—

''(i) the additional benefits of the more costly rule justify its additional costs; and

''(ii) the agency explains why the agency adopted a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative, based on interests that are within the scope of the statutory provision authorizing the rule.

''(2) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF FINAL RULEMAKING.—When the agency adopts a final rule, the agency shall publish a notice of final rulemaking in the Federal Register, which shall include—

''(A) a concise, general statement of the basis and purpose of the rule;

''(B) a reasoned determination by the agency regarding the considerations specified in subsection (c);

''(C) in a rulemaking for a major rule or high-impact rule, a reasoned determination by the agency that the benefits of the rule advance the relevant statutory objectives and justify the costs of the rule;

''(D) in a rulemaking for a major rule or high-impact rule, a reasoned determination by the agency that—

''(i) no alternative considered would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at a lower cost than the rule; or

''(ii) the adoption by the agency of a more costly rule complies with paragraph (2)(B); and

''(E) a response to each significant issue raised in the comments on the proposed rule.

''(3) INFORMATION QUALITY.—If an agency rulemaking rests upon scientific, technical, or economic information, the agency shall adopt a rule only on the basis of the best available scientific, technical, or economic information.

''(4) ACCESSIBILITY.—Not later than the date of publication of the rule, all data, studies, models, and other information considered by the agency, and actions by the agency to obtain information in connection with its adoption of the rule, shall be placed in

the docket for the rule and made accessible to the public.

''(5) RULES ADOPTED AT THE END OF A PRESIDENTIAL ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) During the 60-day period beginning on a transitional inauguration day (as defined in section 3349a), with respect to any final rule that had been placed on file for public inspection by the Office of the Federal Register or published in the Federal Register as of the date of the inauguration, but which had not yet become effective by the date of the inauguration, the agency issuing the rule may, by order, delay the effective date of the rule for not more than 90 days for the purpose of obtaining public comment on whether the rule should be amended or rescinded or its effective date further delayed.

''(B) If an agency delays the effective date of a rule under subparagraph (A), the agency shall give the public not less than 30 days to submit comments.

''(g) APPLICABILITY OF THIS SECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by law, this section does not apply to guidance or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice.

''(2) ADOPTION OF INTERIM RULES.—

''(A) If an agency for good cause finds, and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons for the finding in the rule issued, that compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) before the issuance of an interim rule is unnecessary, such subsections and requirements under subsection (f) shall not apply and the agency may issue a final rule.

''(B) If an agency for good cause finds, and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons for the finding in the rule issued, that compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) before the issuance of an interim rule is impracticable or contrary to the public interest, such subsections and requirements under subsection (f) shall not apply to the adoption of an interim rule by the agency.

''(C) If, following compliance with subparagraph (B), an agency adopts an interim rule, the agency shall commence proceedings that fully comply with subsections (c) through (f) immediately upon publication of the interim rule. Not less than 270 days from publication of the interim rule, or 18 months in the case of a major rule or high-impact rule, the agency shall complete rulemaking in accordance with subsections (c) through (f) and take final action to adopt a final rule or rescind the interim rule. If the agency fails to take timely final action under this subparagraph, the interim rule shall cease to have the effect of law.

''(h) DATE OF PUBLICATION OF RULE.—A rule shall be published not less than 30 days before the effective date of the rule, except—

''(1) for a rule that grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction;

''(2) for guidance; or

''(3) as otherwise provided by an agency for good cause and as published with the rule.

''(i) RIGHT TO PETITION AND REVIEW OF RULES.—

''(1) Each agency shall give interested persons the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.

''(2) Each agency shall, on a continuing basis, invite interested persons to submit, by electronic means, suggestions for rules that warrant retrospective review and possible modification or repeal.

''(j) RULEMAKING GUIDELINES.—

''(1) ASSESSMENT OF RULES.—

''(A) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (in this subsection referred to as the 'Administrator') shall establish guidelines for the assessment, including quantitative and qualitative assessment, of—

''(i) the costs and benefits of proposed and final rules;

''(ii) other economic issues that are relevant to rulemaking under this section or other sections of this title; and

''(iii) risk assessments that are relevant to rulemaking under this section and other sections of this title.

''(B) The rigor of cost-benefit analysis required by the guidelines established under subparagraph (A) shall be commensurate, as determined by the Administrator, with the economic impact of the rule. Guidelines for risk assessment shall include criteria for selecting studies and models, evaluating and weighing evidence, and conducting peer reviews.

''(C) The Administrator shall regularly update guidelines established under subparagraph (A) to enable agencies to use the best available techniques to quantify and evaluate present and future benefits, costs, other economic issues, and risks as objectively and accurately as practicable.

''(2) SIMPLIFICATION OF RULES.—The Administrator may issue guidelines to promote coordination, simplification, and harmonization of agency rules during the rulemaking process. The guidelines shall advise each agency to avoid regulations that are inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, other regulations of the agency and those of other Federal agencies, and to draft its regulations to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from the uncertainty.

''(3) CONSISTENCY IN RULEMAKING.—

''(A) To promote consistency in Federal rulemaking, the Administrator shall—

''(i) issue guidelines to ensure that rulemaking conducted in whole or in part under procedures specified in provisions of law other than those under this subchapter conform with the procedures set forth in this section to the fullest extent allowed by law; and

''(ii) issue guidelines for the conduct of hearings under subsection (e), which shall provide a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination.

''(B) Each agency shall adopt regulations for the conduct of hearings consistent with the guidelines issued under this paragraph.

''(k) EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY.—Nothing in subsection (b)(5), (d)(1)(E), (e), (f)(1), (f)(2)(C), or (f)(2)(D) shall apply to a rulemaking that concerns monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.''.

(d) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—Section 706 of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''To the extent necessary'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL.—To the extent necessary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The determination of whether a rule is a major rule within the meaning of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 551(17) shall not be subject to judicial review.

''(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Agency guidance that does not interpret a statute or regulation shall be reviewable only under subsection (a)(2)(D).

''(d) AGENCY INTERPRETATION OF RULES.—The weight that a court shall give an interpretation by an agency of its own rule shall depend on the thoroughness evident in its consideration, the validity of its reasoning, and its consistency with earlier and later pronouncements.

''(e) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—A court shall review—

''(1) the denial of a petition by an agency under section 553(e) for whether the denial was based on substantial evidence; and

''(2) any petition for review of a high-impact rule under the substantial evidence standard, regardless of whether a hearing was held under section 553(e).''.

(e) AGENCY GUIDANCE; PROCEDURES TO ISSUE MAJOR GUIDANCE; PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO ISSUE GUIDELINES FOR ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) AGENCY GUIDANCE; PROCEDURES TO ISSUE MAJOR GUIDANCE; AUTHORITY TO ISSUE GUIDELINES FOR ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—

''(1) Agency guidance shall—

''(A) not be used by an agency to foreclose consideration of issues as to which the document expresses a conclusion;

''(B) state that it is not legally binding; and

''(C) at the time it is issued or upon request, be made available by the issuing agency to interested persons and the public.

''(2) Before issuing any major guidance, an agency shall—

''(A) make and document a reasoned determination that—

''(i) such guidance is understandable and complies with relevant statutory objectives and regulatory provisions; and

''(ii) identifies the costs and benefits, including all costs to be considered during a rulemaking under subsection (b), of requiring conduct conforming to such guidance and assures that such benefits justify such costs; and

''(B) confer with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs on the issuance of the major guidance to assure that the guidance is reasonable, understandable, consistent with relevant statutory and regulatory provisions and requirements or practices of other agencies, does not produce costs that are unjustified by the benefits of the major guidance, and is otherwise appropriate.

''(3) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall issue updated guidelines for use by the agencies in the issuance of guidance documents. The guidelines shall advise each agency not to issue guidance documents that are inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, other regulations of the agency and those of other Federal agencies, and to draft its guidance documents to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from the uncertainty.''.

(f) ADDED DEFINITION.—Section 701(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(H), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) 'substantial evidence' means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion in light of the record considered as a whole, taking into account whatever in the record fairly detracts from the weight of the evidence relied upon by the agency to support its decision.''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section to sections 553, 556,

701(b), 704, and 706 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any rulemakings pending or completed on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3663. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SECTION 4. FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Federal Permitting Improvement Act of 2013''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) AGENCY CPO.—The term ''agency CPO'' means the chief permitting officer of an agency designated by the head of the agency under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I).

(3) AUTHORIZATION.—The term ''authorization'' means—

(A) any license, permit, approval, or other administrative decision required or authorized to be issued by an agency with respect to the siting, construction, reconstruction, or commencement of operations of a covered project under Federal law, whether administered by a Federal or State agency; or

(B) any determination or finding required to be issued by an agency—

(i) as a precondition to an authorization described under paragraph (A); or

(ii) before an applicant may take a particular action with respect to the siting, construction, reconstruction, or commencement of operations of a covered project under Federal law, whether administered by a Federal or State agency.

(4) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Federal Infrastructure Permitting Improvement Council established by subsection (c)(1).

(5) COVERED PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered project'' means any construction activity in the United States that requires authorization or review by a Federal agency—

(i) involving renewable or conventional energy production, electricity transmission, surface transportation, aviation, ports and waterways, water resource projects, broadband, pipelines, manufacturing, or any other sector as determined by the Federal CPO; and

(ii) that is likely to require an initial investment of more than $25,000,000, as determined by the Federal CPO.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered project'' does not include any project subject to section 101(b)(4) of title 23, United States Code.

(6) DASHBOARD.—The term ''Dashboard'' means the Permitting Dashboard required by subsection (e)(2).

(7) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term ''environmental assessment'' means a concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves—

(A) to briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact;

(B) to aid in the compliance of the agency with NEPA if an environmental impact statement is not necessary; and

(C) to facilitate preparation of an environmental impact statement, if an environmental impact statement is necessary.

(8) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ''environmental document'' means an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

(9) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ''environmental impact statement'' means the detailed statement of significant environmental impacts required to be prepared under NEPA.

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—The term ''environmental review'' means the agency procedures for preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document required under NEPA.

(11) FEDERAL CPO.—The term ''Federal CPO'' means the Federal Chief Permitting Officer appointed by the President under subsection (c)(2)(A).

(12) INVENTORY.—The term ''inventory'' means the inventory of covered projects established by the Federal CPO under subsection (c)(3)(A)(i).

(13) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ''lead agency'' means the agency with principal responsibility for review and authorization of a covered project, as determined under subsection (c)(3)(A)(ii).

(14) NEPA.—The term ''NEPA'' means the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(15) PARTICIPATING AGENCY.—The term ''participating agency'' means any agency participating in reviews or authorizations for a particular covered project in accordance with subsection (e).

(16) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term ''project sponsor'' means the entity, including any private, public, or public-private entity, that seeks approval for a project.

(c) FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Federal Permitting Improvement Council.

(2) COMPOSITION.—

(A) CHAIR.—The President shall appoint an officer of the Office of Management and Budget as the Federal Chief Permitting Officer to serve as Chair of the Council, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) CHIEF PERMITTING OFFICERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—

(I) DESIGNATION BY HEAD OF AGENCY.—Each individual listed in clause (ii) shall designate a member of the agency in which the individual serves to serve as the agency CPO.

(II) QUALIFICATIONS.—The agency CPO described in subclause (I) shall hold a position in the agency of the equivalent of a deputy secretary or higher.

(III) MEMBERSHIP.—Each agency CPO described in subclause (I) shall serve on the Council.

(ii) HEADS OF AGENCIES.—The individuals that shall each designate an agency CPO under this clause are as follows:

(I) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(II) The Secretary of Commerce.

(III) The Secretary of the Interior.

(IV) The Secretary of Energy.

(V) The Secretary of Transportation.

(VI) The Secretary of Defense.

(VII) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(VIII) The Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(IX) The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(X) The Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

(XI) Any other head of a Federal agency that the Federal CPO may invite to participate as a member of the Council.

(C) CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—In addition to the members listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality shall also be a member of the Council.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) FEDERAL CPO.—

(i) INVENTORY DEVELOPMENT.—The Federal CPO, in consultation with the members of the Council, shall—

(I) not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, establish an inventory of covered projects that are pending the review or authorization of the head of any Federal agency;

(II)(aa) categorize the projects in the inventory as appropriate based on the project type; and

(bb) for each category, identify the types of reviews and authorizations most commonly involved; and

(III) add covered projects to the inventory after the Federal CPO receives a notice described in subsection (e)(1)(A).

(ii) LEAD AGENCY DESIGNATION.—The Federal CPO, in consultation with the Council, shall—

(I) designate a lead agency for each category of covered projects described in clause (i)(II); and

(II) publish on an Internet website the designations and categories in an easily accessible format.

(iii) PERFORMANCE SCHEDULES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Federal CPO, in consultation with the Council, shall develop nonbinding performance schedules, including intermediate and final deadlines, for reviews and authorizations for each category of covered projects described in clause (i)(II).

(II) REQUIREMENTS.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—The performance schedules shall reflect employment of the use of the most efficient applicable processes.

(bb) LIMIT.—The final deadline for completion of any review or authorization contained in the performance schedules shall not be later than 180 days after the date on which the completed application or request is filed.

(III) REVIEW AND REVISION.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the performance schedules are established under this clause, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Federal CPO, in consultation with the Council, shall review and revise the performance schedules.

(iv) GUIDANCE.—The Federal CPO may issue circulars, bulletins, guidelines, and other similar directives as necessary to carry out responsibilities under this section and to effectuate the adoption by agencies of the best practices and recommendations of the Council described in subparagraph (B).

(B) COUNCIL.—

(i) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall make recommendations to the Federal CPO with respect to the designations under subparagraph (A)(ii) and the performance schedules under subparagraph (A)(iii).

(II) UPDATE.—The Council may update the recommendations described in subclause (I).

(ii) BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least annually thereafter, the Council shall issue recommendations on the best practices for—

(I) early stakeholder engagement, including fully considering and, as appropriate, incorporating recommendations provided in

public comments on any proposed covered project;

(II) assuring timeliness of permitting and review decisions;

(III) coordination between Federal and non-Federal governmental entities;

(IV) transparency;

(V) reduction of information collection requirements and other administrative burdens on agencies, project sponsors, and other interested parties;

(VI) evaluating lead agencies and participating agencies under this section; and

(VII) other aspects of infrastructure permitting, as determined by the Council.

(d) PERMITTING PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.—

(1) PROJECT INITIATION AND DESIGNATION OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

(A) NOTICE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A project sponsor shall provide the Federal CPO and the lead agency notice of the initiation of a proposed covered project.

(ii) CONTENTS.—Each notice described in clause (i) shall include—

(I) a description, including the general location, of the proposed project;

(II) a statement of any Federal authorization or review anticipated to be required for the proposed project; and

(III) an assessment of the reasons why the proposed project meets the definition of a covered project in subsection (b).

(B) INVITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which a lead agency receives the notice under subparagraph (A), the lead agency shall—

(I) identify another agency that may have an interest in the proposed project; and

(II) invite the agency to become a participating agency in the permitting management process and in the environmental review process described in subsection (f).

(ii) DEADLINES.—Each invitation made under clause (i) shall include a deadline for a response to be submitted to the lead agency.

(C) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—An agency invited under subparagraph (B) shall be designated as a participating agency for a covered project, unless the agency informs the lead agency in writing before the deadline described in subparagraph (B)(ii) that the agency—

(i) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the proposed project; or

(ii) does not intend to exercise authority related to, or submit comments on, the proposed project.

(D) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The designation described in subparagraph (C) shall not give the participating agency jurisdiction over the proposed project.

(E) CHANGE OF LEAD AGENCY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—On the request of a lead agency, participating agency, or project sponsor, the Federal CPO may designate a different agency as the lead agency for a covered project if the Federal CPO receives new information regarding the scope or nature of a covered project that indicates that the project should be placed in a different category under subsection (c)(3)(A)(ii).

(ii) RESOLUTION OF DISPUTE.—Any dispute over designation of a lead agency for a particular covered project shall be resolved by the Federal CPO.

(2) PERMITTING DASHBOARD.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Federal CPO, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall maintain an online database to be known as the ''Permitting Dashboard'' to track the status of Federal reviews and authorizations for any covered project in the inventory.

(ii) SPECIFIC AND SEARCHABLE ENTRY.—The Dashboard shall include a specific and searchable entry for each project.

(B) ADDITIONS.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Federal CPO receives a notice under paragraph (1)(A), the Federal CPO shall create a specific entry on the Dashboard for the project, unless the Federal CPO or lead agency determines that the project is not a covered project.

(C) SUBMISSIONS BY AGENCIES.—The lead agency and each participating agency shall submit to the Federal CPO for posting on the Dashboard for each covered project—

(i) any application and any supporting document submitted by a project sponsor for any required Federal review or authorization for the project;

(ii) not later than 2 business days after the date on which any agency action or decision that materially affects the status of the project is made, a description, including significant supporting documents, of the agency action or decision; and

(iii) the status of any litigation to which the agency is a party that is directly related to the project, including, if practicable, any judicial document made available on an electronic docket maintained by a Federal, State, or local court.

(D) POSTINGS BY THE FEDERAL CPO.—The Federal CPO shall post on the Dashboard an entry for each covered project that includes—

(i) the information submitted under subparagraph (C)(i) not later than 2 days after the date on which the Federal CPO receives the information;

(ii) a permitting timetable approved by the Federal CPO under paragraph (3)(B)(iii);

(iii) the status of the compliance of each participating agency with the permitting timetable;

(iv) any modifications of the permitting timetable; and

(v) an explanation of each modification described in clause (iv).

(3) COORDINATION AND TIMETABLES.—

(A) COORDINATION PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the lead agency receives a notice under paragraph (1)(A), the lead agency, in consultation with each participating agency, shall establish a concise plan for coordinating public and agency participation in, and completion of, any required Federal review and authorization for the project.

(ii) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The lead agency may incorporate the coordination plan described in clause (i) into a memorandum of understanding.

(B) PERMITTING TIMETABLE.—

(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—As part of the coordination plan required by subparagraph (A), the lead agency, in consultation with each participating agency, the project sponsor, and the State in which the project is located, shall establish a permitting timetable that includes intermediate and final deadlines for action by each participating agency on any Federal review or authorization required for the project.

(ii) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the permitting timetable under clause (i), the lead agency shall follow the performance schedules established under subsection (c)(3)(A)(iii), but may vary the timetable based on relevant factors, including—

(I) the size and complexity of the covered project;

(II) the resources available to each participating agency;

(III) the regional or national economic significance of the project;

(IV) the sensitivity of the natural or historic resources that may be affected by the project; and

(V) the extent to which similar projects in geographic proximity to the project were recently subject to environmental review or similar procedures under State law.

(iii) APPROVAL BY THE FEDERAL CPO.—

(I) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT.—The lead agency shall promptly submit to the Federal CPO a permitting timetable established under clause (i) for review.

(II) REVISION AND APPROVAL.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—The Federal CPO, after consultation with the lead agency, may revise the permitting timetable if the Federal CPO determines that the timetable deviates without reasonable justification from the performance schedule established under subsection (c)(3)(A)(iii).

(bb) NO REVISION BY FEDERAL CPO WITHIN 7 DAYS.—If the Federal CPO does not revise the permitting timetable earlier than the date that is 7 days after the date on which the lead agency submits to the Federal CPO the permitting timetable, the permitting timetable shall be approved by the Federal CPO.

(iv) MODIFICATION AFTER APPROVAL.—The lead agency may modify a permitting timetable established under clause (i) for good cause only if—

(I) the lead agency and the affected participating agency agree to a different deadline;

(II) the lead agency or the affected participating agency provides a written explanation of the justification for the modification; and

(III) the lead agency submits to the Federal CPO a modification, which the Federal CPO may revise or disapprove.

(v) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER TIME PERIODS.—A permitting timetable established under clause (i) shall be consistent with any other relevant time periods established under Federal law.

(vi) COMPLIANCE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal participating agency shall comply with the deadlines set forth in the permitting timetable approved under clause (iii), or with any deadline modified under clause (iv).

(II) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If a Federal participating agency fails to comply with a deadline for agency action on a covered project, the head of the participating agency shall—

(aa) promptly report to the Federal CPO for posting on the Dashboard an explanation of any specific reason for failing to meet the deadline and a proposal for an alternative deadline; and

(bb) report to the Federal CPO for posting on the Dashboard a monthly status report describing any agency activity related to the project until the agency has taken final action on the delayed authorization or review.

(C) COOPERATING STATE, LOCAL, OR TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable under applicable Federal law, the lead agency shall coordinate the Federal review and authorization process under this paragraph with any State, local, or tribal agency responsible for conducting any separate review or authorization of the covered project to ensure timely and efficient review and permitting decisions.

(ii) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Any coordination plan between the lead agency and any State, local,

or tribal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be included in a memorandum of understanding.

(II) SUBMISSION TO FEDERAL CPO.—A lead agency shall submit to the Federal CPO each memorandum of understanding described in subclause (I).

(III) POST TO DASHBOARD.—The Federal CPO shall post to the Dashboard each memorandum of understanding submitted under subclause (II).

(4) EARLY CONSULTATION.—The lead agency shall provide an expeditious process for project sponsors to confer with each participating agency involved and to have each participating agency determine and communicate to the project sponsor, not later than 60 days after the date on which the project sponsor submits a request, information concerning—

(A) the likelihood of approval for a potential covered project; and

(B) key issues of concern to each participating agency and to the public.

(5) COOPERATING AGENCY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A lead agency may designate a participating agency as a cooperating agency in accordance with part 1501 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(B) EFFECT ON OTHER DESIGNATION.—The designation described in subparagraph (A) shall not affect any designation under paragraph (1)(C).

(C) LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION.—Any agency not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (1)(C) shall not be designated as a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A).

(e) INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—The consent of Congress is given for 3 or more contiguous States to enter into an interstate compact establishing regional infrastructure development agencies to facilitate authorization and review of covered projects, under State law or in the exercise of delegated permitting authority described under subsection (g), that will advance infrastructure development, production, and generation within the States that are parties to the compact.

(f) COORDINATION OF REQUIRED REVIEWS.—

(1) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each agency shall, to the greatest extent permitted by law—

(A) carry out the obligations of the agency under other applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction with other reviews being conducted by other participating agencies, including environmental reviews required under NEPA, unless doing so would impair the ability of the agency to carry out statutory obligations; and

(B) formulate and implement administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

(2) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—

(A) STATE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS; SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—

(i) USE OF EXISTING DOCUMENTS.—On the request of a project sponsor, a lead agency shall consider and, as appropriate, adopt or incorporate, a document that has been prepared for a project under State laws and procedures as the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment for the project if the State laws and procedures under which the document was prepared provide, as determined by the lead agency in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality, environmental protection and opportunities for public participation that are substantially equivalent to NEPA.

(ii) NEPA OBLIGATIONS.—An environmental document adopted under clause (i) may serve as, or supplement, an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment required to be prepared by a lead agency under NEPA.

(iii) SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT.—In the case of an environmental document described in clause (i), during the period after preparation of the document and prior to the adoption of the document by the lead agency, the lead agency shall prepare and publish a supplemental document to the document if the lead agency determines that—

(I) a significant change has been made to the project that is relevant for purposes of environmental review of the project; or

(II) there have been significant changes in circumstances or availability of information relevant to the environmental review for the project.

(iv) COMMENTS.—If a lead agency prepares and publishes a supplemental document under clause (iii), the lead agency may solicit comments from other agencies and the public on the supplemental document for a period of not more than 30 days beginning on the date on which the supplemental document is published.

(v) RECORD OF DECISION.—A lead agency shall issue a record of decision or finding of no significant impact, as appropriate, based on the document adopted under clause (i) and any supplemental document prepared under clause (iii).

(3) ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS.—

(A) PARTICIPATION.—As early as practicable during the environmental review, but not later than the commencement of scoping for a project requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for the involvement of cooperating agencies in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for a project.

(B) RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES.—Following participation under subparagraph (A), the lead agency shall determine the range of alternatives for consideration in any document that the lead agency is responsible for preparing for the project.

(C) METHODOLOGIES.—The lead agency shall determine, in collaboration with each cooperating agency at appropriate times during the environmental review, the methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative for a project.

(D) PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.—At the discretion of the lead agency, the preferred alternative for a project, after being identified, may be developed to a higher level of detail than other alternatives to facilitate the development of mitigation measures or concurrent compliance with other applicable laws if the lead agency determines that the development of the higher level of detail will not prevent—

(i) the lead agency from making an impartial decision as to whether to accept another alternative that is being considered in the environmental review; and

(ii) the public from commenting on the preferred and other alternatives

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS.—

(A) COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—For comments by an agency or the public on a draft environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of not more than 60 days after the date on which a notice announcing availability of the environmental impact statement is published in the Federal Register, unless—

(i) the lead agency, the project sponsor, and each participating agency agree to a different deadline; or

(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

(B) OTHER COMMENTS.—For all other comment periods for agency or public comments in the environmental review process, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of not later than 30 days after the date on which the materials on which comment is requested are made available, unless—

(i) the lead agency, the project sponsor, and each participating agency agree to a different deadline; or

(ii) the lead agency modifies the deadline for good cause.

(5) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

(A) COOPERATION.—The lead agency and each participating agency shall work cooperatively in accordance with this subsection to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review or could result in denial of any approval required for the project under applicable laws.

(B) LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall make information available to each participating agency as early as practicable in the environmental review regarding the environmental, historic, and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration.

(ii) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—The information described in clause (i) may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

(C) PARTICIPATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Based on information received from the lead agency under subparagraph (B), each participating agency shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern, including any issues that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval needed for the project, regarding any potential environmental, historic, or socioeconomic impacts of the project.

(6) CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS.—The authorities granted under this subsection may be exercised for an individual project or a category of projects.

(g) DELEGATED STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—If a Federal statute permits a State to be delegated or otherwise authorized by a Federal agency to issue or otherwise administer a permit program in lieu of the Federal agency, each member of the Council shall—

(1) on publication by the Council of best practices under subsection (c)(3)(B)(ii), initiate a process, with public participation, to determine whether and the extent to which any of the best practices are applicable to permitting under the statute; and

(2) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, make recommendations for State modifications of the permit program to reflect the best practices described in subsection (c)(3)(B)(ii), as appropriate.

(h) LITIGATION, JUDICIAL REVIEW, AND SAVINGS PROVISION.—

(1) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of any authorization issued by a Federal agency for a covered project shall be barred unless—

(i) the action is filed not later than 150 days after the date on which a notice is published in the Federal Register that the authorization is final pursuant to the law

under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law under which judicial review is allowed; and

(ii) in the case of an action pertaining to an environmental review conducted under NEPA—

(I) the action is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the environmental review on the issue on which the party seeks judicial review; and

(II) the comment was sufficiently detailed to put the lead agency on notice of the issue on which the party seeks judicial review.

(B) NEW INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The head of a lead agency or participating agency shall consider new information received after the close of a comment period if the information satisfies the requirements under regulations implementing NEPA.

(ii) SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—If the preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement is required, the preparation of the supplemental environmental impact statement shall be considered a separate final agency action and the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of the agency action shall be 150 days after the date on which a notice announcing the agency action is published in the Federal Register.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph creates a right to judicial review or places any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of an authorization.

(2) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—In addition to considering any other applicable equitable factors, including the effects on public health, safety, and the environment, in any action seeking a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction against an agency or a project sponsor in connection with review or authorization of a covered project, the court shall—

(A) consider the potential for significant job losses or other economic harm resulting from an order or injunction; and

(B) not presume that the harms described in subparagraph (A) are reparable.

(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), nothing in this section affects the reviewability of any final Federal agency action in a court of the United States or in the court of any State.

(4) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section—

(A) supersedes, amends, or modifies NEPA or any other Federal environmental statute or affects the responsibility of any Federal officer to comply with or enforce any statute; or

(B) creates a presumption that a covered project will be approved or favorably reviewed by any agency.

(5) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection preempts, limits, or interferes with—

(A) any practice of seeking, considering, or responding to public comment; or

(B) any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority that a Federal, State, or local governmental agency, metropolitan planning organization, Indian tribe, or project sponsor has with respect to carrying out a project or any other provisions of law applicable to any project, plan, or program.

(i) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 15 of each year, the Federal CPO shall submit to Congress a report detailing the progress accomplished under this section during the previous fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall assess the performance of each participating agency and lead agency based on the best practices described in subsection (c)(3)(B)(ii).

(3) OPPORTUNITY TO INCLUDE COMMENTS.—Each agency CPO shall have the opportunity to include comments concerning the performance of the agency in the report described in paragraph (1).

(j) APPLICATION.—This section applies to any covered project for which an application or request for a Federal authorization is pending before a Federal agency 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3664. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 203 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 11(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to ensure implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law by trading partners of the United States through capacity building and other appropriate means;

(12) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce; and

(13) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and

scientific data, and are not more restrictive on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements,

while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) FOREIGN INVESTMENT.—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and

(iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of amicus curiae submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i)(I) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) REGULATORY PRACTICES.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards-development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are non-discriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations,

in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 211(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 211(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 211(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 211(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction, in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable, bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 211(17));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(13) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(14) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the ''OECD Anti-Bribery Convention'').

(15) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equitable, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(16) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(17) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(18) TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environment and human health based on sound science; and

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994.

SEC. 203. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of

this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/10 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) ½ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 206 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 202 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 204 and 205.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 206(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''extension disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 203(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 203(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.'', with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the principal negotiating objectives set forth in section 202(b).

SEC. 204. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information to Members of Congress regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and to committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the ''congressional advisory groups'').

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with

and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 205(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

SEC. 205. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 203(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 204(c); and

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 204(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR NOTICE AND CONSULTATION ON DOHA-RELATED AGREEMENTS.—In the case of any plurilateral agreement between the United States and one or more WTO members relating to a matter described in the Ministerial Declaration of the World Trade Organization adopted at Doha November 14, 2001—

(A) the President shall provide the written notice described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) to Congress at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations for the agreement and comply with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of that paragraph with respect to the agreement; and

(B) if another WTO member seeks to join the negotiations after notice is provided under subparagraph (A) and the President determines that the WTO member is willing and able to meet the standard of the agreement and the participation of the WTO member would further the objectives of the United States for the agreement, the President shall—

(i) provide advance written notice to Congress before the WTO member joins the negotiations with respect to whether the United States intends to support the entry of the WTO member into the negotiations; and

(ii) consult with Congress as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 202(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with

respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 207(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(5) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(6) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 203(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 204(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 206, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 203(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 202(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 206(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''resolution'' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 205(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 202(b)(16) of that Act.'', with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 203(a)(2) or 206(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 203(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ''Commission'') with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the

Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 203(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 202(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final text of an agreement pursuant to section 206(a)(1)(C).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final text of an agreement pursuant to section 206(a)(1)(C).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 204(c)(3)(B)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final text of an agreement pursuant to section 206(a)(1)(C), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) OTHER REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PENALTIES.—Not later than one year after the imposition of a penalty or remedy by the United States permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a United States trade agreement, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 206. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 203(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(C) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 203(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(D) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(E) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(C)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 203(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 203(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 203(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''procedural disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the President has ''failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014'' on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 204 and 205 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 204 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 204(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 205(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 15, 2014, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 202(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(c) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 203(c), and section 205(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 207. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.

(a) CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 205(a), if an agreement to which section 203(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 205(a)(1) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union, or

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with WTO members with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 205(a)(2) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies—

(1) the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 205(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any procedural disapproval resolution under section 206(b)(1)(B) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 205(a); provided that

(2) the President as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) notifies the Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 205(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 204(c).

SEC. 208. SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 203(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 203(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 203(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

SEC. 209. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

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

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access, and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are considered in all trade negotiations in accordance with the objective described in section 202(a)(8).

SEC. 210. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b) of section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(2) HEARINGS.—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(3) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(4) PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(5) INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(II) by striking ''not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 206(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 202 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(6) PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 206(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 206(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 203 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014''.

(b) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 203 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 203 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term ''Agreement on Agriculture'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term ''Agreement on Safeguards'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term ''Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term ''Antidumping Agreement'' means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term ''Appellate Body'' means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''common multilateral environmental agreement'' means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''core labor standards'' means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term ''Dispute Settlement Understanding'' means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) ENABLING CLAUSE.—The term ''Enabling Clause'' means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November

28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The term ''environmental laws'', with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) GATT 1994.—The term ''GATT 1994'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.—The term ''General Agreement on Trade in Services'' means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Government Procurement Agreement'' means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) ILO.—The term ''ILO'' means the International Labor Organization.

(15) IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term ''import sensitive agricultural product'' means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.—The term ''Information Technology Agreement'' means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''internationally recognized core labor standards'' means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term ''labor laws'' means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term ''Uruguay Round Agreements'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms ''World Trade Organization'' and ''WTO'' mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBER.—The term ''WTO member'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

SA 3665. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. COMMERCIAL DRIVERS LICENSE SKILLS TESTING REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine—

(A) the Commercial Drivers License (referred to in this section as ''CDL'') skills testing procedures used by each State;

(B) whether States using the procedures described in paragraph (2)(A) have reduced testing wait times, on average, compared to the procedures described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2);

(C) for each of the 3 CDL skills testing procedures described in paragraph (2)—

(i) the average time between a CDL applicant's request for a CDL skills test and such test in States using such procedure;

(ii) the failure rate of CDL applicants in States using such procedure; and

(iii) the average time between a CDL applicant's request to retake a CDL skills test and such test; and

(D) the total economic impact of CDL skills testing delays.

(2) SKILLS TESTING PROCEDURES.—The procedures described in this paragraph are—

(A) third party testing, using nongovernmental contractors to proctor CDL skills tests on behalf of the State;

(B) modified third party testing, administering CDL skills tests at State testing facilities, community colleges, or a limited number of third parties; and

(C) State testing, administering CDL skills tests only at State-owned facilities.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress that contains the results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 202. WAIVER OF NONCONFLICTING REGULATIONS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''infrastructure project'' means any physical systems project carried out in the United States, such as a project relating to transportation, communications, sewage, or water.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''infrastructure project'' includes a project for energy infrastructure.

(2) NONCONFLICTING REGULATION.—The term ''nonconflicting regulation'' means a Federal regulation applicable to an infrastructure project, the waiver of which would not conflict with any provision of Federal or State law, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the head of a Federal department or agency with jurisdiction over a nonconflicting regulation.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' includes—

(i) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, with respect to nonconflicting regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(ii) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with respect to nonconflicting regulations of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) ACTION BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), on receipt of a request of the Governor of a State in which an infrastructure project is conducted, the Secretary concerned shall waive any nonconflicting regulation applicable to the infrastructure project that, as determined by the Secretary concerned, in consultation with the Governor, impedes or could impede the progress of the infrastructure project.

(2) DEADLINE FOR WAIVER.—The Secretary concerned shall waive a nonconflicting regulation by not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of a request under paragraph (1).

(3) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary concerned shall provide a waiver under this subsection with respect to a nonconflicting regulation unless the Secretary concerned provides to the applicable Governor, by not later than the date described in paragraph (2), a written notice that the nonconflicting regulation is necessary due to a specific, direct, and quantifiable concern for safety or the environment.

SEC. 203. STATE CONTROL OF ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION ON ALL AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''available Federal land'' means any Federal land that, as of May 31, 2013—

(A) is located within the boundaries of a State;

(B) is not held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe;

(C) is not a unit of the National Park System;

(D) is not a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(E) is not a Congressionally designated wilderness area.

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

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

(b) STATE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State—

(A) may establish a program covering the leasing and permitting processes, regulatory requirements, and any other provisions by which the State would exercise its rights to develop all forms of energy resources on available Federal land in the State; and

(B) as a condition of certification under subsection (c)(2) shall submit a declaration to the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy that a program under subparagraph (A) has been established or amended.

(2) AMENDMENT OF PROGRAMS.—A State may amend a program developed and certified under this section at any time.

(3) CERTIFICATION OF AMENDED PROGRAMS.—Any program amended under paragraph (2) shall be certified under subsection (c)(2).

(c) LEASING, PERMITTING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) SATISFACTION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each program certified under this

section shall be considered to satisfy all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations), including—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(2) FEDERAL CERTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.—Upon submission of a declaration by a State under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i)—

(A) the program under subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be certified; and

(B) the State shall receive all rights from the Federal Government to develop all forms of energy resources covered by the program.

(3) ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND LEASES.—If a State elects to issue a permit or lease for the development of any form of energy resource on any available Federal land within the borders of the State in accordance with a program certified under paragraph (2), the permit or lease shall be considered to meet all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to judicial review.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.—Activities carried out in accordance with this sectuib shall not be subject to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

SEC. 204. FRACTURING REGULATIONS ARE EFFECTIVE IN STATE HANDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) hydraulic fracturing is a commercially viable practice that has been used in the United States for more than 60 years in more than 1,000,000 wells;

(2) the Ground Water Protection Council, a national association of State water regulators that is considered to be a leading groundwater protection organization in the United States, released a report entitled ''State Oil and Natural Gas Regulations Designed to Protect Water Resources'' and dated May 2009 finding that the ''current State regulation of oil and gas activities is environmentally proactive and preventive'';

(3) that report also concluded that ''[a]ll oil and gas producing States have regulations which are designed to provide protection for water resources'';

(4) a 2004 study by the Environmental Protection Agency, entitled ''Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs'', found no evidence of drinking water wells contaminated by fracture fluid from the fracked formation;

(5) a 2009 report by the Ground Water Protection Council, entitled ''State Oil and Natural Gas Regulations Designed to Protect Water Resources'', found a ''lack of evidence'' that hydraulic fracturing conducted in both deep and shallow formations presents a risk of endangerment to ground water;

(6) a January 2009 resolution by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission stated ''The states, who regulate production, have comprehensive laws and regulations to ensure operations are safe and to protect drinking water. States have found no verified cases of groundwater contamination associated with hydraulic fracturing.'';

(7) on May 24, 2011, before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee of the House of Representatives, Lisa Jackson, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, testified that she was ''not aware of any proven case where the fracking process itself has affected water'';

(8) in 2011, Bureau of Land Management Director Bob Abbey stated, ''We have not seen evidence of any adverse effect as a result of the use of the chemicals that are part of that fracking technology.'';

(9)(A) activities relating to hydraulic fracturing (such as surface discharges, wastewater disposal, and air emissions) are already regulated at the Federal level under a variety of environmental statutes, including portions of—

(i) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(ii) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(iii) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); but

(B) Congress has continually elected not to include the hydraulic fracturing process in the underground injection control program under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(10) in 2011, the Secretary of the Interior announced the intention to promulgate new Federal regulations governing hydraulic fracturing on Federal land; and

(11) a February 2012 study by the Energy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin, entitled ''Fact-Based Regulation for Environmental Protection in Shale Gas Development'', found that ''[n]o evidence of chemicals from hydraulic fracturing fluid has been found in aquifers as a result of fracturing operations''.

(b) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAND.—In this section, the term ''Federal land'' means—

(1) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702));

(2) National Forest System land;

(3) land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

(4) land under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

(c) STATE AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State shall have the sole authority to promulgate or enforce any regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding the treatment of a well by the application of fluids under pressure to which propping agents may be added for the expressly designed purpose of initiating or propagating fractures in a target geologic formation in order to enhance production of oil, natural gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land within the boundaries of the State.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The treatment of a well by the application of fluids under pressure to which propping agents may be added for the expressly designed purpose of initiating or propagating fractures in a target geologic formation in order to enhance production of oil, natural gas, or geothermal production activities on Federal land shall be subject to the law of the State in which the land is located.

SEC. 205. ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES.—

(1) MAXIMUM FUEL ECONOMY INCREASE FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(except an electric automobile)'' and inserting ''(except an electric automobile or, beginning with model year 2016, an alternative fueled automobile that does not use a fuel described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of section 32901(a)(1))''.

(2) MINIMUM DRIVING RANGES FOR DUAL FUELED PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32901(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', except that beginning with model year 2016, alternative fueled automobiles that do not use a fuel described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (a)(1) shall have a minimum driving range of 150 miles'' after ''at least 200 miles''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding at the end the following: ''Beginning with model year 2016, if the Secretary prescribes a minimum driving range of 150 miles for alternative fueled automobiles that do not use a fuel described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (a)(1), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to dual fueled automobiles (except electric automobiles).''.

(3) MANUFACTURING PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32905(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(B) by striking ''For any model'' and inserting the following:

''(1) MODEL YEARS 1993 THROUGH 2015.—For any model'';

(C) in paragraph (1), as redesignated, by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2015''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) MODEL YEARS AFTER 2015.—For any model of gaseous fuel dual fueled automobile manufactured by a manufacturer after model year 2015, the Administrator shall calculate fuel economy as a weighted harmonic average of the fuel economy on gaseous fuel as measured under subsection (c) and the fuel economy on gasoline or diesel fuel as measured under section 32904(c). The Administrator shall apply the utility factors set forth in the table under section 600.510–12(c)(2)(vii)(A) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(3) MODEL YEARS AFTER 2016.—Beginning with model year 2017, the manufacturer may elect to utilize the utility factors set forth under subsection (e)(1) for the purposes of calculating fuel economy under paragraph (2).''.

(4) ELECTRIC DUAL FUELED AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32905 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) ELECTRIC DUAL FUELED AUTOMOBILES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the manufacturer, the Administrator may measure the fuel economy for any model of dual fueled automobile manufactured after model year 2015 that is capable of operating on electricity in addition to gasoline or diesel fuel, obtains its electricity from a source external to the vehicle, and meets the minimum driving range requirements established by the Secretary for dual fueled electric automobiles, by dividing 1.0 by the sum of—

''(A) the percentage utilization of the model on gasoline or diesel fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(c); and

''(B) the percentage utilization of the model on electricity, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(a)(2).

''(2) ALTERNATIVE UTILIZATION.—The Administrator may adapt the utility factor established under paragraph (1) for alternative

fueled automobiles that do not use a fuel described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of section 32901(a)(1).

''(3) ALTERNATIVE CALCULATION.—If the manufacturer does not request that the Administrator calculate the manufacturing incentive for its electric dual fueled automobiles in accordance with paragraph (1), the Administrator shall calculate such incentive for such automobiles manufactured by such manufacturer after model year 2015 in accordance with subsection (b).''.

(5) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 32906(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 32905(e)'' and inserting ''section 32905(f)''.

(b) HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE FACILITIES.—Section 166 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (b)(5), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) INHERENTLY LOW-EMISSION VEHICLES.—If a State agency establishes procedures for enforcing the restrictions on the use of a HOV facility by vehicles listed in clauses (i) and (ii), the State agency may allow the use of the HOV facility by—

''(i) alternative fuel vehicles; and

''(ii) new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles (as defined in section 30D(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''; and

(2) in subparagraph (f)(1), by inserting ''solely'' before ''operating''.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall submit a report to Congress that—

(1) describes options to incentivize the development of public compressed natural gas fueling stations; and

(2) analyzes a variety of possible financing tools, which could include—

(A) Federal grants and credit assistance;

(B) public-private partnerships; and

(C) membership-based cooperatives.

SEC. 206. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS IN EMERGENCIES.

Section 1315 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (23 U.S.C. 109 note; 126 Stat. 549) is amended by striking ''activity is—'' and all that follows through ''(2) commenced'' and inserting ''activity is commenced''.

SEC. 207. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN RIGHT-OF-WAY.

Section 1316 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (23 U.S.C. 109 note; 126 Stat. 549) is amended—

(1) in the heading of subsection (b), by striking ''AN OPERATIONAL''; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1) and subsection (b), by striking ''operational'' each place it appears.

SEC. 208. LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 176 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7506) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c)(1) No'' and all that follows through ''(d) Each'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each'';

(2) in the first sentence, by striking ''prepared under this section''; and

(3) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to—

''(1) title 23, United States Code;

''(2) chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; and

''(3) the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701t et seq.).''.

SEC. 209. TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this title shall terminate on the day that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies, including the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, fails to publish in the Federal Register a report that models the impact of major Federal regulations on job creation across the whole economy of the United States.

(b) UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall update the report described in subsection (a) not less frequently than once every 30 days.

(2) TERMINATION.—The amendments made by this title shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the most recent report described in paragraph (1) is required if the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, fails to update the report in accordance with paragraph (1).

SA 3666. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION ___. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

SA 3667. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—REGULATION OF OIL OR NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND IN STATES

SEC. 201.

This title may be cited as the ''Empower States Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. REGULATION OF OIL OR NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND IN STATES.

The Mineral Leasing Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 44 (30 U.S.C. 181 note) as section 45; and

(2) by inserting after section 43 (30 U.S.C. 226–3) the following:

''SEC. 44. REGULATION OF OIL OR NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND IN STATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue or promulgate any guideline or regulation relating to oil or gas exploration or production on Federal land in a State if the State has otherwise met the requirements under this Act or any other applicable Federal law.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may issue or promulgate guidelines and regulations relating to oil or gas exploration or production on Federal land in a State if the Secretary of the Interior determines that as a result of the oil or gas exploration or production there is an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment.''.

SEC. 203. REGULATIONS.

Part E of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1459. REGULATIONS.

''(a) COMMENTS RELATING TO OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION.—Before issuing or promulgating any guideline or regulation relating to oil and gas exploration and production on Federal, State, tribal, or fee land pursuant to this Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the leasing of certain Indian lands for mining purposes', approved May 11, 1938 (commonly known as the 'Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938') (25 U.S.C. 396a et seq.), the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), or any other provision of law or Executive order, the head of a Federal department or agency shall seek comments from and consult with the head of each affected State, State agency, and Indian tribe at a location within the jurisdiction of the State or Indian tribe, as applicable.

''(b) STATEMENT OF ENERGY AND ECONOMIC IMPACT.—Each Federal department or agency described in subsection (a) shall develop a Statement of Energy and Economic Impact, which shall consist of a detailed statement

and analysis supported by credible objective evidence relating to—

''(1) any adverse effects on energy supply, distribution, or use, including a shortfall in supply, price increases, and increased use of foreign supplies; and

''(2) any impact on the domestic economy if the action is taken, including the loss of jobs and decrease of revenue to each of the general and educational funds of the State or affected Indian tribe.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal department or agency shall not impose any new or modified regulation unless the head of the applicable Federal department or agency determines—

''(A) that the rule is necessary to prevent imminent substantial danger to the public health or the environment; and

''(B) by clear and convincing evidence, that the State or Indian tribe does not have an existing reasonable alternative to the proposed regulation.

''(2) DISCLOSURE.—Any Federal regulation promulgated on or after the date of enactment of this paragraph that requires disclosure of hydraulic fracturing chemicals shall refer to the database managed by the Ground Water Protection Council and the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any regulation described in this section, a State or Indian tribe adversely affected by an action carried out under the regulation shall be entitled to review by a United States district court located in the State or the District of Columbia of compliance by the applicable Federal department or agency with the requirements of this section.

''(2) ACTION BY COURT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A district court providing review under this subsection may enjoin or mandate any action by a relevant Federal department or agency until the district court determines that the department or agency has complied with the requirements of this section.

''(B) DAMAGES.—The court shall not order money damages.

''(3) SCOPE AND STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In reviewing a regulation under this subsection—

''(A) the court shall not consider any evidence outside of the record that was before the agency; and

''(B) the standard of review shall be de novo.''.

SA 3668. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION __—NORTH ATLANTIC ENERGY SECURITY

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''North Atlantic Energy Security Act''.

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

TITLE I—NATURAL GAS GATHERING ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Natural Gas Gathering Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) record volumes of natural gas production in the United States as of the date of enactment of this Act are providing enormous benefits to the United States, including by—

(A) reducing the need for imports of natural gas, thereby directly reducing the trade deficit;

(B) strengthening trade ties among the United States, Canada, and Mexico;

(C) providing the opportunity for the United States to join the emerging global gas trade through the export of liquefied natural gas;

(D) creating and supporting millions of new jobs across the United States;

(E) adding billions of dollars to the gross domestic product of the United States every year;

(F) generating additional Federal, State, and local government tax revenues; and

(G) revitalizing the manufacturing sector by providing abundant and affordable feedstock;

(2) large quantities of natural gas are lost due to venting and flaring, primarily in areas where natural gas infrastructure has not been developed quickly enough, such as States with large quantities of Federal land and Indian land;

(3) permitting processes can hinder the development of natural gas infrastructure, such as pipeline lines and gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; and

(4) additional authority for the Secretary of the Interior to approve natural gas pipelines and gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land would—

(A) assist in bringing gas to market that would otherwise be vented or flared; and

(B) significantly increase royalties collected by the Secretary of the Interior and disbursed to Federal, State, and tribal governments and individual Indians.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITY TO APPROVE NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

Section 1 of the Act of February 15, 1901 (31 Stat. 790, chapter 372; 16 U.S.C. 79), is amended by inserting '', for natural gas pipelines'' after ''distribution of electrical power''.

SEC. 104. CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES LOCATED ON FEDERAL LAND AND INDIAN LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title III of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 685) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 319. CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES LOCATED ON FEDERAL LAND AND INDIAN LAND.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) GAS GATHERING LINE AND ASSOCIATED FIELD COMPRESSION UNIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' means—

''(i) a pipeline that is installed to transport natural gas production associated with 1 or more wells drilled and completed to produce crude oil; and

''(ii) if necessary, a compressor to raise the pressure of that transported natural gas to higher pressures suitable to enable the gas to flow into pipelines and other facilities.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' does not include a pipeline or compression unit that is installed to transport natural gas from a processing plant to a common carrier pipeline or facility.

''(2) FEDERAL LAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Federal land' means land the title to which is held by the United States.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'Federal land' does not include—

''(i) a unit of the National Park System;

''(ii) a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; or

''(iii) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

''(3) INDIAN LAND.—The term 'Indian land' means land the title to which is held by—

''(A) the United States in trust for an Indian tribe or an individual Indian; or

''(B) an Indian tribe or an individual Indian subject to a restriction by the United States against alienation.

''(b) CERTAIN NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the issuance of a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit that is located on Federal land or Indian land and that services any oil well shall be considered to be an action that is categorically excluded (as defined in section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act)) for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if the gas gathering line and associated field compression unit are—

''(A) within a field or unit for which an approved land use plan or an environmental document prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) analyzed transportation of natural gas produced from 1 or more oil wells in that field or unit as a reasonably foreseeable activity; and

''(B) located adjacent to an existing disturbed area for the construction of a road or pad.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—

''(A) FEDERAL LAND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to Federal land, or a portion of Federal land, for which the Governor of the

State in which the Federal land is located submits to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, a written request that paragraph (1) not apply to that Federal land (or portion of Federal land).

''(B) INDIAN LAND.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to Indian land, or a portion of Indian land, for which the Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the Indian land submits to the Secretary of the Interior a written request that paragraph (1) apply to that Indian land (or portion of Indian land).

''(c) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section affects or alters any requirement—

''(1) relating to prior consent under—

''(A) section 2 of the Act of February 5, 1948 (25 U.S.C. 324); or

''(B) section 16(e) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 476(e)) (commonly known as the 'Indian Reorganization Act'); or

''(2) under any other Federal law (including regulations) relating to tribal consent for rights-of-way across Indian land.''.

(b) ASSESSMENTS.—Title XVIII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 1122) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1841. NATURAL GAS GATHERING SYSTEM ASSESSMENTS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF GAS GATHERING LINE AND ASSOCIATED FIELD COMPRESSION UNIT.—In this section, the term 'gas gathering line and associated field compression unit' has the meaning given the term in section 319.

''(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the North Atlantic Energy Security Act of 2014, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes, shall conduct a study to identify—

''(1) any actions that may be taken, under Federal law (including regulations), to expedite permitting for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets; and

''(2) any proposed changes to Federal law (including regulations) to expedite permitting for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets.

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the North Atlantic Energy Security Act of 2014, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

''(1) the progress made in expediting permits for gas gathering lines and associated field compression units that are located on Federal land or Indian land, for the purpose of transporting natural gas associated with crude oil production on any land to a processing plant or a common carrier pipeline for delivery to markets; and

''(2) any issues impeding that progress.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 594) is amended by adding at the end of subtitle B of title III the following:

''Sec. 319. Certain natural gas gathering lines located on Federal land and Indian land.''.

(2) Section 1(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 594) is amended by adding at the end of title XXVIII the following:

''Sec. 1841. Natural gas gathering system assessments.''.

SEC. 105. DEADLINES FOR PERMITTING NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT.

Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—The Secretary of the Interior or other appropriate agency head shall issue a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit (as defined in section 319(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) that is located on Federal lands—

''(1) for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit described in section 319(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, not later than 30 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance; and

''(2) for all other gas gathering lines and associated field compression units, not later than 60 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance.''.

SEC. 106. DEADLINES FOR PERMITTING NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.

Section 504 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) NATURAL GAS GATHERING LINES.—The Secretary concerned shall issue a sundry notice or right-of-way for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit (as defined in section 319(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) that is located on public lands—

''(1) for a gas gathering line and associated field compression unit described in section 319(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, not later than 30 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance; and

''(2) for all other gas gathering lines and associated field compression units, not later than 60 days after the date on which the applicable agency head receives the request for issuance.''.

SEC. 107. LNG REGULATORY CERTAINTY.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make a public interest determination and issue an order under subsection (a) for an application for the exportation of natural gas to a foreign country through a particular LNG terminal not later than 45 days after receipt of an application under subsection (e) for—

''(A) the conversion of that LNG terminal into an LNG import or export facility; or

''(B) the construction of that LNG terminal.

''(2) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall not apply with respect to an application under subsection (a) for the exportation of natural gas—

''(A) to a foreign country—

''(i) to which the exportation of natural gas is otherwise prohibited by law; or

''(ii) described in subsection (c); or

''(B) if the Commission has made a contingent determination with respect to the application.

''(3) EFFECT.—Except as specifically provided in this subsection, nothing in this subsection affects the authority of the Commission to review, process, and make a determination with respect to an application for the exportation of natural gas.''.

SEC. 108. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO UKRAINE AND NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES AND JAPAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (delegating to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations), Congress finds that exports of natural gas produced in the United States to Ukraine, member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and Japan is—

(1) necessary for the protection of the essential security interests of the United States; and

(2) in the public interest pursuant to section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

(b) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by inserting '', to Ukraine, to a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or to Japan'' after ''trade in natural gas''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—ONSHORE OIL AND GAS PERMIT STREAMLINING

Subtitle A—Streamlining Permitting

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Streamlining Permitting of American Energy Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. PERMIT TO DRILL APPLICATION TIMELINE.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

''(A) TIMELINE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an application for a permit to drill, the Secretary shall decide whether to issue or deny the permit.

''(ii) EXTENSION.—On giving written notice of a delay to the applicant, the Secretary may extend the period described in clause (i) for not more than 2 additional periods of 15 days each.

''(iii) FORM OF NOTICE.—The notice referred to in clause (ii) shall—

''(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

''(II) shall include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

''(B) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application shall be considered to be approved, except in a case in which an existing review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is incomplete.

''(C) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

''(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

''(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

''(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date on which the application is submitted to the Secretary.

''(D) FEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall collect a single $6,500 permit processing fee per application from each applicant at the time the final decision is made whether to issue a permit under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The fee described in clause (i) shall not apply to any resubmitted application.

''(iii) TREATMENT OF PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—Of all amounts collected as fees under this paragraph, 50 percent shall be—

''(I) transferred to the field office where the fee is collected; and

''(II) used to process leases and permits under this Act, subject to appropriation.''.

SEC. 203. MAKING PILOT OFFICES PERMANENT TO IMPROVE ENERGY PERMITTING ON FEDERAL LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENERGY PROJECTS.—The term ''energy projects'' includes oil, natural gas, and other energy projects, as defined by the Secretary.

(2) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Federal Permit Streamlining Project established under subsection (b).

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

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Federal Permit Streamlining Project in every Bureau of Land Management field office with responsibility for permitting energy projects on Federal land.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding for purposes of this section with—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(B) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(C) the Chief of Engineers.

(2) STATE PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary may request that the Governor of any State in which energy projects on Federal land are located be a signatory to the memorandum of understanding.

(d) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the signing of the memorandum of understanding under subsection (c), all Federal signatory parties shall, if appropriate, assign to each of the Bureau of Land Management field offices an employee who has expertise in the regulatory issues relating to the office in which the employee is employed, including, as applicable, particular expertise in—

(A) the consultations and the preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536);

(B) permits under section 404 of Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344);

(C) regulatory matters under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(D) planning under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a et seq.); and

(E) the preparation of analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) DUTIES.—Each employee assigned under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of assignment, report to the Bureau of Land Management Field Managers in the office to which the employee is assigned;

(B) be responsible for all issues relating to the energy projects that arise under the authorities of the agency of the employee; and

(C) participate as part of the team of personnel working on proposed energy projects, planning, and environmental analyses on Federal land.

(e) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall assign to each Bureau of Land Management field office identified in subsection (b) any additional personnel that are necessary to ensure the effective approval and implementation of energy projects administered by the Bureau of Land Management field offices, including inspection and enforcement relating to energy development on Federal land, in accordance with the multiple use mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(f) FUNDING.—Salaries for the additional personnel shall be funded from the collection of fees described in section 17(p)(2)(D) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2)(D)) (as amended by section 202).

(g) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the operation of any Federal or State law; or

(2) any delegation of authority made by the head of a Federal agency whose employees are participating in the Project.

SEC. 204. ADMINISTRATION.

Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Interior shall not require a finding of extraordinary circumstances in administering section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942).

SEC. 205. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED CIVIL ACTION.—The term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action (as defined for the purposes of that section) affecting a covered energy project on Federal land.

(2) COVERED ENERGY PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered energy project'' means the leasing of Federal land for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, or any other source of energy, and any action carried out pursuant to that lease.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered energy project'' does not include any disputes between the parties to a lease regarding the obligations under the lease, including regarding any alleged breach of the lease.

(b) EXCLUSIVE VENUE FOR CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS.—Venue for any covered civil action shall lie in the district court where the project or leases exist or are proposed.

(c) TIMELY FILING.—To ensure timely redress by the courts, a covered civil action shall be filed not later than the last day of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which the covered civil action relates.

(d) EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.—The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

(e) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In any judicial review of a covered civil action, administrative findings and conclusions relating to the challenged Federal action or decision shall be presumed to be correct, and the presumption may be rebutted only by the preponderance of the evidence contained in the administrative record.

(f) LIMITATION ON INJUNCTION AND PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that the relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

(2) DURATION OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.—A court shall limit the duration of a preliminary injunction to halt a covered energy project to a period of not more than 60 days, unless the court finds clear reasons to extend the injunction.

(3) DURATION OF EXTENSION.—An extension under paragraph (2) shall—

(A) only be for a period of not more than 30 days; and

(B) require action by the court to renew the injunction.

(g) LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Equal Access to Justice Act'') shall not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in the covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for attorneys' fees, expenses, or other court costs.

(h) LEGAL STANDING.—A person filing an appeal with the Department of the Interior Board of Land Appeals shall meet the same standing requirements as a person before a United States district court.

Subtitle B—BLM Live Internet Auctions

SEC. 211. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''BLM Live Internet Auctions Act''.

SEC. 212. INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the third sentence, by inserting '', except as provided in subparagraph (C)'' after ''by oral bidding''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) INTERNET-BASED BIDDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In order to diversify and expand the onshore leasing program in the United States to ensure the best return to the Federal taxpayer, reduce fraud, and secure the leasing process, the Secretary may conduct onshore lease sales through Internet-based bidding methods.

''(ii) CONCLUSION OF SALE.—Each individual Internet-based lease sale shall conclude not later than 7 days after the date of initiation of the sale.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the tenth Internet-based lease sale conducted pursuant to subparagraph (C) of section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) (as added by subsection (a)), the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, an analysis of the first 10 such lease sales, including—

(1) estimates of increases or decreases in the lease sales, compared to sales conducted by oral bidding, in—

(A) the number of bidders;

(B) the average amount of the bids;

(C) the highest amount of the bids; and
(D) the lowest amount of the bids;
(2) an estimate on the total cost or savings to the Department of the Interior as a result of the sales, as compared to sales conducted by oral bidding; and
(3) an evaluation of the demonstrated or expected effectiveness of different structures for lease sales, which may—
(A) provide an opportunity to better maximize bidder participation;
(B) ensure the highest return to the Federal taxpayers;
(C) minimize opportunities for fraud or collusion; and
(D) ensure the security and integrity of the leasing process.

SA 3669. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REGULATORY CERTAINTY.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.—

''(1) LNG TERMINALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Commission shall make a public interest determination and issue an order under subsection (a) for an application for the exportation of natural gas to a foreign country through a particular LNG terminal not later than 45 days after receipt of an application under subsection (e) for—

''(i) the conversion of that LNG terminal into an LNG import or export facility; or

''(ii) the construction of that LNG terminal.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall only apply to applications for the exportation of natural gas to a foreign country under subsection (a) that have been pending for a period of not less than 180 calendar days.

''(2) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall not apply with respect to an application under subsection (a) for the exportation of natural gas—

''(A) to a foreign country—

''(i) to which the exportation of natural gas is otherwise prohibited by law; or

''(ii) described in subsection (c); or

''(B) if the Commission has made a contingent determination with respect to the application.

''(3) EFFECT.—Except as specifically provided in this subsection, nothing in this subsection affects the authority of the Commission to review, process, and make a determination with respect to an application for the exportation of natural gas.

''(h) JUDICIAL ACTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which an export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—

''(A) an order issued by the Secretary of Energy with respect to the application; or

''(B) the failure of the Secretary to issue a decision on the application.

''(2) ORDER.—If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Secretary has failed to issue a decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Secretary to issue the decision not later than 30 days after the date of the order of the Court.

''(3) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The Court shall—

''(A) set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration; and

''(B) set the matter on the docket as soon as practicable after the filing date of the initial pleading.''.

SA 3670. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION __—DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Domestic Energy and Jobs Act''.

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

TITLE I—IMPACTS OF EPA RULES AND ACTIONS ON ENERGY PRICES

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Gasoline Regulations Act of 2013''.

SEC. 102. TRANSPORTATION FUELS REGULATORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish a committee, to be known as the Transportation Fuels Regulatory Committee (referred to in this title as the ''Committee''), to analyze and report on the cumulative impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency on gasoline, diesel fuel, and natural gas prices, in accordance with sections 103 and 104.

(b) MEMBERS.—The Committee shall be composed of the following officials (or their designees):

(1) The Secretary of Energy, who shall serve as the Chair of the Committee.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Chief Economist and the Under Secretary for International Trade.

(4) The Secretary of Labor, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment and Energy of the Department of the Treasury.

(6) The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief Economist.

(7) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(8) The Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, acting through the Director of the Office of Economics.

(9) The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

(c) CONSULTATION BY CHAIR.—In carrying out the functions of the Chair of the Committee, the Chair shall consult with the other members of the Committee.

(d) CONSULTATION BY COMMITTEE.—In carrying out this title, the Committee shall consult with the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

(e) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date of submission of the final report of the Committee pursuant to section 104(c).

SEC. 103. ANALYSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ACTION.—The term ''covered action'' means any action, to the extent that the action affects facilities involved in the production, transportation, or distribution of gasoline, diesel fuel, or natural gas, taken on or after January 1, 2009, by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a State, a local government, or a permitting agency as a result of the application of part C of title I (relating to prevention of significant deterioration of air quality), or title V (relating to permitting), of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), to an air pollutant that is identified as a greenhouse gas in the rule entitled ''Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act'' (74 Fed. Reg. 66496 (December 15, 2009)).

(2) COVERED RULE.—The term ''covered rule'' means the following rules (and includes any successor or substantially similar rules):

(A) ''Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards'', as described in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions under Regulatory Identification Number 2060–AQ86.

(B) ''National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone'' (73 Fed. Reg. 16436 (March 27, 2008)).

(C) ''Reconsideration of the 2008 Ozone Primary and Secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards'', as described in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions under Regulatory Identification Number 2060–AP98.

(D) Any rule proposed after March 15, 2012, establishing or revising a standard of performance or emission standard under section 111 or 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411, 7412) applicable to petroleum refineries.

(E) Any rule proposed after March 15, 2012, to implement any portion of the renewable fuel program under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)).

(F) Any rule proposed after March 15, 2012, revising or supplementing the national ambient air quality standards for ozone under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409).

(b) SCOPE.—The Committee shall conduct analyses, for each of calendar years 2016 and 2020, of the prospective cumulative impact of all covered rules and covered actions.

(c) CONTENTS.—The Committee shall include in each analysis conducted under this section—

(1) estimates of the cumulative impacts of the covered rules and covered actions relating to—

(A) any resulting change in the national, State, or regional price of gasoline, diesel fuel, or natural gas;

(B) required capital investments and projected costs for operation and maintenance of new equipment required to be installed;

(C) global economic competitiveness of the United States and any loss of domestic refining capacity;

(D) other cumulative costs and cumulative benefits, including evaluation through a general equilibrium model approach;

(E) national, State, and regional employment, including impacts associated with changes in gasoline, diesel fuel, or natural gas prices and facility closures; and

(F) any other matters affecting the growth, stability, and sustainability of the oil and gas industries of the United States, particularly relative to that of other nations;

(2) an analysis of key uncertainties and assumptions associated with each estimate under paragraph (1);

(3) a sensitivity analysis reflecting alternative assumptions with respect to the aggregate demand for gasoline, diesel fuel, or natural gas; and

(4) an analysis and, if feasible, an assessment of—

(A) the cumulative impact of the covered rules and covered actions on—

(i) consumers;

(ii) small businesses;

(iii) regional economies;

(iv) State, local, and tribal governments;

(v) low-income communities;

(vi) public health; and

(vii) local and industry-specific labor markets; and

(B) key uncertainties associated with each topic described in subparagraph (A).

(d) METHODS.—In conducting analyses under this section, the Committee shall use the best available methods, consistent with guidance from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–4.

(e) DATA.—In conducting analyses under this section, the Committee shall not be required to create data or to use data that is not readily accessible.

SEC. 104. REPORTS; PUBLIC COMMENT.

(a) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Committee shall make public and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a preliminary report containing the results of the analyses conducted under section 103.

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—The Committee shall accept public comments regarding the preliminary report submitted under subsection (a) for a period of 60 days after the date on which the preliminary report is submitted.

(c) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the 60-day period described in subsection (b), the Committee shall submit to Congress a final report containing the analyses conducted under section 103, including—

(1) any revisions to the analyses made as a result of public comments; and

(2) a response to the public comments.

SEC. 105. NO FINAL ACTION ON CERTAIN RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not finalize any of the following rules until a date (to be determined by the Administrator) that is at least 180 days after the date on which the Committee submits the final report under section 104(c):

(1) ''Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards'', as described in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions under Regulatory Identification Number 2060–AQ86, and any successor or substantially similar rule.

(2) Any rule proposed after March 15, 2012, establishing or revising a standard of performance or emission standard under section 111 or 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411, 7412) that is applicable to petroleum refineries.

(3) Any rule revising or supplementing the national ambient air quality standards for ozone under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409).

(b) OTHER RULES NOT AFFECTED.—Subsection (a) shall not affect the finalization of any rule other than the rules described in subsection (a).

SEC. 106. CONSIDERATION OF FEASIBILITY AND COST IN REVISING OR SUPPLEMENTING NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR OZONE.

In revising or supplementing any national primary or secondary ambient air quality standards for ozone under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall take into consideration feasibility and cost.

SEC. 107. FUEL REQUIREMENTS WAIVER AND STUDY.

(a) WAIVER OF FUEL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 211(c)(4)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(c)(4)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)(II), by inserting ''a problem with distribution or delivery equipment that is necessary for the transportation or delivery of fuel or fuel additives,'' after ''equipment failure,'';

(2) in clause (iii)(II), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''(except that the Administrator may extend the effectiveness of a waiver for more than 20 days if the Administrator determines that the conditions under clause (ii) supporting a waiver determination will exist for more than 20 days)'';

(3) by redesignating the second clause (v) (relating to the authority of the Administrator to approve certain State implementation plans) as clause (vi); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) PRESUMPTIVE APPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph, if the Administrator does not approve or deny a request for a waiver under this subparagraph within 3 days after receipt of the request, the request shall be deemed to be approved as received by the Administrator and the applicable fuel standards shall be waived for the period of time requested.''.

(b) FUEL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS HARMONIZATION STUDY.—Section 1509 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 1083) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting ''biofuels,'' after ''oxygenated fuel,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(G), by striking ''Tier II'' and inserting ''Tier III''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2014''.

TITLE II—QUADRENNIAL STRATEGIC FEDERAL ONSHORE ENERGY PRODUCTION STRATEGY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Planning for American Energy Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. ONSHORE DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION STRATEGIC PLAN.

The Mineral Leasing Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 44 (30 U.S.C. 181 note) as section 45; and

(2) by inserting after section 43 (30 U.S.C. 226–3) the following:

''SEC. 44. QUADRENNIAL STRATEGIC FEDERAL ONSHORE ENERGY PRODUCTION STRATEGY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

''(2) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ENERGY MINERALS.—The term 'strategic and critical energy minerals' means—

''(A) minerals that are necessary for the energy infrastructure of the United States, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production; and

''(B) minerals that are necessary to support domestic manufacturing, including materials used in energy generation, production, and transportation.

''(3) STRATEGY.—The term 'Strategy' means the Quadrennial Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy required under this section.

''(b) STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to land administered by the Forest Service, shall develop and publish every 4 years a Quadrennial Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy.

''(2) ENERGY SECURITY.—The Strategy shall direct Federal land energy development and department resource allocation to promote the energy security of the United States.

''(c) PURPOSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing a Strategy, the Secretary shall consult with the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration on—

''(A) the projected energy demands of the United States for the 30-year period beginning on the date of initiation of the Strategy; and

''(B) how energy derived from Federal onshore land can place the United States on a trajectory to meet that demand during the 4-year period beginning on the date of initiation of the Strategy.

''(2) ENERGY SECURITY.—The Secretary shall consider how Federal land will contribute to ensuring national energy security, with a goal of increasing energy independence and production, during the 4-year period beginning on the date of initiation of the Strategy.

''(d) OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary shall establish a domestic strategic production objective for the development of energy resources from Federal onshore land that is based on commercial and scientific data relating to the expected increase in—

''(1) domestic production of oil and natural gas from the Federal onshore mineral estate, with a focus on land held by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service;

''(2) domestic coal production from Federal land;

''(3) domestic production of strategic and critical energy minerals from the Federal onshore mineral estate;

''(4) megawatts for electricity production from each of wind, solar, biomass, hydropower, and geothermal energy produced on Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service;

''(5) unconventional energy production, such as oil shale;

''(6) domestic production of oil, natural gas, coal, and other renewable sources from tribal land for any federally recognized Indian tribe that elects to participate in facilitating energy production on the land of the Indian tribe; and

''(7) domestic production of geothermal, solar, wind, or other renewable energy sources on land defined as available lands under section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 109, chapter 42), and any other land considered by the Territory or State of Hawaii, as the case may be, to be available lands.

''(e) METHODOLOGY.—The Secretary shall consult with the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration regarding the methodology used to arrive at the estimates made by the Secretary to carry out this section.

''(f) EXPANSION OF PLAN.—The Secretary may expand a Strategy to include other energy production technology sources or advancements in energy production on Federal land.

''(g) TRIBAL OBJECTIVES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that federally recognized Indian tribes may elect to set the production objectives of the Indian tribes as part of a Strategy under this section.

''(2) COOPERATION.—The Secretary shall work in cooperation with any federally recognized Indian tribe that elects to participate in achieving the strategic energy objectives of the Indian tribe under this subsection.

''(h) EXECUTION OF STRATEGY.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF SECRETARY CONCERNED.—In this subsection, the term 'Secretary concerned' means—

''(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

''(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (including land held for the benefit of an Indian tribe).

''(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—The Secretary concerned may make determinations regarding which additional land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned will be made available in order to meet the energy production objectives established by a Strategy.

''(3) ACTIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall take all necessary actions to achieve the energy production objectives established under this section unless the President determines that it is not in the national security and economic interests of the United States—

''(A) to increase Federal domestic energy production; and

''(B) to decrease dependence on foreign sources of energy.

''(4) LEASING.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary concerned shall only consider leasing Federal land available for leasing at the time the lease sale occurs.

''(i) STATE, FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED INDIAN TRIBES, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND PUBLIC INPUT.—In developing a Strategy, the Secretary shall solicit the input of affected States, federally recognized Indian tribes, local governments, and the public.

''(j) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report describing the progress made in meeting the production goals of a Strategy.

''(2) CONTENTS.—In a report required under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(A) make projections for production and capacity installations;

''(B) describe any problems with leasing, permitting, siting, or production that will prevent meeting the production goals of a Strategy; and

''(C) make recommendations to help meet any shortfalls in meeting the production goals.

''(k) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)), the Secretary shall complete a programmatic environmental impact statement for carrying out this section.

''(2) COMPLIANCE.—The programmatic environmental impact statement shall be considered sufficient to comply with all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for all necessary resource management and land use plans associated with the implementation of a Strategy.

''(l) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days before publishing a proposed Strategy under this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President the proposed Strategy, together with any comments received from States, federally recognized Indian tribes, and local governments.

''(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The submission shall indicate why any specific recommendation of a State, federally recognized Indian tribe, or local government was not accepted.

''(m) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section modifies or affects any multiuse plan.

''(n) FIRST STRATEGY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the first Strategy.''.

TITLE III—ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING CERTAINTY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Providing Leasing Certainty for American Energy Act of 2013''.

SEC. 302. MINIMUM ACREAGE REQUIREMENT FOR ONSHORE LEASE SALES.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 17. (a) All lands'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 17. LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LAND.

''(a) AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—All land''; and

(2) in subsection (a) (as amended by paragraph (1)), by adding at the end the following:

''(2) MINIMUM ACREAGE REQUIREMENT FOR ONSHORE LEASE SALES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting lease sales under this section, each year, the Secretary shall offer for sale not less than 25 percent of the annual nominated acreage not previously made available for lease.

''(B) REVIEW.—The offering of acreage offered for lease under this paragraph shall not be subject to review.

''(C) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—Acreage offered for lease under this paragraph shall be eligible for categorical exclusions under section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42

U.S.C. 15942), except that extraordinary circumstances shall not be required for a categorical exclusion under this paragraph.

''(D) LEASING.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall only consider leasing of Federal land that is available for leasing at the time the lease sale occurs.''.

SEC. 303. LEASING CERTAINTY AND CONSISTENCY.

Section 17(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(a)) (as amended by section 302) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LEASING CERTAINTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not withdraw approval of any covered energy project involving a lease under this Act without finding a violation of the terms of the lease by the lessee.

''(B) DELAY.—The Secretary shall not infringe on lease rights under leases issued under this Act by indefinitely delaying issuance of project approvals, drilling and seismic permits, and rights-of-way for activities under a lease.

''(C) AVAILABILITY OF NOMINATED AREAS.—Not later than 18 months after an area is designated as open under the applicable land use plan, the Secretary shall make available nominated areas for lease under paragraph (2).

''(D) ISSUANCE OF LEASES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall issue all leases sold under this Act not later than 60 days after the last payment is made.

''(E) CANCELLATION OR WITHDRAWAL OF LEASE PARCELS.—The Secretary shall not cancel or withdraw any lease parcel after a competitive lease sale has occurred and a winning bidder has submitted the last payment for the parcel.

''(F) APPEALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall complete the review of any appeal of a lease sale under this Act not later than 60 days after the receipt of the appeal.

''(ii) CONSTRUCTIVE APPROVAL.—If the review of an appeal is not conducted in accordance with clause (i), the appeal shall be considered approved.

''(G) ADDITIONAL STIPULATIONS.—The Secretary may not add any additional lease stipulation for a parcel after the parcel is sold unless the Secretary—

''(i) consults with the lessee and obtains the approval of the lessee; or

''(ii) determines that the stipulation is an emergency action that is necessary to conserve the resources of the United States.

''(4) LEASING CONSISTENCY.—A Federal land manager shall comply with applicable resource management plans and continue to actively lease in areas designated as open when resource management plans are being amended or revised, until a new record of decision is signed.''.

SEC. 304. REDUCTION OF REDUNDANT POLICIES.

Bureau of Land Management Instruction Memorandum 2010–117 shall have no force or effect.

TITLE IV—STREAMLINED ENERGY PERMITTING

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Streamlining Permitting of American Energy Act of 2013''.

Subtitle A—Application for Permits To Drill Process Reform

SEC. 411. PERMIT TO DRILL APPLICATION TIMELINE.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit to drill not later than 30 days after the date on which the application for the permit is received by the Secretary.

''(B) EXTENSIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may extend the period described in subparagraph (A) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary gives written notice of the delay to the applicant.

''(ii) NOTICE.—The notice shall—

''(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

''(II) include—

''(aa) the names and positions of the persons processing the application;

''(bb) the specific reasons for the delay; and

''(cc) a specific date on which a final decision on the application is expected.

''(C) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

''(i) a written notice that provides—

''(I) clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted; and

''(II) detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

''(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

''(D) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application for the permit is received by the Secretary, the application shall be considered approved unless applicable reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

''(E) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

''(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

''(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

''(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.

''(F) FEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall collect a single $6,500 permit processing fee per application from each applicant at the time the final decision is made whether to issue a permit under this paragraph.

''(ii) RESUBMITTED APPLICATIONS.—The fee described in clause (i) shall not apply to any resubmitted application.

''(iii) TREATMENT OF PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—Subject to appropriation, of all fees collected under this paragraph, 50 percent shall be transferred to the field office where the fees are collected and used to process leases, permits, and appeals under this Act.''.

SEC. 412. SOLAR AND WIND RIGHT-OF-WAY RENTAL REFORM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each fiscal year, of fees collected as annual wind energy and solar energy right-of-way authorization fees required under section 504(g) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764(g)), 50 percent shall be retained by the Secretary of the Interior to be used, subject to appropriation—

(1) by the Bureau of Land Management to process permits, right-of-way applications, and other activities necessary for renewable development; and

(2) at the option of the Secretary of the Interior, by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or other Federal agencies involved in wind and solar permitting reviews to facilitate the processing of wind energy and solar energy permit applications on Bureau of Land Management land.

Subtitle B—Administrative Appeal Documentation Reform

SEC. 421. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DOCUMENTATION REFORM.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) APPEAL FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall collect a $5,000 documentation fee to accompany each appeal of an action on a lease, right-of-way, or application for permit to drill.

''(B) TREATMENT OF FEES.—Subject to appropriation, of all fees collected under this paragraph, 50 percent shall remain in the field office where the fees are collected and used to process appeals.''.

Subtitle C—Permit Streamlining

SEC. 431. FEDERAL ENERGY PERMIT COORDINATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENERGY PROJECTS.—The term ''energy projects'' means oil, coal, natural gas, and renewable energy projects.

(2) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Federal Permit Streamlining Project established under subsection (b).

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

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Federal Permit Streamlining Project in each Bureau of Land Management field office with responsibility for issuing permits for energy projects on Federal land.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to carry out this section with—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(B) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(C) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

(2) STATE PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary may request the Governor of any State with energy projects on Federal land to be a signatory to the memorandum of understanding.

(d) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the signing of the memorandum of understanding under subsection (c), all Federal signatory parties shall, if appropriate, assign to each of the Bureau of Land Management field offices an employee who has expertise in the regulatory issues relating to the office in which the employee is employed, including, as applicable, particular expertise in—

(A) the consultations and the preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536);

(B) permits under section 404 of Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344);

(C) regulatory matters under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(D) planning under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a et seq.); and

(E) the preparation of analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) DUTIES.—Each employee assigned under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of assignment, report to the Bureau of Land Management Field Managers in the office to which the employee is assigned;

(B) be responsible for all issues relating to the energy projects that arise under the authorities of the home office of the employee; and

(C) participate as part of the team of personnel working on proposed energy projects, planning, and environmental analyses on Federal land.

(e) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall assign to each Bureau of Land Management field office identified under subsection (b) any additional personnel that are necessary to ensure the effective approval and implementation of energy projects administered by the Bureau of Land Management field offices, including inspection and enforcement relating to energy development on Federal land, in accordance with the multiple-use requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(f) FUNDING.—Funding for the additional personnel shall be derived from the Department of the Interior reforms made by sections 411, 412, and 421 and the amendments made by those sections.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects—

(1) the operation of any Federal or State law; or

(2) any delegation of authority made by the head of a Federal agency whose employees are participating in the Project.

SEC. 432. ADMINISTRATION OF CURRENT LAW.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall not require a finding of extraordinary circumstances in administering section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942).

Subtitle D—Judicial Review

SEC. 441. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COVERED CIVIL ACTION.—The term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action (as defined for the purposes of that section) affecting a covered energy project on Federal land.

(2) COVERED ENERGY PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered energy project'' means the leasing of Federal land of the United States for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, wind, or any other source of energy, and any action under such a lease.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered energy project'' does not include any disputes between the parties to a lease regarding the obligations under the lease, including regarding any alleged breach of the lease.

SEC. 442. EXCLUSIVE VENUE FOR CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS.

Venue for any covered civil action shall lie in the United States district court for the district in which the project or leases exist or are proposed.

SEC. 443. TIMELY FILING.

To ensure timely redress by the courts, a covered civil action shall be filed not later than 90 days after the date of the final Federal agency action to which the covered civil action relates.

SEC. 444. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

A court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as practicable.

SEC. 445. STANDARD OF REVIEW.

In any judicial review of a covered civil action—

(1) administrative findings and conclusions relating to the challenged Federal action or decision shall be presumed to be correct; and

(2) the presumption may be rebutted only by the preponderance of the evidence contained in the administrative record.

SEC. 446. LIMITATION ON INJUNCTION AND PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In a covered civil action, a court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that the relief—

(1) is narrowly drawn;

(2) extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement; and

(3) is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation.

(b) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A court shall limit the duration of a preliminary injunction to halt a covered energy project to not more than 60 days, unless the court finds clear reasons to extend the injunction.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—Extensions under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) only be in 30-day increments; and

(B) require action by the court to renew the injunction.

SEC. 447. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Equal Access to Justice Act''), shall not apply to a covered civil action.

(b) ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COURT COSTS.—A party in a covered civil action shall not receive payment from the Federal Government for attorney's fees, expenses, or other court costs.

SEC. 448. LEGAL STANDING.

A challenger filing an appeal with the Interior Board of Land Appeals shall meet the same standing requirements as a challenger before a United States district court.

TITLE V—EXPEDITIOUS OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM IN NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Petroleum Reserve Alaska Access Act''.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REAFFIRMING NATIONAL POLICY REGARDING NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the National Petroleum Reserve in the State of Alaska (referred to in this title as the ''Reserve'') remains explicitly designated, both in name and legal status, for purposes of providing oil and natural gas resources to the United States; and

(2) accordingly, the national policy is to actively advance oil and gas development within the Reserve by facilitating the expeditious exploration, production, and transportation of oil and natural gas from and through the Reserve.

SEC. 503. COMPETITIVE LEASING OF OIL AND GAS.

Section 107 of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6506a) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) COMPETITIVE LEASING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the Reserve in accordance with this Act.

''(2) INCLUSIONS.—The program under this subsection shall include at least 1 lease sale annually in each area of the Reserve that is most likely to produce commercial quantities of oil and natural gas for each of calendar years 2013 through 2023.''.

SEC. 504. PLANNING AND PERMITTING PIPELINE AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall facilitate and ensure permits, in an environmentally responsible manner, for all surface development activities, including for the construction of pipelines and roads, necessary—

(1) to develop and bring into production any areas within the Reserve that are subject to oil and gas leases; and

(2) to transport oil and gas from and through the Reserve to existing transportation or processing infrastructure on the North Slope of Alaska.

(b) TIMELINES.—The Secretary shall ensure that any Federal permitting agency shall issue permits in accordance with the following timelines:

(1) EXISTING LEASES.—Each permit for construction relating to the transportation of oil and natural gas produced under existing Federal oil and gas leases with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior has issued a permit to drill shall be approved by not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REQUESTED PERMITS.—Each permit for construction for transportation of oil and natural gas produced under Federal oil and gas leases shall be approved by not later than 180 days after the date of submission to the Secretary of a request for a permit to drill.

(c) PLAN.—To ensure timely future development of the Reserve, not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress a plan for approved rights-of-way for a plan for pipeline, road, and any other surface infrastructure that may be necessary infrastructure to ensure that all leasable tracts in the Reserve are located within 25 miles of an approved road and pipeline right-of-way that can serve future development of the Reserve.

SEC. 505. DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate regulations to establish clear requirements to ensure that the Department of the Interior is supporting development of oil and gas leases in the Reserve.

(b) DEADLINES.—At a minimum, the regulations promulgated pursuant to this section shall—

(1) require the Secretary of the Interior to respond, acknowledging receipt of any permit application for development, by not later than 5 business days after the date of receipt of application; and

(2) establish a timeline for the processing of each such application that—

(A) specifies deadlines for decisions and actions regarding permit applications; and

(B) provides that the period for issuing each permit after the date of submission of the application shall not exceed 60 days, absent the concurrence of the applicant.

(c) ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DEADLINES.—If the Secretary of the Interior fails to comply with any deadline described in subsection (b) with respect to a permit application, the Secretary shall notify the applicant not less frequently than once every 5 days with specific information regarding—

(1) the reasons for the permit delay;

(2) the name of each specific office of the Department of the Interior responsible for—

(A) issuing the permit; or

(B) monitoring the permit delay; and

(3) an estimate of the date on which the permit will be issued.

(d) ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the State of Alaska and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, shall approve right-of-way corridors for the construction of 2 separate additional bridges and pipeline rights-of-way to help facilitate timely oil and gas development of the Reserve.

SEC. 506. UPDATED RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall complete a comprehensive assessment of all technically recoverable fossil fuel resources within the Reserve, including all conventional and unconventional oil and natural gas.

(b) COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION.—The resource assessment under subsection (a) shall be carried out by the United States Geological Survey in cooperation and consultation with the State of Alaska and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

(c) TIMING.—The resource assessment under subsection (a) shall be completed by not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) FUNDING.—In carrying out this section, the United States Geological Survey may cooperatively use resources and funds provided by the State of Alaska.

SEC. 507. COLVILLE RIVER DELTA DESIGNATION.

The designation by the Environmental Protection Agency of the Colville River Delta as an aquatic resource of national importance shall have no force or effect on this title or an amendment made by this title.

TITLE VI—INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''BLM Live Internet Auctions Act''.

SEC. 602. INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the third sentence, by striking ''Lease sales'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subparagraph (C), lease sales''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) In order to diversify and expand the United States onshore leasing program to ensure the best return to Federal taxpayers, to reduce fraud, and to secure the leasing process, the Secretary may conduct onshore lease sales through Internet-based bidding methods, each of which shall be completed by not later than 7 days after the date of initiation of the sale.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the tenth Internet-based lease sale conducted pursuant to subparagraph (C) of section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) (as added by subsection (a)), the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, an analysis of the first 10 such lease sales, including—

(1) estimates of increases or decreases in the lease sales, as compared to sales conducted by oral bidding, in—

(A) the number of bidders;

(B) the average amount of the bids;

(C) the highest amount of the bids; and

(D) the lowest amount of the bids;

(2) an estimate on the total cost or savings to the Department of the Interior as a result of the sales, as compared to sales conducted by oral bidding; and

(3) an evaluation of the demonstrated or expected effectiveness of different structures for lease sales, which may—

(A) provide an opportunity to better maximize bidder participation;

(B) ensure the highest return to Federal taxpayers;

(C) minimize opportunities for fraud or collusion; and

(D) ensure the security and integrity of the leasing process.

TITLE VII—ADVANCING OFFSHORE WIND PRODUCTION

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited at the ''Advancing Offshore Wind Production Act''.

SEC. 702. OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECT.—In this section, the term ''offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project'' means a project carried out on or in the waters of the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)) and administered by the Department of the Interior to test or monitor weather (including energy provided by weather, such as wind, tidal, current, and solar energy) using towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure, that—

(1) causes—

(A) less than 1 acre of surface or seafloor disruption at the location of each meteorological tower or other device; and

(B) not more than 5 acres of surface or seafloor disruption within the proposed area affected by the project (including hazards to navigation);

(2) is decommissioned not more than 5 years after the date of commencement of the project, including—

(A) removal of towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure from the project site; and

(B) restoration of the project site to approximately the original condition of the site; and

(3) provides meteorological information obtained by the project to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL PROJECT PERMITTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall require, by regulation, that any applicant seeking to conduct an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project shall obtain a permit and right-of-way for the project in accordance with this subsection.

(2) PERMIT AND RIGHT-OF-WAY TIMELINE AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit and right-of-way for an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project by not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a relevant application.

(B) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—During the 30-day period referred to in subparagraph (A) with respect to an application for a permit and right-of-way under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(i) provide an opportunity for submission of comments regarding the application by the public; and

(ii) consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the heads of other Federal, State, and local agencies that would be affected by the issuance of the permit and right-of-way.

(C) DENIAL OF PERMIT; OPPORTUNITY TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES.—If an application is denied under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide to the applicant—

(i) in writing—

(I) a list of clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was denied; and

(II) detailed information concerning any deficiencies in the application; and

(ii) an opportunity to remedy those deficiencies.

(c) NEPA EXCLUSION.—Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall not apply with respect to an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project.

(d) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(3) shall be—

(1) treated by the Secretary as proprietary information; and

(2) protected against disclosure.

TITLE VIII—CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 801. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPLICABLE COMMITTEES.—The term ''applicable committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

(2) CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''clean energy technology'' means a technology related to the production, use, transmission, storage, control, or conservation of energy that—

(A) reduces the need for additional energy supplies by using existing energy supplies with greater efficiency or by transmitting, distributing, storing, or transporting energy with greater effectiveness in or through the infrastructure of the United States;

(B) diversifies the sources of energy supply of the United States to strengthen energy security and to increase supplies with a favorable balance of environmental effects if the entire technology system is considered; or

(C) contributes to a stabilization of atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations through reduction, avoidance, or sequestration of energy-related greenhouse gas emissions.

(3) CRITICAL MINERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''critical mineral'' means any mineral designated as a critical mineral pursuant to section 802.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''critical mineral'' does not include coal, oil, natural gas, or any other fossil fuels.

(4) CRITICAL MINERAL MANUFACTURING.—The term ''critical mineral manufacturing'' means—

(A) the production, processing, refining, alloying, separation, concentration, magnetic sintering, melting, or beneficiation of critical minerals within the United States;

(B) the fabrication, assembly, or production, within the United States, of clean energy technologies (including technologies related to wind, solar, and geothermal energy, efficient lighting, electrical superconducting materials, permanent magnet motors, batteries, and other energy storage devices), military equipment, and consumer electronics, or components necessary for applications; or

(C) any other value-added, manufacturing-related use of critical minerals undertaken within the United States.

(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(6) MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—The term ''military equipment'' means equipment used directly by the Armed Forces to carry out military operations.

(7) RARE EARTH ELEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''rare earth element'' means the chemical elements in the periodic table from lanthanum (atomic number 57) up to and including lutetium (atomic number 71).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''rare earth element'' includes the similar chemical elements yttrium (atomic number 39) and scandium (atomic number 21).

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

(A) acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey; and

(B) in consultation with (as appropriate)—

(i) the Secretary of Energy;

(ii) the Secretary of Defense;

(iii) the Secretary of Commerce;

(iv) the Secretary of State;

(v) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(vi) the United States Trade Representative; and

(vii) the heads of other applicable Federal agencies.

(9) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(C) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(10) VALUE-ADDED.—The term ''value-added'' means, with respect to an activity, an activity that changes the form, fit, or function of a product, service, raw material, or physical good so that the resultant market price is greater than the cost of making the changes.

(11) WORKING GROUP.—The term ''Working Group'' means the Critical Minerals Working Group established under section 805(a).

SEC. 802. DESIGNATIONS.

(a) DRAFT METHODOLOGY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register for public comment a draft methodology for determining which minerals qualify as critical minerals based on an assessment of whether the minerals are—

(1) subject to potential supply restrictions (including restrictions associated with foreign political risk, abrupt demand growth, military conflict, and anti-competitive or protectionist behaviors); and

(2) important in use (including clean energy technology-, defense-, agriculture-, and health care-related applications).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—If available data is insufficient to provide a quantitative basis for the methodology developed under this section, qualitative evidence may be used.

(c) FINAL METHODOLOGY.—After reviewing public comments on the draft methodology under subsection (a) and updating the draft methodology as appropriate, the Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering to obtain, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) a review of the methodology; and

(2) recommendations for improving the methodology.

(d) FINAL METHODOLOGY.—After reviewing the recommendations under subsection (c), not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a description of the final methodology for determining which minerals qualify as critical minerals.

(e) DESIGNATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a list of minerals designated as critical, pursuant to the final methodology under subsection (d), for purposes of carrying out this title.

(f) SUBSEQUENT REVIEW.—The methodology and designations developed under subsections (d) and (e) shall be updated at least every 5 years, or in more regular intervals if considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(g) NOTICE.—On finalization of the methodology under subsection (d), the list under subsection (e), or any update to the list under subsection (f), the Secretary shall submit to the applicable committees written notice of the action.

SEC. 803. POLICY.

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote an adequate, reliable, domestic, and stable supply of critical minerals, produced in an environmentally responsible manner, in order to strengthen and sustain the economic security, and the manufacturing, industrial, energy, technological, and competitive stature, of the United States.

(b) COORDINATION.—The President, acting through the Executive Office of the President, shall coordinate the actions of Federal agencies under this and other Acts—

(1) to encourage Federal agencies to facilitate the availability, development, and environmentally responsible production of domestic resources to meet national critical minerals needs;

(2) to minimize duplication, needless paperwork, and delays in the administration of applicable laws (including regulations) and the issuance of permits and authorizations necessary to explore for, develop, and produce critical minerals and to construct and operate critical mineral manufacturing facilities in an environmentally responsible manner;

(3) to promote the development of economically stable and environmentally responsible domestic critical mineral production and manufacturing;

(4) to establish an analytical and forecasting capability for identifying critical mineral demand, supply, and other market dynamics relevant to policy formulation so that informed actions may be taken to avoid supply shortages, mitigate price volatility, and prepare for demand growth and other market shifts;

(5) to strengthen educational and research capabilities and workforce training;

(6) to bolster international cooperation through technology transfer, information sharing, and other means;

(7) to promote the efficient production, use, and recycling of critical minerals;

(8) to develop alternatives to critical minerals; and

(9) to establish contingencies for the production of, or access to, critical minerals for which viable sources do not exist within the United States.

SEC. 804. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in consultation with applicable State (including geological surveys), local, academic, industry, and other entities, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive national assessment of each critical mineral that—

(1) identifies and quantifies known critical mineral resources, using all available public and private information and datasets, including exploration histories;

(2) estimates the cost of production of the critical mineral resources identified and quantified under this section, using all available public and private information and datasets, including exploration histories;

(3) provides a quantitative and qualitative assessment of undiscovered critical mineral resources throughout the United States, including probability estimates of tonnage and grade, using all available public and private information and datasets, including exploration histories;

(4) provides qualitative information on the environmental attributes of the critical mineral resources identified under this section; and

(5) pays particular attention to the identification and quantification of critical mineral resources on Federal land that is open to location and entry for exploration, development, and other uses.

(b) FIELD WORK.—If existing information and datasets prove insufficient to complete the assessment under this section and there is no reasonable opportunity to obtain the information and datasets from nongovernmental entities, the Secretary may carry out field work (including drilling, remote sensing, geophysical surveys, geological mapping, and geochemical sampling and analysis) to supplement existing information and datasets available for determining the existence of critical minerals on—

(1) Federal land that is open to location and entry for exploration, development, and other uses;

(2) tribal land, at the request and with the written permission of the Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the land; and

(3) State land, at the request and with the written permission of the Governor of the State.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—At the request of the Governor of a State or an Indian tribe, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to State governments and Indian tribes conducting critical mineral resource assessments on non-Federal land.

(d) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may make grants to State governments, or Indian tribes and economic development entities of Indian tribes, to cover the costs associated with assessments of critical mineral resources on State or tribal land, as applicable.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the applicable committees a report describing the results of the assessment conducted under this section.

(f) PRIORITIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may sequence the completion of resource assessments for each critical mineral such that critical materials considered to be most critical under the methodology established pursuant to section 802 are completed first.

(2) REPORTING.—If the Secretary sequences the completion of resource assessments for each critical material, the Secretary shall

submit a report under subsection (e) on an iterative basis over the 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall periodically update the assessment conducted under this section based on—

(1) the generation of new information or datasets by the Federal Government; or

(2) the receipt of new information or datasets from critical mineral producers, State geological surveys, academic institutions, trade associations, or other entities or individuals.

SEC. 805. PERMITTING.

(a) CRITICAL MINERALS WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Department of the Interior a working group to be known as the ''Critical Minerals Working Group'', which shall report to the President and the applicable committees through the Secretary.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Working Group shall be composed of the following:

(A) The Secretary of the Interior (or a designee), who shall serve as chair of the Working Group.

(B) A Presidential designee from the Executive Office of the President, who shall serve as vice-chair of the Working Group.

(C) The Secretary of Energy (or a designee).

(D) The Secretary of Agriculture (or a designee).

(E) The Secretary of Defense (or a designee).

(F) The Secretary of Commerce (or a designee).

(G) The Secretary of State (or a designee).

(H) The United States Trade Representative (or a designee).

(I) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (or a designee).

(J) The Chief of Engineers of the Corps of Engineers (or a designee).

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Working Group shall operate in consultation with private sector, academic, and other applicable stakeholders with experience related to—

(1) critical minerals exploration;

(2) critical minerals permitting;

(3) critical minerals production; and

(4) critical minerals manufacturing.

(c) DUTIES.—The Working Group shall—

(1) facilitate Federal agency efforts to optimize efficiencies associated with the permitting of activities that will increase exploration and development of domestic critical minerals, while maintaining environmental standards;

(2) facilitate Federal agency review of laws (including regulations) and policies that discourage investment in exploration and development of domestic critical minerals;

(3) assess whether Federal policies adversely impact the global competitiveness of the domestic critical minerals exploration and development sector (including taxes, fees, regulatory burdens, and access restrictions);

(4) evaluate the sufficiency of existing mechanisms for the provision of tenure on Federal land and the role of the mechanisms in attracting capital investment for the exploration and development of domestic critical minerals; and

(5) generate such other information and take such other actions as the Working Group considers appropriate to achieve the policy described in section 803(a).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Working Group shall submit to the applicable committees a report that—

(1) describes the results of actions taken under subsection (c);

(2) evaluates the amount of time typically required (including the range derived from minimum and maximum durations, mean, median, variance, and other statistical measures or representations) to complete each step (including those aspects outside the control of the executive branch of the Federal Government, such as judicial review, applicant decisions, or State and local government involvement) associated with the processing of applications, operating plans, leases, licenses, permits, and other use authorizations for critical mineral-related activities on Federal land, which shall serve as a baseline for the performance metric developed and finalized under subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(3) identifies measures (including regulatory changes and legislative proposals) that would optimize efficiencies, while maintaining environmental standards, associated with the permitting of activities that will increase exploration and development of domestic critical minerals; and

(4) identifies options (including cost recovery paid by applicants) for ensuring adequate staffing of divisions, field offices, or other entities responsible for the consideration of applications, operating plans, leases, licenses, permits, and other use authorizations for critical mineral-related activities on Federal land.

(e) DRAFT PERFORMANCE METRIC.—Not later than 330 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and on completion of the report required under subsection (d), the Working Group shall publish in the Federal Register for public comment a draft description of a performance metric for evaluating the progress made by the executive branch of the Federal Government on matters within the control of that branch towards optimizing efficiencies, while maintaining environmental standards, associated with the permitting of activities that will increase exploration and development of domestic critical minerals.

(f) FINAL PERFORMANCE METRIC.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and after consideration of any public comments received under subsection (e), the Working Group shall publish in the Federal Register a description of the final performance metric.

(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, using the final performance metric under subsection (f), the Working Group shall submit to the applicable committees, as part of the budget request of the Department of the Interior for each fiscal year, each report that—

(1) describes the progress made by the executive branch of the Federal Government on matters within the control of that branch towards optimizing efficiencies, while maintaining environmental standards, associated with the permitting of activities that will increase exploration and development of domestic critical minerals; and

(2) compares the United States to other countries in terms of permitting efficiency, environmental standards, and other criteria relevant to a globally competitive economic sector.

(h) REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit to the applicable committees a report that assesses the performance of Federal agencies in—

(1) complying with chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Regulatory Flexibility Act''), in promulgating regulations applicable to the critical minerals industry; and

(2) performing an analysis of regulations applicable to the critical minerals industry that may be outmoded, inefficient, duplicative, or excessively burdensome.

(i) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section affects any judicial review of an agency action under any other provision of law.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—This section—

(A) is intended to improve the internal management of the Federal Government; and

(B) does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States (including an agency, instrumentality, officer, or employee) or any other person.

SEC. 806. RECYCLING AND ALTERNATIVES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct a program of research and development to promote the efficient production, use, and recycling of, and alternatives to, critical minerals.

(b) COOPERATION.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary of Energy shall cooperate with appropriate—

(1) Federal agencies and National Laboratories;

(2) critical mineral producers;

(3) critical mineral manufacturers;

(4) trade associations;

(5) academic institutions;

(6) small businesses; and

(7) other relevant entities or individuals.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—Under the program, the Secretary of Energy shall carry out activities that include the identification and development of—

(1) advanced critical mineral production or processing technologies that decrease the environmental impact, and costs of production, of such activities;

(2) techniques and practices that minimize or lead to more efficient use of critical minerals;

(3) techniques and practices that facilitate the recycling of critical minerals, including options for improving the rates of collection of post-consumer products containing critical minerals;

(4) commercial markets, advanced storage methods, energy applications, and other beneficial uses of critical minerals processing byproducts; and

(5) alternative minerals, metals, and materials, particularly those available in abundance within the United States and not subject to potential supply restrictions, that lessen the need for critical minerals.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretaries shall submit to the applicable committees a report summarizing the activities, findings, and progress of the program.

SEC. 807. ANALYSIS AND FORECASTING.

(a) CAPABILITIES.—In order to evaluate existing critical mineral policies and inform future actions that may be taken to avoid supply shortages, mitigate price volatility, and prepare for demand growth and other market shifts, the Secretary, in consultation with academic institutions, the Energy Information Administration, and others in order to maximize the application of existing competencies related to developing and maintaining computer-models and similar analytical tools, shall conduct and publish the results of an annual report that includes—

(1) as part of the annually published Mineral Commodity Summaries from the United

States Geological Survey, a comprehensive review of critical mineral production, consumption, and recycling patterns, including—

(A) the quantity of each critical mineral domestically produced during the preceding year;

(B) the quantity of each critical mineral domestically consumed during the preceding year;

(C) market price data for each critical mineral;

(D) an assessment of—

(i) critical mineral requirements to meet the national security, energy, economic, industrial, technological, and other needs of the United States during the preceding year;

(ii) the reliance of the United States on foreign sources to meet those needs during the preceding year; and

(iii) the implications of any supply shortages, restrictions, or disruptions during the preceding year;

(E) the quantity of each critical mineral domestically recycled during the preceding year;

(F) the market penetration during the preceding year of alternatives to each critical mineral;

(G) a discussion of applicable international trends associated with the discovery, production, consumption, use, costs of production, prices, and recycling of each critical mineral as well as the development of alternatives to critical minerals; and

(H) such other data, analyses, and evaluations as the Secretary finds are necessary to achieve the purposes of this section; and

(2) a comprehensive forecast, entitled the ''Annual Critical Minerals Outlook'', of projected critical mineral production, consumption, and recycling patterns, including—

(A) the quantity of each critical mineral projected to be domestically produced over the subsequent 1-year, 5-year, and 10-year periods;

(B) the quantity of each critical mineral projected to be domestically consumed over the subsequent 1-year, 5-year, and 10-year periods;

(C) market price projections for each critical mineral, to the maximum extent practicable and based on the best available information;

(D) an assessment of—

(i) critical mineral requirements to meet projected national security, energy, economic, industrial, technological, and other needs of the United States;

(ii) the projected reliance of the United States on foreign sources to meet those needs; and

(iii) the projected implications of potential supply shortages, restrictions, or disruptions;

(E) the quantity of each critical mineral projected to be domestically recycled over the subsequent 1-year, 5-year, and 10-year periods;

(F) the market penetration of alternatives to each critical mineral projected to take place over the subsequent 1-year, 5-year, and 10-year periods;

(G) a discussion of reasonably foreseeable international trends associated with the discovery, production, consumption, use, costs of production, prices, and recycling of each critical mineral as well as the development of alternatives to critical minerals; and

(H) such other projections relating to each critical mineral as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(b) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—In preparing a report described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) no person uses the information and data collected for the report for a purpose other than the development of or reporting of aggregate data in a manner such that the identity of the person who supplied the information is not discernible and is not material to the intended uses of the information;

(2) no person discloses any information or data collected for the report unless the information or data has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form that does not allow the identification of the person who supplied particular information; and

(3) procedures are established to require the withholding of any information or data collected for the report if the Secretary determines that withholding is necessary to protect proprietary information, including any trade secrets or other confidential information.

SEC. 808. EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE.

(a) WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor (in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and employers in the critical minerals sector) shall submit to Congress an assessment of the domestic availability of technically trained personnel necessary for critical mineral assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, education, and research, including an analysis of—

(1) skills that are in the shortest supply as of the date of the assessment;

(2) skills that are projected to be in short supply in the future;

(3) the demographics of the critical minerals industry and how the demographics will evolve under the influence of factors such as an aging workforce;

(4) the effectiveness of training and education programs in addressing skills shortages;

(5) opportunities to hire locally for new and existing critical mineral activities;

(6) the sufficiency of personnel within relevant areas of the Federal Government for achieving the policy described in section 803(a); and

(7) the potential need for new training programs to have a measurable effect on the supply of trained workers in the critical minerals industry.

(b) CURRICULUM STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering under which the Academies shall coordinate with the National Science Foundation on conducting a study—

(A) to design an interdisciplinary program on critical minerals that will support the critical mineral supply chain and improve the ability of the United States to increase domestic, critical mineral exploration, development, and manufacturing;

(B) to address undergraduate and graduate education, especially to assist in the development of graduate level programs of research and instruction that lead to advanced degrees with an emphasis on the critical mineral supply chain or other positions that will increase domestic, critical mineral exploration, development, and manufacturing;

(C) to develop guidelines for proposals from institutions of higher education with substantial capabilities in the required disciplines to improve the critical mineral supply chain and advance the capacity of the United States to increase domestic, critical mineral exploration, development, and manufacturing; and

(D) to outline criteria for evaluating performance and recommendations for the amount of funding that will be necessary to establish and carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a description of the results of the study required under paragraph (1).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary and the National Science Foundation shall jointly conduct a competitive grant program under which institutions of higher education may apply for and receive 4-year grants for—

(A) startup costs for newly designated faculty positions in integrated critical mineral education, research, innovation, training, and workforce development programs consistent with subsection (b);

(B) internships, scholarships, and fellowships for students enrolled in critical mineral programs; and

(C) equipment necessary for integrated critical mineral innovation, training, and workforce development programs.

(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this subsection shall be renewable for up to 2 additional 3-year terms based on performance criteria outlined under subsection (b)(1)(D).

SEC. 809. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary, shall carry out a program to promote international cooperation on critical mineral supply chain issues with allies of the United States.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Under the program, the Secretary of State may work with allies of the United States—

(1) to increase the global, responsible production of critical minerals, if a determination is made by the Secretary of State that there is no viable production capacity for the critical minerals within the United States;

(2) to improve the efficiency and environmental performance of extraction techniques;

(3) to increase the recycling of, and deployment of alternatives to, critical minerals;

(4) to assist in the development and transfer of critical mineral extraction, processing, and manufacturing technologies that would have a beneficial impact on world commodity markets and the environment;

(5) to strengthen and maintain intellectual property protections; and

(6) to facilitate the collection of information necessary for analyses and forecasts conducted pursuant to section 807.

SEC. 810. REPEAL, AUTHORIZATION, AND OFFSET.

(a) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Critical Materials Act of 1984 (30 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(d) of the National Superconductivity and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 5202(d)) is amended in the first sentence by striking '', with the assistance of the National Critical Materials Council as specified in the National Critical Materials Act of 1984 (30 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.),''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title $30,000,000.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OFFSET.—Section 207(c) of the Energy Independence and Security Act

of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17022(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not appropriated as of the date of enactment of the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act shall be reduced by $30,000,000''.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS UNDER THE SOLID MINERALS LEASING PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Interior may not transfer to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement any responsibility or authority to perform any function performed on the day before the date of enactment of this Act under the solid minerals leasing program of the Department of the Interior, including—

(1) any function under—

(A) sections 2318 through 2352 of the Revised Statutes (commonly known as the ''Mining Law of 1872'') (30 U.S.C. 21 et seq.);

(B) the Act of July 31, 1947 (commonly known as the ''Materials Act of 1947'') (30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);

(C) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

(D) the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.);

(2) any function relating to management of mineral development on Federal land and acquired land under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1732); and

(3) any function performed under the mining law administration program of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 902. AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

Section 105(f)(1) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended by striking ''2055'' and inserting ''2025, and shall not exceed $750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055''.

SEC. 903. LEASE SALE 220 AND OTHER LEASE SALES OFF THE COAST OF VIRGINIA.

(a) INCLUSION IN LEASING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) as soon as practicable after, but not later than 10 days after, the date of enactment of this Act, revise the proposed outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program for the 2012–2017 period to include in the program Lease Sale 220 off the coast of Virginia; and

(2) include the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Virginia in the leasing program for each 5-year period after the 2012–2017 period.

(b) CONDUCT OF LEASE SALE.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 1 year, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall carry out under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) Lease Sale 220.

(c) BALANCING MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.—

(1) JOINT GOALS.—In recognition that the outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced under that program are integral to national security, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing this section—

(A) to preserve the ability of the Armed Forces to maintain an optimum state of readiness through their continued use of energy resources of the outer Continental Shelf; and

(B) to allow effective exploration, development, and production of the oil, gas, and renewable energy resources of the United States.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas off the coast of Virginia that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with—

(A) the agreement entitled ''Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf'' signed July 20, 1983; and

(B) any revision to, or replacement of, the agreement described in subparagraph (A) that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior after July 20, 1983, but before the date of issuance of the lease under which the exploration, development, or production is conducted.

(3) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—The United States reserves the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, national defense areas on the outer Continental Shelf under section 12(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(d)).

SEC. 904. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS MODIFYING THE STREAM ZONE BUFFER RULE.

The Secretary of the Interior may not, before December 31, 2013, issue a regulation modifying the final rule entitled ''Excess Spoil, Coal Mine Waste, and Buffers for Perennial and Intermittent Streams'' (73 Fed. Reg. 75814 (December 12, 2008)).

SA 3671. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SHIFT IN THE COLLECTION OF THE PAYMENT FOR THE TRANSITIONAL REINSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1341(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18061(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting ''beginning on January 1, 2018,'' after ''required to make payments''; and

(ii) by striking ''any plan year beginning in the 3-year period'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''payments made under subparagraph (C) (as specified in paragraph (3));''

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and uses'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''; and'' and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the applicable reinsurance entity makes reinsurance payments to health insurance issuers described in subparagraph (A) that cover high risk individuals in the individual market (excluding grandfathered health plans) for any plan year beginning in the 3-year period beginning January 1, 2014, in an aggregate amount of up to the total of the aggregate contribution amounts described in paragraph (3)(B)(iv), subject to paragraph (4).'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (1)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(C)'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking ''administrative'' and inserting ''operational'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii), the following:

''(iii) the aggregate contribution amount for all States shall be based on the total amount of reinsurance payments made under paragraph (1)(C);'';

(iv) by striking clause (iv), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

''(iv) the aggregate contribution amount collected under clause (iii) shall, without regard to amounts described in clause (ii), be limited to $10,000,000,000 based on the plan years beginning in 2014, $6,000,000,000 based on the plan years beginning in 2015, and $4,000,000,000 based on the plan years beginning in 2016;'';

(v) in clause (v), as so redesignated, by striking ''clause (iii)'' each place that such term appears and inserting ''clause (iv)'';

(vi) by inserting after clause (v), the following:

''(vi) in addition to the contribution amounts under clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), each issuer's contribution amount—

''(I) shall reflect its proportionate share of an additional $20,300,000 for operational expenses for reinsurance payments for calendar year 2014 and for reinsurance collections for calendar year 2018;

''(II) shall reflect its proportionate share of operational expenses for reinsurance payments for calendar year 2015 and for reinsurance collections for calendar year 2019; and

''(III) shall reflect its proportionate share of operational expenses for reinsurance payments for calendar year 2016 and for reinsurance collections for calendar year 2020; and

''(vii) collection of the contribution amounts provided for in clauses (ii) through (vi) shall be initiated—

''(I) for calendar year 2014, not earlier than January 1, 2018;

''(II) for calendar year 2015, not earlier than January 1, 2019; and

''(III) for calendar year 2016, not earlier than January 1, 2020.'';

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''contribution amounts collected for any calendar year'' and inserting ''amount provided under paragraph (5) for reinsurance payments described in paragraph (1)(C)''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking ''that—'' and all that follows through ''the contribution'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''that the contribution''; and

(D) in the flush matter at the end, by striking ''paragraph (3)(B)(iv)'' and inserting the following: ''paragraph (3)(B)(v) and any amounts collected under clauses (ii) of paragraph (3)(B) that, when combined with the funding provided for under paragraph (5), exceed the aggregate amount permitted for making the reinsurance payments described in paragraph (1)(C) and to fund the operational expenses of applicable reinsurance entities,''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) FUNDING.—To carry out this section, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the aggregate amount to be collected for plan years beginning in 2014 set forth in paragraph (3)(B)(iv) for reinsurance payments described in paragraph (1)(C), and an amount equal to the contribution amounts set forth in paragraph (3)(B)(vi) to fund operational expenses of applicable reinsurance entities.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to increase the amount of payments to be collected under subsection (b)(1)(A) or to decrease the amount of the reinsurance payments to be made under subsection (b)(1)(C) of section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18061).

(c) MEDICAL LOSS RATIO.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate regulations or guidance to ensure that health insurance issuers reflect changes made in section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.1 300gg-18) and sections 1342 and 1312(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18063 and 18032(c)).

SA 3672. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. AMERICA STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish a voluntary program, to be known as the ''America Star Program'', under which manufacturers may have products certified as meeting the standards of labels that indicate to consumers the extent to which the products are manufactured in the United States.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF LABELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, by rule—

(A) design America Star labels that are consistent with public perceptions of the meaning of descriptions of the extent to which a product is manufactured in the United States; and

(B) specify the standards that a product shall meet in order to bear a particular America Star label.

(c) CERTIFICATION OF PRODUCTS.—

(1) APPLICATION PROCEDURES.—A manufacturer that wishes to have a product certified as meeting the standards of an America Star label may apply to the Secretary for certification in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary shall establish by rule.

(2) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—Not later than such time after receiving an application for certification under paragraph (1) as the Secretary determines reasonable by rule, the Secretary shall—

(A) determine whether the product described in the application meets the standards of the requested America Star label;

(B) if the product meets such standards, certify the product; and

(C) notify the manufacturer of the determination and whether the product has been certified.

(d) MONITORING; WITHDRAWAL OF CERTIFICATION.—

(1) MONITORING.—The Secretary shall conduct such monitoring and compliance review as the Secretary considers necessary—

(A) to detect violations of subsection (f); and

(B) to ensure that products certified as meeting the standards of America Star labels continue to meet such standards.

(2) WITHDRAWAL OF CERTIFICATION.—

(A) ON INITIATIVE OF SECRETARY.—If the Secretary determines that a product certified as meeting the standards of an America Star label no longer meets such standards, the Secretary shall—

(i) notify the manufacturer of the determination and any corrective action that would enable the product to meet such standards; and

(ii) if the manufacturer does not take such action within such time after receiving notification under clause (i) as the Secretary determines reasonable by rule, the Secretary shall withdraw the certification of the product and notify the manufacturer of the withdrawal.

(B) AT REQUEST OF MANUFACTURER.—At the request of the manufacturer of a product, the Secretary shall withdraw the certification of the product and notify the manufacturer of the withdrawal.

(e) CONSULTATION.—

(1) REQUIRED CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—In establishing America Star labels and operating the America Star Program, the Secretary shall consult with the Federal Trade Commission to ensure consistency with the requirements enforced by the Commission with respect to representations of the extent to which products are manufactured in the United States.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE-SECTOR COMPANIES.—It is the sense of Congress that, in establishing America Star labels and operating the America Star Program, the Secretary should consult with private-sector companies that have developed labeling programs to verify or certify to consumers the extent to which products are manufactured in the United States.

(f) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—Unless a certification by the Secretary that a product meets the standards of an America Star label is in effect, a person may not—

(1) place such label on such product;

(2) use such label in any marketing materials for such product; or

(3) in any other way represent that such product meets, or is certified as meeting, the standards of such label.

(g) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly violates subsection (f) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000.

(2) INELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that a manufacturer—

(i) has made a false statement to the Secretary in connection with the America Star Program;

(ii) knowing, or having reason to know, that a product does not meet the standards of an America Star label—

(I) has placed such label on such product;

(II) has used such label in any marketing materials for such product; or

(III) in any other way has represented that such product meets or is certified as meeting the standards of such label; or

(iii) has otherwise violated the purposes of the America Star Program;

the Secretary may not, for a period of 5 years after the conduct described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii), certify the product to which such conduct relates as meeting the standards of an America Star label.

(B) EFFECT ON EXISTING CERTIFICATION.—In the case of a product with respect to which, at the time of the determination of the Secretary under subparagraph (A), there is in effect a certification by the Secretary that the product meets the standards of an America Star label—

(i) if the product continues to meet such standards, the Secretary may either withdraw the certification or allow the certification to continue in effect, as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(ii) if the product no longer meets such standards, the Secretary shall withdraw the certification.

(C) WAIVER.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may waive or reduce the period referred to in such subparagraph if the Secretary determines that the waiver or reduction is in the best interests of the America Star Program.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL.—

(1) EXPEDITED APPEALS PROCEDURE.—The Secretary shall establish an expedited administrative appeals procedure under which persons may appeal an action of the Secretary under this section that—

(A) adversely affects such person; or

(B) is inconsistent with the America Star Program.

(2) APPEAL OF FINAL DECISION.—A final decision of the Secretary under paragraph (1) may be appealed to the United States district court for the district in which the person is located.

(i) OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may collect reasonable fees from—

(A) manufacturers that apply for certification of products as meeting the standards of America Star labels; and

(B) manufacturers of products for which such certifications are in effect.

(2) ACCOUNT.—The fees collected under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the account that incurs the cost of the certification services provided under this section.

(3) USE.—The fees collected under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation or fiscal-year limitation, to pay the expenses of the Secretary incurred in providing certification services under this section.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AMERICA STAR LABEL.—The term ''America Star label'' means a label described in subsection (a) and established by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1).

(2) AMERICA STAR PROGRAM.—The term ''America Star Program'' means the voluntary labeling program established under this section.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

SA 3673. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 45D(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking '', 2011, 2012, and 2013'' and inserting ''and each calendar year thereafter''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 45D(f)(3) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (f) of section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2013, the dollar amount in paragraph (1)(G) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar

year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2000' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING RULE.—Any increase under subparagraph (A) which is not a multiple of $1,000,000 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000,000.''.

(c) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF.—Subparagraph (B) of section 38(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (v) through (ix) as clauses (vi) through (x), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) the credit determined under section 45D, but only with respect to credits determined with respect to qualified equity investments (as defined in section 45D(b)) initially made before January 1, 2014,''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to credits determined with respect to qualified equity investments (as defined in section 45D(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) initially made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3674. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INBOUND INVESTMENT PROGRAM TO RECRUIT JOBS TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DISTRESSED.—The term ''distressed'', with respect to an area, means an area in the United States that, on the date on which the program is established under subsection (b)—

(A) is included in the most recent classification of labor surplus areas by the Secretary of Labor; and

(B) has an unemployment rate equal to or great than 110 percent of the unemployment rate of the United States.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means an entity that employs not fewer than 50 full-time equivalent employees in high-value jobs.

(3) ELIGIBLE FACILITY.—The term ''eligible facility'' means a facility at which—

(A) an eligible entity employs not fewer than 50 full-time equivalent employees in high-value jobs;

(B) with respect to a rural or distressed area, the mean of the wages provided by the eligible entity to individuals employed at such facility is greater than the mean wage for the county in which the rural or distressed area is located; and

(C) derives at least the majority of its revenues from—

(i) goods production; or

(ii) providing product design, engineering, marketing, or information technology services.

(4) HIGH-VALUE JOB DEFINED.—The term ''high-value job'' means a job that—

(A) exists within an eligible facility; and

(B) has a North American Industrial Classification that corresponds with manufacturing, software publishers, computer systems design, or related codes, and is higher than the mean hourly wage in the country.

(5) RURAL.—The term ''rural'', with respect to an area, means any area in the United States which, as confirmed by the latest decennial census, is not located within—

(A) a city or town that has a population of greater than 50,000 inhabitants; or

(B) an urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to a city or town described in subparagraph (A).

(b) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish a program to award grants to States that are recruiting high-value jobs. Grants awarded under this section may be used to issue forgivable loans to eligible entities that are deciding whether to locate eligible facilities in the United States to assist such entities in locating such facilities in rural or distressed areas.

(c) FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the program through the award of grants to States to provide loans and loan guarantees described in subsection (d).

(2) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State seeking a grant under the program shall submit an application to the Secretary in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Once the program is operational, any State may apply for a grant on an ongoing basis, until funds are exhausted. The Secretary may also establish a process for pre-clearing applications from States. The Secretary shall notify all States of this grant opportunity once the program is operational. All information about the program and the State application process must be online and must be in a format that is easily understood and is widely accessible.

(B) ELEMENTS.—Each application submitted by a State under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a description of the eligible entity the State proposes to assist in locating an eligible facility in a rural or distressed area of the State;

(ii) a description of such facility, including the number of high-value jobs relating to such facility;

(iii) a description of such rural or distressed area;

(iv) a description of the resources of the State that the State has committed to assisting such corporation in locating such facility, including tax incentives provided, bonding authority exercised, and land granted; and

(v) such other elements as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(C) NOTICE.—As soon as practicable after establishing the program under subsection (b), the Secretary shall notify all States of the grants available under the program and the process for applying for such grants.

(D) ONLINE SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish a mechanism for the electronic submission of applications under subparagraph (A). Such mechanism shall utilize an Internet website and all information on such website shall be in a format that is easily understood and widely accessible.

(E) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary may not make public any information submitted by a State to the Secretary under this paragraph regarding the efforts of such State to assist an eligible entity in locating an eligible facility in such State without the express consent of the State.

(3) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall award grants under the program on a competitive basis to States that—

(A) the Secretary determines are most likely to succeed with a grant under the program in assisting an eligible entity in locating an eligible facility in a rural or distressed area;

(B) if successful in assisting an eligible entity as described in subparagraph (A), will create the greatest number of high-value jobs in rural or distressed areas;

(C) have committed significant resources, to the extent of their ability as determined by the Secretary, to assisting eligible entities in locating eligible facilities in a rural or distressed areas; or

(D) meet such other criteria as the Secretary considers appropriate, including criteria relating to marketing plans, benefits to ongoing regional or State strategies for economic development, and job growth.

(4) LIMITATION ON COMPETITION BETWEEN STATES.—The Secretary may not award a grant to a State under the program to assist an eligible entity—

(A) in locating an eligible facility in such State if another State is already seeking to assist such eligible entity in locating such eligible facility in such other State; or

(B) from relocating an eligible facility from one State to another State.

(5) AVAILABILITY OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—For each grant awarded to a State under the program, the Secretary shall make available to such State the amount of such grant not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary awarded the grant. The total amount of grants awarded under this program may not exceed $100,000,000.

(d) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES FROM STATES TO CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts received by a State under the program shall be used to provide assistance to an eligible entity to locate an eligible facility in a rural or distressed area of the State.

(2) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—A State receiving a grant under the program may provide assistance under paragraph (1) in the form of—

(A) a single loan to a single eligible entity as described in paragraph (1) to cover the costs incurred by the eligible entity in locating the eligible facility as described in such paragraph; or

(B) a single loan guarantee to a financial institution making a single loan to a single eligible entity as described in paragraph (1) to cover the costs incurred by the eligible entity in locating the eligible facility as described in such paragraph.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Each loan or loan guarantee provided under paragraph (2) shall have a term of 5 years and shall bear interest at rates equal to the Federal long-term rate under section 1274(d)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(4) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan or loan guarantee issued to an eligible entity under the program for the location of an eligible facility shall be an amount equal to not more than $5,000 per full-time equivalent employee to be employed at such facility.

(5) REPAYMENT.—Repayment of a loan issued by a State to an eligible entity under the program shall be repaid in accordance with such schedule as the State shall establish in accordance with such rules as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of the program. Such rules shall provide for the following:

(A) Forgiveness of all or a portion of the loan, the amount of such forgiveness depending upon the following:

(i) The performance of the borrower.

(ii) The number or quality of the jobs at the facility located under the program.

(B) Repayment of principal or interest, if any, at the end of the term of the loan.

(e) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) ONGOING ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an ongoing assessment of the program.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary may submit to Congress recommendations for such legislative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to improve the program, including with respect to any findings of the Secretary derived by comparing the program established under subsection (b) with the programs and policies of governments of other countries used to recruit high-value jobs.

SA 3675. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BUREAU.—The term ''Bureau'' means the Bureau of Reclamation.

(2) COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The term ''cooperating agency'' means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations, or a State agency subject to section 203(c).

(3) QUALIFYING PROJECTS.—The term ''qualifying projects'' means new surface water storage projects constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding.

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

SEC. 203. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Bureau of Reclamation is established as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all reviews, analyses, opinions, statements, permits, licenses, or other approvals or decisions required under Federal law to construct qualifying projects.

(b) IDENTIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The Commissioner of the Bureau shall—

(1) identify, as early as practicable upon receipt of an application for a qualifying project, any Federal agency that may have jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, approval, or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

(2) notify any such agency, within a reasonable timeframe, that the agency has been designated as a cooperating agency in regards to the qualifying project unless that agency responds to the Bureau in writing, within a timeframe set forth by the Bureau, notifying the Bureau that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the qualifying project;

(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the qualifying project or any review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision associated therewith; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments on the qualifying project or conduct any review of such a project or make any decision with respect to such project in a manner other than in cooperation with the Bureau.

(c) STATE AUTHORITY.—A State in which a qualifying project is being considered may choose, consistent with State law—

(1) to participate as a cooperating agency; and

(2) to make subject to the processes of this title all State agencies that—

(A) have jurisdiction over the qualifying project;

(B) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the qualifying project; or

(C) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the water resource project.

SEC. 204. BUREAU RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The principal responsibilities of the Bureau under this title are to—

(1) serve as the point of contact for applicants, State agencies, Indian tribes, and others regarding proposed projects;

(2) coordinate preparation of unified environmental documentation that will serve as the basis for all Federal decisions necessary to authorize the use of Federal lands for qualifying projects; and

(3) coordinate all Federal agency reviews necessary for project development and construction of qualifying projects.

(b) COORDINATION PROCESS.—The Bureau shall have the following coordination responsibilities:

(1) PRE-APPLICATION COORDINATION.—Notify cooperating agencies of proposed qualifying projects not later than 30 days after receipt of a proposal and facilitate a preapplication meeting for prospective applicants, relevant Federal and State agencies, and Indian tribes to—

(A) explain applicable processes, data requirements, and applicant submissions necessary to complete the required Federal agency reviews within the timeframe established; and

(B) establish the schedule for the qualifying project.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH COOPERATING AGENCIES.—Consult with the cooperating agencies throughout the Federal agency review process, identify and obtain relevant data in a timely manner, and set necessary deadlines for cooperating agencies.

(3) SCHEDULE.—Work with the qualifying project applicant and cooperating agencies to establish a project schedule. In establishing the schedule, the Bureau shall consider, among other factors—

(A) the responsibilities of cooperating agencies under applicable laws and regulations;

(B) the resources available to the cooperating agencies and the non-Federal qualifying project sponsor, as applicable;

(C) the overall size and complexity of the qualifying project;

(D) the overall schedule for and cost of the qualifying project; and

(E) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the qualifying project.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—Prepare a unified environmental review document for each qualifying project application, incorporating a single environmental record on which all cooperating agencies with authority to issue approvals for a given qualifying project shall base project approval decisions. Help ensure that cooperating agencies make necessary decisions, within their respective authorities, regarding Federal approvals in accordance with the following timelines:

(A) Not later than one year after acceptance of a completed project application when an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact is determined to be the appropriate level of review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) Not later than one year and 30 days after the close of the public comment period for a draft environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), when an environmental impact statement is required under the same.

(5) CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.—Maintain a consolidated administrative record of the information assembled and used by the cooperating agencies as the basis for agency decisions.

(6) PROJECT DATA RECORDS.—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, ensure that all project data is submitted and maintained in generally accessible electronic format, compile, and where authorized under existing law, make available such project data to cooperating agencies, the qualifying project applicant, and to the public.

(7) PROJECT MANAGER.—Appoint a project manager for each qualifying project. The project manager shall have authority to oversee the project and to facilitate the issuance of the relevant final authorizing documents, and shall be responsible for ensuring fulfillment of all Bureau responsibilities set forth in this section and all cooperating agency responsibilities under section 205.

SEC. 205. COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) ADHERENCE TO BUREAU SCHEDULE.—Upon notification of an application for a qualifying project, all cooperating agencies shall submit to the Bureau a timeframe under which the cooperating agency reasonably considers it will be able to complete its authorizing responsibilities. The Bureau shall use the timeframe submitted under this subsection to establish the project schedule under section 204, and the cooperating agencies shall adhere to the project schedule established by the Bureau.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD.—Cooperating agencies shall submit to the Bureau all environmental review material produced or compiled in the course of carrying out activities required under Federal law consistent with the project schedule established by the Bureau.

(c) DATA SUBMISSION.—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, the cooperating agencies shall submit all relevant project data to the Bureau in a generally accessible electronic format subject to the project schedule set forth by the Bureau.

SEC. 206. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after public notice in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 553), may accept and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity to expedite the evaluation of a permit of that entity related to a qualifying project or activity for a public purpose under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

(b) EFFECT ON PERMITTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.

(2) EVALUATION OF PERMITS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure

that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

(A) be reviewed by the Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Regional Director's designee, of the region in which the qualifying project or activity is located; and

(B) use the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

(3) IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary and the cooperating agencies receiving funds under this section for qualifying projects shall ensure that the use of the funds accepted under this section for such projects shall not—

(A) impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to the issuance of permits, either substantively or procedurally; or

(B) diminish, modify, or otherwise affect the statutory or regulatory authorities of such agencies.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(2)(A).

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet.

SA 3676. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. NATIONAL ENERGY TAX REPEAL.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, ''The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in cardiovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.'';

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, ''children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor'';

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

SA 3677. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) finalize the proposed rule entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)); or

(2) use the proposed rule described in paragraph (1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) RULES.—The use of the proposed rule described in subsection (a)(1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) shall be grounds for vacation of the final rule, decision, or enforcement action.

SA 3678. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REDUCTION IN CORPORATE TAX RATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

''(1) 15 percent of so much of the taxable income as does not exceed $50,000, and

''(2) 20 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds $50,000.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3679. Mr. JOHANNS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).''.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).''.

SEC. 203. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

SA 3680. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FAMILY HEALTH CARE FLEXIBILITY.

(a) NO LIMITATIONS ON ACCESS TO OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS WITHOUT PRESCRIPTIONS.—Section 9003 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) and the amendments made by such section are repealed; and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied as if such section, and amendments, had never been enacted.

(b) NO LIMITATIONS ON HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.—Sections 9005 and 10902 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) and section 1403 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) and the amendments made by such sections are repealed; and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied as if such sections, and amendments, had never been enacted.

SA 3681. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE II—ENDING OPERATION CHOKE POINT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''End Operation Choke Point Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. BUSINESS ACCESS TO INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 51. BUSINESS ACCESS TO INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal banking agencies may not prohibit or otherwise restrict or discourage an insured depository institution from providing any product or service to an entity that demonstrates to the insured depository institution that such entity—

''(1) is licensed and authorized to offer such product or service;

''(2) is registered as a money transmitting business under section 5330 of title 31, United States Code, or regulations promulgated under such section; or

''(3) has a reasoned legal opinion that demonstrates the legality of the entity's business under applicable law.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) require an insured depository institution—

''(A) to provide any product or service to any particular entity;

''(B) to regularly review the status of any license of an entity; or

''(C) to determine the validity or veracity of any reasoned legal opinion obtained under subsection (a)(3); or

''(2) imply or require that an insured depository institution may only provide products or services to an entity that has met any of the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a).

''(c) LIMITATION ON RULEMAKING.—The Federal banking agencies may not issue any guidance under subsection (a). Any rule implementing subsection (a) shall be promulgated in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

''(d) REASONED LEGAL OPINION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'reasoned legal opinion'—

''(1) means a written legal opinion by a State-licensed attorney that addresses the facts of a particular business and the legality of the business's provision of products or services to customers in the relevant jurisdictions under applicable Federal and State law, tribal ordinances, tribal resolutions, and tribal-State compacts; and

''(2) does not include a written legal opinion that recites the facts of a particular business and states a conclusion.''.

SEC. 203. BUSINESS ACCESS TO FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS.

Title I of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 132. BUSINESS ACCESS TO INSURED CREDIT UNIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board may not prohibit or otherwise restrict or discourage an insured credit union from providing any product or service to an entity that demonstrates to the insured credit union that such entity—

''(1) is licensed and authorized to offer such product or service;

''(2) is registered as a money transmitting business under section 5330 of title 31, United States Code, or regulations promulgated under such section; and

''(3) has a reasoned legal opinion that demonstrates the legality of the entity's business under applicable law.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) require an insured credit union—

''(A) to provide any products or services to any entity;

''(B) to regularly review the status of any license of an entity; or

''(C) to determine the validity or veracity of any reasoned legal opinion obtained under subsection (a)(3); or

''(2) imply or require that an insured credit union may only provide products or services to an entity that has met any of the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a).

''(c) LIMITATION ON RULEMAKING.—The Board may not issue any guidance under subsection (a). Any rule implementing subsection (a) shall be promulgated in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

''(d) REASONED LEGAL OPINION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'reasoned legal opinion'—

''(1) means a written legal opinion by a State-licensed attorney that addresses the facts of a particular business and the legality of the business's provision of products or services to customers in the relevant jurisdictions under applicable Federal and State law, tribal ordinances, tribal resolutions, and tribal-State compacts; and

''(2) does not include a written legal opinion that recites the facts of a particular business and states a conclusion.''.

SEC. 204. AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.

Section 951 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting ''and where such violation or conspiracy to violate is in connection with a violation or conspiracy to violate a section described under paragraph (1)'' after ''financial institution''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the header, by striking ''SUBPOENAS'' and inserting ''INVESTIGATIONS'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) request a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction, to summon witnesses and to require the production of any books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, or other records which the Attorney General deems relevant or material to the inquiry, and which shall be issued only if the Attorney General offers specific and articulable facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information or testimony sought is relevant and material to an ongoing civil proceeding under this section.'';

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON FIRREA COURT ORDERS.—The Attorney General shall submit a report before January 31 of each year, beginning the first January following the date of enactment of the End Operation Choke Point Act of 2014, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, which shall include a detailed description of—

''(A) the number of court orders sought by the Attorney General and the number of orders issued;

''(B) the recipient of the court orders;

''(C) the number of documents requested and received;

''(D) the number of witnesses requested to testify and the number who actually testified; and

''(E) whether a civil enforcement action was filed and the result of any such enforcement action, including settlements that led to the dismissal of charges.''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 205. REQUIRING COOPERATION TO DETER THE COMMISSION OF FINANCIAL FRAUD.

Subsection (a) of section 314 of the USA PATRIOT Act (31 U.S.C. 5311 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', the commission of financial fraud,'' after ''terrorist acts'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

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

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

''(D) means of facilitating the identification of accounts and transactions involving persons engaged in committing financial fraud, subject to the limitations described in paragraph (5).''; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''shall not be used'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''shall not—

''(A) be used for any purpose other than identifying and reporting on activities that may involve terrorist acts, financial fraud, or money laundering; and

''(B) be construed to require financial institutions to determine or assure compliance of any entity with any Federal, State, or other licensing requirements.''.

SEC. 206. LIABILITY FOR DISCLOSURES IN REPORTING SUSPICIOUS TRANSACTIONS.

Paragraph (3) of section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ", for any underlying activity that is the subject of the disclosure," after "for such disclosure"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "civil or" before "criminal".

SEC. 207. FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK DATA ACCOUNTABILITY METRICS.

Section 310 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(C)—

(A) in clause (vi), by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (vii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(viii) generate feedback and report on the utility of the data access service described in subparagraph (B) and the information collected by the service to improve cooperation among data providers and users while reducing regulatory burden and preserving payment system efficiency.";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) for appropriate metrics to monitor, track, assess, and report on access to information contained in the data maintenance system maintained by FinCEN for—

"(A) identifying, tracking, and measuring how such information is used and the law enforcement results obtained as a consequence of that use; and

"(B) assuring accountability by law enforcement agencies for the utility, security, and privacy of such information while reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens.".

SA 3682. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TRUTH IN REGULATING ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Truth in Regulating Act of 2014".

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) increase the transparency of important regulatory decisions;

(2) promote effective congressional oversight to ensure that agency rules fulfill statutory requirements in an efficient, effective, and fair manner; and

(3) increase the accountability of Congress and the agencies to the people they serve.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms "agency", "rule", and "rule making" have the meanings given those terms under section 551 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term "economically significant rule" means any proposed or final rule, including an interim or direct final rule, that may—

(A) have an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more; or

(B) adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;

(3) the term "independent evaluation" means a substantive evaluation of the data, methodology, and assumptions used by an agency in developing an economically significant rule, including—

(A) an explanation of how any strengths or weaknesses in those data, methodology, and assumptions support or detract from conclusions reached by the agency; and

(B) the implications, if any, of the strengths or weaknesses described in subparagraph (A) for the rule making; and

(4) the term "pilot program" means the program for reviewing and reporting on economically significant rules established under subsection (d).

(d) PILOT PROGRAM FOR REPORT ON RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REQUEST FOR REVIEW.—When an agency publishes an economically significant rule, the chair or ranking member of a committee of jurisdiction of either House of Congress may request that the Comptroller General of the United States review the rule.

(B) REPORT.—Subject to subparagraph (D), not later than 180 days after the Comptroller General receives a request under subparagraph (A) for review of an economically significant rule, the Comptroller General shall submit to each committee of jurisdiction in each House of Congress a report that includes an independent evaluation of the economically significant rule.

(C) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The independent evaluation of an economically significant rule by the Comptroller General under subparagraph (B) shall include, with respect to the agency that published the rule—

(i) an evaluation of the analysis by the agency of the potential benefits of the rule, including—

(I) any beneficial effects that cannot be quantified in monetary terms; and

(II) the identification of the persons or entities likely to receive the benefits described in subclause (I);

(ii) an evaluation of the analysis by the agency of the potential costs of the rule, including—

(I) any adverse effects that cannot be quantified in monetary terms; and

(II) the identification of the persons or entities likely to bear the costs described in subclause (I);

(iii) an evaluation of—

(I) the analysis by the agency of alternative approaches set forth in the notice of proposed rulemaking and in the rulemaking record; and

(II) any regulatory impact analysis, federalism assessment, or other analysis or assessment prepared by the agency or required for the economically significant rule; and

(iv) a summary of—

(I) the results of the evaluation of the Comptroller General; and

(II) the implications of the results described in subclause (I).

(D) PROCEDURES FOR PRIORITIES OF REQUESTS.—The Comptroller General may develop procedures for determining the priority and number of requests for review under subparagraph (A) for which the Comptroller General submits a report under subparagraph (B).

(2) AUTHORITY OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(A) COOPERATION BY AGENCIES.—Each agency shall promptly cooperate with the Comptroller General in carrying out this section.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to expand or limit the authority of the Government Accountability Office.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Government Accountability Office to carry out this section $5,200,000 for each of the 3 fiscal years during the period described in subsection (f)(2)(A).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE; DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM; REPORT.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the pilot program shall be in effect for the 3-year period beginning on the effective date of this section.

(B) FAILURE TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS.—If a specific annual appropriation of not less than $5,200,000 is not made to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the pilot program shall not be in effect during that fiscal year.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than the last day of the period described in paragraph (2)(A), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report that—

(A) reviews the effectiveness of the pilot program; and

(B) recommends whether or not Congress should permanently authorize the pilot program.

SA 3683. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION STUDY ON THE COST OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the terms "Administration" and "Administrator" mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof;

(2) the term "major rule" has the meaning given that term under section 804 of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the term "small business concern" has the meaning given that term under in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Administrator shall conduct a study on the total cost, including job losses, of Federal regulations to small business concerns.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting each study required under subsection (b), the Administrator shall use the best available estimates of the costs and the benefits, including estimates produced in accordance with Executive Order 12866 (5 U.S.C. 601 note; relating to regulatory planning and review), disaggregated by each agency issuing a major rule, of—

(1) each major rule promulgated during the year covered by the study that resulted in a net cost to small business concerns; and

(2) the cumulative costs of such major rules.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing a study required under subsection (b), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report, which shall include—

(1) the findings of the study; and

(2) for each study completed after the first study, the increase in the total cost of Federal regulations to small business concerns above the total cost included in the report for the preceding year.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall carry out this section using unobligated funds otherwise made available to the Administration.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that no additional funds should be made available to the Administration to carry out this section.

SA 3684. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION STUDY ON THE COST OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''Administration'' and ''Administrator'' mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof;

(2) the term ''major rule'' has the meaning given that term under section 804 of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given that term under in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Administrator shall conduct a study on the total cost, including job losses, of Federal regulations to small business concerns.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting each study required under subsection (b), the Administrator shall use the best available estimates of the costs and the benefits, including estimates produced in accordance with Executive Order 12866 (5 U.S.C. 601 note; relating to regulatory planning and review), disaggregated by each agency issuing a major rule, of—

(1) each major rule promulgated during the year covered by the study that resulted in a net cost to small business concerns; and

(2) the cumulative costs of such major rules.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing a study required under subsection (b), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report, which shall include—

(1) the findings of the study; and

(2) for each study completed after the first study, the increase in the total cost of Federal regulations to small business concerns above the total cost included in the report for the preceding year.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall carry out this section using unobligated funds otherwise made available to the Administration.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that no additional funds should be made available to the Administration to carry out this section.

SA 3685. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PERMANENT DOUBLING OF DEDUCTIONS FOR START-UP EXPENSES, ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES, AND SYNDICATION FEES.

(a) START-UP EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Clause (ii) of section 195(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$10,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 195 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(b) ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 248 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$10,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

(c) ORGANIZATION AND SYNDICATION FEES.—Clause (ii) of section 709(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$10,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION OF CASH ACCOUNTING RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) CASH ACCOUNTING PERMITTED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 446 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to general rule for methods of accounting) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYERS PERMITTED TO USE CASH ACCOUNTING METHOD WITHOUT LIMITATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible taxpayer shall not be required to use an accrual method of accounting for any taxable year.

''(2) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, a taxpayer is an eligible taxpayer with respect to any taxable year if—

''(A) for all prior taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013, the taxpayer (or any predecessor) met the gross receipts test of section 448(c), and

''(B) the taxpayer is not subject to section 447 or 448.''.

(2) EXPANSION OF GROSS RECEIPTS TEST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 448(b) of such Code (relating to entities with gross receipts of not more than $5,000,000) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' in the text and in the heading and inserting ''$10,000,000''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 448(c) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$5,000,000'' each place it appears in the text and in the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting ''$10,000,000'', and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2014, the dollar amount contained in subsection (b)(3) and paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof. If any amount as adjusted under this subparagraph is not a multiple of $100,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF INVENTORY RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 471 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to general rule for inventories) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYERS NOT REQUIRED TO USE INVENTORIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A qualified taxpayer shall not be required to use inventories under this section for a taxable year.

''(2) TREATMENT OF TAXPAYERS NOT USING INVENTORIES.—If a qualified taxpayer does not use inventories with respect to any property for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, such property shall be treated as a material or supply which is not incidental.

''(3) QUALIFIED TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified taxpayer' means—

''(A) any eligible taxpayer (as defined in section 446(g)(2)), and

''(B) any taxpayer described in section 448(b)(3).''.

(2) INCREASED ELIGIBILITY FOR SIMPLIFIED DOLLAR-VALUE LIFO METHOD.—Section 474(c) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''the dollar amount in effect under section 448(c)(1)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer changing the taxpayer's method of accounting for any taxable year under the amendments made by this section—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer;

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account over a period (not greater than 4 taxable years) beginning with such taxable year.

SEC. 6. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF EXPENSING LIMITATION.

(a) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''shall not exceed'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $250,000.''.

(b) REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.—Section 179(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''exceeds'' and all that follows and inserting ''exceeds $800,000.''.

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 179 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2014, the $250,000 in paragraph (1) and the $800,000 amount in paragraph (2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—

''(i) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—If the amount in paragraph (1) as increased under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000.

''(ii) PHASEOUT AMOUNT.—If the amount in paragraph (2) as increased under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(d) COMPUTER SOFTWARE.—Section 179(d)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking ''and before 2014''.

(e) ELECTION.—Section 179(c)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''and before 2014''.

(f) SPECIAL RULES FOR TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 179(f)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013'' and inserting ''beginning after 2009''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 179(f) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 7. EXTENSION OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 168(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''January 1, 2015'' in subparagraph (A)(iv) and inserting ''January 1, 2016'', and

(2) by striking ''January 1, 2014'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR FEDERAL LONG-TERM CONTRACTS.—Clause (ii) of section 460(c)(6)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014 (January 1, 2015'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015 (January 1, 2016''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for subsection (k) of section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''JANUARY 1, 2014'' and inserting ''JANUARY 1, 2015''.

(2) The heading for clause (ii) of section 168(k)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''PRE-JANUARY 1, 2014'' and inserting ''PRE-JANUARY 1, 2015''.

(3) Section 168(k)(4)(D) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting a comma, and by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(iv) 'January 1, 2015' shall be substituted for 'January 1, 2016' in subparagraph (A)(iv) thereof, and

''(v) 'January 1, 2014' shall be substituted for 'January 1, 2015' each place it appears in subparagraph (A) thereof.''.

(4) Section 168(l)(4) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C), and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) by substituting 'January 1, 2014' for 'January 1, 2015' in clause (i) thereof, and''.

(5) Subparagraph (C) of section 168(n)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(6) Subparagraph (D) of section 1400L(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(7) Subparagraph (B) of section 1400N(d)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013, in taxable years ending after such date.

SEC. 8. EXTENSION OF 15-YEAR STRAIGHT-LINE COST RECOVERY FOR QUALIFIED LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS, QUALIFIED RESTAURANT BUILDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS, AND QUALIFIED RETAIL IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clauses (iv), (v), and (ix) of section 168(e)(3)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SA 3686. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ELIMINATION OF DISINCENTIVE TO POOLING FOR MULTIPLE EMPLOYER PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe final regulations under which a plan described in section 413(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may be treated as satisfying the qualification requirements of section 401(a) of such Code despite the violation of such requirements with respect to one or more participating employers. Such rules may require that the portion of the plan attributable to such participating employers be spun off to plans maintained by such employers.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF ERISA RULES RELATING TO MULTIPLE EMPLOYER DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT OF COMMON INTEREST.—Section 3(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) A qualified multiple employer plan shall not fail to be treated as an employee pension benefit plan or pension plan solely because the employers sponsoring the plan share no common interest.

''(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'qualified multiple employer plan' means a plan described in section 413(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which—

''(I) is an individual account plan with respect to which the requirements of clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) are met, and

''(II) includes in its annual report required to be filed under section 104(a) the name and identifying information of each participating employer.

''(iii) The requirements of this clause are met if, under the plan, each participating employer retains fiduciary responsibility for—

''(I) the selection and monitoring of the named fiduciary, and

''(II) the investment and management of the portion of the plan's assets attributable to employees of the employer to the extent not otherwise delegated to another fiduciary.

''(iv) The requirements of this clause are met if, under the plan, a participating employer is not subject to unreasonable restrictions, fees, or penalties by reason of ceasing participation in, or otherwise transferring assets from, the plan.

''(v) The requirements of this clause are met if each participating employer in the plan is an eligible employer as defined in section 408(p)(2)(C)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, applied—

''(I) by substituting '500' for '100' in subclause (I) thereof,

''(II) by substituting '5' for '2' each place it appears in subclause (II) thereof, and

''(III) without regard to the last sentence of subclause (II) thereof.''.

(2) SIMPLIFIED REPORTING FOR SMALL MULTIPLE EMPLOYER PLANS.—Section 104(a) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1024(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7)(A) In the case of any eligible small multiple employer plan, the Secretary may by regulation—

''(i) prescribe simplified summary plan descriptions, annual reports, and pension benefit statements for purposes of section 102, 103, or 105, respectively, and

''(ii) waive the requirement under section 103(a)(3) to engage an independent qualified public accountant in cases where the Secretary determines it appropriate.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'eligible small multiple employer plan' means, with respect to any plan year—

''(i) a qualified multiple employer plan, as defined in section 3(2)(C)(ii), or

''(ii) any other plan described in section 413(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that satisfies the requirements of clause (v) of section 3(2)(C).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 6. SECURE DEFERRAL ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (k) of section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) ALTERNATIVE METHOD FOR SECURE DEFERRAL ARRANGEMENTS TO MEET NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A secure deferral arrangement shall be treated as meeting the requirements of paragraph (3)(A)(ii).

''(B) SECURE DEFERRAL ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'secure deferral arrangement' means any cash or deferred arrangement which meets the requirements of subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (13), except as modified by this paragraph.

''(C) QUALIFIED PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this paragraph, with respect to any employee, the term 'qualified percentage' means, in lieu of the meaning given such term in paragraph (13)(C)(iii), any percentage determined under the arrangement if such percentage is applied uniformly and is—

''(i) at least 6 percent, but not greater than 10 percent, during the period ending on the last day of the first plan year which begins after the date on which the first elective contribution described in paragraph (13)(C)(i) is made with respect to such employee,

''(ii) at least 8 percent during the first plan year following the plan year described in clause (i), and

''(iii) at least 10 percent during any subsequent plan year.

''(D) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, an arrangement shall be treated as having met the requirements of paragraph (13)(D)(i) if and only if the employer makes matching contributions on behalf of each employee who is not a highly compensated employee in an amount equal to the sum of—

''(I) 100 percent of the elective contributions of the employee to the extent that such contributions do not exceed 1 percent of compensation,

''(II) 50 percent of so much of such contributions as exceed 1 percent but do not exceed 6 percent of compensation, plus

''(III) 25 percent of so much of such contributions as exceed 6 percent but do not exceed 10 percent of compensation.

''(ii) APPLICATION OF RULES FOR MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The rules of clause (ii) of paragraph (12)(B) and clauses (iii) and (iv) of paragraph (13)(D) shall apply for purposes of clause (i) but the rule of clause (iii) of paragraph (12)(B) shall not apply for such purposes. The rate of matching contribution for each incremental deferral must be at least as high as the rate specified in clause (i), and may be higher, so long as such rate does not increase as an employee's rate of elective contributions increases.''.

(b) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS AND EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subsection (m) of section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14) and by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

''(13) ALTERNATIVE METHOD FOR SECURE DEFERRAL ARRANGEMENTS.—A defined contribution plan shall be treated as meeting the requirements of paragraph (2) with respect to matching contributions and employee contributions if the plan—

''(A) is a secure deferral arrangement (as defined in subsection (k)(14)),

''(B) meets the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (11)(B), and

''(C) provides that matching contributions on behalf of any employee may not be made with respect to an employee's contributions or elective deferrals in excess of 10 percent of the employee's compensation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 7. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS WITH RESPECT TO MODIFIED SAFE HARBOR REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45S. CREDIT FOR SMALL EMPLOYERS WITH RESPECT TO MODIFIED SAFE HARBOR REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTION ARRANGEMENTS.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of a small employer, the safe harbor adoption credit determined under this section for any taxable year is the amount equal to the total of the employer's matching contributions under section 401(k)(14)(D) during the taxable year on behalf of employees who are not highly compensated employees, subject to the limitations of subsection (b).

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO COMPENSATION.—The credit determined under subsection (a) with respect to contributions made on behalf of an employee who is not a highly compensated employee shall not exceed 2 percent of the compensation of such employee for the taxable year.

''(2) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO YEARS OF PARTICIPATION.—Credit shall be determined under subsection (a) with respect to contributions made on behalf of an employee who is not a highly compensated employee only during the first 5 years such employee participates in the qualified automatic contribution arrangement.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term used in this section which is also used in section 401(k)(14) shall have the same meaning as when used in such section.

''(2) SMALL EMPLOYER.—The term 'small employer' means an eligible employer (as defined in section 408(p)(2)(C)(i)).

''(d) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No deduction shall be allowable under this title for any contribution with respect to which a credit is allowed under this section.''.

(b) CREDIT TO BE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (35),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting '', plus'', and

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

''(37) the safe harbor adoption credit determined under section 45S.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 45R the following new item:

''Sec. 45S. Credit for small employers with respect to modified safe harbor requirements for automatic contribution arrangements.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years that include any portion of a plan year beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 8. MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate regulations or other guidance that—

(1) simplify and clarify the rules regarding the timing of participant notices required under section 401(k)(13)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with specific application to—

(A) plans that allow employees to be eligible for participation immediately upon beginning employment, and

(B) employers with multiple payroll and administrative systems, and

(2) simplify and clarify the automatic escalation rules under sections 401(k)(13)(C)(iii) and 401(k)(14)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in the context of employers with multiple payroll and administrative systems.

Such regulations or guidance shall address the particular case of employees within the same plan who are subject to different notice timing and different percentage requirements, and provide assistance for plan sponsors in managing such cases.

SEC. 9. OPPORTUNITY TO CLAIM THE SAVER'S CREDIT ON FORM 1040EZ.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall modify the forms for the return of tax of individuals in order to allow individuals claiming the credit under section 25B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to file (and claim such credit on) Form 1040EZ.

SA 3687. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2015.

With respect to calendar year 2015, the Secretary of the Treasury shall implement and enforce section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as if—

(1) in paragraph (2)(E), ''by 174'' is substituted for ''by 120''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), ''40 hours'' is substituted for ''30 hours''.

SA 3688. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XVIII—EMBASSY SECURITY AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND ARMS EXPORT AUTHORITIES

SEC. 1801. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle A—Embassy Security

SEC. 1811. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty Embassy Security, Threat Mitigation, and Personnel Protection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 1812. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) FACILITIES.—The term ''facilities'' includes embassies, consulates, expeditionary diplomatic facilities, and any other diplomatic facility outside of the United States, including facilities intended for temporary use.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

PART I—FUNDING AUTHORIZATION AND TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 1816. CAPITAL SECURITY COST SHARING PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State $1,356,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, which shall remain available until expended, for the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program, authorized under section 604(e) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (title VI of division A of H.R. 3427, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106–113; 113 Stat. 1501A–453; 22 U.S.C. 4865 note).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE CAPITAL SECURITY COST SHARING PROGRAM.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program should prioritize the construction of new facilities and the maintenance of existing facilities in high threat, high risk areas in addition to addressing immediate threat mitigation as set forth in section 1817, and should take into consideration the priorities of other government agencies that are contributing to the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program when replacing or upgrading diplomatic facilities; and

(2) all United States Government agencies are required to pay into the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program a percentage of total costs determined by interagency agreements, in order to address immediate threat mitigation needs and increase funds for the

Capital Security Cost Sharing Program for fiscal year 2015, including to address inflation and increased construction costs.

(c) RESTRICTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF OFFICE SPACE.—Section 604(e)(2) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (title VI of division A of H.R. 3427, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106–113; 113 Stat. 1501A–453; 22 U.S.C. 4865 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''A project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may not include office space or other accommodations for an employee of a Federal agency or department if the Secretary determines that such department or agency has not provided to the Department of State the full amount of funding required by paragraph (1), except that such project may include office space or other accommodations for members of the United States Marine Corps.''.

SEC. 1817. IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION.

(a) ALLOCATION OF AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any amounts otherwise made available for such purposes, the Department of State shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law except as provided in subsection (d), use up to $300,000,000 of the funding provided in section 1816 for immediate threat mitigation projects, with priority given to facilities determined to be ''high threat, high risk'' pursuant to section 1837.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—In allocating funding for threat mitigation projects, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for—

(1) the construction of safeguards that provide immediate security benefits;

(2) the purchasing of additional security equipment, including additional defensive weaponry;

(3) the paying of expenses of additional security forces, with an emphasis on funding United States security forces where practicable; and

(4) any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

(c) TRANSFER.—The Secretary may transfer and merge funds authorized under subsection (a) to any appropriation account of the Department of State for the purpose of carrying out the threat mitigation projects described in subsection (b).

(d) USE OF FUNDS FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—Notwithstanding the allocation requirement under subsection (a), funds subject to such requirement may be used for other authorized purposes of the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program if, not later than 15 days prior to such use, the Secretary certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) high threat, high risk facilities are being secured to the best of the United States Government's ability; and

(2) the Secretary will make funds available from the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program or other sources to address any changed security threats or risks, or new or emergent security needs, including immediate threat mitigation.

SEC. 1818. LANGUAGE TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 416. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Diplomatic security personnel assigned permanently to, or who are serving in, long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary of State at a high threat, high risk post should receive language training described in subsection (b) in order to prepare such personnel for duty requirements at such post.

''(b) LANGUAGE TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Language training referred to in subsection (a) should prepare personnel described in such subsection—

''(1) to speak the language at issue with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on subjects germane to security; and

''(2) to read within an adequate range of speed and with almost complete comprehension on subjects germane to security.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 annually for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out this section.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—The Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors shall, at the end of fiscal years 2015 and 2016, review the language training conducted pursuant to this section and make the results of such reviews available to the Secretary and the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 1819. FOREIGN AFFAIRS SECURITY TRAINING.

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

(1) Department of State employees and their families deserve improved and efficient programs and facilities for high threat training and training on risk management decision processes;

(2) improved and efficient high threat, high risk training is consistent with the Benghazi Accountability Review Board (ARB) recommendation number 17;

(3) improved and efficient security training should take advantage of training synergies that already exist, like training with, or in close proximity to, Fleet Antiterrorism Security Teams (FAST), special operations forces, or other appropriate military and security assets; and

(4) the Secretary should undertake temporary measures, including leveraging the availability of existing government and private sector training facilities, to the extent appropriate to meet the critical security training requirements of the Department of State.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE SECURITY TRAINING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK ENVIRONMENTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State $100,000,000 for improved immediate security training for high threat, high risk security environments, including through the utilization of government or private sector facilities to meet critical security training requirements.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR LONG-TERM SECURITY TRAINING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK ENVIRONMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $350,000,000 for the acquisition, construction, and operation of a new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center or expanding existing government training facilities, subject to the certification requirement in paragraph (2).

(2) REQUIRED CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days prior to the obligation or expenditure of any funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the acquisition, construction, and operation of a new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, or the expansion of existing government training facilities, is necessary to meet long-term security training requirements for high threat, high risk environments.

(3) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION.—If the certification in paragraph (2) is made—

(A) up to $100,000,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) shall also be authorized for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1); or

(B) up to $100,000,000 of funds available for the acquisition, construction, or operation of Department of State facilities may be transferred and used for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1820. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) In addition to exercising any other transfer authority available to the Secretary of State, and subject to subsection (k), the Secretary may transfer to, and merge with, any appropriation for embassy security, construction, and maintenance such amounts appropriated for any other purpose related to diplomatic and consular programs on or after October 1, 2014, as the Secretary determines are necessary to provide for the security of sites and buildings in foreign countries under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary.

''(2) Any funds transferred under the authority provided in paragraph (1) shall be merged with funds in the heading to which transferred, and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as the funds with which merged.

''(k) Not later than 15 days before any transfer of funds under subsection (j), the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

PART II—CONTRACTING AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1821. LOCAL GUARD CONTRACTS ABROAD UNDER DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 4864(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) in evaluating proposals for such contracts, award contracts to technically acceptable firms offering the lowest evaluated price, except that—

''(A) the Secretary may award contracts on the basis of best value (as determined by a cost-technical tradeoff analysis); and

''(B) proposals received from United States persons and qualified United States joint venture persons shall be evaluated by reducing the bid price by 10 percent;''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an explanation of the implementation of paragraph (3) of section 136(c) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, as amended by subsection (a); and

(2) for each instance in which an award is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) of such paragraph, as so amended, a written justification and approval, providing the basis for such award and an explanation of the inability to satisfy the needs of the Department of State by technically acceptable, lowest price evaluation award.

SEC. 1822. DISCIPLINARY ACTION RESULTING FROM UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP IN RELATION TO A SECURITY INCIDENT.

Section 304(c) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834 (c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking ''RECOMMENDATIONS'' and inserting the following: ''RECOMMENDATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever''; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

''(2) CERTAIN SECURITY INCIDENTS.—Unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action. If a Board finds reasonable cause to believe that a senior official provided such unsatisfactory leadership, the Board may recommend disciplinary action subject to the procedures in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 1823. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF STATE.—Nothing in this subtitle or any other provision of law may be construed to prevent the Secretary from using all authorities invested in the office of Secretary to take personnel action against any employee or official of the Department of State that the Secretary determines has breached the duty of that individual or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or a serious breach of security, even if such action is the subject of an Accountability Review Board's examination under section 304(a) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834(a)).

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 304 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by inserting ''or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or the serious breach of security that is the subject of the Board's examination as described in subsection (a),'' after ''breached the duty of that individual'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY.—If a Board determines that an individual has engaged in any conduct addressed in subsection (c), the Board shall evaluate the level and effectiveness of management and oversight conducted by employees or officials in the management chain of such individual.''.

SEC. 1824. SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS FOR SOFT TARGETS.

Section 29 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2701) is amended in the third sentence by inserting ''physical security enhancements and'' after ''Such assistance may include''.

SEC. 1825. REEMPLOYMENT OF ANNUITANTS.

Section 824(g) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''to facilitate the'' and all that follows through ''Afghanistan, if'' and inserting ''to facilitate the assignment of persons to high threat, high risk posts or to posts vacated by members of the Service assigned to high threat, high risk posts, if'';

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the incurred costs over the prior fiscal year of the total compensation and benefit payments to annuitants reemployed by the Department pursuant to this section.''; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) In the event that an annuitant qualified for compensation or payments pursuant to this subsection subsequently transfers to a position for which the annuitant would not qualify for a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary may no longer waive the application of subsections (a) through (d) with respect to such annuitant.

''(5) The authority of the Secretary to waive the application of subsections (a) through (d) for an annuitant pursuant to this subsection shall terminate on October 1, 2019.''.

PART III—EXPANSION OF THE MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD DETACHMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 1831. MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the responsibility of the Secretary for diplomatic security under section 103 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4802), the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall—

(1) develop and implement a plan to incorporate the additional Marine Corps Security Guard personnel authorized under section 404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 5983 note) at United States embassies, consulates, and other facilities; and

(2) conduct an annual review of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program, including—

(A) an evaluation of whether the size and composition of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program is adequate to meet global diplomatic security requirements;

(B) an assessment of whether Marine Corps security guards are appropriately deployed among facilities to respond to evolving security developments and potential threats to United States interests abroad; and

(C) an assessment of the mission objectives of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program and the procedural rules of engagement to protect diplomatic personnel under the Program.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an unclassified report, with a classified annex as necessary, that addresses the requirements set forth in subsection (a)(2).

PART IV—REPORTING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEC. 1836. DEPARTMENT OF STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS PROVIDED BY THE ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD CONVENED AFTER THE SEPTEMBER 11–12, 2012, ATTACKS ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an unclassified report, with a classified annex, on the implementation by the Department of State of the recommendations of the Accountability Review Board convened pursuant to title III of the Omnibus Diplomatic and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.) to examine the facts and circumstances surrounding the September 11–12, 2012, killings of 4 United States Government personnel in Benghazi, Libya.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the overall state of the Department of State's diplomatic security to respond to the evolving global threat environment, and the broader steps the Department of State is taking to improve the security of United States diplomatic personnel in the aftermath of the Accountability Review Board Report;

(2) a description of the specific steps taken by the Department of State to address each of the 29 recommendations contained in the Accountability Review Board Report, including—

(A) an assessment of whether implementation of each recommendation is ''complete'' or is still ''in progress''; and

(B) if the Secretary determines not to fully implement any of the 29 recommendations in the Accountability Review Board Report, a thorough explanation as to why such a decision was made; and

(3) an enumeration and assessment of any significant challenges that have slowed or interfered with the Department of State's implementation of the Accountability Review Board recommendations, including—

(A) a lack of funding or resources made available to the Department of State;

(B) restrictions imposed by current law that in the Secretary's judgment should be amended; and

(C) difficulties caused by a lack of coordination between the Department of State and other United States Government agencies.

SEC. 1837. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK FACILITIES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a classified report, with an unclassified summary, evaluating Department of State facilities that the Secretary determines to be ''high threat, high risk'' in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) CONTENT.—For each facility determined to be ''high threat, high risk'' pursuant to subsection (a), the report submitted under such subsection shall also include—

(1) a narrative assessment describing the security threats and risks facing posts overseas and the overall threat level to United States personnel under chief of mission authority;

(2) the number of diplomatic security personnel, Marine Corps security guards, and other Department of State personnel dedicated to providing security for United States personnel, information, and facilities;

(3) an assessment of host nation willingness and capability to provide protection in the event of a security threat or incident, pursuant to the obligations of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961;

(4) an assessment of the quality and experience level of the team of United States senior security personnel assigned to the facility, considering collectively the assignment durations and lengths of government experience;

(5) the number of Foreign Service Officers who have received Foreign Affairs Counter Threat training;

(6) a summary of the requests made during the previous calendar year for additional resources, equipment, or personnel related to the security of the facility and the status of such requests;

(7) an assessment of the ability of United States personnel to respond to and survive a fire attack, including—

(A) whether the facility has adequate fire safety and security equipment for safe havens and safe areas; and

(B) whether the employees working at the facility have been adequately trained on the equipment available;

(8) for each new facility that is opened, a detailed description of the steps taken to provide security for the new facility, including whether a dedicated support cell was established in the Department of State to ensure proper and timely resourcing of security; and

(9) a listing of any ''high-threat, high-risk'' facilities where the Department of State and other government agencies' facilities are not collocated including—

(A) a rationale for the lack of collocation; and

(B) a description of what steps, if any, are being taken to mitigate potential security vulnerabilities associated with the lack of collocation.

(c) DETERMINATION OF HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK FACILITY.—In determining what facilities constitute ''high threat, high risk facilities'' under this section, the Secretary shall take into account with respect to each facility whether there are—

(1) high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism;

(2) national or local governments with inadequate capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection; and

(3) in locations where there are high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism or national or local governments lack the capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection—

(A) mission physical security platforms that fall well below the Department of State's established standards; or

(B) security personnel levels that are insufficient for the circumstances.

(d) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORT.—The Inspector General for the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall, on an annual basis—

(1) review the determinations of the Department of State with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including the basis for making such determinations;

(2) review contingency planning for high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures in place to respond to attacks on such facilities;

(3) review the risk mitigation measures in place at high threat, high risk facilities to determine how the Department of State evaluates risk and whether the measures put in place sufficiently address the relevant risks;

(4) review early warning systems in place at high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures being taken to preempt and disrupt threats to such facilities; and

(5) provide to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the determinations of the Department of State with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including recommendations for additions or changes to the list of such facilities, and a report regarding the reviews and evaluations undertaken pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (4) and this paragraph.

SEC. 1838. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH-RISK COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT POSTS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with appropriate officials in the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the counterintelligence threat to United States diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations, including—

(1) an assessment of the use of locally employed staff and guard forces and a listing of diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations without controlled access areas; and

(2) recommendations for mitigating any counterintelligence threats and for any necessary facility upgrades, including costs assessment of any recommended mitigation or upgrades so recommended.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

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

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) PRIORITY 1 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT NATION.—The term ''Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nation'' means a country designated as such by the October 2012 National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF).

SEC. 1839. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF BENGHAZI ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the progress of the Department of State in implementing the recommendations of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the progress the Department of State has made in implementing each specific recommendation of the Accountability Review Board; and

(2) a description of any impediments to recommended reforms, such as budget constraints, bureaucratic obstacles within the Department or in the broader interagency community, or limitations under current law.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 1840. SECURITY ENVIRONMENT THREAT LIST BRIEFINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and upon each subsequent update of the Security Environment Threat List (referred to in this section as the ''SETL''), the Bureau of Diplomatic Security shall provide classified briefings to the appropriate congressional committees on the SETL.

(b) CONTENT.—The briefings required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an overview of the SETL; and

(2) a summary assessment of the security posture of those facilities where the SETL assesses the threat environment to be most acute, including factors that informed such assessment.

PART V—ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARDS

SEC. 1841. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Accountability Review Board mechanism outlined in section 302 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act (22 U.S.C. 4832) is an effective tool to collect information about and evaluate adverse incidents that occur in a world that is increasingly complex and dangerous for United States diplomatic personnel; and

(2) the Accountability Review Board should provide information and analysis that will assist the Secretary, the President, and Congress in determining what contributed to an adverse incident as well as what new measures are necessary in order to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

SEC. 1842. PROVISION OF COPIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 days after an Accountability Review Board provides its report to the Secretary in accordance with title III of the Omnibus Diplomatic and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.), the Secretary shall provide copies of the report to the appropriate congressional committees for retention and review by those committees.

SEC. 1843. CHANGES TO EXISTING LAW.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 302(a) of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4832(a)) is amended by inserting ''1 of which shall be a former Senate-confirmed Inspector General of a Federal department or agency,'' after ''4 appointed by the Secretary of State,''.

(b) STAFF.—Section 302(b)(2) of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4832(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such persons shall be drawn from bureaus or other agency subunits that are not impacted by the incident that is the subject of the Board's review.''.

PART VI—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1845. ENHANCED QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

The Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 206 (22 U.S.C. 4824) the following:

''SEC. 207. DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

''The individual serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for High Threat, High Risk Posts shall have 1 or more of the following qualifications:

''(1) Service during the last 6 years at 1 or more posts designated as High Threat, High Risk by the Department of State at the time of service.

''(2) Previous service as the office director or deputy director of 1 or more of the following Department of State offices or successor entities carrying out substantively equivalent functions:

''(A) The Office of Mobile Security Deployments.

''(B) The Office of Special Programs and Coordination.

''(C) The Office of Overseas Protective Operations.

''(D) The Office of Physical Security Programs.

''(E) The Office of Intelligence and Threat Analysis.

''(3) Previous service as the Regional Security Officer at 2 or more overseas posts.

''(4) Other government or private sector experience substantially equivalent to service in the positions listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).''.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessel Transfers and Security Enhancement

SEC. 1851. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Naval Vessel Transfer and Security Enhancement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 1852. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN RECIPIENTS.

(a) TRANSFER BY GRANT TO GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Mexico on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS CURTS (FFG–38) and USS MCCLUSKY (FFG–41).

(b) TRANSFER BY SALE TO THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.—The President is authorized to transfer the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS TAYLOR (FFG–50), USS GARY (FFG–51), USS CARR (FFG–52), and USS ELROD (FFG–55) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3309(a))) on a sale basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761).

(c) ALTERNATIVE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the authority provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) to transfer specific vessels to specific countries, the President is authorized to transfer any vessel named in this title to any country named in this section, subject to the same conditions that would apply for such country under this section, such that the total number of vessels transferred to such country does not exceed the total number of vessels authorized for transfer to such country by this section.

(d) GRANTS NOT COUNTED IN ANNUAL TOTAL OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis pursuant to authority provided by subsection (a) or (c) shall not be counted against the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred in any fiscal year under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(e) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)).

(f) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the recipient to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that recipient, performed at a shipyard located in the United States.

(g) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1853. INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

Section 516(g)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''$425,000,000'' and inserting ''$500,000,000''.

SEC. 1854. INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS AT TRAINING LOCATIONS IN SOUTHWEST ASIA.

Section 544(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347c(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The President shall report to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 656(e)) annually on the activities undertaken in the programs authorized under this subsection.''.

Subtitle C—Amendments to Arms Export Control Act to Enhance Congressional Oversight

SEC. 1861. ENHANCED CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.

Section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF SHIPMENT OF ARMS.—At least 30 days prior to a shipment of defense articles subject to the requirements of subsection (b) at the joint request of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State shall provide notification of such pending shipment, in unclassified form, with a classified annex as necessary, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 1862. LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A license or other approval from the Department of State granted in accordance with this section may also authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations if such items are to be used in or with defense articles controlled on the United States Munitions List.

''(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements shall apply with respect to a license or other approval to authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations under paragraph (1):

''(A) Separate approval from the Department of Commerce shall not be required for such items if such items are approved for export under a Department of State license or other approval.

''(B) Such items subject to the Export Administration Regulations that are exported pursuant to a Department of State license or other approval would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce with respect to any subsequent transactions.

''(C) The inclusion of the term 'subject to the EAR' or any similar term on a Department of State license or approval shall not affect the jurisdiction with respect to such items.

''(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'Export Administration Regulations' means—

''(A) the Export Administration Regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

''(B) any successor regulations.''.

SEC. 1863. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall take such actions as may be necessary to require that, at the time of export or reexport of any major defense equipment listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, the major defense equipment will not be subsequently modified so as to transform such major defense equipment into a defense article.

''(B) The President may authorize the transformation of any major defense equipment described in subparagraph (A) into a defense article if the President—

''(i) determines that such transformation is appropriate and in the national interests of the United States; and

''(ii) provides notice of such transformation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate consistent with the notification requirements of section 36(b)(5)(A) of this Act.

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'defense article' means an item designated by the President pursuant to subsection (a)(1).''.

(b) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT REMOVED FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The President shall ensure that any major defense equipment that is listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, shall continue to be subject to the notification and reporting requirements of the following provisions of law:

''(A) Section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)).

''(B) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415).

''(C) Section 3(d)(3)(A) of this Act.

''(D) Section 25 of this Act.

''(E) Section 36(b), (c), and (d) of this Act.''.

SEC. 1864. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF "SECURITY ASSISTANCE" UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d)) is amended—

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

(2) by amending paragraph (2)(C) to read as follows:

''(C) any license in effect with respect to the export to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country of—

''(i) defense articles or defense services under section 38 of the Armed Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778); or

''(ii) items listed under the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations;''.

SEC. 1865. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF "DEFENSE ARTICLE" AND "DEFENSE SERVICE" UNDER THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3), by striking ''includes'' and inserting ''means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''includes'' and inserting ''means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States,''.

SEC. 1866. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 3(a), 3(d)(1), 3(d)(3)(A), 3(e), 5(c), 6, 21(g), 36(a), 36(b)(1), 36(b)(5)(C), 36(c)(1), 36(f), 38(f)(1), 40(f)(1), 40(g)(2)(B), 101(b), and 102(a)(2), by striking ''the Speaker of the House of Representatives and'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and'';

(2) in section 21(i)(1) by inserting after ''the Speaker of the House of Representatives'' the following '', the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services of the House of Representatives,'';

(3) in sections 25(e), 38(f)(2), 38(j)(3), and 38(j)(4)(B), by striking ''International Relations'' each place it appears and inserting ''Foreign Affairs'';

(4) in sections 27(f) and 62(a), by inserting after ''the Speaker of the House of Representatives,'' each place it appears the following: ''the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives,''; and

(5) in section 73(e)(2), by striking ''the Committee on National Security and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

(b) OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in section 38—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by redesignating the second subparagraph (B) (as added by section 1255(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100–204; 101 Stat. 1431)) as subparagraph (C);

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(I) in clause (xi), by striking ''; or'' and inserting '', or''; and

(II) in clause (xii)—

(aa) by striking ''section'' and inserting ''sections''; and

(bb) by striking ''(18 U.S.C. 175b)'' and inserting ''(18 U.S.C. 175c)''; and

(iii) in subsection (j)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''in'' after ''to''; and

(B) in section 47(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''sec. 21(a),,'' and inserting ''section 21(a),''.

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''Wherever applicable, a description'' and inserting ''Wherever applicable, such report shall include a description''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking ''credits'' and inserting ''credits)''.

Subtitle D—Application of Certain Provisions of Export Administration Act of 1979

SEC. 1871. APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

(a) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 12(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2411(c)) has been in effect from August 20, 2001, and continues in effect on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and notwithstanding section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419). Section 12(c)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 is a statute covered by section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Subsection (a) terminates at the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3689. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

TITLE II—EMPLOYER CREDIT FOR PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Strong Families Act''

SEC. 202. EMPLOYER CREDIT FOR PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45S. EMPLOYER CREDIT FOR PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible employer, the paid family and medical leave credit is an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount of wages paid to qualifying employees during any period in which such employees are on family and medical leave.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any employee for any taxable year shall not exceed the lesser of—

''(A) $4,000, or

''(B) the product of the wages normally paid to such employee for each hour (or fraction thereof) of services performed for the employer and the number of hours (or fraction thereof) for which family and medical leave is taken.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), in the case of any employee who is not paid on an hourly basis, the wages of such employee shall be prorated to an hourly basis under regulations established by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor.

''(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF LEAVE SUBJECT TO CREDIT.—The amount of family and medical leave that may be taken into account with respect to any employee under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed 12 weeks.

''(c) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible employer' means any employer who has in place a policy that meets the following requirements:

''(A) The policy provides—

''(i) all qualifying full-time employees with not less than 4 weeks of annual paid family and medical leave, and

''(ii) all qualifying employees who are not full-time employees with an amount of annual paid family and medical leave that bears the same ratio to 4 weeks as—

''(I) the number of hours the employee is expected to work during any week, bears to

''(II) the number of hours an equivalent qualifying full-time employee is expected to work during the week.

''(B) The policy requires that the rate of payment under the program is not less than 100 percent of the wages normally paid to such employee for services performed for the employer.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An added employer shall not be treated as an eligible employer unless such employer provides paid family and medical leave under a policy with a provision that states that the employer—

''(i) will not interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise of or the attempt to exercise, any right provided under the policy, and

''(ii) will not discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any individual for opposing any practice prohibited by the policy.

''(B) ADDED EMPLOYER; ADDED EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) ADDED EMPLOYEE.—The term 'added employee' means a qualifying employee who is not covered by title I of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

''(ii) ADDED EMPLOYER.—The term 'added employer' means an eligible employer (determined without regard to this paragraph), whether or not covered by that title I, who offers paid family and medical leave to added employees.

''(3) TREATMENT OF STATE-PAID BENEFITS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any leave which is paid by a State or local government shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of paid family and medical leave provided by the employer.

''(4) NO INFERENCE.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as subjecting an employer to any penalty, liability, or other consequence (other than ineligibility for the credit allowed by reason of subsection (a)) for failure to comply with the requirements of this subsection.

''(d) QUALIFYING EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualifying employee' means any employee (as defined in section 3(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act

of 1938) who has been employed by the employer for 1 year or more.

''(e) FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'family and medical leave' means leave for any purpose described under subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (1), or paragraph (3), of section 102(a) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, whether the leave is provided under that Act or by a policy of the employer. Such term shall not include any leave provided as paid vacation leave, personal leave, or medical or sick leave (within the meaning of those 3 terms under section 102(d)(2) of that Act).

''(f) WAGES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'wages' has the meaning given such term by subsection (b) of section 3306 (determined without regard to any dollar limitation contained in such section). Such term shall not include any amount taken into account for purposes of determining any other credit allowed under this subpart.

''(g) ELECTION TO HAVE CREDIT NOT APPLY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may elect to have this section not apply for any taxable year.

''(2) OTHER RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 51(j) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) CREDIT PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (35), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) in the case of an eligible employer (as defined in section 45S(c)), the paid family and medical leave credit determined under section 45S(a).''.

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST AMT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 38(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating clauses (vii) through (ix) as clauses (vii) through (x), respectively, and by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

''(vii) the credit determined under section 45S,''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Section 280C(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''45S(a),'' after ''45P(a),''.

(2) ELECTION TO HAVE CREDIT NOT APPLY.—Section 6501(m) of such Code is amended by inserting ''45S(g),'' after ''45H(g),''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45S. Employer credit for paid family and medical leave.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3690. Mr. REID (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 462, recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia; as follows:

Strike the seventh and eight whereas clauses of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Khmer National Armed Forces of Cambodia facilitated the evacuation of the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh on April 12, 1975, by continuing to fight Khmer Rouge forces as the forces advanced upon the capital;

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 29, 2014, at 2:15 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The title of this hearing is ''Breaking the Logjam at BLM: Examining Ways to More Efficiently Process Permits for Energy Production on Federal Lands.'' The purpose of this hearing is to understand the obstacles in permitting more energy projects on Federal lands and to consider S. 279, the Public Land Renewable Energy Development Act of 2013, and S. 2440, the BLM Permit Processing Improvement Act of 2014, and related issues.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Kristen_Granier@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Jan Brunner at (202) 224–3907 or Kristen Granier at (202) 224–1219.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will to meet on July 30, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Paid Family Leave: The Benefits for Businesses and Working Families.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Ashley Eden of the committee staff on (202) 224–9243.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. REID. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Social Security: A Fresh Look at Workers' Disability Insurance.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Iraq at a Crossroads: Options for U.S. Policy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Role of States in Higher Education.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 3:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24,

2014, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Path to Efficiency: Making FEMA More Effective for Streamlined Disaster Operations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chris Re-Scherer and Kylie Noble, interns with my personal office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING FREEDOM FIGHTERS OF CAMBODIA AND LAOS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 462) recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia and for their continued support and defense of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to the title.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the Rubio amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, the amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 462) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3690) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike the seventh and eight whereas clauses of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Khmer National Armed Forces of Cambodia facilitated the evacuation of the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh on April 12, 1975, by continuing to fight Khmer Rouge forces as the forces advanced upon the capital;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 462

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters (also known as the ''Khmer and Lao/Hmong veterans'') fought and died with United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia;

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters rescued United States pilots shot down in enemy-controlled territory and returned the pilots to safety;

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters retrieved and prevented from falling into enemy hands secret and sensitive information, technology, and equipment;

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters captured and destroyed enemy supplies and prevented enemy forces from using the supplies to kill members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters gathered and provided to the United States Armed Forces intelligence about enemy troop positions, movement, and strength;

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters provided food, shelter, and support to the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the Khmer National Armed Forces of Cambodia facilitated the evacuation of the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh on April 12, 1975, by continuing to fight Khmer Rouge forces as the forces advanced upon the capital;

Whereas veterans of the Khmer Mobile Guerrilla Forces, the Lao/Hmong Special Guerrilla Units, and the Khmer Republic Armed Forces defended human rights, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of representation and association; and

Whereas the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters have not yet received official recognition from the United States Government for their heroic efforts and support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate affirms and recognizes the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters and the people of Cambodia and Laos for their support and defense of the United States Armed Forces and freedom of democracy in Southeast Asia.

The amendment to the title was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia.''.

NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 519) designating August 16, 2014, as ''National Airborne Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 519) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2666

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2666) to prohibit future consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals or work authorization for aliens who are not in lawful status, to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border, and to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse States for National Guard deployments in response to large-scale border crossings of unaccompanied alien children from noncontiguous countries.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask for its second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 28, 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. Monday, July 28; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks the Senate proceed to executive session and resume the consideration of Calendar No. 929, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 5:30 p.m. all postcloture time be deemed expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination, and immediately upon disposition of the Harris nomination, the Senate execute the previous order with respect to Calendar Nos. 915, 916, 913, and 744.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. On Monday, at 5:30 p.m., the Senate will vote on confirmation of the Harris, Mohorovic, and McKeon nominations. There could be up to five rollcall votes on Monday, but we expect several of these to be confirmed by voice.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 28, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:13 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 28, 2014, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LISA S. DISBROW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

VICTOR M. MENDEZ, OF ARIZONA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.

PETER M. ROGOFF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BRUCE H. ANDREWS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 24, 2014*

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge—indeed, to plead—with my colleagues to cosponsor bipartisan legislation that Representative KINZINGER and I will be introducing this afternoon, which would authorize 1,000 additional special immigrant visas to allow the United States to bring our Afghan allies to safety here in America. Earlier this week, Senators MCCAIN and SHAHEEN introduced identical legislation in the other body.

The need for this bill is urgent. Indeed, Congress should have acted yesterday. That is because the State Department has confirmed now that they have completely run out of the visas we authorized in December. In a way, that is good news.

Remember how in previous years the State and other agencies never remotely came close to using the visas that were authorized, which consigned these poor souls to the seventh circle of bureaucratic hell. Processing was so slow and abysmal that only 32 of our Afghan allies received a visa in 2012. People were left in limbo—or worse—while the Taliban hunted them down, kidnapped their siblings, murdered their parents—capturing them, torturing, beheading them.

But the administration responded to the demand from Congress for significant reform in the program, and the agency has aggressively attacked the visa-eligible backlog. Despite the processing—on average, 400 visas each month since January—years of a failed system means that, today, there remains an astonishing 6,340 brave men and women waiting in limbo.

If Congress does not act before we adjourn for the August recess, it means we will be slamming the door to safety for hundreds of our Afghan allies and their families. With each day that passes, these are people whose lives and those of their families are left to the tender mercies of the Taliban—seeking revenge.

Mr. Speaker, Representative KINZINGER and I have a nonpartisan, fully paid-for bill—House leadership willing—that could pass on the floor in the blink of an eye. All we have to do—what we must do—is choose to make it a priority. Remember, we have done this before. Reforms that enabled the program to work passed as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act on this floor by, I found, an inspiring 420–3 margin. Passing this bill is not only the right thing to do for these poor souls, it is in our own national security interest.

As Secretary Kerry pointed out in urging Congress to grant more visas, ''The way a country winds down a war in a faraway place and stands by those who risk their own safety to help us in the fight sends a powerful message to the world that is not soon forgotten.''

Whether or not you supported the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan, what matters now is where we stand in keeping our commitments. This bill, authorizing an additional 1,000 visas for the balance of this current fiscal year, is a Band-Aid—but a critical one. We are going to have to act again in the coming months to deal with fiscal year 2015, starting in October.

For too long, it was the State and other agencies that failed to make this the priority it needed to be. Now that they have upped the attention, the focus, the resources, and the commitment, let's not let Congress be the obstacle. Innocent lives are at stake. American honor is on the line.

I urge my colleagues to do everything they can in the coming days to bring this bill to the floor. It is our duty to save the lives of those who risked so much to help us when we needed them.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, the largest ever study of schizophrenia reported that the condition is tied to more than 100 genes.

This discovery shows more evidence that schizophrenia is a clinical condition just like other medical conditions. Severe schizophrenia, therefore, must be treated with a medical approach, using evidence-based therapies that work.

We know 50 percent of persons with schizophrenia suffer from a neurological impairment that makes them incapable of understanding that they are ill. This lack of awareness, termed ''anosognosia,'' is the leading cause of noncompliance with psychiatric treatment. This neurological problem helps to explain why 40 percent of Americans with a serious mental illness do not receive treatment, and it explains how our system fails to help those most in need.

Anosognosia occurs most frequently when schizophrenia or a bipolar disorder affects portions of the frontal lobe, resulting in impaired executive function. The patients are neurologically unable to comprehend that their delusions or hallucinations are not real. This is different than denial; this is a change in the wiring of the brain. These individuals don't recognize they are ill. When they don't meet the 200-year-old definition of being in imminent danger to harm themselves or others, their friends and families are powerless to help them. Uninformed observers wrongly believe that, because the patients can look at them and talk to them, they must be fully functional and aware, but they are not.

Much like if they had Alzheimer's disease or were in a coma, these individuals with schizophrenia can't voluntarily request treatment on their own. We would never deny care to a stroke victim or to a senior with Alzheimer's simply because he or she couldn't articulate her need for treatment. Yet, in

cases of serious brain disorders, we allow millions to suffer because of the chaotic patchwork of State and Federal laws that says we can't even act when we know we must.

Further, when a patient is discharged from a hospital with anything from a minor cut to a heart transplant, there must be a written treatment plan, and that plan is readily shared with family members who will assist with followup, but not so with serious mental illness. Again, we would not do this to someone with Alzheimer's. We would not say, ''I can't treat your grandmother until she is well enough to tell me to treat her, but I can't tell you about her treatment until she gives you permission.''

These mentally ill men and women who are in need of medical attention end up sitting in jails, sleeping behind dumpsters, or being sedated and chained to hospital gurneys in emergency rooms. They cycle in and out of prison, the ER, and shelters. That is a lifestyle we have relegated 3.6 million Americans to. We deny people the right to treatment. We deny them the right to get better. How cruel is that?

As a result, 1 million Americans last year attempted suicide, and 40,000 people died from suicide. There are 300,000 homeless, 500,000 in jail, and 700,000 in other prisons. The mentally ill are also more likely to be robbed, physically assaulted, raped, and sexually assaulted. So, while several States and counties have taken bold action to help those who have been cast aside by our current system, the Federal Government sits, oblivious to the problem, and, in some cases, actually creates barriers to treatment for those who need help the most.

Serious mental illness is more detrimental to your long-term health than being a heavy smoker, and it increases your risk for diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. It reduces your life span by some 25 years. There is also a financial toll. A study conducted by Duke University determined that assisted outpatient treatment saves taxpayers $50,000 per patient. It also increases medication compliance and decreases incarceration, hospitalization, and homelessness.

The problem is that four States still prohibit the use of this medical model, and most county health systems haven't implemented it; and studies have shown that each time individuals with mental illnesses experience a break from reality, their brains actually suffer from permanent injury. All of this is happening at a time when we know more about the brain than we ever have.

We tell families that Federal laws prohibit you from knowing why your loved one is in a mental health crisis, and doctors tell the family, ''Your son is only a little dangerous right now, but please bring him back when he becomes truly violent, and then he can be treated.'' How absurd. Can you imagine if we told someone with diabetes, ''Your blood sugar is too low, but we are going to wait until you are in a diabetic shock before we give you insulin''? The doctor would be fired, and the hospital would be sued. We would ensure that it never happens again. Yet, for families in a mental health crisis, this scenario plays out every single day, and not a word is spoken about it. The reason is that people don't understand the neurological basis of mental illness.

What we need to do is have a Congress that is able to confront its own denial and change the laws that need to be changed. We can fix the mental health system but not if Congress does not act. We must pass H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because ignoring this problem will not make it go away, and where there is no help, there is no hope at all.

IDEAL FASTENER CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a company in my district called the IDEAL Fastener Corporation.

Recently, they announced a $5.7 million expansion of their facility in Oxford, North Carolina. This expansion will create 155 jobs by the year 2019, and it is welcome news for Granville County, which is an important part of my congressional district. Now, Mr. Speaker, 155 jobs in some communities across our great country may be relatively small, but in this rural community, this is a big deal.

IDEAL Fastener Corporation was established in 1936 by Elie Gut, and it has been a strong member of the Oxford community since moving its corporate headquarters there in 1966. IDEAL Fastener Corporation is still family owned and is operated by Ralph and Mary Gut and their three children—Jeff, Steven, and Michelle.

Since bringing their world headquarters to Oxford, IDEAL Fastener Corporation has grown to become the second largest zipper manufacturer in the entire world with production and sales facilities in over 20 countries. They are in the process now of launching three new products and are making major capital investments that will benefit their employees and the North Carolina economy.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, July 21, I marked my 10th anniversary here in the House of Representatives; and if there is one thing that I have come to recognize and appreciate, it is that small businesses and small industries are what drive our economy. Companies like IDEAL Fastener Corporation are the lifeblood of our economy.

I congratulate IDEAL Fastener and the Gut family on this tremendous, tremendous announcement. I wish them nothing but continued success in the future.

OBAMA ECONOMY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, before President Obama leaves for his 2-week-long vacation at Martha's Vineyard, he has a lot of work to do.

Contrary to what he said in Austin, Texas, this month, Americans are not better off than when he took office in 2009. In fact, his policies are hurting families and businesses everywhere.

He should focus on what House Republicans are doing and cooperate by getting his party leaders in the Senate to act on more than 40 bills to get our economy moving, get people back to work, and roll back his administration's harmful policies like Dodd-Frank and ObamaCare—the major force behind the transition to part-time America.

Under President Obama, the average unemployment rate tops 8 percent; we have got 47 million people on food stamps; 48 million people between the ages of 18 and 64—the very heart of our workforce—have not worked one day in the last 12 months; and nearly 91 million people over age 16 aren't working at all; almost 50 percent of the unemployed have stopped looking for work; and 76 percent of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. The list could go on and on.

We can fix this through real tax reform, getting the government out of health care, energizing the energy business, and ensuring America remains the world's superpower with a strong and well-equipped military.

□ 1015

As a business owner and job creator for more than 40 years, I know that the constant threat of tax hikes, overregulation, and massive government overhauls hurts businesses, it burdens families, lowers income, and stifles the economy. Everyone is simply playing defense in America.

That is why the House continues to pass pro-jobs bills that empower Americans and strengthen the economy. These are real solutions that will improve the quality of life for generations to come.

So I urge HARRY REID and the Democrats in the Senate to take up these bills now before President Obama leaves for vacation.

In God we trust.

CHRISTIANITY IN IRAQ IS BEING WIPED OUT

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, ''Imagine if a fundamentalist Christian sect captured the French city of Lyon and began a systematic purge of Muslims. Their mosques were destroyed, their crescents defaced, the Koran burned, and then all Muslims forced to flee or face execution. Such an event would be unthinkable today, and if it did occur, Pope Francis and all other Christian leaders would denounce it and support efforts by governments to stop it.

Yet that is essentially what is happening in reverse now in Mosul, as the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham drives all signs of Christianity from the ancient city. Christians have lived in Mosul for nearly 2,000 years, and today they are reliving the Muslim religious wars of the Middle Ages.''

These are not my words. These are the words of the first two paragraphs of an editorial from The Wall Street Journal earlier this week.

Now, I want to read parts of an email I received yesterday from someone on the ground in Iraq:

All Mosul churches and monasteries are being seized by ISIS. There are around 30. The cross is being removed from all of them. Many of them are burned or destroyed and looted. Many of them are used as ISIS centers.

The religious Sunni, Shiite, and Christian tombs are being destroyed in Mosul. This destruction is endangering the very ancient sites, including Jonah's tomb.

It has been widely reported that the ISIS soldiers have painted ''N'' on the doors of Christians to signify that they are ''Nasara,'' the word for Christians.

Shiite homes were painted with the letter ''R'' for ''Rawafidh,'' meaning rejecters or protestants.

Christianity, as we now know it, is being wiped out. With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities and regions and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country.

I believe what is happening to the Christian community in Iraq is genocide. I also believe it is a crime against humanity.

Where is the West?

Where is the Obama administration?

Where is this Congress?

The silence is deafening. The West, particularly the church, needs to speak out.

The Obama administration needs to make protecting this ancient community a priority. President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry need to have the same courage that President Bush and former Secretary of State Colin Powell had when they said genocide was taking place in Darfur.

The United Nations has a role. It should immediately initiate proceedings in the International Criminal Court against ISIS for crimes against humanity.

The Congress needs to hold the administration accountable for the failure to act.

I will close today by reading the final two paragraphs of The Wall Street Journal editorial. It said:

Today's religious extremism is almost entirely Islamic. While ISIS' purge may be the most brutal, Islamists in Egypt have driven thousands of Coptic Christians from homes they have occupied for centuries. The same is true across Muslim parts of Africa. This does not mean that all Muslims are extremists, but it does mean that all Muslims have an obligation to denounce and resist the extremists who murder or subjugate in the name of Allah. Too few imams living in the tolerant West will speak up.

The Wall Street Journal went on to say: ''As for the post-Christian West, most elites may now be nonbelievers. But a culture that fails to protect believers may eventually find that it lacks the self-belief to protect itself.''

William Wilberforce, the British parliamentarian and abolitionist who abolished slavery, famously told his colleagues, as I tell this House and this administration: ''Having heard all of this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say you did not know.''

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SERGEANT BOB REASONER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, South Carolina and the United States lost a hero. Sergeant Bob Reasoner was a World War II United States Army Air Corps veteran and a tail gunner assigned to the 68th Squadron, with the famous 44th Bomber Group known as The Flying 8 Balls.

The events of December 7, 1941, compelled Mr. Reasoner to serve in World War II, survive three life-threatening missions, a year in German POW camps, and 2½ years in a hospital undergoing multiple surgeries from his injuries.

During Sergeant Reasoner's military career, he participated in 21 successful bombing missions over Germany and France. During the return flight of one of those missions, Bob's plane was unexpectedly diverted, ran out of fuel, and crashed in Wales.

While he was at the hospital recuperating from his injuries, Bob was given the option to return to the United States but turned down that offer so he could continue to serve his country.

On October 1, 1943, Sergeant Reasoner flew his last mission, during which his B–24 Liberator, the Black Jack, as it was known, was attacked and caught fire. Parachuting to the ground with his head engulfed in flames—now remember that Sergeant Reasoner was a tail gunner. He had a long way to travel from the rear of that aircraft as it burned, falling from the sky.

But as he was parachuting down, he passed out from his injuries, and he woke up in a hospital. His head and his eyes were wrapped in bandages, and all he could hear was German.

He was now a POW, captured by the German soldiers. His captors allowed him only a weeklong hospital stay before shuffling him between different POW camps over the next year.

On his 26th birthday, September 26, 1944, he returned home to the United States of America. He told me, he said: ''That was the first time I felt safe. Seeing the Statue of Liberty was an amazing feeling because I knew then that I was home.''

Bob Reasoner earned three Purple Hearts for his heroic service to our country. But if Bob was still alive today, he would say that he wouldn't want his service defined by his numerous distinctions that he was awarded but, rather, he would want us to remember the 21 successful missions he was a part of to help secure freedom for this country and many other countries.

I had the opportunity to meet Bob in my hometown of Clinton, South Carolina, where he was in a retirement home, and I heard his stories firsthand. And after talking to Bob, I went on to learn more about the heroic actions of the 44th Bomb Group.

During my research, I came across a great compilation by Will Lundy, who was a ground crewman on the 67th Bomb Squadron of the 44th Bomb Group, called the Roll of Honor and Casualties.

I recommend everyone look that up and read it. The stories are amazing. This compilation documents the heroic stories of these men who fought for our freedoms, including my friend, Bob Reasoner.

He lived his life quietly among us, bearing the scars of war and service. His ear was mangled. His eyelids had been reconstructed. He bore the scars of numerous burns.

I am especially grateful for Mr. Reasoner's bravery in protecting the United States, and I grieve with his family and friends during the loss of a great man, an American soldier and a true American hero.

May God bless the men and women who served in World War II. May God continue to bless those who serve our country and have served our country, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

THE BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, wherever I go, people express a growing anger over the illegal immigration that is overwhelming our southern border.

People ask me:

''How can we talk about securing the border in Ukraine or Iraq while our own border is wide open?''

''How can we talk about supporting the population of Central America when we are nearly $18 trillion in debt?''

''How can we talk about giving jobs to millions of illegal immigrants when fewer Americans are working today than when this so-called recovery began?''

They ask: ''If the Federal Government can't defend our own border, what good is it?''

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer them. The fact is, our southern border is wide open. It is practically undefended, and everybody knows it.

The many thousands streaming across it know that if they break our laws and enter our country illegally, they will be rewarded with free food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, legal representation, and relocation, all at the expense of struggling American families.

Ninety-five percent of them believe they will get ''permiso'' to stay and, at the moment, they are right.

Until we fundamentally change this reality, the mass incursion of our borders will continue, and our Nation's sovereignty will slowly fade away.

The American people are awakening to the danger that illegal immigration poses to our country. It is crowding out millions of jobs desperately needed by American workers. It is overwhelming our schools, our hospitals, our courts, law enforcement, prisons, and our local and State budgets.

Perhaps worst of all, it is undermining the process of legal immigration upon which our country is founded. Why should anyone go to the expense and trouble of obeying our immigration laws when they can reap rich rewards simply by defying them?

This administration has actively encouraged this crisis with its promises of amnesty, and it now needs another $4 billion to feed, clothe, and house this new surge. Conspicuously lacking from the President's proposal is any serious effort at enforcement or deportation.

The advocates of illegal immigration tell us we need comprehensive immigration reform, but what they really mean is extending some form of amnesty to those now illegally in this country. Yet, it is precisely these promises of amnesty that are causing and encouraging the mass migration we are now seeing.

Any short-term measure this House approves must include provisions:

First, to rescind the President's unlawful Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals order that has clearly encouraged the current surge;

Second, to detain all of these new arrivals while expedited deportation hearings proceed;

Third, to provide unrestricted access for law enforcement to all Federal lands at the border;

And fourth, to activate the National Guard in whatever numbers are necessary to secure our southern border now.

Once the immediate tide has been turned back, it is imperative that existing laws are enforced before any new laws are considered, including:

Rigorous enforcement of sanctions against any employer who hires an illegal immigrant;

Completion of the border fence that was authorized in 2006;

Deportation of any illegal immigrant who comes into contact with law enforcement or who illegally applies for government assistance; and

Resumption of Federal cooperation with local and State law enforcement agencies to ensure enforcement of our immigration law.

If we are not willing to enforce our current laws, there is no reason to believe that any future laws will be enforced. And until we enforce them, we really can't accurately assess what changes might be needed.

The people with whom I talk are tired of excuses. They are tired of promises of future reforms. They want to see our current laws enforced and our border secured, and every act of this House should be focused on pressuring the President to do so.

History is shouting this warning at us: that nations that either cannot or will not defend their borders aren't around very long.

Let that not be the legacy of this administration, and let it not be the epitaph of the American Republic.

SENATE INACTION

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House now for 6 months, and I regrettably rise today to express my frustration, and I know the frustration of thousands of people in my district in southwest Alabama and, I believe, people all over the United States of America.

People are tired of the stagnation coming from Washington. Just look at the disapproval rating of this Congress and the disapproval rating of our President.

The people of this country want to see action, action on growing our economy, action on cutting spending, action on health care, action on immigration, action on the crisis at the VA, action on foreign policy and all the problems we see around the world that involve our interests. They want to see action.

□ 1030

Just earlier this week, I was at the White House for a bill-signing ceremony of the Workforce Investment Act, or the SKILLS Act, as we called it here in the House.

The SKILLS Act was a great example of Democrats and Republicans in this House and the Senate coming together behind a common goal of improving our Nation's workforce training programs, which is so important at this time in our recovering economy.

During the bill-signing ceremony, the President implored us to send more bipartisan job-creating bills his way. The problem is the President doesn't need to lecture this House on that. The President needs to look no further than the majority leader in the Senate, the gentleman from Nevada.

In the House, we have passed nearly 300 bills that are sitting in the Senate, waiting for action—at least 40 of those bills are job-creating bills. We have continued in this House to do the people's work, making our way through seven of the appropriations bills that we are required by the Constitution to pass to fund the government. The Senate has not completed a single one.

Now, some may say the issue is that Republican Senators have demanded to have amendments considered. I don't think that is too much to ask. Here in the House, we have considered at least 180 minority amendments to appropriations bills alone, 180.

One of my colleagues in the House from the other side of the aisle was quoted in an article as saying that she wanted ''to thank the Republicans for their generosity. I am just grateful for the bipartisanship here.''

That is not the same message coming out of the do-nothing Senate. One Democratic Senator was quoted as saying that he has ''a hard time getting on the train in the morning.'' Former Senate leaders Tom Daschle and Trent Lott have said the Senate ''has degenerated into a polarized mess.''

Now, this probably shouldn't come as much of a surprise because, yet again this year, the Senate failed to even pass a budget.

I was just elected this past December. Prior to that, I was in the Alabama State Senate, and in our State, the State of Alabama, as in most States, our legislature is required to pass a budget and appropriations bills every year on time, and they have to be balanced.

So every year, the Alabama Legislature passes budgets with appropriations in them on time, and they are balanced. The United States Congress can't do that, the greatest debating body ever known to the world, the United States Senate can't do that?

I can't imagine what the people in my district would think if they saw the

inaction coming from the United States Senate, but they see the results of it, and it troubles them greatly.

We have heard this song and dance before, and most of us now know how it is going to end. At some point—sooner, rather than later—the House will be forced to consider a continuing resolution to prevent a government shutdown.

The Senate can prevent this by following the House in regular order, doing the people's work, making the hard decisions, and advancing individual appropriations bills, as we have done in the House.

That is how government is supposed to work, and that is the only way we are going to be able to make serious reforms to spending programs.

I have come to this body a number of times to offer amendments to pending bills that would have cut spending, and I am going to keep pushing for these types of strategic spending reductions, but when the Senate refuses to do its part, it makes this process impossible.

The Senate's inaction is going to force those in the House to make an unfair choice, and I ask them to act differently for the people of this country, so we can get things done.

EDUCATION FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about education. A quality, affordable education is vital to ensuring that American students are prepared for the jobs of the 21st century. For West Virginians, for Americans to compete for jobs, they need to have the skills, knowledge, and training to make them attractive to employers.

Education opens doors. A diploma or degree brings with it the promise of a better future, better wages, a better quality of life, a better future for one's family. Without a quality education, the possibilities of life are truly limited, not limitless.

In the House of Representatives, we are taking action today to ensure that every American has access to quality education and an education that is affordable and understandable.

Later today, we will pass two bills to help students pay for college and better manage the debt that they accrue. The Empowering Students through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act will better educate students about the financial implications of student loans and help them borrow the money they need, not all of the money that they are offered.

We hear time and time again of the crushing debt that our students are coming out of college and higher education with. We want to help them better manage that and understand that.

So with counseling on the front end, they will know what they are actually getting into, instead of waiting until the back end and hitting them with the hammer of this is where you are now, so you have got to deal with it.

We will also pass the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act which, very simply, makes permanent the American Opportunity Tax Credit.

West Virginians want to work. Americans want to work. West Virginia's employers want to hire at home. They want to have access to an educated workforce, and by investing in education, we invest in our Nation's future. We invest in growing our Nation's economy, and we invest in the future of generations yet to come.

DOMESTIC ENERGY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each day, we hear about new opportunities as a result of developing our own domestic energy resources. What we hear less about is how many crises we have avoided as America has moved from energy scarcity to energy abundance.

Last week, on July 15, historian, Pulitzer Prize winner, and renowned energy expert Daniel Yergin stated that, without the recent domestic boom in oil production, the United States would be in deep economic trouble.

''I am convinced, were it not for what's happened these last few years, we'd be looking at an oil crisis,'' he said, according to the Pennsylvania energy news publication, StateImpact, covering Mr. Yergin's remarks.

''We'd have panic in the public. We'd have angry motorists. We'd have inflamed congressional hearings, and we'd have the U.S. economy falling back into a recession,'' he added.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we have jobs coming back to the United States that were previously headed overseas due to cheaper labor and other competitive advantages. Today, the U.S. is looking a bit more welcoming for businesses and job growth and for the American worker.

From The Wall Street Journal earlier this week, ''The competitive advantage that U.S. companies will receive from the lower cost provided by shale gas . . . is attracting investment from some of the industry's bigger names. Just last week, the International Energy Agency said some 30 million European jobs are at risk as manufacturers of petrochemicals, plastics, and fertilizers are relocating to the U.S.''

Additionally, as reported in Politico earlier this week, ''A strange thing happened in the past few months as Ukraine battled with Russian-backed separatists, rockets flew over Israel, and much of Iraq fell to Islamist insurgents: gasoline prices for U.S. motorists stayed pretty much flat. The price at the pump has even fallen in the past week, even after Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 exploded over Ukraine and Israel sent ground forces into Gaza . . . It's yet another sign of the unexpected changes wrought by the U.S. energy boom, which has turned the United States into one of the world's largest oil producers and the biggest producer of natural gas.''

Mr. Speaker, the opportunities of domestic energy production are apparent. As a result, we have new opportunities here at home and abroad. Americans are keeping more money in their pockets due to lower heating costs and prices at the pump.

U.S. businesses are bringing operations back to the U.S. to create jobs here at home. Companies from across the globe are bringing their operations to the United States, so that they can do business at a lower cost.

American families are able to find good-paying jobs. We are helping the U.S. remain competitive, and we are becoming more economically secure.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Thomas Koys, St. James at Sag Bridge Catholic Church, Lemont, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I give You thanks and I ask Your blessing upon all gathered here. Lord, I beg You to enlighten us, and I ask You to be merciful to our country, as we strive to win that kind of peace that You desire.

As these people debate the best ways to order our society, give them humble hearts to seek that order that flows from Your supreme intelligence.

Help them to learn the lesson that You tried to teach Your chosen people in the time of Samuel, the prophet; that to be the most favored nation in Your eyes, that nation must be unlike other nations.

Lord, I pray for ministers of all faiths that they may be protected from the penalties assigned to lawbreakers who find it their duty to follow their conscience, save those who think it their duty to destroy America.

Put in our hearts a desire to build a nation unafraid to follow Your commands.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

WELCOMING REVEREND THOMAS KOYS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce our guest chaplain this morning, Father Thomas Koys, pastor of St. James at Sag Bridge Catholic Church in Lemont, Illinois. Fitting for a pastor who loves American history, St. James was founded in 1833 and has a historic church building completed in 1858.

A longtime Chicagoland resident, Father Koys attended St. Mary Elementary in Riverside, Archbishop Quigley Preparatory Seminary, and Niles College Seminary at Loyola University. He went on to receive two master's degrees from Catholic University of America and from University of St. Mary of the Lake.

Father Koys was ordained in 1985 and has become an important voice in the Catholic community. In 2002, he authored ''The Ashes That Still Remain'' and also hosts a radio show on Winds of Change Radio in Chicago.

He learned to speak Spanish while on a 4-month mission in Guerrero, Mexico. Father Koys' Spanish is very much welcomed in ministering to the large Spanish-speaking population in the Chicago Archdiocese.

In the Archdiocese, he is also very active in advocating for life and for family issues, and is involved in leading the Catholic Professionals of Illinois.

An avid cyclist, Father Koys has participated in numerous cycling fundraisers to fight multiple sclerosis, which has affected his brother, John.

This afternoon, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Father Koys to the House of Representatives, and thank him for serving today as our guest chaplain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on the each side of the aisle.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE ANSWERS ABOUT THE IRS

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

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, for over a year, the Ways and Means Committee has led an investigation into the IRS targeting conservative individuals for their beliefs. We found that the IRS subjected Americans to harassment, going so far as to question the content of their prayers and their political beliefs, subjecting them to audits, and leaking their personal taxpayer information.

They worked on rules behind closed doors that would restrict the rights of groups to organize, to speak out, and to educate the public.

They destroyed over 2 years' worth of emails, emails that are key to the investigation.

The IRS has spent years denying, delaying, and obstructing. The American people deserve some answers, and I am committed to ensuring they know the truth of what really happened at the IRS.

THE TRAGEDY OF FLIGHT MH–17

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep sympathy for all of those affected by the tragedy of Flight MH–17. It is unthinkable that a commercial airliner would ever be shot down by a surface-to-air missile, and yet, that is exactly what happened in the part of Ukraine controlled by Russian separatists.

The evidence seems to point to one perpetrator, one party intent on inflicting pain and suffering upon the innocent.

The fire of Ukraine's crisis has undoubtedly been fueled by Russia and its operatives. So let this senseless tragedy serve as a wake-up call to the international community.

This conflict could end today. It is in Mr. Putin's hands. But until then, I support the sanctions that the United States has already levied against Russia and stand strongly with the people of Ukraine in their struggle for autonomy and sovereignty.

My heart will forever go out to all those lost in this horrific act of war and the loved ones they leave behind.

GOOGLE DOES A BETTER JOB THAN THE IRS

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, did you know that Google keeps emails for 7 years?

Google, a company which is used for personal emails, keeps your emails, evidently, longer than the IRS. Well, that is, at least, what we are understanding now from the IRS.

I think it is highly doubtable that these emails simply disappeared. And seeing the other claims by the IRS that have turned out to be falsities, I believe this is also. I do not believe that they have lost them.

First, the IRS delayed in telling the American people, through their report of the missing emails. They did not even acknowledge the problem that occurred.

Second, the IRS Commissioner Koskinen was, I believe, untruthful when he referred to these emails being missing. No, not in April, as he first claimed, but actually February 2, according to the IRS deputy associate chief counsel, did he recognize that they were missing.

Madam Speaker, I would say if Google can keep these emails for 7 years, I think the IRS should have to do the same, and if they can't do their job, we are going to, as Members of Congress, find out.

AMERICA NEEDS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, it has been 13 months, 13 months since the Senate passed a bipartisan, comprehensive bill, and yet, the Speaker has not let that bill come to the floor.

So we filed a bipartisan bill with almost 200 cosponsors, and still the Speaker will not let that bill come to the floor. And why?

Well, first they said that the Republicans were working on their own bill,

so we waited and we waited for them to put it forward—and nothing.

Then they said they needed more time, so we gave them more time, and the Republicans gave us nothing.

Then, they said it was because the majority leader lost.

And finally, finally, the fault of not having a comprehensive immigration bill is on the children, the children at the border. We are suddenly scared of children at the border.

Madam Speaker, there is one person responsible for us not having comprehensive immigration reform, and it is the Speaker of this House.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

EXPECT MORE FROM THE IRS

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

Mr. GOWDY. There is a hunger in this country, Madam Speaker, for things that bind us together. Americans agree the IRS should never target citizens. Americans agree the government should tell us the truth.

The IRS has offered eight different explanations for targeting our fellow citizens. If we, Madam Speaker, changed our story to government eight different times, we would be called inmates.

We can't lie to government. Therefore, government should never be able to lie to us.

We agree no President should ever prejudge the outcome of an investigation while that investigation is ongoing. No President should ever say there is not a smidgeon of corruption while an investigation is ongoing.

We agree government should play by the same rules that we play by. We have to keep our emails, we have to keep our receipts, we have to keep our records. Why should it be any different for the IRS?

Finally, Madam Speaker, if we want something in this country that unites us and binds us together, expecting more and better from the IRS seems like a really good place to start.

DECENCY AND HUMANITY

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, this week, even as the House is approving seven different bills to fight the scourge of child sex trafficking, the cry to strip rights and protections from some children persists.

Indeed, at the very same time that our Republican colleagues were speaking here on the floor about doing whatever it takes to protect vulnerable children, they were demanding that immigrant children be sent back immediately.

The support for exploited children which existed across this aisle must extend to children who were born on both sides of the border.

Sadly, fear and hysteria are creating a steady drumbeat to remove legal protections against trafficking for children who are simply seeking refuge here. Exploited children should not be politically exploited.

No, we cannot accept every one of them. We are not asking for amnesty, but how about a little human decency, a little humanity?

How about just following existing law and supplying the resources to see that it is effectively implemented?

IRS' HYPOCRITICAL WARNINGS TO TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have a saying in Texas that one should ''practice what they preach.'' But the IRS has released a video that states the importance of keeping good records.

Now, isn't that lovely?

Maybe they should save the lecture for Lois Lerner and the IRS ''Taxocrats.''

In the video, ''Helen'' from the IRS says:

> Whether you are an individual or a business owner, you can avoid headaches at tax time by keeping good records during the year. Keeping well-organized records helps you answer questions if your return is selected for examination by the IRS.
>
> You should usually keep these records supporting your tax returns for 3 years. You must keep all employment tax records for at least 4 years after the tax is paid.

Are you kidding me, Madam Speaker?

It is interesting. The IRS expects Americans to keep years and years of records, but they lose, misplace, destroy, and hide their own records.

The IRS says, Oh, rules for thee, but not for me.

A little more practicing and a little less preaching by the hypocritical IRS is in order.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1215

FAMILIES FIRST

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the average family income in Stockton, California, has gone down 12 percent over the last 3 years. Families are working longer hours for less pay, and this is happening across the Nation. Wages are falling, while the cost of living inches up. That is why Democrats have a plan to put families first.

First, let's put people to work now by fixing our aging infrastructure and providing tax incentives for hiring. Then let's create a workforce of the future by providing universal early childhood education and give more Pell grants to college students.

Let's make sure that women make equal pay for equal work and that families have quality, affordable child care. I ask my Republican colleagues: Why aren't we doing these things right now? Don't the middle class families deserve some help?

There are other critical issues languishing here, such as immigration reform and action on climate change. We need leadership, not inaction. I challenge our Republican colleagues to get to work now to start solving our Nation's problems.

THE IRS SCANDAL

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

Mr. LONG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address an important issue, the scandal engulfing the IRS.

Lois Lerner is a central figure in the scandal surrounding the IRS' decision to target certain groups of Americans for scrutiny and other unequal treatment due to their political beliefs.

Now, we have learned emails pertinent to this investigation are missing in very suspicious circumstances involving multiple deletions of records and the physical loss of computer equipment.

The missing emails only add to the IRS' gross misconduct and raise disturbing questions about the professionalism and neutrality of bureaucrats who are supposed to enforce the law in a fair, evenhanded manner.

In May, the House held Lois Lerner in contempt of Congress and passed a resolution calling for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate the IRS. The IRS' conduct appears widespread and almost certainly harmed the right of free speech, which we cherish in this country.

It is critical that Congress discovers the full truth of what happened at the IRS and that the responsible individuals are held accountable for their actions.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, the Department of the Interior recently began the process of developing an offshore oil and gas leasing program for 2017 to 2022.

However, the development of a 5-year program isn't simply about which

areas should be leased and drilled and which should not. It is about whether drilling in new offshore fields is the way of the future.

As a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I am here to ask: How will we address the imminent and multiple threats of climate change resulting from our overdependence on carbon fossil fuels?

We could double down or triple or quadruple down on the energy sources of the last two centuries, or we could take steps to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and have a sustainable energy future.

The last few years have seen tremendous progress in harvesting the renewable energy potential of our oceans. We should oppose the unwise expansion of offshore oil and gas leasing and drilling.

IRS NOT ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, have you tried to use the excuse the dog ate your homework? Well, Lois Lerner, the former director of the exempt organizations of the IRS seems to think the excuse that she can't find her emails is acceptable to tell Congress.

When the House requested access to Ms. Lerner's emails, the IRS had known for months that the hard drives of hers and many other officials had conveniently been destroyed. Government agencies are missing accountability.

The American people have constantly been looking for answers as to why the IRS chose to harass taxpayers based on their political beliefs and restrict their First Amendment rights.

The IRS is currently tasked with enforcing the failing health care law, and now, they are attempting to regulate free speech. The double standard that plagues the IRS must end. Asking Americans for years of paperwork regarding their taxes is simply hypocritical when the IRS is unable to produce information required of them.

I know the investigations conducted by the various House committees will help to expose what really happened and work to prevent this kind of government overreach from occurring again. Government needs to be transparent and accountable to the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, today, some of my colleagues from across the aisle unveiled their proposal to address poverty in America. It is ironic because, tomorrow, they will vote to push 6 million children deeper into poverty by excluding their low-income families from the child tax credit.

I just wish they would explain what they will do differently from their current budget, which is a hard-hearted and direct attack on the poor.

Two-thirds of the cuts in the Republican budget come from our social safety net, including Medicaid, nutrition assistance, and education. Their budget ends the Medicare guarantee and raises prescription drug costs for seniors.

It raids Pell grants, raises the already overwhelming cost of college, and slashes investments in jobs to rebuild our national infrastructure, and it does this to cut taxes by one-third for the well-off and well-connected, while continuing to reward companies that ship our jobs overseas.

Madam Speaker, cutting services for low-income Americans, blocking a livable wage, and increasing health care costs isn't a path to prosperity. It is a promise of poverty.

If we expect to have any hope of reducing poverty in generations to come, we need a strong safety net today, and we need to invest in quality education and good jobs to create opportunities for the future. Democrats promise to do that.

WITH GREAT POWER COMES GREAT RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the IRS plays an essential role in the Obama administration. They are responsible for enforcing the failing health care law, interfering with free speech, and handling finances for the government.

Sadly, it has become apparent this organization is corrupt and, therefore, is unable to fulfill its duties to the American people.

The House has revealed a clear record of IRS harassment based on political belief, threatening jobs. Claims of missing emails are inexcusable. Proof of deliberate delinquency are apparent. The IRS is entrusted with great responsibility, yet their actions disrespect the American people they are supposed to serve.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war of terrorism.

My sympathy to the family and friends of Earl Brown, a dedicated patriot of Brookland Baptist Church.

TRANSPORTING LIQUID NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns with the Department of Energy's proposal to transport liquid nuclear waste from Ontario's Chalk River Research reactor to the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site, across several States and over the Peace Bridge, which is located in my western New York congressional district.

Unlike spent nuclear fuel, which can be safely transported in solid form, in liquid form, it is more radioactive and complicated to transfer. Most concerning is that in the event of a spill, liquid highly-enriched uranium would be difficult to contain.

A major contamination in the Buffalo-Niagara region could potentially have dire consequences on the Great Lakes, the Niagara region, and the greater Buffalo-Niagara population.

Madam Speaker, a plan that carries this level of risk should not be done without a thorough review. The Department of Energy must undertake a formal environmental impact statement before proceeding.

THE IRS SCANDAL

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, they say where there is smoke, there is fire, and as far as the IRS is concerned, with their credibility, they are engulfed in flames.

Just this week, IRS staff testified to the Oversight Committee that they may still have some of Lois Lerner's missing emails, despite earlier claims they were lost forever.

On Tuesday, the Ways and Means Committee discovered Lerner's hard drive was only ''scratched,'' information that conflicts with their earlier statements that the data was unrecoverable.

It is clear the IRS refuses to be fully forthcoming, and their behavior continues to raise serious questions about potential criminal wrongdoing and the targeting of conservative groups.

Here in the House, we are committed to oversight, transparency, and ensuring we get the answers we need in the pursuit of understanding what really happened.

THE RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak out against the misguided efforts to reduce or repeal the Renewable Fuel Standard. The RFS was enacted in 2005 to improve our economy, our environment, and our energy independence.

However, it is currently threatened by an EPA draft proposal that would

roll it back, and as highlighted in a recent op-ed by Senators CHUCK GRASSLEY and AMY KLOBUCHAR, by Big Oil's attempt to protect its market share and profits at the expense of American consumers.

As they wrote, ''The Federal law has helped to displace oil imports, increase domestic energy security, create jobs in rural America, curb pollution with cleaner-burning fuel, and lower prices at the pump for consumers.''

In Iowa, biofuels have created 73,400 jobs, pumping $5 billion of wages annually into our economy, and $19.3 billion of economic activity annually. In the United States, it has created 852,000 jobs, $46.2 billion in wages, and $185 billion in economic activity.

Why would we push back and go backwards, instead of moving forward into the future?

YOU CAN'T FOOL ALL THE PEOPLE ALL THE TIME

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. As the saying goes, ''You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.''

A year into investigations regarding the IRS improperly targeting applications submitted by conservative groups, the IRS claimed to have lost Lois Lerner's emails to or from outside agencies or groups for a period of more than 2 years as a result of a computer crash—not just her computer, but five others as well.

IRS Commissioner John Koskinen has told us that the hard drives on her computer and the others could not be restored and had been recycled.

As a former defense attorney, if a client told me this story, I would say: You can tell the judge and the jury whatever you want, but you are not fooling anybody, and if that is your story, you are going to jail.

MIGRANT CHILDREN

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

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the religious and faith-based communities in our Nation that have come forward to demand that we treat the children coming to our country with love and respect and not deny them their due process rights.

Here are some of the words of the faith-based community themselves. This is from the Evangelical Immigration Table, which includes the National Association of Evangelicals, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, and many, many more.

''The antitrafficking law is working according to its design,'' the religious leaders said. ''It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation.''

We hear from Rabbi Asher Knight of Temple Emanu-El in Dallas. ''The question for us is: How do we want to be remembered, as yelling and screaming to go back or as using the teachings of our traditions to have compassion and love and grace for the lives of God's children?''

Lastly, Pope Francis writes, ''A change of attitude towards migrants and refugees is needed on the part of everyone.''

I hope to have that. I thank President Bush for signing the law and standing by it in this hysterical moment.

THE IRS' DANGEROUS DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, imagine telling the IRS you ''just lost'' your paperwork; or ''sorry, I accidentally deleted my tax forms, guess I won't be getting those to you.''

How do you think the IRS would respond? Not well. The IRS would find your actions ''inexcusable,'' paid back with a fine or criminal punishment, but when the IRS asks the same of us, we are expected to let them off the hook.

Losing 2 years' worth of emails is not only unlikely, but it is unacceptable. The IRS would not accept that excuse from the people of Montana, and Montanans will not accept that excuse from the IRS.

This double standard is abusive. It is irresponsible. The IRS holds a great deal of power over the individual lives of the American people, and the requirements they ask of us, we are asking of them.

As representatives of the people the IRS is hurting, the House will hold the IRS to the standards that they hold the rest of America.

ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

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

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of an immediate cease-fire and cessation of hostilities between Israel and the Palestinians of Gaza, in order to resume negotiations and create a more lasting peace and security for all parties, to end this tragic conflict.

Madam Speaker, we must do all that we can to help these parties come to terms that put the Palestinians on a path to fulfilling their legitimate aspirations of independence, while with the greatest certainty that ensures the survival and the security of Israel.

I commend and strongly urge President Obama and Secretary Kerry to continue in their bold efforts in ending this war. I offer them my full support, and I ask my colleagues to do the same, so that Israel and Palestine may someday soon live side by side in peace with one another.

□ 1230

THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE HAS A MAJOR CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has a major credibility problem. Last month, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner John Koskinen told Congress under oath that the agency had confirmed that backup tapes storing Lois Lerner's emails were destroyed.

Now we learn from IRS officials that such tapes may, in fact, exist. Last week, the IRS filed a declaration in Federal Court stating that Lois Lerner's hard drive was destroyed and the data contained on the hard drive was unrecoverable, yet testimony provided to the House Ways and Means Committee by IRS IT professionals suggests that the hard drive was merely scratched and the data was, in fact, recoverable.

Of course, the IRS has identified roughly 80 individuals of interest in the investigation, and yet now they tell us that as many as 19 of them may have suffered Lois Lerner-style hard drive crashes.

Madam Speaker, the troubling part about this is the American citizen would never be able to get away with these types of explanations. It is intolerable to have one set of rules for the IRS and one set of rules for the rest of us.

CANCEL THE AUGUST RECESS TO DO THE PEOPLE'S WORK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, creating opportunity for hardworking American families and reigniting the American Dream should be the top priority of this Congress, but instead, we are about to embark on a 1-month legislative recess as the House Republican leadership continues to block action on legislation to create jobs and to grow the middle class.

Legislation awaiting action in an up-or-down vote is piling up: legislation to raise the minimum wage; to renew emergency unemployment insurance; to pass comprehensive immigration reform; to rebuild our crumbling roads,

bridges, and ports; enacting a manufacturing policy so that we can make things in America; and voting on paycheck fairness to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

Passing all these policies would jump-start the middle class and expand opportunity for all Americans. But instead, instead of taking those up, we are about to leave town for a month of undeserved time off.

We should get to work on the work of the American people. They expect that from us, and they deserve nothing less.

SOME PEOPLE ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as an American small businesses owner, I deliver to my accountants each and every year tremendous sums of information that is then used to compile a tax return that I, along with my wife, like other hardworking Americans, must sign under penalty of perjury.

I have no doubt that five CPAs, given the same information from any taxpayer, would calculate five different tax liabilities. Yet when the IRS comes calling, every American is guilty until they prove their innocence.

Make a mistake or lose a receipt? For the taxpayer, guilty. Pay the penalty and interest, or the IRS will use the law to take your home, your car, your life savings, and they will put you in jail and leave your family in the ditch. But when the IRS gets caught cheating, they lie to Congress, take the Fifth, and destroy the evidence.

If they get away with this, what and who is next?

I can't help but think, Madam Speaker, that we must be getting close to George Orwell and what he described in his novel. While some people are created equal, under this administration others are more equal.

Had the IRS abused liberal groups, the press and the administration would demand the prosecution of the individuals responsible, and that is exactly what should be happening right now.

IRS: DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Madam Speaker, it has become apparent that the Federal agencies operate by one standing principle: do as I say, not as I do.

The IRS has shown a blatant disregard for the truth, and it is apparent there is something to hide.

Madam Speaker, I look to the other side, and I have to ask: Where is your outrage? Why have none of my Democratic friends been willing to look at the Internal Revenue Service's actions and say: Do you know what? This is bigger than partisan politics. Something is wrong here, and we need to protect the rights of Americans. Are you so committed to government power that you are unwilling to stand up and do the right thing?

Our job is to protect the rights of the people, not take them away. It is time we remember that in this Chamber.

A TALE OF TWO STANDARDS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, Tom Brokaw said the targeting of 298 conservative groups by the IRS was ''outrageous'' and called for a ''complete investigation and thorough housecleaning.'' He said:

> This is not a conservative or liberal issue. It really is about trusting your government.

Chris Matthews said there was obvious ''profiling'' of conservative groups, and said about Lois Lerner pleading the Fifth:

> Why, if you have nothing to hide, why doesn't she sit in that witness stand and answer truthfully?

Tom Brokaw and Chris Matthews are certainly not political conservatives.

One of the leading Capitol Hill newspapers today asks, ''What about the hard drive?'' and says the IRS in Federal court this past Friday said Lois Lerner's hard drive was wiped clean by the IRS and sent to an outside disposal company to be shredded. There are thousands of missing emails which just happen to include those going from the IRS to the White House.

All over this Nation, people have seen that there is one standard for ordinary citizens and another for employees of the Internal Revenue Service and friends of those in the White House. We need a much simpler, fairer tax law, Madam Speaker, that would allow us to do away with the politicized IRS altogether.

REMEMBERING DETECTIVE JOHN GIBSON AND OFFICER JACOB CHESTNUT

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, on July 24, 1998, 16 years ago today, two Capitol policemen were killed in this building in the line of duty.

At 3:40 p.m., an insane man shot Officer Jacob Chestnut in the back of the head. He died where he fell. He was directing a family to the restrooms when he was killed.

The insane man ran into the office of the majority leader, Tom DeLay, my predecessor in Congress. Mr. DeLay's bodyguard, Detective John Gibson, was shot. Despite being mortally wounded, he returned fire and brought the shooter down.

Today, both Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson lie forever in glory across the river in Arlington National Cemetery. May they always rest in peace.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 24, 2014 at 10:43 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 40.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4984.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4984.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1240

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, every family knows the cost of pursuing a higher education is out of control. It is felt intensely each and every day by countless Americans, by parents who worry how they will put their kids through college, by students who fear they will be left with a pile of debt and no job prospects, and by working men and women who hope a degree will let them reach the next rung on the economic ladder.

We know that solutions to the college cost problem must ultimately come from States and institutions, but there are things Congress can do right now to keep the dream of a postsecondary education within reach.

Helping students find the right institution is one way we can make a difference. Yesterday, the House passed, with strong bipartisan support, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. The legislation will arm students with the best information available in a format that is easy to understand, information that includes key facts such as an institution's costs, completion rates, and student loan debt.

Students and families currently face a tsunami of information that is mostly confusing, conflicting, and unnecessary. The bill streamlines the information and how it is delivered, enabling students to be smart shoppers in the college marketplace.

However, picking an institution is only half the challenge. Families then have to figure out how to pay for it, and far too many are unprepared to make those tough decisions. Some students choose loans and debt when other assistance in the form of grants and scholarships are readily available. And those that do opt for student loans often have no real concept of what they are getting into or what it means for their future.

Clearly, current policies promoting financial literacy are coming up short. That is why I am pleased to support the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. This bipartisan legislation includes a series of reforms that will help students and families make wise financial decisions about their postsecondary education.

For example, the bill ensures borrowers—both students and parents—receive annual counseling that reflects their personal situations and requires consent each year before receiving a Federal loan. The legislation also makes sure low-income individuals who rely on Pell grants are informed about the terms and conditions of their grant.

The bill also delivers more robust counseling upon graduation, requiring that information on a borrower's loan balance and anticipated monthly payments be provided. Finally, the legislation directs the Secretary of Education to maintain a consumer-tested, online counseling tool that will help institutions put this important information into the hands of those who need it.

Madam Chairman, this legislation is part of a broader effort to strengthen our Nation's higher education. Neither this bill nor the bills passed earlier this week are a silver bullet to challenges we face. However, by working together, we can begin to make a difference in the lives of students and families, and that is precisely what the House is doing.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank the bipartisan authors of the legislation, Representatives BRETT GUTHRIE, RICHARD HUDSON, and SUZANNE BONAMICI.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

I would like to start by thanking Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Congressman GUTHRIE for their leadership on this bill, which will improve the financial counseling that millions of student loan borrowers receive. I am pleased that Members are coming together to take a meaningful step toward protecting student loan borrowers. I also want to thank the Committee on Education and Workforce staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work to include Members' shared priorities in a bill that has earned tremendous bipartisan support.

The need for enhanced financial counseling for students is clear. More than 40 million Americans are carrying more than $1.2 trillion in student loan debt, and default rates are climbing. At the same time there is evidence that student loan debt is a drag on the broader economy. Borrowers struggling with debt may delay purchasing a new car, a home, or new appliances. They may be unable to access capital to start a business, or they may put off saving for retirement.

Of course, the solution to the mounting burden of student loan debt will require a number of changes. We will need to address rising tuition, and we will need to do a better job of granting existing borrowers access to affordable repayment plans. But we also must help current and future students understand their rights and obligations as borrowers. And we need to help them forecast their obligations in the years after college so they can make informed decisions now and for the future.

One of the frustrations I hear frequently from former students is that they didn't understand the jumble of terms and products in the student loan market when they were borrowing. Many didn't ask questions until after they left college. What kind of loans did they borrow? When will they need to begin repayment? What will their monthly payments be, and what repayment plans will be available?

That is why I am especially pleased that H.R. 4984 goes beyond entrance counseling for new borrowers and requires annual counseling for all student loan borrowers.

Under this bill, students, whether they are sophomores or seniors, will have information about how much they have borrowed, what they are expected to borrow to complete their education, how their loans will accrue interest, and what they can expect their monthly payments to be when they leave college. They will be better able to see their road to repayment.

Importantly, providing annual counseling means that borrowers who don't graduate will still receive information about what to expect when they leave school and enter repayment. Borrowers will have more clarity on their monthly payments under two repayment plans: income-based repayment and the standard 10-year option. Streamlining this information will simplify the repayment process.

Borrowers will be reminded each year that they don't have to borrow the full amount made available, and they should consider grants, work study, and Federal loans before turning to private lenders. Unlike current practice, borrowers will receive financial counseling before signing their master promissory note, and they will be reminded that they can repay interest before it capitalizes.

H.R. 4984 will provide for the first time important disclosures to parents who borrow for their children. Parent borrowers of student loans will be given virtually the same information about their loans as students receive. And the bill will extend counseling to Pell grant recipients so that they understand the limits on eligibility for Pell grants, and the circumstances in which they would be asked to repay their grants.

Finally, this bill delivers enhanced student loan information in consumer-tested formats to check for student understanding. It will ensure that we provide personalized borrower information that the borrowers understand.

Madam Chair, there is another reason why this bill is so important right now. Recent consumer complaints suggest that some debt settlement companies are using predatory practices to

target student loan borrowers. These firms target low-income and minority borrowers, but also Americans giving back through public service careers, like firefighting, teaching, and law enforcement. These firms are reportedly charging thousands of dollars to enroll borrowers in Federal income-based repayment programs, a program that borrowers can enroll in for free.

Until we can address these predatory practices directly, this bill will go a long way to ensuring that students fully understand their eligibility for income-based repayment. In short, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act will help Pell grant recipients and student loan borrowers. It will help the borrowers anticipate their monthly payments and plan their road to repayment. This will make a real positive difference, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4984.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a key member of the committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

But first, I want to say thanks to my friend from Oregon, Congresswoman BONAMICI, for putting together a coalition of both sides where we can come together to address a problem that faces so many of the people who sent us here to represent them. And to the chairman, we are going to pass three or four bills this week in a bipartisan manner. The President signed a bill that passed this committee this week as well. It shows that he is putting together where we can find common ground to solve problems that really affect the people who sent us here to represent them. We appreciate him for that.

But to address this bill: with the rising costs of attaining a college degree, many students need financial assistance to make that dream a reality. This bill will increase financial literacy by reforming the current guidelines to require annual counseling for student borrowers. In doing so, students will be empowered with the knowledge necessary to understand what they are borrowing, which financial options to draw from first, and the implication of their future debt load in repayment scenarios.

A June 2014 report from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that less than 50 percent of survey respondents with student debt have what they consider a high loan literacy.

Current Federal law only requires colleges and universities to provide financial counseling to student borrowers at the beginning of their studies. In short, these students get a quick snapshot of their loan obligations after they have already committed to the first year's loans, and then again once they have accrued their entire loan burden. Making matters worse, these counseling sessions tend to be broad and not based on information specific to the borrower. Many of today's students do not have a clear picture of what their financial obligation will look like upon graduation, and aren't necessarily given any opportunity to make decisions to alter that course. So will this bill make a difference?

Well, we have an example. Indiana University—being from Kentucky, I have to admit, Indiana University has begun a process of educating students annually prior to accepting their aid package for the following year, similar to our efforts in this bill. IU found that Federal undergraduate Stafford loan disbursements dropped by $31 million, or 11 percent, from the previous year. That is five times the decline in the national average. And they still were served in college. They just didn't take out too much excess debt.

Through this bill, we hope to expand upon what institutions like Indiana University are doing and reform the current guidelines to require annual counseling for student borrowers, and ensure that students are empowered with the information they need to take control of their financial futures.

I encourage my colleagues, and I appreciate the bipartisan support, and particularly my friend from Oregon, for working together, and I encourage my colleagues to support this meaningful legislation so we can arm students with the financial knowledge needed and help lower their debt burdens.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), a champion for access to higher education.

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Representative BONAMICI for working together to find common ground on this bipartisan legislation, and I rise in support of H.R. 4984.

This legislation enacts commonsense safeguards and reforms to make financial counseling more effective for students and their families. Specifically, this legislation ensures that student loan recipients receive comprehensive information on an annual basis, detailing the terms and conditions, as well as the individual responsibilities throughout the life of their loans.

As an adjunct professor at Arizona State University, I frequently hear from my students about how difficult it is to effectively manage their student loans. One year ago, I brought stories from my own Arizona State University students to the House floor to demonstrate how student debt impacts their futures and our community.

One former student in my district, Brandy, faces over $100,000 in student debt. While this legislation will make it easier for her to understand the terms of her loan, we shouldn't fool ourselves, because this legislation will not make repaying her loan any easier, it won't provide relief from rising interest rates, and it doesn't take meaningful steps to address the skyrocketing cost of higher education. So together, we must do more here in Congress to create quality, higher education opportunities for America's students.

So while this legislation is no substitute for a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, it is a good step forward. It doesn't yet provide a meaningful solution that addresses the rising cost of college, but it is very important that we stand today and make the important start to ensure students are fully informed about their loans and student debt.

I relied on Pell grants, academic scholarships, and Federal loans all through my schooling, just like my Arizona State University students do today. I know that students need guidance and assistance to manage their student debt.

I talk to young people who are excited to share their ideas and thoughts with me about how to solve some of our world's biggest problems, but it concerns me when I see these same young students are daunted by the prospect of an expensive education that they want but fear they can't afford.

Rising college costs are putting higher education and the American dream out of reach for too many hardworking American families. Education is the key to economic growth, job creation, and for many, a clear pathway out of poverty. I know this because education was the key to my own path from poverty to the middle class. So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and continue working together to make college affordable for Arizona students.

I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for yielding and for her hard work.

Mr. KLINE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a colleague from the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4984, and I want to commend Congressman GUTHRIE and Congresswoman BONAMICI for their efforts in bringing this bill first to our committee and now to the floor, and I particularly want to commend the bipartisan nature with which this legislation has been developed. Hopefully it will pass today with the same support that it passed out of the Education Committee.

My other hope is that we can take this same bipartisan spirit that attends

this legislation and apply it to the really, really important work that we have before us with respect to higher education and reauthorizing the Higher Ed Act, and that is specifically seeing to it that collectively we work together to see to it that the student financial aid programs embodied in title IV of the Higher Ed Act are reauthorized and, in fact, strengthened, and that they remain as robust as they need to be to ensure that students continue to have access to the educational institutions of their choice.

Frankly, title IV is in peril. I hope we can work on that. And let me be specific about at least one program in title IV, and that is the Perkins Loan Program. We have had the Perkins Loan Program since 1958. It was passed in the wake of America's shock that we were beaten into space by the Russians, and so there was an effort to make it easier for the young men and women of this country to pursue higher education. That goal, by the way, and that need that existed in 1958 still exists today. And yet under current law, if we do not act, the 2015–2016 academic year will be the last year that the Perkins loan will be in existence.

Our students across the country borrow $1.4 billion a year.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

So $1.4 billion a year will be taken out of the student aid portfolio at a time when students can least afford for that to happen. Given declining incomes and rising colleges costs, students are caught in a squeeze where they are unable to meet the expenses that a higher education demands. We simply cannot let this happen, and I very much hope that again on a bipartisan basis we can renew not just this program, but we can also overcome what appears to be a policy directive of our friends on the other side to squeeze the student financial aid programs.

□ 1300

The budget resolution that passed the House of Representatives freezes Pell grants at $5,700 for the next 10 years. That means, 10 years from now, if that were to ever take on the force of law, the buying power of the Pell grant will be severely diminished.

That same budget resolution essentially eliminates the SEOG program and puts enormous restrictions on the college workstudy program. These are programs that are absolutely essential to a student's ability to finance their education. I very much hope we can work together to see to it that they remain as robust as they need to be.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, we have no further speakers on this side, and I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, will give student loan borrowers a much better understanding of their road to repayment. It does this by helping students track the amount they borrowed, predict monthly payments, and access affordable repayment plans.

As I mentioned, this bill is not a cure-all for the problems student loan borrowers face, which include rising tuition and opaque servicing contracts, but the bill serves a very important purpose, and it is especially important because of the cost of college and the challenges of managing student debt.

Greater transparency about what it means to borrow student loans will help students anticipate their obligations and advocate for their rights as borrowers, and perhaps greater transparency will elevate the conversation about the underlying need to address college costs.

Again, I want to thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Representative GUTHRIE for their bipartisan effort on this important bill. It has been delightful to work with them. I look forward to more bipartisanship in the Education and the Workforce Committee.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4984, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, I want to thank my colleagues from the committee, the principal authors of this bill—Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. GUTHRIE—for their fine work here and for the spirit of enthusiasm and bipartisanship which they have brought to this effort.

I would remind all of my colleagues, as we move forward towards reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, this is absolutely not the whole thing, but it is another important step down that road.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of the amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 113–53. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 4984

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act''.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL COUNSELING.

Section 485(l) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(l)) is amended to read as follows:

''(l) ANNUAL FINANCIAL AID COUNSELING.—

''(1) ANNUAL DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible institution shall ensure that each individual who receives a Federal Pell Grant or a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan) receives comprehensive information on the terms and conditions of such Federal Pell Grant or loan and the responsibilities the individual has with respect to such Federal Pell Grant or loan. Such information shall be provided, for each award year for which the individual receives such Federal Pell Grant or loan, in a simple and understandable manner—

''(i) during a counseling session conducted in person;

''(ii) online, with the borrower acknowledging receipt of the information; or

''(iii) through the use of the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(B).

''(B) USE OF INTERACTIVE PROGRAMS.—In the case of institutions not using the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(B), the Secretary shall require such institutions to carry out the requirements of subparagraph (A) through the use of interactive programs, during an annual counseling session that is in-person or online, that test the individual's understanding of the terms and conditions of the Federal Pell Grant or loan awarded to the student, using simple and understandable language and clear formatting.

''(2) ALL INDIVIDUALS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to each individual receiving counseling under this subsection shall include the following:

''(A) An explanation of how the student may budget for typical educational expenses and a sample budget based on the cost of attendance for the institution.

''(B) An explanation that an individual has a right to annually request a disclosure of information collected by a consumer reporting agency pursuant to section 612(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)).

''(3) STUDENTS RECEIVING FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to each student receiving a Federal Pell Grant shall include the following:

''(A) An explanation of the terms and conditions of the Federal Pell Grant.

''(B) An explanation of approved educational expenses for which the student may use the Federal Pell Grant.

''(C) An explanation of why the student may have to repay the Federal Pell Grant.

''(D) An explanation of the maximum number of semesters or equivalent for which the student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant, and a statement of the amount of time remaining for which the student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant.

''(E) An explanation of how the student may seek additional financial assistance from the institution's financial aid office due to a change in the student's financial circumstances, and the contact information for such office.

''(4) BORROWERS RECEIVING LOANS MADE UNDER PART D (OTHER THAN PARENT PLUS LOANS).—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to a borrower of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct

PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student) shall include the following:

''(A) To the extent practicable, the effect of accepting the loan to be disbursed on the eligibility of the borrower for other forms of student financial assistance.

''(B) An explanation of the use of the master promissory note.

''(C) An explanation that the borrower is not required to accept the full amount of the loan offered to the borrower.

''(D) An explanation that the borrower should consider accepting any grant, scholarship, or State or Federal work-study jobs for which the borrower is eligible prior to accepting Federal student loans.

''(E) A recommendation to the borrower to exhaust the borrower's Federal student loan options prior to taking out private loans, an explanation that Federal student loans typically offer better terms and conditions than private loans, and an explanation that if a borrower decides to take out a private education loan—

''(i) the borrower has the ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower's choice;

''(ii) the proposed private education loan may impact the borrower's potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title; and

''(iii) the borrower has a right—

''(I) to accept the terms of the private education loan within 30 calendar days following the date on which the application for such loan is approved and the borrower receives the required disclosure documents, pursuant to section 128(e)(6) of the Truth in Lending Act; and

''(II) to cancel such loan within 3 business days of the date on which the loan is consummated, pursuant to section 128(e)(7) of such Act.

''(F) An explanation of the approved educational expenses for which the borrower may use a loan made under part D.

''(G) Information on the annual and aggregate loan limits for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans.

''(H) Information on how interest accrues and is capitalized during periods when the interest is not paid by either the borrower or the Secretary.

''(I) In the case of a Federal Direct PLUS Loan or a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, the option of the borrower to pay the interest while the borrower is in school.

''(J) The definition of half-time enrollment at the institution, during regular terms and summer school, if applicable, and the consequences of not maintaining at least half-time enrollment.

''(K) An explanation of the importance of contacting the appropriate offices at the institution of higher education if the borrower withdraws prior to completing the borrower's program of study so that the institution can provide exit counseling, including information regarding the borrower's repayment options and loan consolidation.

''(L) For a first-time borrower, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum, a standard repayment plan and, using the regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation the borrower intends to be employed, an income-based repayment plan under section 493C, and based on—

''(i) a range of levels of indebtedness of—

''(I) borrowers of Federal Direct Stafford Loans or Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; and

''(II) as appropriate, graduate borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans or Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; or

''(ii) the average cumulative indebtedness at graduation for students who borrowed loans made under part D and who are in the same program of study as the borrower.

''(M) For a borrower with an outstanding balance of principal or interest due on a loan made under this title—

''(i) a current statement of the amount of such outstanding balance and interest accrued;

''(ii) based on such outstanding balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum, the standard repayment plan and, using regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation the borrower intends to be employed, an income-based repayment plan under section 493C; and

''(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under each repayment plan described in clause (ii), based on—

''(I) the outstanding balance described in clause (i);

''(II) the anticipated outstanding balance on the loan for which the student is receiving counseling under this subsection; and

''(III) a projection for any other loans made under part D that the borrower is reasonably expected to accept during the borrower's program of study based on at least the expected increase in the cost of attendance of such program.

''(N) The obligation of the borrower to repay the full amount of the loan, regardless of whether the borrower completes or does not complete the program in which the borrower is enrolled within the regular time for program completion.

''(O) The likely consequences of default on the loan, including adverse credit reports, delinquent debt collection procedures under Federal law, and litigation, and a notice of the institution's most recent cohort default rate (defined in section 435(m)), an explanation of the cohort default rate, and the most recent national average cohort default rate for the category of institution described in section 435(m)(4) to which the institution belongs.

''(P) Information on the National Student Loan Data System and how the borrower can access the borrower's records.

''(Q) The contact information for the institution's financial aid office or other appropriate office at the institution the borrower may contact if the borrower has any questions about the borrower's rights and responsibilities or the terms and conditions of the loan.

''(5) BORROWERS RECEIVING PARENT PLUS LOANS FOR DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to a borrower of a Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student shall include the following:

''(A) The information described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) and (N) through (Q) of paragraph (4).

''(B) The option of the borrower to pay the interest on the loan while the loan is in deferment.

''(C) For a first-time borrower of such loan, sample monthly repayment amounts under the standard repayment plan based on—

''(i) a range of levels of indebtedness of borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of a dependent student; or

''(ii) the average cumulative indebtedness of other borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of dependent students who are in the same program of study as the student on whose behalf the borrower borrowed the loan.

''(D) For a borrower with an outstanding balance of principal or interest due on such loan—

''(i) a statement of the amount of such outstanding balance;

''(ii) based on such outstanding balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan; and

''(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan, based on—

''(I) the outstanding balance described in clause (i);

''(II) the anticipated outstanding balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection; and

''(III) a projection for any other Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of the dependent student that the borrower is reasonably expected to accept during the program of study of such student based on at least the expected increase in the cost of attendance of such program.

''(E) Debt management strategies that are designed to facilitate the repayment of such indebtedness.

''(F) An explanation that the borrower has the options to prepay each loan, pay each loan on a shorter schedule, and change repayment plans.

''(G) For each Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection, the contact information for the loan servicer of the loan and a link to such servicer's Website.

''(6) ANNUAL LOAN ACCEPTANCE.—Prior to making the first disbursement of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan) to a borrower for an award year, an eligible institution, shall, as part of carrying out the counseling requirements of this subsection for the loan, ensure that the borrower accepts the loan for such award year by—

''(A) signing the master promissory note for the loan;

''(B) signing and returning to the institution a separate written statement that affirmatively states that the borrower accepts the loan; or

''(C) electronically signing an electronic version of the statement described in subparagraph (B).''.

SEC. 3. EXIT COUNSELING.

Section 485(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''through financial aid offices or otherwise'' and inserting ''through the use of an interactive program, during an exit counseling session that is in-person or online, or through the use of the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A)'';

(B) by redesignating clauses (i) through (ix) as clauses (iv) through (xii), respectively;

(C) by inserting before clause (iv), as so redesignated, the following:

''(i) a summary of the outstanding balance of principal and interest due on the loans made to the borrower under part B, D, or E;

''(ii) an explanation of the grace period preceding repayment and the expected date that the borrower will enter repayment;

''(iii) an explanation that the borrower has the option to pay any interest that has accrued while the borrower was in school or that may accrue during the grace period preceding repayment or during an authorized period of deferment or forbearance, prior to the capitalization of the interest;'';

(D) in clause (iv), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''sample information showing the average'' and inserting ''information, based on the borrower's outstanding balance described in clause (i), showing the borrower's''; and

(ii) by striking ''of each plan'' and inserting ''of at least the standard repayment plan and the income-based repayment plan under section 493C'';

(E) in clause (x), as so redesignated, by striking ''consolidation loan under section 428C or a'';

(F) in clauses (xi) and (xii), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(xiii) for each of the borrower's loans made under part B, D, or E for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection, the contact information for the loan servicer of the loan and a link to such servicer's Website; and

''(xiv) an explanation that an individual has a right to annually request a disclosure of information collected by a consumer reporting agency pursuant to section 612(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)).'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by inserting ''online or'' before ''in writing''; and

(B) by adding before the period at the end the following: '', except that in the case of an institution using the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A), the Secretary shall attempt to provide such information to the student in the manner described in subsection (n)(3)(C)''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting '', such as the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A),'' after ''electronic means''.

SEC. 4. ONLINE COUNSELING TOOLS.

Section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) ONLINE COUNSELING TOOLS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, the Secretary shall maintain—

''(A) an online counseling tool that provides the exit counseling required under subsection (b) and meets the applicable requirements of this subsection; and

''(B) an online counseling tool that provides the annual counseling required under subsection (l) and meets the applicable requirements of this subsection.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS OF TOOLS.—In maintaining the online counseling tools described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that each such tool is—

''(A) consumer tested, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, to ensure that the tool is effective in helping individuals understand their rights and obligations with respect to borrowing a loan made under part D or receiving a Federal Pell Grant;

''(B) understandable to students receiving Federal Pell Grants and borrowers of loans made under part D; and

''(C) freely available to all eligible institutions.

''(3) RECORD OF COUNSELING COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) use each online counseling tool described in paragraph (1) to keep a record of which individuals have received counseling using the tool, and notify the applicable institutions of the individual's completion of such counseling;

''(B) in the case of a borrower who receives annual counseling for a loan made under part D using the tool described in paragraph (1)(B), notify the borrower by when the borrower should accept, in a manner described in section 485(l)(6), the loan for which the borrower has received such counseling; and

''(C) in the case of a borrower described in subsection (b)(1)(B) at an institution that uses the online counseling tool described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, the Secretary shall attempt to provide the information described in subsection (b)(1)(A) to the borrower through such tool.''.

SEC. 5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for maintaining the Department of Education's Financial Awareness Counseling Tool, $2,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–546. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike ''borrower'' and insert ''individual''.

Beginning page 7, line 12, amend subparagraph (L) to read as follows:

''(L) For a first-time borrower—

''(i) a statement of the anticipated balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection;

''(ii) based on such anticipated balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum—

''(I) the standard repayment plan; and

''(II) an income-based repayment plan under section 493C, as determined using regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation in which the borrower has an interest in or intends to be employed; and

''(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under each repayment plan described in clause (ii), based on the average cumulative indebtedness at graduation for borrowers of loans made under part D who are in the same program of study as the borrower.''.

Page 11, beginning line 7, amend subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) For a first-time borrower of such loan—

''(i) a statement of the anticipated balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection;

''(ii) based on such anticipated balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan; and

''(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan, based on the average cumulative indebtedness of other borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of dependent students who are in the same program of study as the student on whose behalf the borrower borrowed the loan.''.

Page 13, line 17, insert ''after receiving the applicable counseling under paragraphs (2), (4), and (5) for the loan'' after ''ensure that''.

Page 19, beginning line 1, redesignate section 5 as section 6.

Page 18, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 5. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT LOAN COUNSELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall begin conducting a rigorous, longitudinal study of the impact and effectiveness of the student loan counseling—

(1) provided under subsections (b), (l), and (n) of section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092), as amended by this Act; and

(2) provided through such other means as the Secretary of Education may determine.

(b) CONTENTS.—

(1) BORROWER INFORMATION.—The longitudinal study carried out under subsection (a) shall include borrower information, in the aggregate and disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, income, and status as an individual with a disability, on—

(A) student persistence;

(B) degree attainment;

(C) program completion;

(D) successful entry into student loan repayment;

(E) cumulative borrowing levels; and

(F) such other factors as the Secretary of Education may determine.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The disaggregation under paragraph (1) shall not be required in a case in which the number of borrowers in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual borrower.

(c) INTERIM REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the commencement of the study under subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Education shall evaluate the progress of the study and report any short-term findings to the appropriate committees of Congress.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the manager's amendment. This amendment is brought forth in close cooperation with the ranking member of the committee, my friend GEORGE MILLER.

This amendment will improve the information provided to first-time student loan borrowers and clarify that borrowers must accept their loans annually after they have completed their counseling.

The amendment will also require the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences to collect a study of the impact and effectiveness of the student loan counseling required under this act.

This amendment ensures borrowers are getting the information they need prior to making their final decisions on how to pay for their college education. It also ensures policymakers have information on how well financial aid counseling is working to prevent overborrowing and what can be improved to make it even more effective.

The underlying bill, which received unanimous support coming out of the committee, will deliver students and parents the tools and information they need to borrow and repay their student loans in a responsible way. This amendment improves the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, the manager's amendment, which I support and encourage my colleagues to support, helps bolster counseling for first-time borrowers, so that they are fully aware of the financing they may be required to use over their entire college education.

The manager's amendment also ensures that students needing to borrow a student loan receive counseling before they sign the master promissory note.

I am also pleased that this manager's amendment includes my proposal for the Department of Education to do a comprehensive, longitudinal study on the impact and effectiveness of current student loan counseling practices, so we know what actually works.

We owe it to student loan borrowers and higher education institutions to find out if the counseling requirements affect borrowers' understanding and their decisions.

In particular, we need to know if the programs we create in Congress improve outcomes for students. Will enhanced financial counseling help more students earn degrees, borrow less, and successfully enter repayment? We need to know if these outcomes benefit equally students of different races, ethnicities, genders, and income levels.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bipartisan manager's amendment, so that students can have more and better and high-quality information about their student loans.

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

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her support of this amendment. She is a principal author of the underlying legislation and her support of this amendment is very, very helpful.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following:

''(C) An introduction to the financial management resources provided by the Financial Literacy and Education Commission.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

I rise today as someone who went to college with the help of grants and loans and the support of a family and a community that had my back. It is in that spirit that I rise today to offer an amendment designed to help students and borrowers get access to more information about sound financial practices.

We know that financial literacy is important. It helps provide people with a roadmap for making sound financial decisions, to avoid or get out of debt, to prepare for emergencies, and to save for a brighter future.

Studies have found that 20-somethings have an average debt of $45,000, primarily from student loans, but also from car loans, mortgages, and credit card debt. When the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development provided an international financial literacy test, American students ranked below average.

We need to do more to promote financial literacy, and it is particularly important that students who are getting federally-supported loans are getting the tools that they need to keep their finances on track.

We need to support resources that teach students financial literacy and provide them with the tools that they need to improve decisionmaking and strengthen their household budgets. Helping more students shore up their financial management skills also has a direct impact on the economic and financial stability of our country.

Congress took a critical step forward in providing these resources by creating the Financial Literacy and Education Commission as part of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act of 2003, legislation that passed the House with overwhelmingly bipartisan support and was signed into law by President George W. Bush.

The Financial Literacy and Education Commission developed resources that help consumers better understand financial products. It offers guidance on how to financially prepare for and respond to major life events, and it gives tips on savings and borrowing and deterring fraud.

The amendment that I offer today would direct universities and the Department of Education to provide students with information about the financial management resources provided by the Financial Literacy and Education Commission.

For many students, a student loan is the first loan of their lives. As students consider the financial assistance that they need to get a decent education, it is critically important that they have the information they need to responsibly manage their finances.

I particularly want to applaud the ongoing work and leadership in promoting financial literacy by the co-chairs of the House Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, including Representative HINOJOSA, who has been a strong advocate of financial literacy initiatives and played a critical role in creating this commission.

I am also pleased to be joined by my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who sponsored this legislation that helped create this commission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I want to commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for what I consider a straightforward, commonsense amendment.

This is an amendment to the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act, what we commonly call the FACT Act. The FACT Act is known for a free credit report and the requirement on the three main credit reporting agencies to amend their records.

If you notify one of an error, they have to make an examination and then correct it. Financial literacy was also an important part of the FACT Act because you have your credit report, but if you don't have good financial literacy, it is not going to be a good credit report.

In 2003, the subcommittee—which I chaired at that time—passed this in the full committee, and we had bipartisan support. Judy Biggert—who is no longer with us—from Illinois, I think, was one of the leaders on our side, but there were many on both sides.

A commission was formed without almost any cost to the people, and it did a lot of good research on financial literacy, how to avoid bad financial decisions, debt load, what different financial products were there, where to turn in case of an emergency. It is called mymoney.gov. It is an excellent resource.

What we found—and Mr. KILMER did a lot of work on this and Mr. HINOJOSA and others—is that people are not utilizing that and that colleges and universities, when students apply for loans, they are not directing them to that site, which can actually save them money upfront. So what this does is it engages the colleges and universities and simply encourages them to have their students take advantage of them.

Particularly, there is an urgency today because we often hear that students are leaving school with high debt

loads, and hopefully, as a result of this amendment and other steps that are being taken in this important legislation overall, students in the future can avoid some of the mistakes and not graduate with such a heavy debt load.

It is refreshing to have a bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. KILMER for yielding.

I rise in support of the Kilmer-Hinojosa-Bachus-Petri-Tsongas amendment. This amendment will ensure that students are aware of important consumer information tools of the Financial Literacy and Education Commission created by the Treasury.

□ 1315

We know that students often lack basic financial literacy, which makes it hard for them to make thoughtful decisions on complex financial products. Financial institutions may be providing information that is designed to steer young people into accounts that may not be best for them.

Providing important consumer information in an unbiased way can increase financial literacy of students and may help reduce college costs. That is exactly what this amendment accomplishes.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so students can be equipped with better and more comprehensive financial literacy tools.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I would simply recognize Mr. PETRI's and Ms. TSONGAS' contributions in helping Mr. KILMER with this amendment—and there may be others.

I want to express to the full committee chair our appreciation for supporting this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I just want to close by thanking Mr. BACHUS not just for his support of this amendment, but for his career of work on behalf of financial literacy, and not just working on behalf of our students, but all of our families.

I also want to thank the rest of my fellow cosponsors of the underlying bill, as well as the chairman and the ranking member and their staffs for working with me on this amendment.

As someone who couldn't have gone to college without the assistance of financial aid, I am hopeful that this will take a meaningful step toward providing young people with tools that they need to live financially responsible lives.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

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

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following:

''(C) Based on the most recent data available from the American Community Survey available from the Department of Commerce, the estimated average income and percentage of employment in the State of domicile of the borrower for persons with—

''(i) a high school diploma or equivalent;

''(ii) some post-secondary education without completion of a degree or certificate; and

''(iii) a bachelor's degree.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to support giving students and families the resources needed to make informed decisions about both their education and their finances.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for his great work on this bill. I also want to thank the chairman, Mr. KLINE, and Ranking Member MILLER for working in a truly bipartisan process on this legislation to provide students with commonsense, personalized financial counseling about one of the greatest investments a student can make: their investment in their own education.

I strongly support the underlying legislation and offer this amendment as a complement to better inform students about not only the costs, but the benefits of completing their education.

With tuition rates quickly outpacing grants and scholarships, American students and their families increasingly rely on student loans to access higher education. Coupled with increased enrollment, student loan debt has ballooned to more than $1.2 trillion—greater than credit card debt, for the first time in history.

Last summer, we came together to pass bipartisan legislation which decoupled student loan interest rates from the whims of Washington and provided students and families the certainty needed to make long-term plans for the future. The bill before us today continues that mission by giving students the information they need to understand the rights and responsibilities that come along with investing in their higher education.

For many students, these loans are their first and often most costly experience as a borrower. Failing to provide students with the information they need to make responsible decisions and manage their debt does not just impact the delinquent borrower, but also the taxpayers.

Similarly, having students understand both their monthly and lifetime costs of debt they are accruing will enlist students in the fight to get student loan debt under control.

That said, despite mounting debt, a college degree is still generally one of the best investments students can make. For example, the average income for young adults with a bachelor's degree is just over $50,000, with only 4.9 percent unemployment. The dropoff for individuals who do not finish is steep, around $13,000 per year of income and a much higher unemployment rate of 7 percent.

We do not want students failing to complete their degree simply because they fear taking out additional loans. That is why I am putting forward this reasonable amendment to improve the underlying legislation by simply adding the inclusion of income and employment data for different levels of educational attainment. This information would strengthen the counseling required by improving students' perspectives as they take charge of their future and their finances.

Madam Chair, this major potential earnings reduction, combined with hefty student loans in repayment, is a recipe for financial disaster. That is why it is so important that students and families have the full picture when making decisions regarding investments in higher education, as the underlying bill offers.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple yet important amendment to make sure students can make the best decision possible while understanding the full impact of student loans they take out.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 4, strike ''(E)'' and insert ''(F)''.

Page 4, after line 3, insert the following:

''(E) An explanation that if the student transfers to another institution not all of

the student's courses may be acceptable in transfer toward meeting specific degree or program requirements at such institution, but the amount of time remaining for which a student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant, as provided under subparagraph (D), will not change.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we all know that higher education is a key to the ladder of success in the United States. It is one of the most important things that we can invest in. We just recently saw a study that showed that if, in fact, you have a 4-year degree, you are going to make significantly more than if you just graduated from high school. You can imagine that in today's world—at least where I live in California, the innovation State—a master's or a doctorate is really what you need to have.

The value of a degree is very, very important, but we also see, of course, the student debt increasing. Students get out with their bachelor's degree, have a mound of debt, and then they are trying to get a master's, a Ph.D., or a profession. It is very, very difficult.

One of the most vital programs that we have in the United States is the Pell grant program to help them. But let's face it, it is very difficult to understand all the ins and outs of how to get a Pell grant, how you use it, the purpose, how many units you can take, what you can't take, how long it can take you, et cetera, et cetera. So it is another burden that we are putting on the students and the families when they don't really get the good picture of how to use that program.

My amendment would help spell out for students and families how that Pell grant would be used. It would simply require institutions to better counsel transfer students on their maximum Pell grant eligibility and the effect that it may have as a result of credits in courses that don't transfer to another institution.

I know that, at least in California, when we look to go to the university, we usually say let's do the first year at the least expensive place to do it, and that would be our community college—which, by the way, they are the gems of our community. They are doing incredible work.

But sometimes when students using the Pell grant get there, they might have, for example, some remedial classes. They might have to brush up on their English or their math. In doing that, the Pell grant is being used up, and then those units don't transfer to that 4-year university they go to. So the student ends up miscalculating what it is really going to cost them to finish off their diploma.

This amendment simply looks to make these types of obstacles obvious and transparent to possible transfer students so as to have the clearest view of their degree timelines and the impact on their financial aid.

Let's ensure that students have the clearest information, that they get it upfront, and that they understand how they are going to get this done. In fact, a lot of these students are sometimes first-timers in their families who are trying to achieve a diploma from a university.

We are still miles away from getting that achievement gap closed in many of our communities. I know we have been working on it for a long time now in Orange County, California, but this will be a little piece of trying to get that.

While I am at it, I would like to thank Congressman GUTHRIE, Congressman HUDSON, and Congresswoman BONAMICI, who have, in good faith, championed the work on this bill. I still wish we could get to the Higher Education Act, but if we can't do that, this is a good first step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I want to make the point that I am supporting all of the amendments offered today, but I wanted to take this opportunity with this particular amendment to thank the gentlewoman from California, because this amendment makes sure that these students in this confusing world that we are trying to help sort out get a clear explanation that their Pell grant eligibility is limited to 12 semesters and it will not reset if they transfer.

That is just an example of the kind of confusion that is out there, and it is one of the reasons that we insisted on putting counseling for Pell grant recipients, not just loan recipients, in the base bill. But her language brings absolute clarity to this issue. I thank her for that.

I support this amendment and the other amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 10, insert at the end the following: ''an explanation of treatment of loans made under part D and private education loans in bankruptcy,''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It would add an explanation of how Federal and private student loans are treated in bankruptcy to the list of the disclosures contained in the underlying bill.

Unfortunately, too many students lack basic financial literacy, and if they don't have a proper understanding of their rights and responsibilities when it comes to student loans, it can lead to serious consequences for their financial future.

That is why I am pleased to support this legislation that Mr. KLINE has offered—he has done such a good job bringing a bipartisan bill here—and the important financial counseling it requires.

However, one area that is not included is an explanation of the stringent requirements we have placed when it comes to erasing your student loans in bankruptcy.

While bankruptcy is never something to be taken lightly, our system does allow an honest but unfortunate debtor the opportunity for a fresh start if their financial situation is desperate enough. Most people assume that their student loans can be discharged along with their other consumer debts during bankruptcy proceedings, but that is not the case.

□ 1330

Under current law, borrowers must show that continuing to back their loans would impose an ''undue hardship'' on them and their dependents, a standard that, in practice, is nearly insurmountable. Bankruptcy law exempts very few types of debt from elimination through the bankruptcy process, but there are certain exceptions. For example, for principled policy reasons, we exempt child support, taxes, criminal fines, and intentional torts. In 1978, Congress added Federal student loans to this list.

This protects Federal student loan programs—and the taxpayer dollars that fund them—from fraud and abuse by borrowers. This also makes sense because Federal loans offer certain protections to ease the burden on debtors,

like fixed interest rates and opportunities for deferments, income-based repayments and forbearance; but in 2005, the Bankruptcy Protection Act was passed, and the bankruptcy protection was extended to private loans, which are not required to have and often do not have such consumer protections. In fact, private lenders often market directly to students, luring them into unaffordable loans that saddle them with debts for decades to come.

That is why I have introduced legislation to remove the exemption for private student loans and why the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has called for a study on whether bankruptcy rules for student loans should be modified. That, however, is not the issue here. The fact remains that this is the law, and students should be aware that their loans, both Federal and private, can only be discharged in bankruptcy in exceptional circumstances. That is why I propose this small refinement to the underlying legislation—to ensure that borrowers understand the hurdles they may face in wiping the slate clean.

I thank Mr. KLINE for allowing this and the Rules Committee for allowing this amendment to be made in order, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I think, again, this amendment is underscoring the many issues that students and their parents and families are facing as they go into this postsecondary education adventure. Some of them, really, are coming off of jobs. The last thing they are thinking about is bankruptcy or the size of their loans. Most of them don't even know what bankruptcy is—or many of them don't know. Maybe they are a lot smarter than I was at that time.

This amendment makes it clear that they understand the difference between the rules under a student loan—if they don't pay it or can't pay it—and under other loans. Without this sort of explanation, they wouldn't have any idea that their loans were not dischargeable in bankruptcy except, as the gentleman says, in some unusual circumstances.

Again, that is why this sort of financial counseling early and often is going to be very careful, because this isn't a simple matter of taking out—we will use a car loan as an example with a set amount, a set interest—a set amount that you pay back for a set number of years. Folks understand how that works. But in having student loans merged with all sorts of other programs—workstudy programs and Pell grants and so forth—it is no wonder that students are graduating, stepping out and—oh, by the way—they can't find jobs because the economy is in so much trouble. They had such high expectations when they stepped into their college experiences or their postsecondary experiences, and then they came out and found out that the jobs weren't available, and they have this confusing mess that they have to deal with, and the last thing that they ever gave any thought to was this whole notion of bankruptcy.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. KLINE for his explanation and his support. He is upriver from us, but that is where the Mississippi River starts before it becomes so beautiful on the bluffs of the city of Memphis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Now I can't pass it up.

Madam Chair, there is quite a bit of difference in the Mississippi River between the gentleman's district and Minnesota. In fact, you can step across the Mississippi River in Minnesota, and I don't think that is true—in fact, I am absolutely positive that it is not true—anywhere else. It is always interesting when we have guests come to our great State. When we ask them if they would like to step across the river, they are disbelieving until we take them up there to Itasca. Literally, it is no wider than this desk.

I wish that trying to figure out one's student loans and grants and workstudies were as easy as getting across the Mississippi River.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 5, strike ''and the'' and insert ''the most recent national average cohort default rate, and the''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to support the legislation that we are considering today, and I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together to work on this important bill.

As we have been hearing, it is critical that we provide our Nation's students with the information they need to make informed decisions about what colleges they should attend and how they should pay for them.

I think the authors of this bill did a great service by including a provision to provide students with information about the student loan default rate for the schools they plan to attend. However, I believe that this legislation does not provide the students with the national student loan default rate across all schools, making it harder for them to have an accurate understanding of where their prospective schools stand nationally.

I have introduced a simple amendment to provide student loan borrowers with the latest national average default rate for all schools. If this amendment passes, all students, as they are applying for their student loans, will know what the default rate for student loans is at the schools they are choosing to attend versus the national default rate for student loans. I believe that this will allow students to better determine whether an institution has a record of delivering a quality education that is right for them. By providing students with more tools in their pursuits of education, students will be able to make more informed choices and save taxpayers the cost of more Federal student loans going into default.

Students in my district and around the country know the burden of student loan debt all too well. Giving our students all of the information will give them a better chance of being able to repay their loans and build successful futures.

Mr. Chairman and my colleague, Ms. BONAMICI, I applaud you on your work on this strong and important piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–546.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, after line 16, insert the following new subparagraph, and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly:

(E) in clause (ix), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''decreased credit score,'' after ''credit reports,''; and

(ii) by inserting ''reduced ability to rent or purchase a home or car, potential difficulty

in securing employment,'' after ''Federal law,'';

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that builds upon the existing language in this bill to strengthen protections for American students. My amendment ensures students have the information that they need to make important financial decisions that could impact their lives long after graduation.

As you may be aware, combined student loan debt in our Nation has topped $1 trillion, and the unfortunate reality is that many of those students do not know the enormous harm that defaulting on that debt can cause to them. Nearly 15 percent of the student loan borrowers default within 3 years of graduation, and this can have serious consequences on their ability to rent an apartment, to purchase a car or a house, or to even obtain future employment.

Madam Chair, I applaud the spirit of this bipartisan legislation to provide enhanced financial counseling services to our Nation's students, and I look forward to voting in favor of it. My amendment will make a very simple adjustment to ensure the full effectiveness, however, of the bill.

My amendment will simply require that all student borrowers receive an explanation of the impact of a delinquency or of a default on loans to their credit scores, including the borrower's future ability to find employment or to purchase a home or a car. It is important for students to have this information when they first receive the loans. For many recent graduates, the idea of a credit report or a credit score may seem very abstract. My amendment ensures that the impact of delinquencies or defaults are explained in very concrete terms.

Recent graduates are the top in their fields but, all too often, fall behind when it comes to financial literacy, which can have a lasting impact on their lives, and it can also take a toll on our economy. For more than 20 years, I worked as a financial adviser, helping families plan for their futures. It is important that all of our graduates understand how the decisions they make today will affect them and their families down the road when they are finding a job, buying a car, or renting or trying to own a home. We need to promote financial literacy when it can do the most good—before a borrower gets in trouble.

As we continue working to make college more affordable for our students, I believe this legislation and my amendment to it are both commonsense steps in the right direction that we can act on immediately. I look forward to a strong bipartisan vote on this bill, and I hope the Senate takes up this important legislation in a timely manner. I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3393, STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4935, CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 680

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-54 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 3393 the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 3393;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 3393 to reflect the addition of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 3393, H.R. 4935 shall be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1345

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of two measures, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of these two measures, as is customary with tax legislation. In addition, the resolution provides for 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935. And it provides for a motion to recommit on each bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the rule combines both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935 before sending it to the other body.

Madam Speaker, with tuition prices continuing to climb, more Americans are struggling to plan for and afford higher education. Today's broken Tax Code makes it even harder to pay for college, with 15 complicated, overlapping education provisions that take the IRS 90 pages to explain.

We need to simplify education tax benefits so families can actually use them, and we need to get our economy back on track so students and families are earning enough to afford a good education.

H.R. 3393 takes a good first step. It consolidates four current tax benefits for higher education, the American opportunity tax credit, the Hope Scholarship credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the college tuition deduction into a new, simplified and, most importantly, permanent tax credit.

In addition, H.R. 3393 also includes strong antifraud provisions requiring taxpayers to include on their tax return the name and taxpayer identification number of the student and the employer identification number of the applicable higher education institution.

In addition, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4935, which modernizes and improves the child tax credit. Originally created in 1997 to help ease the financial burden that families incur when they have children, this credit has failed to keep pace with the cost of raising a child. Initially, it provided a maximum credit of $400 per child. However, under the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, this credit was expanded to $1,000 per child, was made partially refundable, and was indexed for inflation.

Unfortunately, some of these good changes expired in 2010. I would note for my colleagues that even with these increases, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by approximately 4.4 percent a year.

H.R. 4935 would index the child tax credit for inflation, eliminate the marriage penalty, and would require an individual to include their Social Security number on their tax return to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit.

Current estimates suggest that at least $13 billion in improper refundable tax credit payments are made each year. This provision would help to combat that growing problem.

Madam Speaker, the cost of raising children increases every year, but the current child tax credit fails to take these increased costs into account. In addition, the current tax credit penalizes married couples.

By making these commonsense changes, we can ensure that the credit truly serves its intended purpose.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation, which continues our targeted approach to updating, improving, and modernizing the Tax Code.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman for recognizing the great State of Colorado, where we hope to have you visit my district and ski in Vail, or perhaps enjoy the comfortable, temperate summer weather in our mountain resort area.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, and H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.

These two so-called extender bills, which are among several that this body has considered, are all unpaid for.

Instead of allowing amendments on these bills, they are brought before us under an entirely closed process that blocks efforts by either Democrats or Republicans to come up with new and better ways to improve the effectiveness of these tax cuts, or to provide offsetting cuts to expenditures or closing other revenue loopholes that would pay for these tax cuts. So, essentially, this is not a real proposal before us today.

I think that the child tax credit and Student and Family Tax Simplification Act are widely popular on both sides of the aisle, but real policy discussion is how we pay for them. That is the real discussion. That is what the House and the Senate will need to negotiate. That is what the President will need to negotiate.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with corresponding cuts so that these can be paid for. But, under this closed rule, we are not even able to have a discussion of that. We are considering yet another set of unpaid-for tax extender bills that will add to our deficit.

Now, at the beginning of this year, Chairman CAMP put forward a true, revenue-neutral comprehensive tax reform bill. That was a real attempt to not add to our ballooning deficit and reduce taxes. To be clear, this is not.

While I oppose this bill, I certainly support the intention of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which is to provide incentives for people across the country to pursue higher education, and I look forward to the real discussion of how we pay for it. Money doesn't grow on trees.

Students can receive a maximum annual credit of $2,500 for pursuing college, vocational school, or a university to help them pursue their dreams of achieving a postsecondary education, which is more important than ever to have a chance at succeeding in the 21st century workforce.

I am pleased the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act authorized the AOTC to help both undergraduate and graduate students pay for their studies. I am thrilled the Republicans now support extending provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That is a positive development for families across our country.

In my home district of Colorado, I am pleased to have two flagship research universities, Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder, which are leading the way in undergraduate and graduate education and research that benefits our communities and our health.

Students at these universities shouldn't have to spend their time wondering how the Tax Code will affect their ability to pay for books and tuition. They should be learning. They should be engaged in research and innovation to grow our economy, and not have to play the guessing game about what Congress does, which this bill, unpaid for, only furthers.

Now, while this legislation would extend the AOTC to help more traditional students, unfortunately, it would take away educational benefits from the majority of students today.

By replacing the Hope Scholarship Credit and eliminating the Lifetime Learning Credit, we will harm adult learners and those who might have lost their jobs in one sector and are trying to get training to go into another growing sector so that they can improve their life station.

Many students who use the Lifetime Learning Credit, which has no limit on the number of years it can be claimed for each student, are low-income Americans, out-of-work Americans, folks who we want to get back to work so they are not reliant on government programs.

Madam Speaker, why would we remove a tax credit that provides incentives for adults to learn throughout their lives at a time in our economy where it is more important than ever to do so?

We need to recognize the changing demographics and ensure that our tax system aligns with the real needs of 21st century learners.

That is why the major higher education associations, including the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, and the Association of American Universities all oppose this legislation. These colleges and universities want to make higher education more affordable, not just for traditional students but for lifelong learners as well.

I applaud my colleagues for recognizing the challenge of college affordability. I applaud my colleagues for basing a program around expiring provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

I was thrilled that just yesterday the House passed H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, which I coauthored with Representative SALMON, by a vote of 414–0. How wonderful the Democrats and Republicans were able to come together around a practical method to reduce costs and improve the quality of college.

While this legislation would provide much-needed relief for some students,

it is far from making college more affordable for everybody. Unfortunately, the legislation called forth under this rule would actually increase our Federal deficit by approximately $96.5 billion over 10 years.

Let's have a real discussion about making college more affordable. Let's have a real discussion about paying for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend. We do agree conceptually on quite a bit in terms of the Tax Code. I think both of us individually, and both sides collectively, honestly want to do things that make it easier for people to pursue a higher education.

Certainly, I think we are all interested in eliminating the marriage penalty as well. So I think we are moving broadly in the same direction, even though we have some disagreement.

I will point out to my friend that it is not unusual that tax legislation would come to the floor in a closed rule. As a matter of fact, that is almost always the way it is done, simply because you have to be able to score the items, and you have to understand what the real cost of tweaking is.

So whether Republicans or Democrats are in control, a closed rule is usually the order of the day on any tax legislation.

I appreciate my friend's concern about the deficit, and in that I am quite sincere.

Now, I do also always like to point out to my friends that when they were in the majority, for 4 years in a row the deficit got greater each year. And since we have been in the majority the last 4 years the deficit has gotten smaller each year.

So I actually think that we not only have a rhetorical concern about the deficit, we have demonstrated over and over again that certainly this current majority is very, very serious about dealing with it and will continue to do that by reining in spending and putting forward thoughtful reform proposals, which I believe we have done.

I would also point out to my friend, and I think he would agree with me on this, this is a vehicle. This is not going to be the final product. My friend is exactly correct when he says there will be a negotiation.

Our concern has been, watching what has been going on on the other side of the rotunda, so to speak, is that there hasn't been very much serious work. We think they are going to look at the extenders package in terms of tax relief and basically just try and jam that through without any thoughtful pruning and without making elements of it which have been approved over and over and over again, and which are clearly popular on a bipartisan basis, permanent.

So that is what we are trying to do. I think we are constructing a platform to go into negotiation with the Senate. And I suspect what emerges will be somewhat different than what either side goes in with. That is pretty normal in the legislative process.

But I think the concepts here that we are moving forward on are correct and, I think, have broad popular appeal and bipartisan support. These are provisions—and we have done this over several bills now—that both parties have approved overwhelmingly, time and time again on a sort of yearly basis. And we want to take those things and make them permanent.

I suspect, in that process, some things that are less popular might be jettisoned. But again, that is for the negotiators to decide. We are simply trying to get to that conference.

We are marking out what our position is. We recognize the Senate will have to do the same thing, and from there we will move and, perhaps, at a later point in this process we can find ourselves actually on the same side.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend from the State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my fellow Rules Committee Member and RSC president now, rapid ascent, to make whatever remarks he cares to.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee has a tough job, but it is interesting to hear folks down here talking about both their agreement on tax reform and deficits and their agreement about what a rule ought to look like.

I have kind of gotten a little bit of both of their passions with me today, Madam Speaker, because Ways and Means bills do have to come to the floor under a closed rule.

The way the rules work, if you have an open rule, anything that is relevant to the underlying bill, you can discuss, so when you bring a tax bill to the floor, suddenly, the entire Tax Code becomes available for amendment, and you can imagine what a brouhaha that would be. I would enjoy that debate. I would thoroughly enjoy that debate, but it would never, ever end.

That is not so with our spending bills. When our spending bills come to the floor, they come under a completely open process, so that we can examine the underlying spending.

Just to take folks through the Rules Committee process a little bit, Madam Speaker, what we did here is we waived the CutGo provision in the rules. There are a lot of focus groups going on around the Chamber right now about how we should change the rules to make the system work better.

Sometimes, in the Rules Committee, we end up waiving some of the rules to make the system work better. Some folks think it makes it work better, some folks think it makes it worse, but we should have that conversation as a body.

We had to waive CutGo in this rule, Madam Speaker, because it increases mandatory spending. I have a bill beside me—and it really drives this point home. In fact, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado who was making this point.

We voted on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill this year. It was a $3 billion spending bill. We had eight amendments on the floor of the House. It passed. We voted on the Financial Services spending bill. It was a $21 billion spending bill. We had 51 amendments on that bill. We passed it out of the House.

We voted on the Energy and Water spending bill, a $34 billion spending bill, with 78 amendments on the floor of the House. We voted on the Commerce-Justice-Science bill, a $51 billion bill, with 84 amendments on the floor of the House. It goes on: Transportation, $52 billion, with 68 amendments; Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, $71 billion, with 24 amendments.

It brings us to one of the underlying bills today, a bill that I think touches the heart of absolutely every man or woman in this Chamber, our constituents back home, trying to help our children access the higher education services that they need, but in this case, it is going to increase mandatory spending by $73 billion—more than any of the appropriations bills we passed this year, except for our Defense Department Appropriations bill—and it is not going to be able to allow a single amendment on the floor of the House.

Now, that is just the process. That is the process that we have when we are dealing with tax bills, but my question for my colleagues is: Does mandatory spending deserve some additional scrutiny, the kind of scrutiny that we give to appropriated spending, to discretionary spending? I will tell you that it does. I am so proud of what this House does on discretionary spending.

My friend from Oklahoma happens to be an appropriator. He is an appropriations cardinal, in fact, which means he has leadership responsibilities over there. This committee comes to the Rules Committee—and my friend from Colorado recognizes this—they come to the Rules Committee, and they ask for an open rule every single time.

They say: We have done the best we can do to give the House our proudest work, but if anybody else has ideas about how to improve it, come to us. We want this to be a collaborative product.

We can't do that with this bill before us today, and it increases mandatory

spending by $73.7 billion. I cannot count the number of times I have heard my colleagues in this body say it is not the appropriations spending that is the problem. It is the mandatory spending that is the problem.

We are moving awfully fast in the body this week to appropriate $73.7 billion in new mandatory spending. I know people's hearts and heads are with these young people that we are trying to help get ahead, that we are trying to help access higher education, but there is only one place we are going to find this $73.7 billion, and that is in the pocketbooks of those very same young men and women when we borrow this money today to spend it on them and ask them to pay it back, with interest in the future.

I caution my colleagues today, spending is a constitutional responsibility that we have. It is a constitutional responsibility that we have placed in the Appropriations Committee, where things are scrutinized line by line by line.

Never before this year has so much money gone out the door in so little amount of time, with so little input from the very capable Members on both sides of the aisle.

With that, again, I encourage my colleagues to read this rule. You will support this rule, but examine the underlying legislation carefully.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to take all this in. I certainly agree with his premise that we need to talk about mandatory spending. I think that there is a bipartisan desire to do that, and several years ago, there was a thoughtful Bowles-Simpson proposal that began to take on some of those issues.

I think that it is a discussion that—particularly when nondiscretionary spending is the vast majority of Federal spending, you can only do so much on the discretionary side, so it is very important to do that.

Clearly, all of these tax extenders and tax expenditures and mandatory spending through outlays and Social Security and Medicare, that is what that discussion is about. It is a very important one. This bill is yet another one that kicks the ball down the road, doesn't deal with any of those issues, and doesn't allow for any consideration of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill creates a new tax credit to provide an incentive for U.S. companies to move jobs from overseas back to America and will end the tax deductions for companies that outsource jobs.

Instead of considering two tax bills that hurt American families and bloat the deficit, let's consider one that brings American jobs home.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, so that we can offer an amendment to consider my legislation, H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Yesterday, it passed in the Senate 93–7.

Now, there is something fundamentally wrong if we can't get a boost here, and it passes 93–7 across the board, Democrats and Republicans.

So what are we talking about here? An ''aye'' vote for the previous question is a vote to keep giving corporate America a tax break for every job they ship overseas to China. Let's start there.

Over the last few weeks, I heard a lot about corporate welfare in reference to the Export-Import Bank, before we debate it next week. It costs the government not one dime to help out the businesses. In fact, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has 255,000 jobs in jeopardy in Oklahoma.

The Bring Jobs Home Act ends taxpayer writeoffs that pay moving costs when companies ship jobs abroad. We, as a body, have supported in the past giving money to businesses and corporations that send jobs overseas. That does not make sense.

What we want to do is to help those companies to come back because these are good-paying jobs. That is how manufacturing jobs primarily left this country.

Over the last 10 years, 2.4 million American jobs have been shipped overseas, and U.S. taxpayers have helped foot the bill. That, to me, is insanity. It is like paying someone for the rope they are going to hang you with.

Economists estimate that across the country, over 21 million jobs are at risk of being outsourced, 500,000 of them in my own home State of New Jersey.

At a time when we are trying to create good-paying manufacturing jobs in the United States, it quite simply makes no sense for the U.S. taxpayers to help foot the bill for companies that want to outsource jobs instead. My bill ends this taxpayer subsidy once and for all.

Instead, the Bring Jobs Home Act would provide a new 20 percent tax credit for companies that bring jobs back to the United States of America. This will provide a substantial incentive for more and more companies to create jobs and invest right here in our own country.

We are already seeing a trend towards insourcing. Manufacturing employment is up by 600,000 jobs since the end of the Great Recession, and for the first time, in 2013, companies were reshoring jobs at the same rate that they offshored them. We have still got a big hole to dig ourselves out of from 2003, with up to 150,000 jobs being offshored each month. We are still out of balance by about 1 million jobs.

Companies like Master Lock, Caterpillar, Ford, GE, and Walmart even—which is not one of my favorites—are starting to see the value in bringing manufacturing back to this country. We have got the R&D, the infrastructure, the educated workforce, and we have got the consumers, and, again, we have the most productive workers in the world.

It is not just the big guys. More than 80 percent of companies bringing work back have $200 million or less in sales, so let's give these companies a little extra incentive to make it in America by providing them with this tax credit to help our manufacturing economy continue its rebound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. A robust manufacturing-based economy will lead to widespread prosperity for businesses and the people who work there. Manufacturing jobs pay 23 percent more than workers in other parts of the economy, and every $1 in manufacturing sales creates $1.40 worth of economic impact.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the shortsighted policies that stifle investment here in America and focus on what we can do to incentivize investment and job creation. I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have opened quite a range of things to talk about with Mr. WOODALL's remarks and Mr. POLIS' response and my good friend from New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL's proposal. Let me sort of take some of them up in order.

My friend from Colorado, who I know is sincere, talked a little bit about the need to reform entitlements, and I couldn't agree with him more, and that is a discussion I think we really, seriously need to engage in as a body.

I would invite my friend, if he has an opportunity, to look at a bipartisan bill that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY)—from his side of the aisle—and I have on Social Security reform.

It doesn't really deal with a lot of the reform, but it is a process bill. It would send us down the road to have a bipartisan proposal which, I can assure you, would have things that your side doesn't like and things that my side doesn't like, and then we would have to vote on it up or down.

I think it is a thoughtful way to try to begin to deal with some of these, and it is genuinely bipartisan, so I would hope my friend from Colorado would look at that.

My friend from New Jersey mentioned the Ex-Im Bank. I couldn't agree with him more. I support it. I have consistently supported it, and I know there is a disagreement on our side of the aisle, I think, largely about that.

I hope that it is resolved in regular order—that is, that the committee votes on it and it comes down to the floor. When that happens, I look forward to working with my friend to enact that legislation.

I am intrigued by what my friend from New Jersey had to say about his tax proposal because I think, at the minimum, he has certainly put his finger on an important problem which is a real loophole that we ought to consider.

Now, I don't consider myself an expert on tax legislation. I am like my friend in the chair. I am an appropriator. That is the world I know. So I would hope that my friend's proposal would get appropriate consideration in our Ways and Means body and move through regular order because I think this is an area that we can cooperate on.

Frankly, we have got some bipartisan proposals in terms of stranded profits overseas that I think both sides could work together on, perhaps, and bring some investment back to our shores, but we do have to defend the process whereby we move legislation—that is it needs to come through the appropriate committee, we duly consider it, and it reaches here.

Again, while I may oppose the process by which my friend is moving, I am not at all prepared to say I oppose his product. I just simply haven't had a chance to look at it, but I think he is addressing an important issue.

The last area I do have to disagree with my friend on a little bit: I do like Walmart. I am a shopper at Walmart, and I am a stockholder at Walmart, and I think they are a great American company, but we live in a great country. My friend can shop where he chooses to, and I can shop where I choose to, and we will get down the road.

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

□ 1415

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I don't have a Walmart near where I live, so I don't have that same choice.

I would add that I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I think the frustration around the process is we are open to any process of bringing forward the ideas that Mr. PASCRELL talked about to the floor, and we are presenting them in this context. There is a growing frustration on a number of issues, whether it is fixing our broken immigration system, whether it is extending unemployment, or whether it is how we are paying for these tax cuts. We want to avail ourselves of every procedural opportunity for this House to consider the items that matter to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for American jobs and good government. I rise to support the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Our current corporate tax law is broken. Today, companies that move American jobs overseas are able to take tax deductions for relocating jobs outside the United States. Let me say that again. Companies located here in the United States are able to take tax deductions for moving American jobs overseas.

Don't we have that backwards? Shouldn't we give tax deductions to those moving jobs back home, back to America? The Bring Jobs Home Act will provide for not only an end to company rewards for shipping jobs overseas, it will also provide companies an incentive to restore jobs in America.

Right in my home State of Illinois, over 690,000 jobs are at risk of being sent overseas. At a time when we are desperately trying to grow the job market in our country, we simply cannot, in good conscience, let the American taxpayer foot the moving bill for megacorporations.

When I was a young man, I worked the assembly line at Caterpillar, just like my father did. We put in a hard day's work for an honest day's pay. Caterpillar understood the importance of keeping jobs here in America. In the last few years, Caterpillar has been bringing jobs back to the U.S., back to my home State of Illinois, just like GE and Ford have. Let's give them the incentive they deserve for doing the right thing.

Join me in supporting this bill so we can bring jobs home.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I care to consume.

Again, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, I frankly have no objection to my friends' using the process to bring these ideas up for debate and discussion. I actually think that is helpful and that moves the process forward, and I applaud them for that. I don't disagree necessarily with what they are talking about in terms of tax deductions for jobs that are exported as opposed to jobs that could be imported. I think that is something we ought to consider.

But, it is not the subject of the legislation that is in front of us today. Those subjects are, one, what can we do to modernize the Tax Code and give students permanent certainty in terms of tax deductions that are available to educate themselves and give their families the ability to deal a little bit with the mounting cost of college. That is a good idea. Both sides can broadly agree at least in principle. And what can we do to make sure the marriage penalty disappears and that we can target appropriate tax relief to families with children at least up to a certain level of income, I believe $150,000, to give them a little break with the cost of raising children.

Those, to me, are modest steps, but they are important programs because they affect the daily lives of American workers. I am not suggesting that what my friends are proposing doesn't do the same thing. I just think this vehicle, we probably ought to work within the bounds of what Ways and Means has sent us.

I will say, I sense some of my friend's frustration in terms of moving legislation. We have got 321 bills sitting in the United States Senate that haven't been acted upon that this House has sent over there, so I know a lot about feeling shut out. I think if our friends on our side of the aisle in the upper Chamber were here, they would tell you that they have had fewer amendments this year than Democrats in this Chamber have gotten on any appropriations bill that we have brought forward. We don't have a broken Congress. We have a broken United States Senate, in my view.

But, having said that, we have got a chance, I think, here to take a step in the right direction, to thoughtfully consider things that have worked their way through the Ways and Means Committee, to position this Chamber to sit down at a later point and negotiate with our friends—Republican and Democrat alike—in the other Chamber and perhaps produce, toward the end of this year, some good and permanent changes in the Tax Code that, if an agreement is reached, I suspect we could have overwhelming bipartisan support for.

So, we are just at that point in the process where we need to develop and put forward our proposals. We would hope that our counterparts in the United States Senate do the same thing, and that we can sit down and again find common ground in between. We have done that on some occasions before. If we will just operate the way our procedures are set up, I am confident we can do that again.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. COLE. I am certainly prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill here before us today are yet another symbolic bill, and when this House only has another week in session before September, we are passing a bill that

doesn't move here or there on the actual renewal of these tax credits, doesn't deal with the deficit or entitlement spending, and doesn't deal with immigration reform. It is a bill to presumably show the public that Republicans care about this particular tax credit as do, of course, Democrats.

But there is no real effort to figure out how we are going to pay for it. We would all love to cut every tax. Why not cut every tax down to zero and not tax anybody? But where is the money coming from?

It is the same with this. It is a feel-good, meaningless gesture that I, frankly, think the American people see through, which is why this body's approval rating hovers around 12 percent.

The bill makes in order the child tax credit improvement and costs $115 billion over 10 years. Un-offset costs of this cost each taxpayer $2,600.

Aside from the significant cost this imposes on the American people, there are also some substantive concerns that we talked about. While the bill would give some families a permanent tax break, it would actually harm our most vulnerable women and children. Specifically, the bill fails to extend a critical provision of CTC, which has helped low-income, working families lift themselves out of poverty.

The bill also indexes the current maximum credit of $1,000 per child to inflation, which only benefits those with incomes high enough to receive the maximum benefit. Further, the bill extends the child tax credit up the income scale on a permanent basis, allowing only families who make over six figures to benefit.

Ironically, on the same day that Representative PAUL RYAN is unveiling his antipoverty plan, this particular proposal before us—which we are not allowed to offer our suggestions to amend under this closed rule—would actually push 12 million more people, including 6 million children, into poverty.

Unfortunately, there has been a provision added to this bill at the Rules Committee that would bar children who are American citizens but have immigrant parents from receiving the tax credit. This bill includes a provision that only allows the tax credit to be claimed if the taxpayer has a Social Security number, even if they are claiming the credit for children who have a Social Security number and are full American citizens.

This impact is huge. It would deny 5.5 million poor American children from being able to receive this tax credit, deny millions of U.S. citizens much-needed assistance for being able to afford their rent, clothing, and food just because of who their parents are. That is not right and that is not just.

It is no wonder that groups that care about this from across the ideological spectrum, including the National Women's Law Center, First Focus Campaign for Children, Half in Ten, Children's Defense Fund, National Immigration Law Center, and the National Council of La Raza, have all come out in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it would be disgraceful if one of the only votes we took on immigration this year was to roll back benefits for U.S. citizens who happen to have parents who violated our law. With 1 week left before the August recess, Republicans, unfortunately, have little time to introduce and pass a bill that actually deals with immigration and addresses the crisis at our border.

President Obama sent a request to Congress to address the increased flow of families and unaccompanied minors from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala across our border. As you know, these families that I had the opportunity to visit with this last weekend in McAllen, Texas, in San Antonio, at Lackland Air Force Base, are fleeing horrific situations, often including gangs, rape, murder, trafficking, and extreme poverty, and are seeking refuge in this great country just as my own great-grandparents did, as well as that of many of my colleagues.

This problem with the crisis at the southern border is only one of so many symptoms about our dysfunctional immigration system, which is why Congress needs to bring forward the bipartisan H.R. 15 bill for a vote and allow that to proceed to the Senate and President Obama's desk to resolve this crisis.

It is unconscionable to think that the only immigration-related legislation that the House actually may pass in the 113th Congress could be one aimed at cutting off benefits to American children or deporting children. We continue to fail to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress. This body has already had the opportunity to act on legislation that passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds and that the President would sign.

H.R. 15, our House bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I am a proud sponsor of, would create American jobs, ensure we are more competitive in a global economy, lower the deficit, reflect our values as Americans, unite families, secure our border, and restore some sense of normalcy and law to the chaos that now surrounds our immigration system.

The American people overwhelmingly support immigration reform, but, unfortunately, House Republicans continue to not allow a vote on reform and have failed to bring forward a bill to address the dire humanitarian crisis at our border. And here in this bill, we have another bill to cut off benefits to American kids just because of who their parents are.

I cannot support this closed rule and these underlying bills. They will add to our deficit. They fail to address some of the most critical issues of our time, and they have significant policy flaws that make these particular programs worse for some of our American families that need the credits the most.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Let me address a number of remarks my friend made in passing. Let me begin by reminding anybody who happens to be listening or following the debate this isn't an immigration bill. This is actually a tax bill, and it is really about trying to make some things that have had bipartisan support permanent.

We all agree that we need to, insofar as we can, help people that are educating themselves or members of their family and provide appropriate tax relief. That is what this bill does. It is simply that simple.

Number two, we all think that you shouldn't have a tax penalty for being married, and if we can do things to help you with the cost of raising a family, we ought to try and do those things because it has been tough. That is what this bill does.

Now, we can disagree about the merits, but I think the general thrust is something we probably broadly agree on. Making those items permanent within the Tax Code is important so people can actually get used to using the benefits, understand them—sort of internalize them—and make them permanent and predictable for families. So that is our goal with this legislation.

Finally, we would like to get, eventually, to a conference with our friends in the Senate who I suspect would share some of my friend from Colorado's concerns that might be in their legislation. He knows how the process works. We will sit down at that point and see if we can find common ground. If the two negotiating teams can, then I suspect we will come back with something that a great number of us on both sides of the aisle can support.

What my friend, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of Ways and Means, is trying to do is actually make permanent some very good bipartisan ideas that I think we can rally around.

Now, my friend also mentioned the deficit, and I want to, again, laud his concern for that. I appreciate that. I genuinely do. I recognize this is a work in progress, not a final product, but I will point out again for the record, when my friends were in the majority,

the deficit got worse every single year. It has gotten lower every single year since then. So I think we are serious about dealing with the deficit.

I would invite my friend, and I know he would seriously engage in this, let's find some areas on the part of the budget that I think need addressing—the entitlement area—where perhaps we can find some common ground.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. There is no doubt that it takes both parties working together to dig the country into this much debt.

Mr. COLE. I do want to disagree with my friend on a couple of points.

Number one, this isn't a symbolic piece of legislation. It is legislation in progress, but it is not feel-good. I know Mr. CAMP and his committee are anxious to actually change many aspects of the Tax Code.

□ 1430

I know Mr. CAMP wants to make at least some of these things permanent. We may succeed or we may not, but it is certainly not meant to be anything other than serious.

Also, my friend mentioned and talked at considerable length about the issue of immigration and the border crisis, two issues that I regard as somewhat distinct. We do have a border crisis, and I suspect we will see legislation to deal with that. There is a difference in philosophy. I think the administration just wants resources to manage it. I think we would like to change some of the root causes and address it, and hopefully stop the massive flow and all of the human tragedy that goes with it.

There is a huge debate about what do we do with unaccompanied juveniles or minors who arrive, and that is an important debate to have. But we ought to stop and think: Is there something that we are doing that is encouraging that flow? Because, believe me, everything that is coming out of this is bad. It disrupts the societies from which these people are coming. We are treating children from Mexico different than we are treating them from Guatemala. We have people now pouring money into criminal cartels and strengthening them. And finally, the children themselves, the juveniles themselves, are confronted with a thousand-mile long journey where they are breaking not just the laws here but also in Mexico. They are at great risk. They are traveling with criminals. There is a lot of abuse. Some of them are undoubtedly forced into sex trafficking and perhaps others to the drug trade. There are plenty of opportunities for abuse. Nobody should want that to happen.

We are going to try to offer some serious proposals. I am very pleased with my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, KAY GRANGER from Texas, who has put together a working group and some very thoughtful proposals. We have tried to scrub them on the Appropriations Committee. Hopefully we will be able to address that issue.

Finally, let me just end with this. In closing, I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, to continue this deliberative approach towards fundamental tax reform. The child tax credit has existed since 1997, and the reforms contemplated in this legislation are important. In addition, the consolidation of four separate education credits into one simplified credit will result in much less taxpayer confusion.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 680 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Carney
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Nunnelee
Rogers (MI)

□ 1501

Messrs. MCNERNEY, GARCIA, and Ms. KUSTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WOODALL and COFFMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on July 24, 2014, I missed rollcall vote No. 442 on Ordering the Previous Question. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Edwards
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kingston
Lewis
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1508

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4984.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1510

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–546 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 14, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—404

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg

Walden	Welch	Wolf
Walorski	Wenstrup	Womack
Walz	Westmoreland	Woodall
Wasserman Schultz	Whitfield	Yarmuth
Waters	Williams	Yoder
Waxman	Wilson (FL)	Yoho
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Young (IN)
	Wittman	

NOES—14

Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Miller (MI)
Blackburn	Gohmert	Stockman
Brooks (AL)	LaMalfa	Weber (TX)
Broun (GA)	Marchant	Young (AK)
Burgess	McClintock	

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Lewis
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Capito	Honda	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Jackson Lee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1516

Mr. BURGESS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 677, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4984, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 16, line 2, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 16, line 7, strike the period, close quotation marks, and semicolon at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 16, after line 7, insert the following:

''(xv) information on the anticipated monthly payment amount for each loan made to the borrower under part B, D, or E under, at a minimum, a standard repayment plan, if such loan were refinanced so that the applicable rate of interest on the loan is 2 percent lower than the applicable rate of interest on the loan as determined under section 455(b)(8).'';

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It won't kill the bill, and it will not send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, there are 5 legislative days remaining until this House recesses for the August district work period. It is unacceptable that the House would recess without taking meaningful action on one of the most important issues confronting students and parents and middle class families in my district in Massachusetts and all throughout the country—student loan debt.

Throughout this week, I have offered amendments and motions that provide student loan borrowers the opportunity to refinance their existing high-interest loans to a lower rate, much like homeowners and businesses are often able to do. It would help them save thousands of dollars over the life of their loans. It would serve as an economic stimulus, as the savings generated from the refinanced loans would increase students' discretionary funds that would likely be reinvested and spent at local businesses, and it would help reduce the deficit.

It would also enable tens of millions of Americans to pursue their goals and move forward with their lives. I continue to hear from those whom I represent who share their personal stories. They tell me what a priority student loan refinancing is for them and their families.

A young woman from Reading, Massachusetts, emailed me this morning, and she said:

My husband and I, already struggling to make ends meet, scraped together enough money to make my loans current, but the payments are almost too much to bear. With the cost of living steadily rising and our incomes staying flat, it is becoming more and more difficult to provide for our family let alone pay back these loans at exorbitant rates. Being able to refinance them would be a godsend to myself and my family.

Another woman from Danvers, Massachusetts, emailed me today as well, and she said:

I am not looking for a magic solution to make my loans just disappear. It was my decision to take them out, and it is my responsibility to repay them, but lowering my interest rates would lower my monthly payments. I could breathe a little easier whenever my 9-year-old car makes a funny noise in knowing there is a little bit of cushion in my bank account for a mechanic. I could get my wisdom teeth out and still be able to afford to eat. I could finally start to think that maybe having a child just might be possible for me after all.

Mr. Speaker, these women are our customers, and this House should be in the business of serving their interests. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues have denied or defeated all of our efforts to allow for student loan refinancing.

Mr. Speaker, we are not deterred, and we won't give up. We are here again today, fighting for students and their families. The motion I am offering today simply requires that students know what they would owe if they were permitted to refinance their loans just like consumers can do who refinance their mortgages right now.

Let's be clear. Voting against this motion is a vote to hide from students the significant benefits that refinancing would afford. Let's give them the information and allow them to decide for themselves if they, like the women I mentioned from Reading and Danvers, support student loan refinancing. I believe they do, Mr. Speaker, and I believe, if this were brought to the floor of the House, that we would have a majority in favor. I urge support for the motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, this proposal for a hypothetical refinancing interest rate would make financial understanding even more confusing. We have been working on a process here to make it easier for students and parents to understand their loans and grants and workstudy programs. This would not be helpful.

This motion, like all motions to recommit, affords the minority an opportunity to speak for 5 minutes to try to make political points before a procedural vote. That is done. Let's take the vote. Vote ''no'' on this and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5111.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 220, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—193

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—220

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
McKeon
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1532

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 11, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—405

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Moore	Rogers (AL)	Speier
Moran	Rogers (KY)	Stewart
Mullin	Rohrabacher	Stivers
Mulvaney	Rokita	Stutzman
Murphy (FL)	Rooney	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Takano
Nadler	Roskam	Terry
Napolitano	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Rothfus	Thompson (MS)
Negrete McLeod	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (PA)
Neugebauer	Royce	Thornberry
Noem	Ruiz	Tiberi
Nolan	Runyan	Tierney
Nugent	Ruppersberger	Tipton
Nunes	Rush	Titus
O'Rourke	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Tsongas
Owens	Salmon	Turner
Palazzo	Sánchez, Linda T.	Upton
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Pascrell	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Paulsen	Scalise	Vargas
Payne	Schakowsky	Veasey
Pearce	Schiff	Vela
Perlmutter	Schneider	Velázquez
Perry	Schock	Visclosky
Peters (CA)	Schrader	Wagner
Peters (MI)	Schwartz	Walberg
Peterson	Schweikert	Walden
Petri	Scott (VA)	Walorski
Pingree (ME)	Scott, Austin	Walz
Pittenger	Scott, David	Wasserman Schultz
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Pocan	Serrano	Waxman
Polis	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Pompeo	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Posey	Shea-Porter	Wenstrup
Price (GA)	Sherman	Whitfield
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Williams
Quigley	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Sinema	Wittman
Reed	Sires	Wolf
Reichert	Slaughter	Womack
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Yarmuth
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Richmond	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Rigell	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Roby	Southerland	Young (IN)
Roe (TN)		

NOES—11

Amash	Lankford	Stockman
Broun (GA)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Hanabusa	Nunnelee
Bishop (UT)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Campbell	Honda	Pelosi
Capito	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Kingston	
Gingrey (GA)	Lewis	

□ 1539

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 445 and 446, I was delayed at the office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate that one of us rise to recognize the sacrifice made by Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut. Detective Gibson was in the office of Tom DeLay. Officer Chestnut was at the memorial door allowing visitors to come in. He was shot in the back of the head. Detective Gibson was trying to protect not only the then-Majority Leader DeLay but also other members of the staff and of the public. They did what we expect them to do, and they paid for that with their lives.

All of us, I know, express our deep gratitude to the members of the Capitol Police force, who every day get out of bed and strap on a gun, put a badge to their chest or in their wallet or on their person, and come to this Capitol to defend not only the Members and the staff but the millions of people who come to visit the Capitol of the United States regularly. They allow us to have confidence that we can do the people's business in safety and security.

So not only is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we pay tribute to Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut, but also to give thanks to those who serve daily that this Capitol might operate on behalf of the American people.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of Mr. HOYER.

As most of you know in this Chamber, my previous career was in law enforcement, 33 years. And there are some Members in here who have served their community as a police officer.

In my experience in 33 years, I felt the pain of the loss of a partner and a best friend. I felt the pain of the loss of a neighbor and a very good friend and academy graduate friend.

As the sheriff, I lost officers during my term, 8 years as sheriff in Seattle.

I appreciate the time that we take today to honor those who have died to protect Members of this body, and to recognize all of those law enforcement officers across the country, across the world, for that matter, who are protecting us each and every day.

But I think one of the most important things we can do, ladies and gentlemen, is not only remember them and their service, but remember their families. Their families lost a husband. They lost a father, a brother, an uncle, a grandpa.

This is real life-and-death stuff that these folks face every day.

□ 1545

MENTAL ILLNESS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add my comments. For those of us who were here that tragic day, the perpetrator of that horrendous act was a schizophrenic who was off his medicine, untreated, and drove three-quarters of the way across this country to commit those heinous crimes.

Before this House today are two bills, one authored by a Republican from Pennsylvania, TIM MURPHY, and another authored by a Democrat from Arizona, RON BARBER.

All these years have passed, and we have never yet brought to this floor a measure that would make a difference in this country for those who suffer with mental illness and some of whom, unfortunately, obtain weapons.

I believe that we have a moment in this House to do something exceptional, and I hope it can happen in this Congress.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—409

Aderholt	Benishek	Brady (PA)
Amash	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)
Barber	Bishop (NY)	Brooks (IN)
Barletta	Black	Broun (GA)
Barr	Blackburn	Brown (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Beatty	Bonamici	Buchanan
Becerra	Boustany	Bucshon

Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Fleischmann
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Lowenthal
McAllister
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Rogers (MI)

□ 1553

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 680, I call up the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–552 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3393

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Student and Family Tax Simplification Act''.

SEC. 2. CONSOLIDATION OF CERTAIN TAX BENEFITS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.—Section 25A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 25A. AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, with respect to each eligible student, an amount equal to the sum of—

''(1) 100 percent of so much of the qualified tuition and related expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year (for education furnished to the eligible student during any academic period beginning in such taxable year) as does not exceed $2,000, plus

''(2) 25 percent of so much of such expenses so paid as exceeds the dollar amount in effect under paragraph (1) but does not exceed twice such dollar amount.

''(b) PORTION OF CREDIT REFUNDABLE.—So much of the credit allowable under subsection (a) with respect to each eligible student (determined without regard to this subsection and section 26(a) and after application of all other provisions of this section) as does not exceed $1,500 shall be treated as a credit allowable under subpart C (and not under this part). The preceding sentence shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer is a child to whom section 1(g) applies for such taxable year.

''(c) LIMITATION BASED ON MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so allowable (determined without regard to this subsection and subsection (b) but after application of all other provisions of this section) as—

''(A) the excess of—

''(i) the taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income for such taxable year, over

''(ii) $80,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return), bears to

''(B) $10,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).

''(2) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'modified adjusted gross income' means the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year increased by any amount excluded from gross income under section 911, 931, or 933.

''(d) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—No credit shall be allowed under this section with respect to any eligible student for any taxable year if—

''(1) such student was taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section (by the taxpayer or any other individual) for any 4 prior taxable years, or

''(2) such student has completed (before the beginning of such taxable year) the first 4 years of postsecondary education at an eligible educational institution.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term 'eligible student' means, with respect to any academic period, a student who—

''(A) meets the requirements of section 484(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(a)(1)), as in effect on August 5, 1997, and

''(B) is carrying at least ½ the normal full-time work load for the course of study the student is pursuing.

''(2) QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified tuition and related expenses' means tuition, fees, and course materials, required for enrollment or attendance of—

''(i) the taxpayer,

''(ii) the taxpayer's spouse, or

''(iii) any dependent of the taxpayer with respect to whom the taxpayer is allowed a deduction under section 151,

at an eligible educational institution for courses of instruction of such individual at such institution.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR EDUCATION INVOLVING SPORTS, ETC.—Such term does not include expenses with respect to any course or other education involving sports, games, or hobbies, unless such course or other education is part of the individual's degree program.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR NONACADEMIC FEES.—Such term does not include student activity fees, athletic fees, insurance expenses, or other expenses unrelated to an individual's academic course of instruction.

''(3) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible educational institution' means an institution—

''(A) which is described in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088), as in effect on August 5, 1997, and

''(B) which is eligible to participate in a program under title IV of such Act.

''(f) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to a taxpayer with respect to the qualified tuition and related expenses of an individual unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such individual, and the employer identification number of any institution to which such expenses were paid, on the return of tax for the taxable year.

''(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS, ETC.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of qualified tuition and related expenses otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to an individual for an academic period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (c)) by the sum of any amounts paid for the benefit of such individual which are allocable to such period as—

''(i) a qualified scholarship which is excludable from gross income under section 117,

''(ii) an educational assistance allowance under chapter 30, 31, 32, 34, or 35 of title 38, United States Code, or under chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code, and

''(iii) a payment (other than a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance within the meaning of section 102(a)) for such individual's educational expenses, or attributable to such individual's enrollment at an eligible educational institution, which is excludable from gross income under any law of the United States.

''(B) COORDINATION WITH PELL GRANTS NOT USED FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the amount of any Federal Pell Grant under section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of expenses (other than qualified tuition and related expenses) which are taken into account in determining the cost of attendance (as defined in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph) of such individual at an eligible educational institution for the academic period for which the credit under this section is being determined.

''(3) TREATMENT OF EXPENSES PAID BY DEPENDENT.—If a deduction under section 151 with respect to an individual is allowed to another taxpayer for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which such individual's taxable year begins—

''(A) no credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to such individual for such individual's taxable year, and

''(B) qualified tuition and related expenses paid by such individual during such individual's taxable year shall be treated for purposes of this section as paid by such other taxpayer.

''(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREPAYMENTS.—If qualified tuition and related expenses are paid by the taxpayer during a taxable year for an academic period which begins during the first 3 months following such taxable year, such academic period shall be treated for purposes of this section as beginning during such taxable year.

''(5) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any amount for which a deduction is allowed under any other provision of this chapter.

''(6) NO CREDIT FOR MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS.—If the taxpayer is a married individual (within the meaning of section 7703), this section shall apply only if the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse file a joint return for the taxable year.

''(7) NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—If the taxpayer is a nonresident alien individual for any portion of the taxable year, this section shall apply only if such individual is treated as a resident alien of the United States for purposes of this chapter by reason of an election under subsection (g) or (h) of section 6013.

''(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2018, the $2,000 amount in subsection (a)(1), the $1,500 amount in subsection (b), and the $80,000 amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2017' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of $100 ($1,000 in the case of the amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii)), such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $100 ($1,000 in the case of the amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii)).

''(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this section, including regulations providing for a recapture of the credit allowed under this section in cases where there is a refund in a subsequent taxable year of any amount which was taken into account in determining the amount of such credit.''.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TUITION PAID RATHER THAN TUITION BILLED.—Section 6050S(b)(2)(B)(i) is amended by striking ''or the aggregate amount billed''.

(c) REPEAL OF DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking section 222 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such part).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 62(a) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (18).

(2) Section 72(t)(7)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 25A(g)(2)'' and inserting ''section 25A(f)(2)''.

(3) Sections 86(b)(2)(A), 135(c)(4)(A), 137(b)(3)(A), 199(d)(2)(A), 219(g)(3)(A)(ii), and 221(b)(2)(C)(i) of such Code are each amended by striking ''222,''.

(4) Section 469(i)(3)(F)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking ''221, and 222'' and inserting ''and 221''.

(5) Section 529(c)(3)(B)(v)(I) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 25A(g)(2)'' and inserting ''section 25A(f)(2)''.

(6) Section 529(e)(3)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 25A(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 25A(d)''.

(7) Section 530(d)(2)(C) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 25A(g)(2)'' in clause (i)(I) and inserting ''section 25A(f)(2)'', and

(B) by striking ''HOPE AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS'' in the heading and inserting ''AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT''.

(8) Section 530(d)(4)(B)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 25A(g)(2)'' and inserting ''section 25A(d)(4)(B)''.

(9) Section 6050S(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsection (g)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (f)(2)''.

(10) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsection (i)(6)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(11) Section 6213(g)(2)(J) of such Code is amended by striking ''TIN required under section 25A(g)(1)'' and inserting ''TIN, and employer identification number, required under section 25A(f)(1)''.

(12) Section 1004(c) of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''section 25A(i)(6)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 25A(b)'',

(ii) by striking ''with respect to taxable years beginning after 2008 and before 2018'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''with respect to each taxable year'', and

(iii) by striking ''for taxable years beginning after 2008 and before 2018'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''for each taxable year'',

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Section 25A(i)(6)'' and inserting ''Section 25A(b)'', and

(C) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''subsection (i)(6)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(13) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to section 25A and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 25A. American opportunity tax credit.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PELL GRANT EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 117(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or'',

(2) by striking ''received by an individual as a scholarship'' and inserting the following: ''received by an individual—

''(A) as a scholarship'', and

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

''(B) as a Federal Pell Grant under section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3393.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, more and more Americans are pursuing the dream of earning a college degree, but for many, realizing that dream is getting more difficult. Tuition prices continue to climb, making it harder for Americans to plan for and afford a higher education. Worse yet, our broken Tax Code makes it harder than ever to pay for it.

Currently, there are 15 complicated and, at times, overlapping education provisions that include over 90 pages of IRS instructions. Students and parents alike are already juggling busy schedules as is, and they shouldn't be forced to go through 90 pages of IRS explanations just to figure out the best way to save and pay for a college education.

We need a simple solution that makes it easier to qualify for tax relief and to ultimately afford college. We owe it to the millions of young adults paying their way through college and the families who budget every year to save for their children's education to simplify the system and help make a good education affordable.

The bill before us, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, would do just that. This legislation will make paying for college easier, by combining and making more efficient four tax benefits for higher education into a new, simpler, and more valuable American opportunity tax credit, and this new, improved credit will provide greater benefits for those who need it most.

I am proud that this bipartisan provision is based off of years of work by the Ways and Means Committee and, in particular, committee members DIANE BLACK of Tennessee and DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, the cochairs of the Education and Family Benefits Tax Reform Working Group, who worked across the aisle to help simplify the Code.

I should also note that the Obama administration has expressed support for an approach that assumes a permanent extension of the AOTC. We have a real opportunity today to work across the aisle to make life better for hardworking Americans.

By consolidating the current American opportunity tax credit, the Hope Scholarship credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the college tuition deduction into one simplified AOTC credit, college students can get the help they need without navigating almost 100 pages of forms.

The bill would provide a permanent 100 percent tax credit for the first $2,000 of certain higher education expenses and a 25 percent tax credit for the next $2,000 of expenses.

The first $1,500 of the credit is refundable, ensuring that students get the benefits, regardless of tax liability. This can go a long way for students and their families, especially in these tough economic times.

The American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, who cite the AOTC as the most important source of support for college students in the Tax Code, recently voiced their support for this bill, stating, ''The legislation achieves several important objectives for the Nation's college students, who continue to face substantial financing challenges, even at low-cost community colleges. Its simplification of the current array of higher education tax benefits is critical, given that their complexity has led to widespread underutilization.''

Additionally, this provision would allow Pell grants to be used for a wider array of expenses, including room and board, without triggering additional tax liability. Not only does this provision have widespread bipartisan support, but a postelection poll found that over 80 percent of Americans support extending these policies.

No one should be discouraged from pursuing continued learning, but because tuition prices continue to climb while wages continue to fall, families and students nationwide are wondering if they can even afford it.

□ 1600

Today we can do better. We can do better by these hardworking Americans. I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to move this bill through the House and ask for both the Senate and the administration to work with us in finding simple, commonsense solutions like these for the American people.

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

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

What Republicans are, in essence, trying to do here and elsewhere, if I might say so today, is to soften their image. But they can't run away from the hard reality that at every turn, over the last several years, they have sought to pass laws making life more difficult for middle- and low-income families.

On the Republican chopping block, unemployment insurance blocked for 3 million Americans. Food assistance for low-income Americans would be cut by nearly 20 percent in the Ryan Republican budget, and a minimum wage increase hasn't occurred in 5 years, yet Republicans refuse to provide an increase. Medical assistance for Americans would be slashed by the Ryan Republican budget, with funding for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program cut to the tune of 26 percent within 10 years. Social Services Block Grants, which provide flexible funds for States to help vulnerable populations, are eliminated under the Ryan Republican budget. Pell grants would be reduced by 400,000 under the Ryan Republican budget. Job training funding was targeted for deep cuts in the 2011 spending bill the House Republicans passed, and housing assistance would end for 800,000 low-income families in the Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill House Republicans just passed.

Indeed, hard-hearted actions contradict the soft rhetoric of today. We should be very skeptical when zebras try to change their stripes.

Today's legislation is part of a set of 14 tax provisions that Ways and Means Republicans have marked up and made permanent without offsets at a cost of $825 billion to taxpayers. By the end of this week, the total that House Republicans will have passed on the floor is more than $700 billion, not a dime offset. It is kind of easy to come here and say this is what we want to do when we don't pay a dime to do it.

Let it be clear in terms of this call on bipartisanship. All the Democrats on Ways and Means voted against this bill, and the Statement of Administration Policy says it opposes it. Let me give some details.

In simplifying education provisions within the Tax Code, this bill leaves behind numerous undergraduate students, graduate students, and lifetime learners. It replaces the Hope Scholarship credit and repeals both the lifetime learning credit and the now-expired deduction for qualified tuition expenses, and it limits the overall deduction for the first 4 years of schooling.

It harms students across the board. Undergraduates who take longer than 4 years to complete their degrees would be impacted, a change that loses sight of the fact that the median length of time that it takes undergrads to get their degrees is, today, more than 4 years. Adult learners would face higher costs. Three in four students are adult learners, who tend to take much longer to complete their degrees because they work full-time, have dependents, serve in the military, or have some combination of the foregoing and take longer to complete their degree.

Low-income and middle-income graduate students would lose out. In 2013, the lifetime learning credit, which this bill eliminates, served nearly 2 million students with incomes at or below $75,000, including 1 million with an income of $40,000 or less. Two years ago, one-quarter of all graduate students earned less than $11,000. During the same year, 31 percent of the 1.3 million master's degree students received no financial aid. Two years ago, one-quarter—one-quarter—of all graduate students earned less than $11,000. During the same year, 31 percent of the 1.3 million master's degree students received no financial aid. In 2011, nearly 2 million tax returns claimed the qualified tuition deduction, which expired at the end of this year and this bill does not extend.

That is one reason we have a letter from the American Council on Education. Here is what they say:

However, as we discussed in our attached letter of April 4, 2014, to Ways and Means Committee members, there are a number of other changes in the legislation which cause us great concern. Even as reported, the bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law. It also would harm graduate students and lifetime learners who utilize the tuition deduction or the LLC. Because we continue to have serious concerns about the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, we cannot support—we cannot support—the bill as currently written, even in the form as reported.

This is sent on behalf of the following: the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, the Council of Graduate Schools, and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.

That letter so much speaks to this issue.

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

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

I insert in the RECORD letters of support for the legislation from the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, as well as the United States Student Association.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES,
July 21, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), which represent the nation's more than 1,100 community college presidents and their trustees, we write in support of H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. The legislation achieves several important objectives for the nation's college students, who continue to face substantial financing challenges, even at low-cost community colleges. Its simplification of the current array of higher education tax benefits is critical given that their complexity has led to widespread under-utilization.

H.R. 3393 also includes a number of enhancements to the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC) that benefit college students:

Makes AOTC Permanent: Currently set to expire at the end of 2017, the AOTC is the most important source of support for college students in the tax code. H.R. 3393 makes the benefit permanent and ensures that it will remain in place for students and families.

Increases Refundability: The AOTC's partial refundability is of great assistance to the many low-income students who attend community college. Currently, the maximum refundability under the AOTC is $1,000. H.R. 3393 increases that amount by 50%, raising it to $1,500, and provides students an easier path to claim that full refund.

Creates Better Alignment with the Pell Grant: Currently, an estimated one million college students with unmet financial need do not receive any benefit from the AOTC due to its poor coordination with the Pell Grant program. The vast majority of these students attend low-cost institutions, particularly community colleges. H.R. 3393 remedies this situation.

Indexes the AOTC to Inflation: H.R. 3393 recognizes that college prices are not static, and adjusts the AOTC for inflation (but not college tuition) starting in 2018.

We recognize that this legislation embodies certain trade-offs. Overall, however, it would better target benefits to community college students and other low-income students, and create a simplified system that greatly benefits all students and families. These are critically important objectives, and action on them is overdue. We thank you for your consideration of this legislation and urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

WALTER G. BUMPHUS,
AACC President and CEO.
J. NOAH BROWN,
ACCT President and CEO.

UNITED STATES STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

THE US STUDENT ASSOCIATION'S STATEMENT ON THE STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT BILL

WASHINGTON, DC.—On behalf the United States Student Association's (USSA) 1.5 million student members, we support the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act (H.R. 3393). The current crisis in higher education, and especially for low-income students, necessitates swift action for access and affordability.

This Act is a multi-pronged approach that would streamline existing tax credits—while making the American Opportunity Tax Credit permanent, increasing the maximum refundability, and enhancing coordination with the Pell Grant. Students are more likely to succeed if they do not have to navigate the complex landscape of higher education funding and support.

While we do believe that tax credits may not be the best solution in terms of expanding access and affordability for our low-income members—we much prefer funding and stronger support for the Pell Grant—we are nevertheless pleased that Congress is restarting an important conversation about simplification, thus benefiting all students and families.

Our vision is one in which students, no matter their race or socioeconomic status—have equal access and succeed in college—is paramount to the success of this nation. We look forward to working on these pressing issues with members of Congress.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I know we are hearing a lot from the other side about how this ought to be paid for, but they, frankly, exempted this from PAYGO. Well, what does that mean? They said this doesn't need to be paid for—this is such important policy—because if we can get people started on the road to an education by getting a college degree, their chances of succeeding economically in life are so much better. And that really has become a basic for succeeding in America today is to get that bachelor's degree.

I know they are concerned about the graduate students, but, frankly, the Tax Code isn't there for those going to Harvard Law and Stanford Medical School. And there are other provisions that help provide for students: grants, loans, and scholarships.

This is about how can the Tax Code, how can all Americans help those get that basic level of education that gets you that bachelor's degree that gets you on the road of economic opportunity, because if we don't have an upwardly mobile society, we actually put at risk the American Dream.

With that, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, thank my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee for all their help and their hard work on moving this bill forward. I would also like to thank Chairman CAMP for his leadership and for his dedication in helping American taxpayers and families, which is really what this bill is about.

Coming from two hardworking parents with no more than a ninth grade education between them, attending college was little more than just a dream for me growing up. Yet, with my parents' support and some hard work, I was able to be the first of my family to attend college and go on to graduate with a degree in nursing. This has allowed me to spend over 40 years working as a nurse in the health care industry.

Just as this dream was for me, pursuing higher education is a dream for millions of children and their parents across this great Nation. It is a well known fact that the cost of education is climbing and that, for far too many, the ability to save and pay for college without ending up under a mountain of debt is simply out of reach.

Today's broken Tax Code does little to ease that financial burden or to even provide a sense of security that education will be a reality in the future. That is why, under Chairman CAMP's leadership, I worked across the aisle with my colleague, DANNY DAVIS, as the chair and cochair of the Ways and Means Committee's Education Tax Reform Working Group last year.

Over the course of our 7-month bipartisan working group meetings, frustration with the Tax Code was a common theme of what we heard. For instance, there are currently 15 different tax benefits related to education. Four of those are designed to help individuals save prior to becoming a student, nine are available for while the student is in school, and two exist for when the student has completed his or her education.

It was overwhelming when we had tax experts explain it, so it was not difficult to imagine how parents trying to navigate these 90 pages of IRS instructions would simply toss up their hands and say, ''I give up.''

That is why the work that Mr. DAVIS and I did during the time together on this Education Tax Reform Working Group didn't end when we delivered our report to our colleagues. Instead, our desire to provide at least some relief from that frustration led the two of us to work to see how we could clean up the Code and help families struggling to finance education costs.

That process led us to introduce H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. Now, this legislation consolidates four existing education provisions—the Hope credit, the American opportunity tax credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the tuition deduction—into a single, modernized and strengthened AOTC.

Streamlining the number of education provisions and retooling those that are most effective allows us to simplify the Code and reduce some of the confusion that exists today. As a result, students can spend less time figuring out how to finance the cost of education and more time developing the skills they need to succeed in our knowledge-based economy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all can agree that it ought to be easier for any family to plan, save, and invest in education. Everyone in this Chamber can agree that we should do everything that we can to help American children attain higher education and achieve their dream.

So I am proud that, as the chairman has already referenced, the American Association of Community Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, the National Association of College Stores, and the United States Student Association—the United States Student Association—have announced their support for this bill.

Now I ask for my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this commonsense measure to help American students and families.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I include a letter from the American Council on Education with all of the signatories in the RECORD.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

Re Student and Family Tax Simplification Act (H.R. 3393)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the higher education associations listed below, I write to express concerns about H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and encourage further improvements to this important legislation when it is considered on the House floor next week.

We have long supported reform of the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC), the Hope Scholarship Credit, the Lifetime Learning Credit (LLC), and the tuition deduction. All of these currently are overly complex and difficult for students and their families to correctly use. We believe a consolidated credit can simplify the higher education tax benefits while retaining positive aspects of the present credits and deductions to better serve low- and middle-income traditional and nontraditional students now and in the future, helping them attain an associate or bachelor's degree or pursue postbaccalaureate education or lifelong learning.

Overall, H.R. 3393 takes several important steps forward to create a simpler, single tax credit. We applaud the fact that the bill increases refundability and includes an important fix to better coordinate the AOTC and the Pell Grant. We are also very pleased that the bill was amended at markup to maintain the AOTC's current income phase-out limits.

However, as we discussed in our attached letter of April 4, 2014 to Ways and Means Committee members, there are a number of other changes in the legislation which cause us great concern. Even as reported, the bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law. It also would harm graduate students and lifetime learners who utilize the tuition deduction or the LLC. Because we continue to have serious concerns about the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, we cannot support the bill as currently written, even in the form as reported.

As a result of our strong support for reforming these credits, we have had many discussions with tax staff over the past months about ways to implement reforms that address our concerns. We believe the legislation could be modified to ensure students who are currently eligible for a federal tax benefit could still receive some benefit. For example, one improvement we support is replacing the bill's proposed four-year limit for the AOTC with a lifetime dollar cap that would allow part-time, full-time, and graduate students to take advantage of the credit.

We remain deeply committed to continuing to work with the authors of the bill and the Ways and Means Committee to improve the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act to better serve traditional and non-traditional low- and middle-income students, now and in the future.

Sincerely,

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD,
President.

On behalf of:
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Council on Education
Association of American Universities
Association of Governing Boards
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
College and University Professional Association for Human Resources
Council for Christian Colleges & Universities
Council of Graduate Schools
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU).

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2014.

Re Higher Education Provisions in the Tax Reform Act of 2014 Discussion Draft

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of the American Council on Education and the undersigned higher education associations, we write regarding your recently released discussion draft of the Tax Reform Act of 2014. We commend you for your leadership on an issue as important as tax reform. Reforming the tax code is a critical element to addressing our nation's long-term fiscal health. There are a number of provisions in your discussion draft that would affect students and families, as well as the colleges and universities that serve them. We write now to comment on the education incentives addressed in your discussion draft. In the near future, we will offer additional comments on other provisions affecting higher education.

While the federal tax code is no substitute for the Pell Grant, Federal Work-Study, other federal student aid programs, and the financial aid colleges and universities provide, over the past two decades it has played an increasingly important role in helping low- and middle-income students and families finance higher education. The tax code contains a number of provisions, enacted discretely over time, that together create a framework that functions as a kind of ''three-legged stool'' intended to advance three important goals: 1) to encourage saving for higher education; 2) to help students and families pay for college; and 3) to assist with the repayment of student loans. This framework helps serve the needs of low- and middle-income students and families as they invest in themselves and their resources in higher education. Moreover, the broadening of access to higher education has larger benefits by helping to sustain a stable and productive society. We believe this framework should be strengthened and made more effective to aid more students and families.

We are very pleased to see that the discussion draft seeks to create a simpler, consolidated higher education tax credit. However, we believe that ultimately, the draft would make substantial changes to a number of higher education tax incentives that will undermine the ''three-legged stool'' framework and increase the burden on students and families in paying for college. While we support simplification, it can and should be

done in a way that will not effectively increase the cost of a higher education for middle-income and nontraditional low-income students and families.

PROVISIONS TO HELP PAY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The current tax code contains several provisions that help students and families pay for higher education: the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC), the Lifelong Learning Credit (LLC), the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses (tuition deduction), Section 127 Employer-provided Educational Assistance, and Sec. 117(d) Qualified Tuition Reductions.

THE AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT, THE LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT, AND THE TUITION DEDUCTION

We strongly support reform of current tax credits and the tuition deduction to provide students a single credit that provides assistance towards an associate or bachelor's degree, post-baccalaureate education and lifelong learning. Like you, we believe such a tax credit would serve students better than the current overly complex credits and tuition deduction. Indeed, we endorsed the Universal Higher Education and Lifetime Learning Act of 2007 (H.R. 2458), bipartisan legislation which you introduced in the 110th Congress with then-Rep. Rahm Emanuel, which would have created a simpler, consolidated tax credit. Overall, the discussion draft takes several important steps forward to create a simpler, single tax credit. Unfortunately, some of the changes made by the draft would in fact be steps backward for many students and their families who benefit under current law.

Among the most positive steps forward, the bill maintains the expanded eligible expenses of the AOTC, which includes required course materials, as well as permanently extending and indexing a reconfigured AOTC. In a provision particularly important to the neediest students, the bill increases AOTC refundability to 60 percent from the current 40 percent, and permits eligible students to get the maximum value of $1,500 in refundability more easily.

Equally important, the draft better coordinates the interaction of the AOTC with the Pell Grant, and, for the first time, completely excludes the Pell Grant from taxable income. Under current law, the AOTC contains a grant/scholarship offset that has the unintended effect of sharply limiting the size of the tax credit for needy students. As a result, some of the lowest-income students receiving the maximum Pell Grant award ($5,645 for the current academic year) receive no benefit from the AOTC, regardless of the level of refundability. We applaud you for addressing this problem, which is crucial to helping these needy students.

Unfortunately, the draft would make other changes that would eliminate benefits for many students and thereby adversely impact their financial ability to pursue an associate or bachelor's degree, graduate education, or lifelong learning. In short, we believe that the single, consolidated tax credit created by the draft will harm traditional middle-income undergraduates, adult learners (particularly those with lower incomes), and low- and middle-income graduate students. Because of the draft's reconfigured AOTC, which significantly lowers current income eligibility phase-outs, eliminates the Lifetime Learning Credit, and the tuition deduction, these students would not receive tax benefits they currently rely upon to help finance their higher education.

First, the draft appears to rely on outdated assumptions about the typical student in higher education. Today, nearly 50 percent of undergraduates and three-quarters of all students are adult learners, age 23 or older, with a quarter over age 30, a proportion that will likely continue to grow. These students are not just older than their traditional classmates. They tend to work full-time or have dependents—including multiple roles as parents and caregivers—serve in the military, or some combination of these, and take a longer time to complete their degree. Moreover, 50 percent of all students attend part-time, which inevitably increases time to completion. While the median time to degree for all bachelor's degree recipients is 4.3 years, for adult students (between ages 24–29), the median time to degree is 6.6 years. Consequently, the bill's four-year limit on benefits, in combination with the elimination of the LLC and tuition deduction for which part-time students are eligible, will cost many undergraduates financial assistance.

A reformed, consolidated credit should preserve current benefits for as many students as possible and take into account the demographic profile of today's students described above. The number of these nontraditional students will increase in the future, and any legislation that creates a permanent, consolidated credit should address their needs. A lifetime dollar usage cap on the benefit rather than a four-year limitation is a potential solution.

Second, with its adoption of the Hope Tax Credit income phase-out limits, the draft reduces the income phase-outs to amounts originally enacted in 1997 for the Hope Tax Credit, which are well below those in the current AOTC. This change would make many middle-income students and their families ineligible for benefits. Many of these families are increasingly caught between stagnant wage growth and their ineligibility for most other forms of federal financial aid. Moreover, these reduced income phase-out limits do not take into account the realities of the cost of living in different regions of the country. For example, no one would consider as wealthy a two-wage earning couple, such as a retail manager and a teacher, living in a high-cost area with one or more children and a combined family income of $135,000. This is equally true of the single parent earning $72,000 with a college-bound child or two. Yet, both families would be ineligible under the reconfigured AOTC in this bill.

Third, the reconfigured AOTC proposed in this draft would provide no benefit to lifelong learners and graduate students, many of whom are low-income and need assistance in pursuing additional skill development or the advanced degrees that employers and our economy require. We need to preserve tax benefits that enhance access for such students.

According to the Tax Policy Center, recent data demonstrate that the LLC is serving students with low and moderate incomes. In 2013, approximately 1.95 million students with an income at or below $75,000 utilized the LLC, including 1 million with an income of $40,000 or less.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, in 2011–12, a quarter of all graduate students earned less than $11,000, and half were below $32,000. During that same year, there were 1.3 million master's degree students—nearly three-quarters of all graduate students—and approximately 31 percent received no financial aid. Forty-six percent of all master's students and 25 percent of all doctoral students borrowed for their degree. The median amount of those loans per year was $15,665 for master's students and $17,629 for doctoral students. The percentage of African American and Hispanic master's and doctoral students with loans was higher than the national average, and their median loan balances were higher as well. A significant number of master's students pursue degrees in fields that are not highly compensated, like teaching, social work, counseling, or public health. The loss of benefits for graduate students under this draft comes on top of recent decisions by policy makers to end graduate-student eligibility for federal subsidized loans and force them to pay higher interest rates on student loans than undergraduates, a troubling pattern of increasing the cost of education for students pursuing advanced degrees.

In short, we are concerned that the bill takes away benefits from one set of students—both low- and middle-income, as well graduate students—to pay for aid to a narrower set of low-income students. While the goal to enhance assistance to the neediest students is laudable and certainly a goal we share, we do not believe it should be at the expense of other students and families who may be struggling to invest in a higher education.

Given your long-standing interest in improving these overly complex education incentives as well as the bipartisan support for action on this issue, we believe the time may be right to make important reforms to these provisions. Unfortunately, we cannot support the approach taken in the discussion draft. Instead, we urge you to consider other legislative models for reform, such as your previous legislation and the American Opportunity Tax Credit Act of 2013 (H.R. 1738), which would also consolidate the AOTC and Lifetime Learning Credit into one simplified, permanent AOTC but in ways that address the concerns outlined above.

SECTION 127 EMPLOYER-PROVIDED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Section 127 allows employers to offer employees up to $5,250 annually in tuition assistance, which is excluded from taxable income. It is effectively a matching grant program in which the federal government forgoes a proportionally small amount of revenue to leverage the investment employers make in their employees and the American workforce. According to the most recent available Department of Education data, the more than 1.1 million American workers who used this tuition assistance in the 2011–12 academic year had average annual earnings of $53,880. This provision has been an important means of building and adding to the competencies of the workforce and is a critical tool to help our nation accelerate its economic growth. The top majors among recipients of this benefit include those in the STEM fields. More than 35 percent of degrees pursued by employees using education assistance are master's degrees.

Section 127 was made permanent in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. Instead of repealing Section 127, we firmly believe this overwhelmingly successful element of the tax code should be enhanced to allow employers to offer higher levels of tax-favored tuition assistance to their employees. We recommend that the $5,250 annual limit, which has not changed since the 1970s, be increased with an automatic adjustment for inflation. This would be an extremely effective reform that would generate more private sector funds for financial aid to low- and middle-income students.

SECTION 117(D) QUALIFIED TUITION REDUCTIONS

Section 117(d) permits educational institutions, including colleges and universities, to provide their employees, spouses, or dependents with tuition reductions that are excluded from taxable income. This long-standing provision helps employees and members of their families afford a college education, providing an important benefit to many middle and low-income college employees. A broad cross-section of our employees benefit from Section 117(d). Indeed, under the law, if an institution chooses to offer this benefit, then all employees must be able to receive it. As such, the benefit has been used by a range of employees, including secretaries and other front-line administrative staff and maintenance and janitorial staff, as well as faculty. In addition to the help it provides our employees, Section 117(d) also gives colleges and universities an important tool for recruiting and retaining valued employees, helping maintain the quality of education our schools can offer. It has been particularly important for many small, private, denominational schools to compete for top employees. Eliminating this benefit would particularly harm employees who are poised to send their children to college and have premised their career choices and college savings decisions on the existing tuition benefits for their children, hurting the lowest-paid college employees the most. For these reasons, Section 117(d) should be preserved.

PROVISIONS TO ASSIST IN REPAYMENT OF STUDENT LOANS:

The current tax code contains provisions that affect the ability of students to repay their student loan debt. As students increasingly have come to rely on loans to finance their college education, we strongly believe the tax code should continue to assist borrowers as they repay their loans.

REPEAL OF STUDENT LOAN INTEREST DEDUCTION (SLID):

The draft would repeal the above-the-line deduction for student loan interest. SLID currently permits taxpayers with less than $75,000 of income ($155,000 for joint filers) to deduct up to $2,500 in federal student loan interest payments each year. To qualify, a student loan must have been for qualified educational expenses, such as tuition and fees, course materials, and room and board.

Over the course of an undergraduate education, many students take out at least one federal student loan. According to the College Board, 34 percent of undergraduates used federal loans to finance their education in the 2012–13 academic year. Managing student loan debt after graduation can be a significant hardship. Recent federal actions have increased borrowing costs by eliminating the six-month interest grace period college graduates previously received and by implementing interest charges for graduate student borrowers while they are in school. With these increased loan costs, SLID has become even more important. The current $2,500 interest limit has been in place since 1997. SLID should not be eliminated.

EXCLUSION OF DISCHARGE OF STUDENT LOAN DEBT:

The discussion draft would repeal the tax exclusion for student loan debt forgiven for individuals that worked for a specified time period in certain professions or for a class of employers. This tax exclusion applies to several federal and state loan forgiveness programs, including the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) for borrowers working in government and certain nonprofit jobs, TEACH to assist future teachers, and the National Health Services Corps Loan Repayment Program, which assists medical health professionals working in underserved areas of the country. Each of these programs permits former students with high student loan debt to more easily manage their debt and avoid default in exchange for working, likely for lower salaries, in ways that help serve our society.

Congress created various student loan forgiveness programs, including some of the programs mentioned above, in an effort to increase college access and affordability by lowering the burden of student loan debt. We have long supported these efforts and the tax exclusion of the discharge of remaining student loan debt as part of these programs because we believe in the policy goal and the attendant benefits it provides to the larger society. Indeed, we have long advocated that this tax exclusion be extended to two other federal loan forgiveness programs, the Income-Based Repayment (IBR) and Income Contingent Repayment (ICR), to which it does not currently apply. Repeal of the current tax exclusion of discharge of student loan debt would undermine the purpose of these important loan forgiveness programs. In addition, for those programs that require regular loan repayment over many years, taxing the discharge of remaining student loan debt would amount to punishment of these responsible borrowers.

Currently, there are approximately 20 million students enrolled in college in the United States, with approximately 12 million (60 percent) taking out student loans to pay for college. Student loan debt is now in excess of $1 trillion, exceeding debt in consumer credit cards. At a time when more students are borrowing more money for college, it would be a terrible and shortsighted policy decision to repeal the current tax exclusion for discharge of student loan debt. Instead, this exclusion should be preserved and expanded to cover amounts forgiven under the IBR and ICR programs

CONCLUSION:

As we know you agree, our nation's long-term economic growth depends upon a larger, well-educated and trained workforce. Despite their well-documented flaws, the current AOTC, LLC, and the tuition deduction work in tandem with other forms of federal student financial support, including Sections 127 and 117(d) and other tax provisions, to enhance access to education, advance attainment and workforce development goals, and help sustain a vibrant society. We are confident that a consolidated credit can simplify the higher education tax benefits while still retaining aspects of the present credits and deductions that serve an increasingly diverse student population. In addition, we strongly believe that comprehensive tax reform provides a critical opportunity to enhance the ''three-legged stool'' framework of federal education tax incentives.

We stand ready to work with you to improve your discussion draft in ways that will advance the broader goal of reforming the education tax incentives to better serve traditional and non-traditional low- and middle-income students now and in the future.

Sincerely,

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD,
President.

On behalf of:

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Council on Education

Association of American Universities

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

College and University Professional Association for Human Resources

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities

Council of Graduate Schools

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Today's bill is another element of a Republican agenda that has consistently weakened our Federal commitment to educational opportunity.

I agree with the American Council on Education which said:

''The Federal Tax Code is no substitute for the Pell grant, Federal Work-Study, and other Federal student aid programs.''

Republicans have voted again and again in this Congress to cut these investments in our future. House Republicans approved a budget that would eliminate $90 billion of Pell grants, would deny 125,000 students Federal Work-Study assistance, and would have reduced funding for Hispanic-serving universities and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Now the Republicans come to the floor and are really boasting of the fact that this particular version of the bill does not cut Federal tax incentives for education as much as they wanted to.

□ 1615

As originally introduced by my colleague from Tennessee, this bill would have denied 5 million Americans every year an opportunity to use education tax incentives that exist under current law. They would have slashed assistance under the act by $5 billion a year, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. And so they went back and tinkered with it a little bit, and they are here today to brag that they have a D-minus bill and that is better than the failing bill that they offered initially.

I understand that after years of opposing this particular incentive, they might want to change course. They all voted against the improvements, the changes that I authored in 2009 for the American Opportunity Tax Credit. They have consistently opposed the concept of refundability, that is, assisting those students who might not have a tax liability as big as the amount of the credit. And it is progress that they have come around to supporting the credit at all and the concept of helping those at the bottom of the ladder.

But while they have reduced the depths of the serious cuts that they proposed only a few months ago to these tax incentives, they have not

stopped the bleeding. They deny assistance to many students across America who are assisted by our current law. That is why, as my colleague Mr. LEVIN pointed out, a group of educational institutions, whether it is Hispanic colleges or Christian colleges or land grant colleges, they all oppose this bill. They have said, and again I quote:

''The bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law.''

That is what the educational experts say. And that is because the bill eliminates a guarantee under existing law called the Lifetime Learning Credit. It is eliminated entirely for so many students, and it is important to understand who those students are because I have seen and talked with them at places like San Antonio College, ACC, and St. Philip's College.

What kind of person are we talking about? Someone who is a single mother, who has a child to take care of, and continues to work trying to get her associate's degree first, to move out of a low-wage job into a better job, and then go on to UT or somewhere else, but she can't get it all done in 4 years; a mid-level worker who wants to shift industries and needs to upgrade his or her skills for a job in the new economy. They have to work and go to school at night. They can't get it all done in 4 years. A recent college graduate who says, you know, in order to get the job I am best qualified for, I am going to have to have a master's degree. But they are denied assistance and the opportunity to climb up the economic ladder of success, not by the existing law, but by the changes that the Republicans proposed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. All these students lose out. The impact is serious. According to the Department of Education, about half of all students pursuing a higher education attend part time, which inevitably extends the time it takes for them to complete the degree.

Eliminating a tax incentive for higher education that takes more than 4 years away will deal a blow to nearly 2 million students across America who claimed the Lifetime Learning Credit, or they did in 2013. Of these, about a million earn less than $40,000 a year. That is who is being cut by this.

I have legislation that over 100 of our colleagues have joined to do all the streamlining they talk about, but to make the American Opportunity Tax Credit permanent and to ensure that we don't cut out benefits to students who are counting on these benefits, we need to reject this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. We need to reject this bill that still comes up too short for too many students. We need to let them succeed in today's global economy and ensure that students have the support that America needs to be competitive and successful.

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

I do want to say that this was an incredible experience for me to be able to work with such a fine gentleman as Mr. DAVIS.

We began this process with the chairman giving us an opportunity to take a look at this very complicated group of tax provisions in our code. What we found, with the Joint Committee on Taxation helping us, as I referenced in my opening remarks, there are 90 different pages, no less the fact that there are provisions that step on top of one another, and we actually asked the Joint Committee on Taxation, to help simplify this, to do a diagram for us, just a flowchart.

What we found was, they came back and said this is so complicated that we can't even do a flowchart that would make sense. So we set out asking various groups to come and talk to us. These went all of the way from the very conservative, the very progressive side, think tanks, universities, colleges, those who represented the 529 provision, and to just come and let us know about what they thought about what was currently in the code.

We heard consistently over and over again, it didn't matter where they were on the spectrum, we heard this is so complicated that people are not even using it because they can't figure it out. As a matter of fact, there is a GAO study that indicated that 1.5 million tax filers who qualify for either the tuition and fee deduction or the lifetime learning credit in 2009 did not even claim the credit or the deduction because of its complication.

So it was my honor to work with my esteemed colleague in going to work to say: What can we do to simplify this so that we can make sure that people who really need this assistance are going to get that assistance that is there in the code but they can't even figure it out?

So after about 7 months, hammering back and forth about what we felt would best fit the needs of the students of this country and help to get them a start in college, to get them going, to be sure that they would have that opportunity to use those tax credits, we came up with this product. We then rolled it out with a press conference, and I am very proud to say that this was an effort of bipartisanship, one that I think if we could do more of that here in Congress, we would be accomplishing a lot. So it really is my honor to stand here today with my colleague who we worked so well together on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my real pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a distinguished—to put it lightly—member of our committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. It is amazing how any bill that reaches the House, all you have to do is put a title on it and then not read it, and you think you have got something going. Listen to the way this bill, H.R. 3393, is described. It sounds like the committee that put it together was well on the way to reform, that they have taken a whole lot of complex provisions and combined them into one to make it easier for the applicant to understand what is going on. The problem with that is when you do all of that and make it simple, and then put a trillion-dollar bill on top of it and make it permanent and cut off benefits for other people, it just shows that when people use the word ''reform,'' it doesn't necessarily mean that you are doing better.

I admired the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when he put together a tax bill and had the courage to eliminate a lot of the tax credits that were not paid for, a lot of loopholes that were in the law, and I think it was supposed to be revenue neutral, as difficult as that sounded. But no one ever thought, certainly not PAUL RYAN, when he said:

> The people deserve a government that works for them, not one that buries them in more debt.

Well, this is exactly what this bill does. It is permanent. There are no provisions to pay for it, and it buries us in more debt.

But what really annoyed me the most was this 4-year limit because, if I can just beg the House for its indulgence, when I came out of the Army, I thought I was the cat's meow in terms of how much people appreciated my contribution to the security of this country. And of course I went to the Veterans Administration to see what my benefits as related to education would be. They told me the first thing I had to do was to take an aptitude test and that Catholic Charities would provide the test. So I picked up my rosary and I went to Catholic Charities, and they asked me a lot of questions.

When they completed it, they concluded that I should be studying to become a mortician or an electrician. I didn't emphasize that I was Catholic because I didn't think it would make that much difference. But when I refused to agree with that conclusion and asked them to show me one question that I answered that would allow them to believe that I should be a mortician or an electrician, they said: My son, it is not so much that, it is just that you have a 4-year cap on the education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RANGEL. They said you have a 4-year cap on the education. I was shocked to be reminded that I hadn't completed high school. I had to complete 2 years of high school and 4 years of college. Instead of telling me that, I found out the hard way that I had a 4-year ceiling. Well, I was able to convince them after a year to reduce my 2 years by combining it with credits for 1 year and the college for 4 years to 3 years, so I got under the hammer.

But I cannot imagine, when technology means so much for a person to hold onto their job, just to keep up with the technology that is there, when they can almost feel the elevation of the qualifications that are necessary, that the United States Government would say: Well, you almost made it because we have just put a 4-year cap on your ability to really be productive in this country.

But I guess what hurts me the most is the hypocrisy that is involved here when we talk about the national debt. Is that something we just have to talk about? Should we talk about the interest that we pay on the national debt, or should we really just talk about getting a Tax Code that is simplified, that does encourage economic growth, and that does make it possible for people to believe there is equity in this.

Now, I know the chairman had a beautiful draft and it was lauded by Republicans and Democrats, but this is the end of the session and we find ourselves with the tax bills accumulating a trillion dollars worth of debt, so why talk about giving someone an education when the debt of the Nation may bury them, as the chairman of the Budget Committee has said.

So I am convinced that the image hasn't changed, but the method in presenting a cutoff of benefits has changed in how it is presented.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the esteemed chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, when I hear my friends from the other side talk about their concern for the growing national debt, I know we must have a good bill because they don't want to talk about the bill. The deficit went up every year the Democrats were in the majority, and it has gone down every year the Republicans have been in the majority, but let me talk a little bit about this piece of legislation.

When it was created, it was not paid for. It was created for 2 years. When it was renewed in 2010 for 2 years, it was not paid for. When it was renewed in 2012 for 5 years, it was not paid for.

What we have in this country is repeatedly renewing tax policy for short term, not paying for it, not making it reliable. We are the only nation in the world that does this. What we are looking for is not only making this policy simpler and easier to understand, as the sponsor of the bill has explained very well, but we also want to make this permanent so we don't have to come back and wonder, so families that are planning for three or four of their kids to go to college over the next 10 years don't have to wonder, Are these provisions going to be there? Am I going to finally figure out these 100 pages of instructions and start to plan for my children's college education only to find, oh, Congress didn't get around to extending this provision this time?

□ 1630

So part of this is about permanency. How do we make these policies last? Also, how do we make sure that people at the lower end of the economic ladder have a chance to save for college, have a chance to get in college, even though they may not have income to qualify for some of the tax credits?

This reform does that. I think this is an important step forward. It has been extended basically for a budget window without being paid for by both parties, so let's call it what it is, it is permanent policy.

Let's make it permanent policy so families and students can rely on a constant policy, so that they can plan and save for a college education, which is becoming more and more a basic standard that people need to succeed in life.

I think if we can do anything this year, it is about making a statement that we want to help families and students succeed not only in school, but also going forward in their careers and lives.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, my friend from Michigan. I hope his solution here today, given the dysfunction that we have seen in the process coming out of this Congress in recent years, is not just to come forward with a series of permanent changes to the U.S. Tax Code without paying for any of it and exploding our national debt for future generations to have to grapple with, but unfortunately, that has been the trend in the Ways and Means Committee over the last couple of months.

I also want to commend the work that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) has done with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) in putting together this bipartisan bill.

I am all for simplification of the Tax Code. I am all for streamlining these tax credits to make it easier for students and their families to better afford higher education. I am all for finding a bipartisan path forward to make sure that no student is left behind, that those doors of educational opportunity are there and open for all Americans, but we ought to do that the right way, not the wrong way.

Unfortunately, the bill here before us today is the wrong way to approach the issue. First of all, it is one of 14 permanent changes to the Tax Code that have been reported out of the Ways and Means Committee now, exceeding over $800 billion, without any of it being offset and without a nickel of it being paid for—this on the heels of the last few years we have been trying to figure out a way to get our fiscal house put back in order.

There has been a whole lot of shrill and a whole lot of crying on this floor about runaway budget deficits and the unsustainable debt that our Nation has accumulated and the fact that we have to borrow so much money from China. This bill compounds that problem. It doesn't solve it.

This bill alone would add close to $97 billion to the national debt over the next 10 years. Again, none of it paid for, but there are also some substantive problems with this bill, too, that, unfortunately, due to a lack of hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, due to a lack of discussion and feedback from our universities throughout the country, is not addressed, not the least of which—and I have heard this from universities back in Wisconsin—that there is a significant administrative change hiding in this bill.

Currently, schools can report either eligible tuition charges that are billed to students or paid to students. This bill takes away the billing aspect of reporting to the IRS.

Now, that is probably a trend that we ought to pursue and should fix in the future, but to do it abruptly, given where the computer systems lie with their universities right now, is bound to cause severe disruption in regards to these tax credits for students.

I am afraid that it has not been well-vetted, and it hasn't been thought through because, again, it is an election year, and we are racing these bills to the floor in order to do our press releases back home and score cheap political points with constituencies that would prefer to see legislation advance without paying for it; but it is something that we ought to fix before we burden the bursars' offices throughout the Nation and trying to revamp their computer systems overnight. They are telling us it is not going to work.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Michigan has highlighted the impact this is going to have on our graduate

students. The graduate students are affected by the streamlining of the education credits that are embodied in this bill because only 4 years are available under this legislation. It is expected to have a profound impact on the affordability of graduate education for students throughout the Nation. I don't think that has been vetted all that well either.

It is because we are not doing regular order around here. It is an election year—I get it—and there is nothing easier in the world to bring permanent changes to the Tax Code that everyone would desire to see, but without making the tough decision and paying for it as well, while at the same time coming forward with budget resolutions that is cutting back on the availability of Pell grants for low-income students or workstudy programs for low-income students or TRIO or GEAR UP programs that are geared for low-income students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Somehow, some way, it became fashionable to cut those programs that have benefited low-income students, including myself. When I was a kid growing up, my family didn't have the financial means to send me to school, so I was able to qualify for a Pell grant, I did do workstudy all 4 years. Without that availability, I don't know where I would have ended up with my education.

That is where we seem to go to first in the budget for cuts and then coming forward today on a bill that will add $97 billion to the deficit without paying for it and without vetting it the way it should be. We have still got time. Let's do this right now.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' and give this body time to fix some of the deficiencies in the bill, but also to make the tough decision and do it in a fiscally responsible manner.

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

What I would like to do is read from a letter that we received in support of this legislation from the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees.

I am just going to lift a couple of paragraphs out of here that I think address some of the responses from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am only going to read three pieces, although there are more.

This is why they say that they believe this benefits college students. I want to read the one that says it ''makes AOTC Permanent: Currently set to expire at the end of 2017, the AOTC is the most important source of support for college students in the Tax Code. H.R. 3393 makes the benefit permanent and ensures that it will remain in place for students and families.''

The chairman referenced that just a few moments ago.

Another paragraph: ''Creates better alignment with the Pell grant: Currently, an estimated 1 million college students with unmet financial need do not receive any benefit from the AOTC due to its poor coordination with the Pell grant program. The vast majority of these students attend low-cost institutions, particularly community colleges.''

This bill remedies this situation.

Then the last piece: ''Indexes the AOTC to inflation: H.R. 3393 recognizes that college prices are not static and adjusts the AOTC for inflation starting in 2018.''

So I believe that that speaks to those pieces that we said are so important in this reform.

Now, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the leader of our conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader on this legislation—great work—and the chairman.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. I was the first in my family to graduate from college, and I understand firsthand the struggle that families face to pay for higher education. As a matter of fact, I am still paying off some student loans from graduate school.

For today's graduates, the picture is even much bleaker. In fact, seven out of 10 graduates are entering the workforce with $33,000 in student loan debt, up $2,000 just from last year. For many, student and parent loans are often the only option to address the higher cost of college.

Our outdated Tax Code is no help. With 15 different complicated overlapping provisions, we need a Tax Code that works for people. That is what H.R. 3393 does. It simplifies the Tax Code, so that families and students can actually use and benefit from it as they pursue higher education.

The latest unemployment rate for recent college graduates is 8½ percent. More than 16 percent of them are underemployed. We need every tool at our disposal to put money back in the pockets of families, so that they are empowered to make better choices.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3393.

Mr. LEVIN. Could I ask how much time there is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentlewoman have other speakers?

Mrs. BLACK. I am ready to close.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman has just talked about her work in graduate school. This bill would eliminate help for millions of people in graduate school. That is what this bill does.

I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Tax-based aid represents more than half of all nonloan Federal support for higher education, giving tax policy a critical role in promoting college affordability, access, and completion.

Although I strongly support improving the education credits for students and families, I cannot support the Republican piecemeal tax approach that would add $825 billion to the deficit and imperil our economic recovery and the well-being of our citizens.

As partners in the Education and Family Benefits Tax Working Group, I was delighted to work with Representative BLACK and her staff from Tennessee. I want to thank her and her staff for a wonderful legislative experience. It was, indeed, a delight.

I also want to commend Chairman CAMP for taking the bold initiative to put comprehensive tax reform in the discussion and on the table.

Our bill represents a bipartisan compromise that integrates promising reforms to tax-based education benefits suggested to us by both conservative and progressive stakeholders.

This bill simplifies our Tax Code and strengthens our investment in students and their families, expanding aid to the lowest-income students by modestly expanding the refundability of the credit, removing obstacles to claiming the credit, improving the coordination of tax and Pell policies, and indexing the credit to inflation.

However, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act was intended as part of comprehensive tax reform. Within a comprehensive package, policymakers are better able to pay for our tax cuts and ensure that groups of taxpayers who may lose out in one section are helped in others.

I look forward to continuing to work in a bipartisan way to improve education tax policy, but I oppose moving this bill in isolation of other education tax reforms and at the exclusion of other critical tax provisions that help the working poor, strengthen economically distressed communities, promote affordable housing, help cover public transportation costs, incentivize businesses to hire hard-to-employ workers, and assist teachers with classroom expenses.

I don't think anything is much more important than education affordability, but I believe that first things come first. For me right now, before I

would suggest spending any more money, I would suggest that we find a way to put an unemployment check in the hands of the 3 million people who are waiting in America, so they can live until they can get to college.

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

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

In conclusion, we favor on this side of the aisle simplification. We are in favor of reducing the number of pages. We are not in favor of leaving out millions of students.

□ 1645

This approach hasn't been refuted. It leaves out millions of undergraduates, millions of graduate students, and millions of people who are in longer-term education needs who can't complete college in 4 years, and, in many cases, want to go on to graduate school.

So what has happened here is another bill has come out of committee that is part of a package that was over $800 billion. It leaves out so many, yet you make it permanent. These are people permanently left out. Why?

Many of these bills go back some years. We will have to check back many years ago and see if perhaps they were paid for. The recent one was in the Recovery Act of 2009, which we favored, but we did not favor making permanent laws that would leave out. That is what is being done here.

I have heard: Oh, we will come back some other time. You are going to come back some other time when you have added a trillion dollars to the deficit? That is not believable.

Indeed, what is believable is the result of this kind of reckless course is it is going to squeeze further discretionary, nondefense expenditures. That squeezing out is, as I said earlier, is the hard-hearted approach of the Ryan budget.

We see what happens when Republicans essentially use the argument that we can't pay for it, when they cut all the kinds of programs that I mentioned at the beginning, so many were cut out in the Ryan Republican budget.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I could say a lot of things, but I don't think there is any better way for me to conclude than for me to read a letter that I will submit for the RECORD from a student who actually sent this to me today.

I do want to read it, but I think you will see after I read it that the emphasis here is that we are helping those who need help the most by what we are doing with the simplification of this particular part of the Code.

For the sake of the identity of the person, I am going to use the name Nancy.

Let me read this to you:

Dear Congresswoman Black, my name is Nancy, and I attend Atlanta Technical College. The additional $500 in refunds in your bill for students like me will be extremely beneficial.

I am the mother of five, full-time worker, and student. Although I intend to continue my higher education once I graduate from the Atlanta Technical College, I have found out my Pell grant will expire next semester. I now find myself in the position of taking out loans for future semesters to make sure my tuition and books are paid for.

I plan to use my taxes to help with this dilemma. The additional $500 may not seem like it would cover a lot, but in my case, it will cover at least one three-credit class or at least three of my textbooks. I would love the opportunity to have an option of using these moneys that are outright mine than to put myself in debt more by taking out a full amount of any loan.

My only hope is that you take this letter into consideration, for there are many others out there in my predicament.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BLACK, My name is Nancy and I attend Atlanta Technical College. The additional $500 in refunds in your bill for students like me would be extremely beneficial.

I am a mother of 5, full time worker and student. Although I intend to continue my higher education once I graduate from Atlanta Technical College, I have found out my Pell grant will expire next semester. I now find myself in the position of taking out loans for future semesters to make sure my tuition and books are paid for.

I plan to use my taxes to help with this dilemma. The additional $500 may not seem like it would cover a lot, but in my case, it will cover at least one 3 credit class or at least 3 of my textbooks. I would love the opportunity to have an option of using monies that are out right mine, than to put myself in debt more by taking out the full amount of any loan.

My only hope is that you take this letter into consideration, for there are many others out here in my predicament.

Mrs. BLACK. I think there is no better way than to end with something that comes from the heart of a student who is working so hard. She has five children and is a full-time worker and student. Because of the refundability of this tax provision, if it were placed into law, you can see how it would really help those who we are trying to help the very most.

So I would urge my colleagues, for the sake of helping our students, especially those who are at the lower and middle income, to support H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sinema moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3393 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 4. INFORMING STUDENTS OF SAVINGS THROUGH LOWER INTEREST RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in publications relating to the credit allowed under section 25A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, include a table that illustrates the difference between monthly payment amounts (with respect to various principal amounts and, at a minimum, under a standard repayment plan) for specified higher education loans—

(1) under the applicable rate of interest on such loans as determined under section 455(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and

(2) under a rate of interest on such loans that is 2 percent lower than such applicable rate of interest.

(b) SPECIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN.—For purposes of this section, the term ''specified higher education loan'' means any loan which is made under part B, D, or C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This motion is straightforward and common sense. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to provide students with the information they need to compare the costs of student loans.

In providing information on tax credits, the Treasury Secretary must publish a table showing the amount of savings that a student would achieve on a monthly basis under different student loan rates. Students should be provided this important information before they take on debt.

Mr. Speaker, our country has a student debt crisis. As an adjunct professor at Arizona State University, I frequently hear from my students about how difficult it is to effectively manage their student loans.

Angela Schultz, Brian Garcia, Iliamari Vazquez, Brandie Reiner, Jack Welty, Andy Albright, Diego Soto, Anthony Carly, Ellen Hamilton, Ariel Carlos, Kent Fogg, Joe Slaven, Brandy Pantilione, Gary Brewer, and Christopher Valles are only a few of the young college graduates from Arizona

State University, my alma mater, who shared their stories with me.

Some of these young people are my students at Arizona State University. Some are recent graduates. Some of them are thinking of starting a family, while others are working hard to care for the families they already have.

What do these graduates want? They just want a fair shot. They want to know that their hard work in college mattered, that it led to the promise that their parents made to them when they were little—the promise we all believe in: if you work hard and play by the rules, you can succeed.

Essentially, they want what each one of us has wanted for ourselves, what we want for our own kids, and what we are working for in our districts. They want a shot at the American Dream.

Angela graduated from Arizona State University in 2012. She now faces the biggest financial hurdle of her life. She doesn't face massive medical bills or an expensive car loan. It is not rent or mortgage payments. It is a bill for over $85,000 in student loans. Iliamari will graduate in 2015. When she does, she will have over $64,000 in student loans.

Nationally, outstanding student loans now total more than $1.2 trillion, surpassing total credit card debt, and every year, students are taking on more. An estimated 71 percent of college seniors had debt in 2012, with an average outstanding balance of $29,400 for those who borrowed to get a bachelor's degree.

Young people are foregoing long-term job opportunities and home ownership in order to meet the urgent demands of their large student loan payments.

I relied on Pell grants, academic scholarships, and Federal loans all through school, just like my Arizona State students do today. I know students need guidance and assistance to manage their student debt.

I talk to young people who are excited to share their ideas and thoughts with me about how to solve some of the world's biggest problems. However, it concerns me that these same young people are daunted by the prospect of an expensive education that they want, but fear they cannot afford.

Rising college costs are putting higher education and the American Dream out of reach for too many hardworking Arizona families. Education is key to economic growth and job creation and, for many, it is a clear pathway out of poverty. I know this because education was the key to my own path out of poverty and to the middle class.

We must take action to combat this crisis. We need to give students the information they need to make smart decisions about paying for education. That is why I offered this motion to recommit today. It is why I am asking my colleagues to support this reasonable motion, and I call on Congress to do more to make the American Dream accessible and affordable for more American families.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with helping give middle class families the resources need to send their kids to college. This has nothing to do with making tax policy more certain, easier to understand, or simplifying a very complex area of the Tax Code. This has nothing to do with helping families who are struggling to pay for education.

Let's get on with trying to do that job. Let's reject this motion to recommit, let's pass the underlying bill, and let's help middle class America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 219, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—195

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce

Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Marchant
McAllister
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)

□ 1725

Messrs. GARRETT and DENHAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 187, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Amash
Bachmann
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garrett
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Marchant
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Royce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1731

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 449 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

TRIBUTE TO THE 193 DUTCH NATIONALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON MALAYSIAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 17

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Dutch Caucus here in the U.S. House of Representatives, I rise today with a heavy heart to express our condolences at the tragic loss of life of nearly 300 people on Malaysian Airlines Flight 17.

On that flight, there was one American and a number of others from Australia, Malaysia, and a number of other countries. But counted among those were 193 Dutch nationals. Just to put that in perspective, that is like having a country the size of the United States lose over 3,600 people. That is the impact that it has had with our friends in the Netherlands. This attack on innocent civilians can only be described, I believe, as an act of terror, as it was flying over Ukrainian airspace.

We are rising today jointly, in a bipartisan fashion, to express our condolences to our friends in the Netherlands. The Netherlands was the first nation to ever recognize our Nation, the United States of America, officially back during the Revolutionary War. And they have been stalwart partners and stalwart friends throughout the history of our country.

With that, I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend and colleague for yielding. I am honored to stand with him and all of us in solidarity with the people of the Netherlands and the families and loved ones of all the victims of that act of terror.

We look forward to working together to make sure that this situation is resolved as quickly as possible and the perpetrators are held accountable. I know we all stand together on that as well. And I am grateful to my colleague from Michigan for bringing us together for this purpose.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today we humbly ask our colleagues to join us in a moment of silence as we pay our respects and honor the memory of all 298 passengers aboard MH17 that had their lives tragically cut short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members please rise for a moment of silence.

PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 207, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—205

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Capito
DesJarlais
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Kingston
Lewis
Marchant
Meeks
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pompeo
Rogers (MI)
Tiberi
Whitfield

□ 1743

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4098

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from H.R. 4098.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 203 of the Senate amendment (relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with title V of the Senate amendment (relating to health care related to sexual trauma); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the military sexual trauma provisions that were included in the Senate-passed H.R. 3230 and to urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to instruct conferees to accept these provisions.

As you know, the statistics on military sexual assault are staggering. In 2012, a Pentagon survey estimated that 26,000 women and men were sexually assaulted. However, the Pentagon only received 3,374 formal allegations. Clearly, there remains a deep-seated cultural problem in the military that discourages our servicemen and -women from coming forward to report cases of sexual assault.

Nonetheless, if one counts those cases reported, more and more men and women are currently leaving the military with PTSD from sexual assault. This cannot continue. Military sexual assault is the ultimate violation of the basic principles of trust, respect, honor, and dignity that is the bedrock of the principles our military men and women expect and deserve, and they are principles our country rightly demands.

Changing culture, as anyone from the public or private sectors know, and those of us dealing with issues at the Veterans Administration know all too well, changing culture is very difficult. But the culture of our military must change, and we, my colleagues, need to accelerate that change, from the military chain of command to reforms of our military justice system.

Clearly, preventing military sexual assault in the first place is critical, but it is equally critical that we provide servicemembers leaving the military who have suffered from sexual assault, to make access to care at the VA easier and safer, to make sure survivors get the benefits and services they need, and to ensure that the VA provides the very best treatment possible.

Compassion and care are a critical part of healing for those who have been sexually assaulted. We need an environment where it is safe to speak up and where we would never find anyone's story unjustly dismissed or treated with indifference, which would only make the trauma and the wound even deeper.

We have a bill before us that provides relief not only for those who have endured sexual assault, but for so many of the issues facing our veterans at this very moment.

I deeply appreciate the leadership from our chairman on the committee, who has done a tremendous amount to help our veterans, and he continues to do so. But the time to act is now. The crisis is clear. We have a path to address it. We have veterans who deserve it, and we have a Congress willing to provide the resources needed.

We have said time and time again in our hearings we need big change and big ideas. We need real transformation, and, most importantly, we need a VA whose sole purpose and mission is to serve our veterans with the same vigor and sacrifice that our veterans have served our country.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans must come first in everything we do. There is a lot of work ahead of us that the VA needs to do, and our committee must continue to do so. Persistent and consistent oversight every step of the way on our part will leverage the leadership and the strategic plan from within the VA to ensure that we deliver timely and quality health care with a compassion that our veterans and their families have earned and deserve.

I have no doubt that the leadership of the chairman has been instrumental to our committee's being able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to get us to this point, and it is imperative that we continue to work in a bipartisan fashion. Our veterans are counting on us, and our country is counting on us.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health and someone who has respected all of the work of the committee on these issues, it is my belief that our veterans simply cannot and should not wait another day.

We have a bill that the Senate has passed and that we know the House would pass. We are currently scheduled by the Speaker to recess next Thursday. If the Speaker keeps to that timeline, we need to accept what is on the table: a bill that we know can pass both Houses and that we know the President will sign so that our veterans receive the care they deserve. We must include the provisions to improve VA treatment for survivors of military sexual trauma.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to instruct conferees, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct would require the House to recede to the Senate amendments to H.R. 3230. As Chairman MILLER has stated during debate on nearly identical motions to instruct last week and again last night, the foremost goals of the House and Senate conference committee are, one, to improve timely access to high-quality health care for veterans who have been waiting for weeks, months, or even years; and, two, to improve the accountability and overall operations of the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system. This was the central charge to the conferees at the beginning of the conference and remains so today. I have no doubt that my colleague from California, Congresswoman BROWNLEY, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, shares these goals. However, this motion does not further our pursuit of them.

Tonight, our attention is best spent devoted to finding a true compromise—one that best serves our Nation's veterans and taxpayers and lays the foundation for correcting the departmental deficiencies that have brought us here—and not tying the conference committee's hands with an unnecessary, unhelpful, unbinding, and time-consuming motion to instruct.

As the gentlewoman knows, because she was in the Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing with the acting VA Secretary, this morning, Chairman MILLER offered a proposal that would largely agree with nearly everything in the Senate bill, with a few minor exceptions.

Chairman MILLER's proposal would accept title I through title VII of the original Senate bill, with amended language to include all 27 leases authorized by the House last December in H.R. 3521 rather than the 26 that the Senate approved; provide VA with $102 million for fiscal year 2014 to address the Department's internal funding

shortfalls; provide $10 billion of no-year, mandatory, emergency funding to cover the cost of the Senate's choice provisions, with the remaining Senate provisions subject to appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am supportive of Chairman MILLER's proposal because it is a fair, commonsense approach that ensures Congress is able to continue its oversight to ensure that taxpayers' funds are spent wisely.

As we all know, recently, Senator SANDERS, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and cochair of the conference committee, has indicated his desire to expand the scope of the conference to include VA's recent request for an additional $17.6 billion. We call that an airdrop. Unfortunately, there is virtually no parachute in the form of detailed justification for this request, and to a great extent, Congress' acceptance of unsubstantiated funding requests in the past have helped get us to where we are today.

This summer, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has held multiple full committee oversight hearings to discuss the access and accountability failures VA has been subjecting our veterans to. These hearings have confirmed that the problems VA is facing today require long-term and large-scale reform. Adding more money, more people, and more infrastructure to a system that has not proven itself able to make effective use of its existing resources that it has been provided without first implementing underlying reforms does not serve our veterans well and will not prevent them from continuing to face unacceptably long patient waiting times.

It has been proven time and time again by the VA inspector general, the Government Accountability Office, the administration, and others that VA has been suffering from widespread data manipulation and a systemic lack of integrity.

Given that, what confidence do we have that the $17.6 billion resource request that VA is now making is based on data that is valid or reliable, particularly given that the committee has received very little analysis, justification, or verification of these numbers?

Before Congress can contemplate devoting such a significant amount of taxpayer money, it is imperative that VA provide a full accounting of each additional dollar that is being requested. The resource request the Department has put forward so far is not the well thought-out and thoroughly justifiable position that our Nation's veterans and our taxpayers deserve. Rather, it is an unsubstantiated guess put together in the back room of a massive bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe we could have already come to an agreement if Senator SANDERS would not have insisted on moving the goalposts so dramatically. The House has passed almost a dozen bills reforming the VA that have waited months for Senate consideration. The Senate could pass those bills and send them to the President to become law today.

I would remind Ms. BROWNLEY that one such bill, H.R. 2527, would extend VA's military sexual trauma counseling, along with care and treatment programs, for veterans for sexual trauma that occurred during Active Duty or Active Duty for training to veterans who experienced such trauma during inactive duty training.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, we are continually trying to work out a deal with the Senate, but I would submit to this body these motions to instruct are unproductive, are slowing down the conference process, and have become nothing more than a political ploy to distract from the true issues facing our veterans and the conference committee.

So with that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to instruct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to recognize my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado. He has worked hard on this committee. I want to make clear that what we are talking about today is the bill that passed the Senate 93–3. So we are not talking about an airdrop or moving the goalpost; we are talking about the bill that passed out of the Senate 93–3.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) who has been a leader on this issue and introduced the Military Sexual Trauma Claims Administration Reform and Eligibility Act.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from California for yielding to me, and for addressing this important issue of coverage for victims of sexual assault in the National Guard.

I rise in support of the Brownley motion to instruct. As you have heard described, this proposal addresses an unacceptable gap in current law that effectively leaves some victims of military sexual assault without the support and treatment they need.

Members of the National Guard and other reserve components of the armed services have fought bravely for our country, many completing numerous tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the attacks on September 11, more than 50,000 guardsmen and guardswomen have been called to service both at home and abroad. We recognize the value of their service, of the National Guard, and of other reserve components, and we thank them for their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, some guardsmen and -women, like other members of the armed services, are victimized by sexual assault while on Active Duty. If that happens, they are provided all of the VA resources and services they need to recover and heal, physically and emotionally. These benefits, however, are not offered to members of the National Guard or other reserve components who experience sexual assault while on inactive training missions. For example, members of the Guard are required to participate in training missions one weekend a month and two weeks a year, but benefits and services, such as counseling and medical care, do not extend to victims sexually assaulted during those mandatory training missions. This oversight is simply unacceptable and leaves so many who have served our country so bravely without assistance or support during a devastating time.

On May 28, the House unanimously agreed to a solution to this problem by passing legislation I introduced last year, the bipartisan National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act. This legislation is supported by a number of the leading veterans service organizations.

The National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act would fix this omission and clarify that all victims of sexual trauma in the National Guard or other reserve components have access to the care they need to help them recover from acts of sexual trauma while they are on inactive or reserve duty.

The Senate wisely included this language in the VA reform bill that passed their body 93–3, and it is important that this provision, which has been passed by the House already, be included in the final version of the bill. I was pleased to hear it mentioned by our colleague from Colorado, so I am glad that there is support for keeping it in the conference report.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Brownley motion to instruct to ensure that all victims of sexual assault, regardless of what kind of duty they are on, have access to the care they need.

Mr. LAMBORN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), a valued and insightful member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BROWNLEY for her friendship and for her commitment to our Nation's veterans.

I rise to support the Brownley motion to instruct the conferees on H.R. 3230. It has been one of the most humble honors for me to serve on the Veterans' Affairs committee, one of the most bipartisan committees in this Congress.

This week I had the honor to join my constituent, Sergeant Ryan Pitts, as he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Honor at the White House, and my

husband and I joined Ryan and his wife, Amy, and their son, Luke, at the Pentagon as he was inducted into the Hall of Fame. He honored his colleagues, the chosen few who lost their lives in Afghanistan, and on his behalf and on their behalf it is a tremendous privilege for me to continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in service to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and outraged when our committee uncovered long wait times, secret wait lists, and manipulated records at the Veterans Administration. When our men and women in uniform return home after fighting for our freedom, they should never ever have to fight just to receive the medical care that they have earned and they deserve. That is why I was proud to work with Republicans and Democrats to pass commonsense reforms to hold VA leaders accountable and increase access to care for our veterans.

I also partnered with the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) to cosponsor legislation that puts forward even stronger VA reforms and which has already passed in the Senate. Both Chambers of Congress have passed bipartisan bills in response to the scandal at the VA, and now it is time to finish the job and reconcile this legislation.

We owe it to our veterans to stay right here in Washington and to work together until we can send a final bill to the President's desk to improve care for all our veterans. And we must ensure that this final legislation contains strong protections for veteran survivors of sexual trauma.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, sexual assault in our military is a full-blown epidemic. According to the Department of Defense, an estimated 26,000 servicemembers have suffered unwanted sexual contact in just 2012 alone. This is an outrage. When a young woman or a young man signs up to serve our country, they know that they may face danger in combat, but it is unacceptable that so many of these brave Americans are attacked every year by their own colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KUSTER. It is unacceptable that so many of our brave Americans are attacked every year by their own colleagues. And when survivors come forward, which only happens a fraction of the time, our flawed military justice system often turns a blind eye.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to work across the aisle with our colleagues, JACKIE WALORSKI, LORETTA SANCHEZ, and many others to pass strong whistleblower protections into law and help prevent retaliation against those who bravely report these crimes. We need to continue to work together, and I implore our colleagues to join us in voting ''yes'' on the motion to instruct and to guarantee that our veterans will be protected.

I again partnered with Representative WALORSKI to introduce legislation to extend VA travel benefits to veterans travelling to seek treatment for injuries resulting from sexual trauma.

Republican and Democrat alike, so many of us fought to reform our military justice system and transfer authority to independent prosecutors.

And together, this House passed the Ruth Moore Act to help ensure that veterans suffering from sexual trauma have access to the services they need.

In a Congress bogged down by gridlock and partisanship, this issue has united both parties.

When working to rid our military of sexual assault, and to better serve its survivors, we have proven that Congress can still find common ground and solve problems.

So let's build on that progress and pass this motion, which would agree to Senate-passed language to expand VA services for the treatment of military sexual trauma.

In addition, this motion would improve coordination between the VA and Department of Defense.

These are goals that we can all support.

So I implore our colleagues—join us in voting yes, and let's continue the important work of protecting our service members from sexual assault, and guaranteeing only the best care for those veterans who suffered from these crimes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) who has been an extraordinary leader and champion, and also the cochair of the Military Sexual Assault Prevention Caucus.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROWNLEY for allowing me to speak on this very worthwhile motion, and I rise in support.

Statistics from the Department of Veterans Affairs indicate that as many as one in five women are sexually assaulted while serving in the military. But receiving benefits from the VA remains a challenge.

Last year, the Service Women's Action Network, the Yale Law School Veterans Legal Services Clinic, the ACLU, and the ACLU of Connecticut released a report showing that veterans who experience sexual assaults have their benefits claims denied more than veterans with other types of PTSD. The report also found the rate of granting these claims varied greatly depending on the particular VA regional office. The St. Paul, Minnesota, office granted only 26 percent of the military sexual trauma claims they received, while the office in Los Angeles granted more than 88 percent of the claims they received.

Anyone who has seen the powerful documentary ''The Invisible War'' has anguished along with Kori Cioca. Kori survived a horrific sexual assault while serving, and suffered severe injuries to her face and jaw incident to the assault. She waited for years for an answer from the VA on the jaw surgery she needed, but her claim was ultimately and shockingly denied.

The VA has a long way to go when it comes to granting benefits for survivors of military sexual trauma. The Senate provisions in section 503 of the Senate bill would make sure that Congress is better informed on how the VA is treating military sexual trauma.

Section 503 would also address what the VA is doing for male victims of sexual assault. According to the Defense Department, by the numbers, men in the military are more often victims of sexual assault than women.

Yesterday, Senator GILLIBRAND of New York screened a documentary on Capitol Hill called ''Justice Denied.'' In it, male victims tell the heart-wrenching stories of being sexually assaulted, and too often being ignored by their commands after they reported an attack and isolated by their fellow servicemembers for doing so. We must do a better job—a much better job—of protecting these men and taking care of them after these incidents. The Senate bill allows us to start to do that.

Finally, section 501 expands eligibility for counseling services which are so important to people healing. About 2 years ago, a woman veteran came to my office to talk to me about being sexually assaulted while she was in the military. She hadn't spoken to many people about what had happened to her before, and it was difficult to do so. But she had just come from a summit where she had met a number of survivors just like her who had had similar experiences. This opportunity to meet people with similar stories and share their experiences strengthened her. She was similarly strengthened through counseling and group therapy. She has become more and more comfortable speaking about her story because of the treatment she has received. I have now seen her bravely telling her story to a rapt audience after a screening of ''The Invisible War.''

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this very important motion that will help to improve care to so many servicemembers.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) who has been instrumental in reforming the Uniform Code of Military Justice in her role on the House Armed Services Committee.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, whom I am honored to serve with and who I want to compliment for bringing recognition to this issue and a spotlight on the importance of providing this service to veterans when they are no longer in Active Duty.

The reason why this particular section 503 is so critical is because so few of these survivors ever come forward when they are on Active Duty to speak about their sexual assault. In fact, the military in many respects encourages them not to come forward because oftentimes the result is, when you do come forward, you are labeled as having a personality disorder and then honorably but involuntarily discharged from the military.

The stories I have heard over the last 3 or 4 years are really very disturbing because it makes the case over and over again that the military does not really want to deal with this issue.

□ 1815

So 26,000 sexual assaults or sexual harassments that take place to members of the military every year. 5,000—only 5,000 of them report them, only 500 of them go to court-martial, and only 250 see any kind of time in jail or prison.

There are many of these victims who upon retiring, upon being discharged from the military, are into drugs and alcohol, and all of a sudden find out that what is really driving their conditions is the fact that they were raped when they were in the military.

I had the opportunity just last week to spend some time at the MST program in Menlo Park, California, with five survivors who were in an inpatient program. They were all extraordinarily grateful for the opportunity they had to participate in that program.

They found it to be a lifesaver, literally a lifesaver. They were all on the brink before being admitted into this particular program and for the first time feel that they are getting their lives back, but one of the great eye-opening parts of that experience was that, of the five women, four of them would be homeless upon leaving this in-treatment program, which went on for about 45 days.

On top of everything else that we are learning about MST, I think it is important to recognize that survivors, particularly women survivors—but I believe it is true of men survivors as well—need to be in programs that are single-sex because they have so many issues associated with it and that we have got to find housing for them after they leave.

With that, I support the motion.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who has also been a leader and advocate for justice for our survivors in the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me add my appreciation to Ms. BROWNLEY for her leadership on this issue and for the women that are on the floor who are members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and members of the Armed Services Committee, who really have led this issue, which I believe all of America understands.

Let me thank Mr. LAMBORN, who is from Colorado and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and as we debate this motion to instruct, a personal plea to Mr. LAMBORN, that this is truly a reasoned response to the heinous number of women and some men in the United States military who have experienced traumatic sexual assault and trauma.

This is a simple motion to instruct. It asks us to cede to the provision in the Senate, which allows for the care, health care, under the veterans health care system, of those who have experienced sexual trauma.

As Ms. BROWNLEY has indicated, I am a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, and we address these questions through the Judiciary Committee on issues of domestic violence and sexual assault and find ways, of course, to be able to respond to women who have been victimized.

We took a long time to pass the Violence Against Women Act, but the whole idea was to include an infrastructure to protect women who are frightened to come forward and to acknowledge the criminality of domestic violence and violence against women.

Can we do no less for the women in the United States military who put on the uniform and took an oath to swear allegiance to the United States and to extend their bodies on the front lines to be able to protect this Nation, can we not do any less than to offer to them simple health care when they come forward on sexual trauma?

Just a few years ago, I provided a PTSD center at one of my nonveteran or nonmilitary hospitals. It was overwhelmingly received by veterans who were off campus and wanted to go to a place that was not as congested as a veterans hospital, but I will tell you that PTSD is truly a health phenomenon.

The distinctive sexual trauma that some of my colleagues have mentioned that women have hidden and never spoken about for years should not be rejected when they come forward finally because we have opened the system to be able to secure health care. They should not be, in essence, directed to a life of drug abuse and alcohol abuse because they are fearing. They should be able to get health care.

So I ask my colleagues, 26,000 and growing and others who are also involved, this is an important motion to instruct, and I congratulate, again, Ms. BROWNLEY. My heart breaks—as she served as the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs—my heart breaks that when you are abused, when your face is abused, when your body is abused, that is a health crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Having just come back from my community where two women and families have been killed through the violence of domestic violence, they live no more—but what about those who are soldiers who put on the uniform who are experiencing a lifelong experience of injuries and psychological trauma?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this motion to instruct offered by my colleague, Ms. BROWNLEY. What more can we do or how much less can we do for women and men who put on the uniform who are suffering from sexual trauma? It must be part of the Veterans' Affairs health reform.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire if the gentleman from Colorado will have any additional speakers?

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, there are no plans to have any additional speakers.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Then I am prepared to close.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge all Members to oppose the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would like to add that as ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, I led a hearing last July to address VA care and treatment for military sexual trauma survivors.

The subcommittee looked at the coordination of care and services offered by the Department of Defense and the VA. I was truly saddened to listen to the testimonies of those who spoke. Their pain and suffering was evident in every word they spoke. I know it was hard for all of them to share their stories, and I know all of us understand the immense bravery it took for them to do so.

I know that all of us, including those who have come to speak today, are dedicated to addressing military sexual assault. The Senate bill takes an important step forward toward that end. It is but one very important reason why I call on my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Let's insist that the Department of Defense and the VA address the epidemic of military sexual assault, which

must include appropriate care and treatment of trauma survivors, and let's adopt the language in the Senate bill that addresses military sexual trauma.

We have a bill before us that was crafted by Members of Congress whose dedication to our veterans is beyond question, but we are running out of time. We have a bill that we know will pass both Houses, that we know the President will sign, that we know will provide significant relief to our veterans immediately.

We simply cannot negotiate any longer. Time is of the essence. We should move forward. We should adopt the Senate bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to instruct conferees, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in my district, we buried Dr. Evelyn E. Thornton, the first African American to graduate from the University of Houston with a Ph.D. in math and a leader in civic matters and education.

Because of my responsibility of speaking at this civic leader's funeral home going service, I missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall vote No. 442, I would have voted ''no'' on the motion on ordering the previous question on H.R. 4935 and H.R. 3393;

On rollcall vote No. 443, I would have voted ''no'' on H. Res. 680, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4935, Child Tax Credit Improvement Act, and H.R. 3393, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act;

On rollcall vote No. 444, I would have voted ''yes'' on an amendment to H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act, offered by Mr. KILMER and Mr. HINOJOSA;

On rollcall vote No. 445, I would have voted ''yes'' on a motion to recommit H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act;

On rollcall vote No. 446, I would have voted ''yes'' on final passage of H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act;

On rollcall vote No. 447, I would have voted ''yes'' on H.R. 5111, to improve the response to victims of sex trafficking, by Representative BEATTY;

On rollcall vote No. 448, I would have voted ''yes'' on a motion to recommit on H.R. 3933, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act;

On rollcall vote No. 449, I would have voted ''no'' on H.R. 3393, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act; and

On rollcall vote No. 450, I would have voted ''yes'' on H.R. 3230, Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

16TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPITOL SHOOTING

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House observed a moment of silence to remember the loss of two heroes who gave their lives to protect others.

The deaths of Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut are heartbreaking. An additional tragedy, however, is that this House has not taken action to prevent such incidents from happening again.

The man who took the lives of the two police officers had paranoid schizophrenia and had previously been committed to a psychiatric hospital after threatening to kill the President, a hospital technician, and his neighbors. His paranoid delusions told him to attack the Capitol. Weston cycled in and out of emergency rooms as he refused medication and followup treatment.

We know that the perpetrator had a brain disease, but our broken mental health system prevents others like Weston from being treated. The sad truth of this situation is it won't be long before we read in the headlines of another preventable tragedy.

The memories of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut deserve our respect, their families our gratitude, but all families deserve our action.

We must pass H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because where there is no help there is no hope.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES OF JULY 3, 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to section 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the text of an amendment (the ''Amendment'') to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958, as amended (the ''1958 Agreement''). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Amendment. The joint unclassified letter submitted to me by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy providing a summary position on the unclassified portions of the Amendment is also enclosed. The joint classified letter and classified portions of the Amendment are being transmitted separately via appropriate channels.

The Amendment extends for 10 years (until December 31, 2024), provisions of the 1958 Agreement that permit the transfer between the United States and the United Kingdom of classified information concerning atomic weapons; nuclear technology and controlled nuclear information; material and equipment for the development of defense plans; training of personnel; evaluation of potential enemy capability; development of delivery systems; and the research, development, and design of military reactors. Additional revisions to portions of the Amendment and Annexes have been made to ensure consistency with current United States and United Kingdom policies and practice regarding nuclear threat reduction, naval nuclear propulsion, and personnel security.

In my judgment, the Amendment meets all statutory requirements. The United Kingdom intends to continue to maintain viable nuclear forces into the foreseeable future. Based on our previous close cooperation, and the fact that the United Kingdom continues to commit its nuclear forces to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have concluded it is in the United States national interest to continue to assist the United Kingdom in maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent.

I have approved the Amendment, authorized its execution, and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 24, 2014.*

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. EVELYN E. THORNTON

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I was on official business in Houston, honoring the life of Dr. Evelyn Thornton. She was a great American. Dr. Thornton was the mother of two wonderful daughters: Yvonne Denise, a trained lawyer; and Wanda, an outstanding physician honored by all.

Dr. Thornton, who lost an eye in her early twenties, went on to be the first African American to receive a Ph.D. from the University of Houston, a school that African Americans could not go to for many, many years.

She was a member of the Links and Alpha Kappa Alpha, but what she was known for is 40 years of teaching. Evelyn was an educator who lifted the lives of young people at Prairie View A&M.

She was a graduate of Texas Southern University, got married, had grandchildren, great-grandchildren, daughter-in-laws and a son-in-law, Russell, a leader in the community.

What was most noted is the simplistic style that Evelyn had of humility and her willingness to serve the people.

I would say that today we laid to rest in Houston a great American, Dr. Evelyn E. Thornton, whose contributions should continue to be remembered.

CHILDREN ARE A VULNERABLE POPULATION

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, in this country, we have reached the consensus that victims of human trafficking should be provided help. That consensus was north-south, east-west, conservative-liberal, and Democrat-Republican. Human trafficking victims need protections.

Now there is a discussion of truncating that protection, and we must say that would be wrong. We know especially for child victims that special care must be taken to elicit the facts of what has happened. And the idea that we would short-circuit that process for children who are human trafficking victims at our border is unconscionable.

Now we have received a letter from the National Association of Immigration Judges telling us the ground truth: that special care must be taken for child victims. These are not the same as other cases.

I include for the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Immigration Judges.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF IMMIGRATION JUDGES,
San Francisco, CA, July 22, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives.

Re Special Concerns Relating to Juveniles in Immigration Courts

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: The National Association of Immigration Judges (NAIJ) is a voluntary organization formed in 1971 with the objectives of promoting independence and enhancing the professionalism, dignity, and efficiency of the Immigration Court. We are the recognized collective bargaining representative of the fewer than 230 Immigration Judges located in 59 courts throughout the United States.

Our nation's Immigration Court system is currently facing an unprecedented surge in the numbers of unaccompanied minors who have presented themselves at our southern border seeking shelter. As you and your colleagues consider how to address this complex and urgent situation, we would like to offer our expertise to help inform your decision-making. The opinions provided here do not purport to represent the views of the DOJ, the Executive Office for Immigration Review or the Office of the Chief Immigration Judge. Rather, they represent the formal position of the NAIJ, and my personal opinions, which were formed after extensive consultation with members of the NAIJ.

In the legal arena, it is universally accepted that children and juveniles are a vulnerable population with special needs. Since the passage of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) in 2008, Congress has codified special provisions such as non-adversarial adjudication of unaccompanied children's asylum claims and, to the extent practicable, access to legal services through pro-bono representation. The law recognizes that these children are especially vulnerable to potential human trafficking and abuse. From the perspective of practicalities, because of their vulnerabilities and lack of full competency, Immigration Court cases involving children and juveniles must be conducted in a different manner than those of adults. Immigration Judges are charged with assuring that those who come before them understand their rights and responsibilities under governing law. For minors, it can be especially challenging to effectively communicate the complicated nuances of our law and the possible remedies which may be available to them. Immigration judges are trained to alter their demeanor and lexicon to adapt to the more limited life experiences and understanding of minors, but that alone is not enough. The judge must carefully gauge the response they receive to be sure that the minor truly understands what he or she is being told, rather than feigning compliance in order to please the judge as an authority figure.

Judges must assure that a minor is put at ease in an inherently stressful and unfamiliar setting. These precautions are not solely for the benefit of the minor, but are a practical necessity for a judge in order to obtain the information necessary to arrive at a fair and accurate result based on a true understanding of the child's situation. To do so, an atmosphere of trust must be established, and a rapport developed which assures that the minor is both emotionally able and psychologically willing to discuss issues which may be embarrassing, shameful or traumatizing. In order to accomplish this, a judge frequently has to take more time than in the case of an adult to make the child feel sufficiently safe so as to fully participate in the hearing. This often involves multiple hearings, so that familiarity with the people, location and general process can ease tensions and inspire confidence.

Because many of the juveniles we see in proceedings come from countries where governmental authorities are corrupt or pose a danger to them, Immigration Judges need to be particularly aware of the environment in which their hearings are conducted, so that their neutrality and independence is clearly demonstrated, enabling a minor to address difficult issues without fear or a feeling of futility. We must go to great lengths to create an courtroom environment where our hearings are not perceived as coercive. Frequently we find that both children and adults who appear in Immigration Court do not understand the difference in the roles of the government trial attorneys and judges, and even when provided pro bono counsel, assume that everyone associated with the proceeding functions as a prosecutor or law enforcement official. At this early stage some of our judges have reported concerns about the lack of quality of interviews that have resulted in ''negative credible fear'' findings and summary deportation orders at the border. For all these reasons, it is particularly important that Immigration Judges be the ones charged with making these crucial determinations, rather than Border Patrol agents.

The complexity of a judge's job is increased exponentially due to the language and cultural differences which we routinely encounter, as well as the limitations upon minors who are not represented by attorneys. Under governing regulation, children under sixteen without responsible adults to help them cannot accept service of the charging documents which initiate removal proceedings, and those under fourteen without a responsible adult cannot enter pleadings to those charges. In addition, in the vast majority of cases, the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility for relief rests on the minor, even though their ability to gather the evidence necessary to support their claim—whether it is personal documentation, general country conditions information or expert opinions—is greatly reduced because of their age. In many cases, the lack of corroborating evidence may be fatal to a claim for relief from removal. This is even more true for a child's case, since their ability to provide clear, consistent and detailed testimony that could support a claim without corroborating evidence may be compromised by their age.

All these factors lead inexorably to the conclusion that removal proceedings regarding juveniles should not be subject to strict time constraints regarding scheduling or decision-making. Judges need the ability to tailor the time frames of various aspects of the proceedings to the emotional, physical and psychological state of the individual in court. The ability to find local counsel or obtain supporting evidence and documentation can vary significantly depending on an individual's age, mental capacity and custodial circumstances.

The adage ''haste makes waste'' is apropos to the context of these cases, because speeding up or truncating the process creates an unacceptably high risk of legal errors which directly lead to higher rates of appeal. Rather than making the process move more

quickly overall, the opposite occurs as appeals cause a backlog and delay at the higher levels of our court systems, which in turn, drives up the fiscal costs of these proceedings. This effect has been proven by past experience when proceedings at the Board of Immigration Appeals were ''streamlined'' only to result in an outcry from the federal circuit courts and harsh criticism of the lack of proper records for them to review, resulting in remands rather than resolutions. Similarly, bypasses to Immigration Court proceedings such as expedited removal proceedings have been subject to serious criticisms by neutral observers, including the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees. In this situation, the concern is not that ''haste makes waste,'' but that hasty decisions could result in loss of lives or limbs, by deporting individuals to a country where they face persecution.

It is our experience that when noncitizens are represented by attorneys, Immigration Judges are able to conduct proceedings more expeditiously and resolve cases more quickly. Judges have found that cases with legal representation generally 1) reduce the number and length of proceedings for benefits for which individuals are ineligible; 2) generally require fewer continuances for preparation (including when applications must be processed with other agencies); 3) obviate appeals based on a lack of understanding regarding legal rights or concerns about fairness; 4) take less hearing time for judges because they are better researched and organized; and 5) tend to reduce the number of futile claims which utterly lack a basis in the law. Because of those and several additional reasons why attorneys are beneficial to our process, allowing judges to grant reasonable requests for continuances, based on their knowledge of the local availability of low fee and pro bono counsel, ends up being the most time-efficient approach.

A due process review of the fundamental fairness of any proceeding requires consideration of three distinct factors: first, the nature of the private interest affected; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation through the procedures used and the probable value of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and finally, the fiscal and administrative burdens that those additional or substitute procedural requirements would place on the government. Immigration Judges are in the best position to guarantee due process, while at the same time efficiently and fairly conducting removal proceedings. However, to do so, they must be given the flexibility to balance the needs of the individual appearing in court with the interests of an expeditious adjudication based on the unique situation presented in each case. Rigid deadlines hamper rather than enhance that ability, and artificial constraints on the time necessary to fairly adjudicate cases will likely promote litigation, rather than resolve individual cases. For all these reasons. NAIJ strongly opposes the proposed implementation of a seven-day adjudication time frame for these cases.

With the proper allocation of resources to allow the hiring of sufficient Immigration Judges and support staff to assist them, we would be able to schedule all hearings within appropriate time frames. Justice would be served and legal challenges to individual outcomes reduced. While the need to address the surge in juveniles is seen as paramount now, the overall context of this crisis cannot be overlooked. As of today's date, there are only 228 full time Immigration Judges in field offices, handling a nationwide caseload of more than 375,500 cases. The average time to decision nationally has now climbed to 587 days. The unfortunate and ironic fact is that with long delays, people whose cases will eventually be granted relief suffer, while those with cases which will ultimately be denied benefit. Individuals with ''strong'' cases are trapped in limbo inside the United States while family members abroad become ill and die, family members who can provide them with eligibility for an immigration benefit die, and their claim for relief becomes stale by the passage of time. Conversely, those individuals who do not qualify for benefits, or who have adverse discretionary factors making them undeserving of legal status are allowed to remain for years, possibly accruing eligibility for relief, while their cases are pending.

We believe that the totality of this situation deserves your immediate attention, so that fairness and balance can be assured to all who appear in our nation's Immigration Courts. If the general needs of our entire caseload are sacrificed to address the short term crisis, we fear that the overall reputation of the Immigration Court system will be damaged unnecessarily and irreparably.

Of course, if we can provide any additional information or answer specific questions you may have, please just let us know.

Very truly yours,

DANA LEIGH MARKS,
President.

□ 1830

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be here today on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, along with other members of the Progressive Caucus. We have long fought for the middle class and those aspiring to be in the middle class. Today, specifically, we want to address Congressman PAUL RYAN's plan to help alleviate poverty in this Nation.

Needless to say, we were excited to find out a Republican wanted to talk about poverty, given the votes that we have had this session in this body. Whether it be the draconian cuts that appeared in the House Republican budget, the slashing of food stamps and assistance to the most needy in this country, to see a Republican finally stand up and talk about poverty, we were excited. And we want to have that conversation this evening.

So just what is in Congressman PAUL RYAN's plan to help alleviate poverty? I am sure it must be something about raising the minimum wage to $10.10 in the next 3 years so that we can help lift people who are making $15,000 a year out of poverty. I am sure it addresses equal pay for equal work so that men and women are paid for doing the same work. But it doesn't appear that is part of PAUL RYAN's plan.

I am sure it addresses some educational issues. I am sure it helps people pay back their loans at lower rates and makes sure we have expanded Pell grants available so that no one should be denied a higher education simply because they can't afford it. No, that is not part of the Ryan plan either.

I am sure there is an investment in early childhood education, because every person in this room must surely know that if we help invest at those earliest years, you can have a lifetime of experiences and opportunities for someone. That is not in the plan either.

Surely, it must address investments in infrastructure. We have crumbling roads and bridges. We have bridges and roads that are old enough that they are eligible for Medicare in this country. Surely, putting people back to work at a time like this and investing in our infrastructure would make sense. It is also not in the Ryan plan.

Let me try one more thing. It has got to be here. We must provide incentives to create good-paying jobs here in America rather than overseas. Clearly, the 21st century Make It In America Act must not be in the plan either.

All those things that I just mentioned—raising the minimum wage, making sure we have equal pay for equal work, expanding opportunity through expanded Pell grants and helping people refinance their student loans, helping people get access to early education and investing in our infrastructure and jobs here at home—are part of the House Democratic Middle Class Jumpstart program. They are what we would do in our first 100 days if we were to take over the majority after this fall.

But surely there must be something we could talk about today in PAUL RYAN's plan. There has got to be something equally bold and, hopefully, not just old, a bunch of old ideas warmed over, brought back to us in versions of block grants and not really providing any real assistance that the most needy in this country need.

I am joined by a number of my colleagues today who are going to address exactly what is in PAUL RYAN's plan and perhaps how we can offer a little different perspective to help the most needy in our country.

I would like to start out with a very esteemed and respected colleague from Illinois, Representative DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much. I am pleased to be here to join you, Mr. POCAN, and other members of the Progressive Caucus as we talk about the real deal in terms of what it is that you do to reduce poverty.

I read some of what we are talking about, and I really couldn't believe that that had anything to do with the reduction or any efforts to seriously reduce poverty.

We have made some progress in the last 50 years, but it is unacceptable that 49.7 million people, including 13 million children, were poor in 2012. In my congressional district alone, 41 percent of children, or 67,000 children, live in poverty. It also is shameful that racial disparities remain in the experience of poverty, with child poverty for African Americans being 29.2 percent, in 2012, compared to 9 percent for their White peers.

And so I welcome working with anybody that would like to reduce poverty. As a matter of fact, ever since I have been here, I have championed two of the chief proposals mentioned by the Ryan plan: expanding the earned income tax credit to childless and noncustodial parents, as well as reducing incarceration among low-risk and nonviolent offenders.

The earned income tax credit is one of the most effective antipoverty programs that we have. A Brookings Institution report highlights that the high rate of incarceration in our country exacts considerable cost from American taxpayers, especially from State governments and families.

However, I am extremely concerned about the proposed way of paying for these programs. Rather than asking large corporations to pay their fair share of taxes or closing international tax loopholes that allow large, multinational companies to evade billions of dollars in taxes, the Ryan plan would eliminate or eviscerate many important programs like the Social Services Block Grant and the Economic Development Administration.

So I don't know what Mr. RYAN is really talking about. It seems to me that he is talking the same talk we have heard so often.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. DAVIS, you are a member of the Ways and Means Committee so perhaps we can seek some clarification on the earned income tax credit expansion, which you say you have championed, and that is a very effective antipoverty program, one of the elements in the Ryan antipoverty program that you say is a good feature but you object to the pay-for for the expansion of the earned income tax credit.

In order to expand it to folks up to age 64, as he proposes, which is a great idea—and incentives work, because he says a lot of poor people don't want to work—this would enable low-income people to have that subsidy through the Tax Code, as we benefit many corporations that same way.

Just recently, the Ways and Means Committee just extended about $618 billion of corporate taxes. I am wondering what the pay-for for these corporate extenders were.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. They didn't really deal with pay-fors. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that many of us objected to the piecemeal way in which the Republicans are looking at what we call tax reform is we have been trying to move towards comprehensive tax reform where you look at all of the taxation that we are doing. And yes, there would be what is called some losers and some winners, but you wouldn't cherry pick and just give corporate giveaways and not do things like make sure that you have got the new market tax credits in, which are designed to help redevelop, restore, and reconstitute communities that are hurting, that are seriously underfunded and don't have things.

Many communities in my district which were actually burned out by the riots after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King are still burned out.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. DAVIS, that was very confusing to me, and I will take my seat, but I just wanted clarification on that.

The earned income tax credit, which is a benefit that is provided to ordinary Americans through the Tax Code, we are required to eviscerate programs like Meals on Wheels for elders through the Social Services Block Grant and to get rid of maybe some of the low-income heating programs that heat homes in places like Chicago that are cold in order to pay for an expansion of the earned income tax credit, but the $618 billion in tax cuts which were designed to be just temporary but you made permanent the other day, I guess you pay for it by not giving unemployment compensation to people.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let's say the majority on the committee made it permanent because we voted—that is, those of us who are Democrats voted against it. That is why I think it is so important that we are here this evening.

I just simply want to again commend Mr. POCAN for taking the leadership to bring us together and give us the opportunity to discuss these issues.

I just say: Right on, my brother. I am glad to be here with you.

□ 1845

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative DAVIS, so much for all of your advocacy on behalf of those who are struggling to be in the middle class and for making sure we can try to reduce poverty.

Representative DAVIS is right. There are a couple of nuggets that are in the Ryan proposal that make sense. I think there could be bipartisan support for criminal sentencing reform. There should be, and it is long past due, and it is good to see that proposed in the plan.

As Representative GWEN MOORE from Milwaukee so eloquently put forth, expanding tax credits for childless workers is something through the earned income tax credit we would support except that, perhaps, the Ryan proposal doesn't quite fund it in a way that makes sense.

So there are a few nuggets in there, but there is an awful lot that really doesn't do much about reducing poverty and, in fact, would probably, very likely, increase poverty in the near term.

I would like to yield to another colleague of mine, to someone who has been this body's, really, most outspoken person in talking about poverty. She is leading a task force for the Democratic Caucus that specifically addresses poverty. I would like to yield to my great colleague from the State of California, Representative BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you, Mr. POCAN, for yielding but also for organizing, not only this Special Order tonight, but for having these Special Orders in order to really raise a level of awareness with regard to these important issues facing millions of Americans in our country. We know that you are here every week, sometimes by yourself, but I have to thank you for your tremendous leadership and for helping the Progressive Caucus continue to beat the drum on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we all know today that, of course, the Republican Budget Committee chair, PAUL RYAN, rolled out his expanding opportunities for all plan for addressing poverty in America. That is what it is called.

I can say, like you, I am happy to see that there are some areas we can work on together in this plan. That includes fixing our broken criminal justice system, expanding and supporting the earned income tax credit if we don't, as his plan calls for, rob Peter to pay Paul. I am glad to see that the conversation on poverty in this country is finally catching up and catching on with my Republican colleagues at the national level.

We have been working for a long time—our task force, you, all of us here tonight on this floor and others—to try to get this urgent issue the attention it really requires here in the House of Representatives, but we know that, ultimately, most of Mr. RYAN's recommendations are more about rhetoric than reality.

My question in looking at his list of proposals is, first of all: Where is the jobs plan? We all know that the primary means and pathway out of poverty is a good-paying job with benefits.

Add to that that his proposal has, really, the same—I call it—old-time block granting proposals that we have seen, once again, for, I guess, 4 years in the Ryan budget. In fact, if you will recall, the Ryan Republican budget takes more than two-thirds of its cuts from programs that serve low-income and vulnerable Americans. When he talks

about consolidating programs, including SNAP, into block grants, it is as if he is forgetting that his budget cuts $300 billion in these 11 programs for the next 10 years. I can't quite figure out why the rhetoric in the plan lays this out, but yet his budget takes the same plan and cuts $300 billion.

It does nothing, as I said, to create jobs. It does nothing to provide Americans a living wage or to extend unemployment insurance to the 3.3 million long-term unemployed. People really need to understand that this plan is not about substance. It is about Republicans trying to put a compassionate face on their draconian policies. That is what this is about.

Some of us have raised some key questions about this proposal, and I would like to just lay out some of these questions when we are evaluating his plan. The House Ways and Means Committee, under the tremendous leadership of our ranking member, SANDY LEVIN, laid out some of these questions, which include:

Does compassionate conservatism really just mean cutting spending while saying you are about caring for the poor?

Will this plan include proposals that have been shown to both reward work and reduce poverty, such as increasing the minimum wage and extending benefits to the long-term unemployed who are looking for work?

Will Representative RYAN support flexible assistance to States to help struggling Americans or will he push States to cut such assistance?

Will Mr. RYAN's proposal fit into a balanced approach to address the deficit?

I just have to say, Mr. POCAN and others who are listening tonight, in this block granting proposal and in many of his proposals, there are work requirements. For any of the services or for any of the programs, you have to have a job. They have cut workforce training, and they have not created any jobs, so their work requirement as eligibility for programs that help provide this bridge over troubled waters just doesn't make any sense. It is wrong. Unless you have got a full-employment economy and unless the recession has really ensured that everyone has a good-paying job, then a work requirement to be eligible for benefits in order to help reduce poverty or to help lift you out of poverty is just counterproductive, and it doesn't make any sense. This is something that we have to continue to work on in terms of Mr. RYAN. We need this conversation. It needs to be bipartisan.

This week, some of us are taking the Live the Wage Challenge from the Raise the Wage coalition. We are living on $77 a week, which is what a minimum wage employee in this country has to live on after taxes and housing expenses. We are doing this, though, to raise awareness of the everyday struggles of millions of our constituents. We will be off of this $77-a-week budget in a week, but millions of our constituents won't be. I wish that this plan would really have a pathway so that millions of our constituents would be able to live off of a good-paying job with benefits.

Finally, let me just say that this Congress should focus on supporting and expanding programs that are working to lift people out of poverty—programs that have worked for the last 50 years since the war on poverty began—such as Head Start. I will tell you that we have got a long way to go. We shouldn't talk about cutting these programs. They have helped people move into the middle class. We know that. We should not play politics with poverty.

I hope the Republicans really get real about reducing poverty rather than trying to fool the public, and that is what is happening now. They are trying to fool the public with this new brand, and it is a new brand of conservative compassion, but I will tell you that this rhetoric has nothing to do with the reality of the Ryan budget. This is where the rubber meets the road.

Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to talk about this.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative LEE.

Representative LEE and I and Representative MOORE all serve on the Budget Committee, and we have had a lot of time to see the PAUL RYAN Republican budget.

When you talk about the SNAP program, I will just give one example. I remember, in this body, we had a debate as to whether we were going to cut $20 billion or eventually $39 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Yet we knew, when the Ryan budget was proposed—the Republican budget that was voted on in this body—the cuts to the SNAP program were $135 billion. Either there has been a rebirth in how we look at poverty from the other side of the aisle or, perhaps, there is just a little different packaging of some of the same bad ideas that just sound a little better, and I really appreciate your bringing those out.

Ms. MOORE. Before you leave, I wanted to know if you would respond to a question, Ms. LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Yes.

Ms. MOORE. You mentioned in your remarks that, in the Budget Committee and on the budget that this House passed, there were 300—was it ''billion'' dollars in cuts?

Ms. LEE of California. It was $300 billion by consolidating the 11 programs that he wants to block grant to the States.

Ms. MOORE. But what he says in his rollout is that this is budget neutral, which means that it won't cost taxpayers any more. It is budget neutral, and it won't cost taxpayers any more, but it also will not cut programs. It is a really clever sort of budgeting trick on one hand, don't you think, to say you are not going to cut it from where you have already cut it?

Ms. LEE of California. It is more than clever. I think it is wrong to mislead the public as it relates to the numbers. It is cooking the books. It is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It may be budget neutral, but, definitely, the cuts will take place in order to get to a budget neutral plan, and that is the problem I have with this. By consolidating all of these programs and by block-granting these programs, who is going to see the cuts and feel the cuts of the block granting? It is going to be the most vulnerable.

Thank you very much for raising that, but it is true. We see this on the Budget Committee each and every day.

Mr. POCAN. Representative LEE, if you would yield to one more question since we are talking about the bad math that we all too often see from the other side of the aisle: Didn't we also, during the budget, see some incredibly bad math when it came to the budget's repealing the benefits of the Affordable Care Act but its somehow trying to keep the revenue in savings? Wasn't that bad math something like $2 trillion worth of bad math, and now we are supposed to accept this $300 billion, allegedly, ''no cuts'' to the program? What were those numbers?

Ms. LEE of California. It was very interesting. Of course, they have opposed the Affordable Care Act and have tried to repeal it—what?—50-some times now, but yet have captured the savings, which the Affordable Care Act is very clear on having made, to base their budget on those captured savings.

I think that, again, it is fuzzy math, and it is a way to deceive the public. It is a way to promote their policies of making sure that those who have access to affordable health care now don't have it in the future and that those who need it will be prevented from gaining it through the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. MOORE. I just want to ask you one more question about this fuzzy math, Congresswoman, since you serve on the Budget Committee.

The SNAP program is an entitlement program. What it means is, if you are eligible for food stamps, you receive them. Food stamps were critical in getting people over the hump in the recession. People sometimes reported that their only income was these food stamps.

So, if you see block grant SNAP—and correct me if I am wrong—what that means is that no matter how bad the economy becomes—because we have a countercyclical economy if we get a recession or a depression—and no matter

how many people are eligible for food stamps, once you get your block grant, your some certain amount of money, and once that money runs out, then you will find yourself on a waiting list or not being served. Is that how you understand a ''block grant''?

Ms. LEE of California. Exactly, Congresswoman MOORE. I am glad you raised that because that is exactly what happens.

First of all, there will be some requirements of the States but not many, and once the States run out of money, it is too bad. Food stamp recipients may or may not receive the type of assistance they need to help them with this as a bridge over troubled waters. It is not a fair system. We would see more people being cut from SNAP rolls, and we would also see more people needing food stamps because of the safety net being eroded even further. So it is a catch-23. Block-granting all of this to the States would harm the most vulnerable.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Representative LEE. I appreciate it. Your final comments about how hard it is to actually be able to eat a block grant, perhaps, is part of the problem of why we don't quite trust what we see in that it will work as presented. Thank you so much for your time.

I would like to yield to another colleague of mine who is also from the State of California. He is one of my fellow freshman colleagues, Representative MARK TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Earlier today, your colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) released his long-awaited antipoverty plan. This is a bold step for Mr. RYAN because, if you look at the history of the Republican Party, there is a clear and undeniable pattern of implementing policies that help the top 2 percent but that do nothing for those struggling to make ends meet. Of course, they have proposed various ''reforms'' over the years, but those initiatives were never anything other than safety net cuts or ineffective, recycled ideas disguised as reform. I am thinking of a childhood jingle, ''Jack and the Beanstalk''—Fee-fi-fo-fum. I smell the budget of faux reform.

□ 1900

That appears to be the case here.

Mr. RYAN calls his new plan an ''Opportunity Grant,'' as it would consolidate safety net programs such as food stamps and housing vouchers into a single grant to States.

If that sounds familiar, that is because an ''Opportunity Grant'' is nothing more than block grants under a new name, and block grants have been shown to have limited impact in helping to lift people out of poverty.

Now, if Mr. RYAN really wanted to lift people out of poverty, he would support a raise in the minimum wage. Raising the minimum wage will increase the take-home pay for more than 28 million workers, add $35 billion to the economy in higher wages through 2016, and create 85,000 new jobs as a result of increased economic opportunity.

At the very least, I know that my colleague, BARBARA LEE from California, is, as I am, undertaking the challenge to live on a minimum wage by living off of $77, the average amount of money left over for full-time minimum wage workers after taxes and housing expenses.

I would challenge Mr. RYAN to step inside the shoes of someone who is living on that minimum wage. Although I know I could never fully understand what it is like, this challenge will give me a small glimpse into the lives of many people in my district.

So I would like to invite Mr. RYAN to participate in the challenge so he can, for a brief moment, understand what it is like for people in poverty to live on such a wage. Perhaps then Mr. RYAN will understand that the same old recycled ideas will not help those who really are in need.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TAKANO, for all the work you are doing.

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield to a colleague of mine from the great State of Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a great friend of mine going back to the days in the State legislature, not only a great friend, but a great mentor to me.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Mr. POCAN. And I want to join my other colleagues for thanking you for your stewardship with the Progressive Caucus and putting this Special Order together.

I won't waste a lot of time complimenting our fellow Wisconsinite for at least listening to some of the ideas that have come from the Democratic side in his poverty plan. I think that looking at mandatory minimums is a long overdue sort of proposal that needs to get some traction.

Certainly, expanding the earned income tax credit for millions of Americans will make a true difference in many people's lives, and I just want to congratulate Mr. RYAN for that.

But let me be really clear. You don't have to really go through the entire 70 pages of his proposal because he starts right out in the beginning telling you that he doesn't believe that the safety net programs, that the efforts to help people get out of poverty for all these years, have been very helpful. He starts off by calling them a failure.

We all know that many of the programs created under FDR and President Lyndon Baines Johnson literally ended poverty among the elderly, for example. And we have seen poverty, as compared to what it would have been, cut at least by half because of Medicaid, because of Medicare, because of food stamps, because of other sorts of programs.

Yet, I guess Mr. RYAN believes that if you just keep saying it enough times, it will come true. We have heard Mr. RYAN lecture all of us, all over the country, about how the so-called entitlement programs are going to down our economy. He doesn't believe that the $618 billion worth of corporate tax breaks that he passed last week is a detriment to our economy, but he has called for, on a consistent basis, for privatizing Social Security, for block-granting Medicaid—not in this particular plan.

In case people don't understand what block-granting is, just think chopping block. You give the States some certain amount of money, and when they run out, they just run out. You are no longer categorically eligible.

He has proposed voucherizing Medicare, giving seniors some certain amount of money. You do very well if all you need is a flu shot. But if you have a heart attack or a stroke, that is not going to go very far toward your health care.

He has consistently—and now, in this particular proposal, block-granting one of the great entitlement programs, the SNAP program, which worked beautifully in the last recession. We now see the food stamp rolls going down, as the economy improves. And when the economy is bad, the food stamp rolls go up.

That did not happen with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act. It was not responsive to our countercylical economy. So what that really means is that these block-granted programs were fixed, framed, and frozen, starting out with a $300 billion cut. Eventually we will see that they will become totally inadequate toward ameliorating poverty, and we will see the poverty rolls creep up, and it will be particularly egregious on women and children.

Women and children: women, are disproportionately adversely impacted and benefit from these safety net programs. Food stamps: women disproportionately need food stamps, disproportionately use these programs.

The pay-fors, it is just egregious to say that we will provide the earned income tax credit and we will start by cutting programs like Meals on Wheels for the elderly and the food and nutrition programs for children.

Go right for the food, right at the bottom of the hierarchy of needs. Go right straight there and take food, literally, out of poor people's mouths in order to pay for the earned income tax credit expansion.

I wish we had sort of done that last week when we passed the $618 billion of corporate welfare without a pay-for at all.

So I just say that this is yet another chapter in a book we have seen before. This is just another incarnation of an idea that there is some moral hazard to helping poor people, that you have got to restrict and limit how much you do for them, and that most of the money that is generated through our economy ought to be plowed back into helping corporations and not people.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative MOORE. You have been an advocate your entire life for those who are most needy, those trying to aspire to be in the middle class. Thank you for all that you do, and so articulately explaining the problems with PAUL RYAN's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield to another colleague of mine, a colleague from the great State of Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the chair of our very important policy and steering committee, and a good friend and colleague of mine in the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. I can't thank you enough for the great work that you are doing and being such a leader on issues that focus on what this institution has, by way of offering opportunity for people. That is its mission. We know that.

I thank you for coming to the Congress for the right reasons, and for helping to try to make a difference in people's lives.

A rose is a rose is a rose. Once again, Chairman RYAN has come forward with what he and the Republican majority purport to be a serious plan for addressing poverty in America. And once again, the centerpiece of his plan is the same old bad idea.

Chairman RYAN wants to dismantle all of the major Federal antipoverty programs that have long been proven to work for families in need. He wants to convert them into a block grant for the States. He now calls them Opportunity Grants.

That is a message. It sounds good. They are block grants, pure and simple. They put decisions in the hands of the States. They cut the funding, and they take all of the safeguards out and they fray the social safety net. That is what it is about. They have been consistent about this year after year after year.

I will just tell you about the food stamp program. Congressman POCAN, you were not here 17 years ago. I was, when the then-Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, said we need to block-grant the SNAP program, Medicaid, and a variety of other programs. It is the same failed policy over and over and over again.

Let me talk about food stamps for a second. Food stamps helped to lift 5 million Americans above the poverty line in 2012, 2.2 million of them children.

Every single dollar invested in food stamps generates $1.79 in local economic activity. But what would Chairman RYAN do?

He would end food stamps, our Nation's most important antihunger initiative, in favor of a block grant, just like he would end the low-income energy assistance program, LIHEAP, child care fund, weatherization assistance, public housing, temporary assistance for needy families, community development grants, and dislocated worker grants.

If you read his report, it is almost diabolical in the sense that the language that is used, and it is language, and it is a message, and it does nothing to provide opportunity or to help the poor in this country.

There are some good parts of his antipoverty plan. Expanding the EITC for childless workers. But even that issue is infected with bad ideas.

To pay for this EITC expansion already introduced by the Democratic Party, Mr. RYAN would end programs like the social services block grant, which helps roughly 23 million Americans, half of them children, with child care assistance, child abuse prevention, and community-based care for seniors and disabled persons.

He also wants to end the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, which—it is madness—which reaches over 115,000 students in 14 States with healthy foods. And then he will decry people who are on food stamps and say they are selecting the wrong foods for their families, when he will just cut the Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program.

What have we come to here?

What is this harshness that has come over our public policy, that mean-spiritedness that has come over our public policy?

For over a year now, Chairman RYAN has tried to pretend that he wants to put forth serious proposals to alleviate poverty in America. But the proof is in the pudding.

Look at his most recently proposed budget. Two-thirds of the cut in that budget fall on low and middle-income families. It tries to turn Medicare into an underfunded voucher program, shreds our social safety net, block-grants food stamps and Medicaid, slashes the WIC program, that is Women, Infants and Children, by $595 million.

It cuts spending that we do every year on health issues, on worker training, on education. He tries to cut that program by $791 billion over the next 10 years.

It slashes the child care assistance program, as I said, job training program, Pell grants, and medical research.

I am a cancer survivor. I am alive because of the grace of God and biomedical research. Why shouldn't other people have the advantage of biomedical research?

Why would he want to cut that?

And he does this all while cutting taxes for the wealthiest.

□ 1915

I am glad to see that Chairman RYAN at least recognizes that he and his party need to be doing more to help end poverty and hunger in our Nation, and I hope we can engage in a constructive dialogue on issues like the EITC expansion and sentencing reform.

If Chairman RYAN and the Republican majority want to get serious about helping families in need, they can start tomorrow. They need to make sure that their Republican child tax credit bill—so generous to those who can afford it—that they need to make sure that that helps low-income kids as well.

That child tax credit program will cut the child tax credit for 450,000 veterans. What are our veterans doing? They are serving. They are sacrificing themselves and their families, and he wants to cut their child tax credit. That is what is in there.

Then he talks about the deserving poor and the undeserving poor. Let me ask Chairman RYAN: What about low-income kids? What about them? What about the infants and toddlers? Tell us, Mr. Chairman, who are the ''deserving'' infants and toddlers? Who are the ''undeserving'' infants and toddlers? We need an answer to our question.

Our colleagues could join us in raising the minimum wage, something that is long overdue, but until then, actions speak louder than words.

The bulk of this new plan, I am afraid, is the same old snake oil, the same tired, discredited, ideological attacks on the social safety net that Chairman RYAN and this majority have been putting forward time and again since coming to power in 2010. It will not wash. It is harsh. It is cruel, and it is mean-spirited.

That is not why we came to this institution, Mr. POCAN. It is not why you came. It is not why I came. It was the hope and the dream and the opportunity to provide opportunity for the people of this Nation, to make this institution do what our Founding Fathers thought it should do and to give people a chance.

This Expanding Opportunity in America will take away people's opportunities, and the American public knows it.

Thank you for what you are doing. It is an honor to work with you and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), Congressman RYAN of Ohio, and our other colleagues who stood on this floor tonight to decry this shame of a document.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative DELAURO, for your many years of service to this body and to the people of the country and fighting for those who need help the most.

I now would like to yield to another colleague of mine, but I am not going to say ''Representative RYAN'' because that might be confusing, given the conversation we are having, but let's say maybe the Budget Committee's other Representative RYAN, the Democratic Representative RYAN from the State of Ohio.

So I yield to another Budget Committee member, Representative TIM RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

My office does get a lot of phone calls against this budget, but they are not realizing that I am supporting them against the Paul Ryan budget. I think these reforms—and I was able to come a little bit earlier and listen to some of my colleagues talk about what is in this document that is supposed to be a new idea, a new way, a new approach—and while I commend Chairman RYAN for trying to come up with some new ideas, I am all about innovation. I am all about a new approach.

I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) hit the nail on the head when she was talking about the fruits and vegetables and the healthy food.

If we are going to move forward as a country, if we want to make sure we take care of the issue of half the country in the next 10 years is going to either have diabetes or prediabetes—and it is going to drive up Medicaid costs, it is going to drive up Medicare costs, it is going to drive up private insurance—one of the issues we need to focus on is how do we get more money into programs that are going to make sure young kids have access to fresh foods, period.

We don't need to get really complicated. We don't need to come up with any new grand scheme. We have already got it. It is already in there, and Chairman RYAN is taking it out, deinvesting in the very things that are going to drive down health care costs, make kids better able to learn and focus and concentrate on the classroom, so they are not having a Fruit Roll-Up and think that it is fruit. They are having fruits and vegetables and access to food over the weekends and all of these things.

I find it extremely interesting that a majority of the cuts that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) proposed to reduce poverty—and in his budgets, two-thirds of the savings in the FY15 Republican budget came from programs that serve these populations, including moving millions out of the SNAP program.

So a new approach is great, innovation is fantastic, but we know what we need to do, and it starts with diet. It starts with wellness. It starts with some of these other things that are going to allow that person who may be living in poverty to be as strong and capable, as healthy as they possibly can, so they can work themselves out of poverty.

Nobody here is defending the status quo—oh, great, people are accessing public funds or public programs—we want to get people on a ladder out of poverty. That is what America should be all about, but we are failing miserably, and this program and the cuts that Chairman RYAN is talking about are going to make it worse.

I think we rank 10th or 11th in people coming up from poverty, lower socioeconomic status, and finally making their way to the middle class. We rank down from other countries—Nordic countries and the rest.

I want to thank the gentleman for doing this. I think this is an amazing opportunity for us to provide some contrast to what Chairman RYAN has proposed, but let me say I think one of the most direct benefits for the war on poverty is an increase in the minimum wage, and today—ironically enough—is the 5-year anniversary since the minimum wage has been increased.

Some States are higher than the $7.25 Federal minimum wage. In Ohio, it is $7.95 and is indexed for inflation, which is better, but it is not anywhere near where we need to be.

I wanted to come and talk for a couple of minutes about what we need to do and what the benefits would be, and I know we normally hear from somebody who is going to say this is going to cost jobs, this is going to slow down economic growth and all the rest, and I will share with them a study that just came out from Labor that said that the 13 States that increased the minimum wage this year had some increase—whether indexed for inflation or through legislation—saw an increase in the minimum wage, had more rapid job growth than all of the other States.

For those people who don't understand how that could be—because we hear so much rhetoric: this is going to cost jobs, this is going to cost jobs—if the average family has more money in their pocket to go out and buy things, that is good for the economy.

Imagine if the Walmarts and the Sam's Clubs and all the rest had a higher minimum wage, if those folks were making an extra couple bucks an hour—and it doesn't have to happen tomorrow. We can do it and stage it over the course of the next few years to make sure it doesn't have a dramatic impact on business—but if all of those folks made an extra $16 or $20 a day, an extra $100 a week, an extra $200 every two weeks of pay, an extra $400 a month, that is a lot of money.

That is enough to go out and get a Chevy Cruze made in Lordstown, Ohio, and pay the insurance and the rest on that. What does that do for the economy if the 1.5 million people in the country—the 62,000 people in my congressional district who make the minimum wage go out and have a little bit of extra money? That is how you are going to move the economy.

Maybe we could get rid of some of these programs because that family will have access to the food because they will have a little bit more money in their pockets, so they will be able to afford the fruits and vegetables and the kinds of food they need to stay healthy, prevent disease, and be able to concentrate and focus in the classroom.

I just want to make two last points. The first is zero increase in the minimum wage, and if you are in the private sector, you have seen a 10 percent increase in earnings, just 10 percent over the past 4 or 5 years since 2009. If you want to go out and get apples, 16 percent increase—bacon has gone up 67 percent; cheddar cheese, 20 percent; milk, 20 percent; eggs, 30 percent; gas, there has been a 44.5 percent increase in gas since 2009.

Now, if you are making minimum wage and all of these costs are going up—for eggs and milk and gas and bacon and coffee, coffee went up 27 percent, the kinds of things that are basic staples to the American diet—how are you going to keep up? How are you going to say, oh, I want to send my kid to a basketball camp in the summer or maybe an afterschool program or I need a baby sitter or I need to catch a cab? You don't have any extra money. You just don't.

I think it is essential for us, if we are going to close the income inequality gap between the wealthiest in our country and the poorest in our country, if we are going to close that, if we want people to work hard and play by the rules and then benefit, this is something that is very simple.

We get a lot of rhetoric. We heard it in the last Presidential election: 47 percent of the country are takers, they want to be on the dole, they don't want to work.

Then we have something that is going to benefit the people who are working, doing the jobs that many Americans don't want to do, cleaning the hotel rooms, working at the gas station, the wear and tear on their bodies over the years, the long hours, swing shifts, and the whole lot. This increase will not just benefit minimum wage workers. It is going to go up and benefit everybody.

The last point—I promise—we need minimum wage workers who are out there to be organized. We didn't always have a 40-hour workweek. We didn't always get time-and-a-half over 40 hours. We didn't always have a 5-day workweek. We didn't have a National Labor Relations Act. We didn't have Social Security. We didn't have Medicare.

These were things that came about because average people got organized, and they said enough is enough. We are not going to have our senior citizens

work until they die. We are not going to have our senior citizens not have health care. We are not going to have people working in unsafe factories—and you are going to work 40 hours a week.

From our side, we expect people to go out and work and work their butts off to get ahead. Our job is to stay organized, to make sure that policies are in place that are both good for the economy and good for families in the United States.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for the opportunity to come here and share just briefly. I look forward to working with you. Hopefully, we can get a vote on the House floor sometime soon. I don't think we will. I am not really optimistic about it, but I hope that we can organize over the next few months and years to make this a reality for all of those families in the United States.

Mr. POCAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, Representative RYAN, for all you have done in your relentless fight on behalf of the workers in your district, and thank you so much, again, for being here today.

Finally, I would like to yield to a colleague of mine—another freshman colleague of mine from the great State of New York, Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the Badger State, for yielding to me, as well as for the tremendous leadership that you continue to exhibit week after week in leading the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Special Order hour, championing issues important to working families and the poor and the sick and the afflicted, those who need our government to be more compassionate, giving them the assistance they need in order to pursue the American Dream.

I appreciate that advocacy, and I appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly on the plan presented by Chairman PAUL RYAN, Expanding Opportunity in America.

I would like to believe that that is the objective, and I certainly am of the view that the chairman is acting in good faith, as it relates to his willingness to try to tackle the issue of poverty in America, but if you put it all in the context of the Ryan budget that has come to the floor of the House of Representatives year after year after year since the Republicans claimed the majority, which passed with overwhelming support from their caucus, the question is: Is their real interest in expanding opportunity in America, or is the fundamental objective really to expand inequality in America?

□ 1930

What PAUL RYAN are we talking to in attempting to have this conversation? Is it the Chairman RYAN whose budget cut $125 billion in supplemental nutrition assistance in a country where 50 million people are food insecure, 18 million of those individuals children? We can't have a real conversation about opportunity if that is still the position of Chairman RYAN, his Budget Committee, and the majority.

Are we having a conversation with a chairman whose budget cut $260 billion in higher education funding, threatening to rob young Americans from their pursuit of their dream of obtaining a college education and being all that they can be in America? We can't have a real conversation about opportunity with individuals who want to cut $260 billion in higher education spending.

I want to believe that we can proceed in good faith and try and tackle this issue. But are we entering into a discussion with the same group of individuals, the chairman whose budget cut $732 billion in Medicaid, a program designed to benefit, in significant numbers, poor, elderly, and disabled individuals? That is not expanding opportunity in America. That is expanding inequality in America.

Certainly, there are some proposals contained in the document that was unveiled today that we can embrace and have a meaningful discussion about in trying to arrive at common ground—sentencing reform as well as the notion of expanding the earned income tax credit. But there is no minimum wage enhancement. There is no infrastructure investment. There is no unemployment compensation insurance renewal. There is no equal pay for equal work, and there is no real effort to deal with the issues that we are prepared to work on to solve the problem of poverty for millions of Americans. For that reason, I am skeptical that this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES. I, too, am skeptical. Having served on the Budget Committee with you, we have seen two different PAUL RYANs. We are hoping that maybe this is a reformed PAUL RYAN, but we are also fearful this is just a repackaged PAUL RYAN. So thank you so much.

Finally, I would like to yield to a colleague from the Progressive Caucus from the great State of Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I can't thank you enough for leading this Special Order. Again, the passion that you have shown in your service here in the United States Congress really speaks to what Americans send their representatives to the Congress for, to be problem solvers.

I am going to use the word ''pray.'' I pray that there is a reformed Chairman RYAN, Congressman RYAN, because I have come from my district, you go to your district, and we see the pain. I see the pain of those who have not been able to secure an unemployment insurance extension. I live with the value of the earned income tax credit. I am going to spend a little time on that.

My son, some many years ago as a young man, volunteered with the HOPE Project. He went to New Orleans right after Hurricane Katrina and was able to work with the victims—the survivors, they like to be called, and they were—of Hurricane Katrina in applying for their earned income tax credit. It was a lifeline for people who had worked.

So I just want to end on this note by thanking you, by saying that there are people who are waiting for the Congress to act, to pass the earned income tax credit, raise the minimum wage, extend unemployment insurance, pass the middle class package of the Democrats, and work on behalf of the American people.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JACKSON LEE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

BILLS LANGUISHING IN THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and appreciate being here on behalf of my colleagues and to have a discussion that is going to focus on what we are doing with our time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like it never fails. When we are out and about in our districts talking with our constituents, people will approach us, and they want to talk about how concerned they are about the cost of living and what they see happening to the price at the pump and to the price at the grocery store. They want to talk about how concerned they are with how much more education seems to cost them. They are concerned about our national security. They are concerned about the border security. They are concerned about their retirement security. The list goes on and on and on.

They will look at us and, Mr. Speaker, without fail, they will say: Tell me exactly what you are doing about this. I want to know what you are doing to address this problem or that problem or any of the issues that all of us hard-working families are out there facing every single day—every day.

What they are looking for is solutions. What we have realized is that many times they don't know exactly how hard we are working here in the House and that the obstruction that is happening is not necessarily here in the House. What is happening is across the dome over on the Senate side.

Now, I have got in front of me 300 of the 332 bills that have passed this House—300 of the 332 bills that have passed this House. Now, sometimes people will say: Where are those bills sitting? Why haven't they gone to the President's desk?

Well, I always like to tell them, they are on the desk of HARRY REID. It is unfortunate, but it is where those 332 bills are languishing.

Now, as we begin to look at being out of D.C. and working in our districts for August, one would think that the majority leader over in the Senate, Mr. REID, would get busy with trying to clean his desk. Most people do that. When they expect to be out of town working for a few weeks, they try to get their desk cleaned off, and they try to get things pushed out to where they need to go. They get things organized. They get things done. But that is not what we are seeing in the Senate.

I had one of my constituents come up to me one day and say: Look, I am all for the Larry the Cable Guy approach.

I said: Tell me what that is.

They said: Git-R-Done.

That is what people are looking for, getting the job done on behalf of hard-working taxpayers.

Now, sometimes people will say: Tell me what all is in this list of things that you have done.

Let me just go through what we have found in our bills that have been passed. 178 of these 332 bills, 178 of the bills passed with no opposition, none at all. There was agreement, total agreement, on these bills.

One would think that the Senate majority leader would say: 178 bills in which there is complete agreement, those bills coming out of the House? Surely we can move those forward in the Senate. Surely, out of 100, we can get 60 to agree on something.

But it is amazing. The Senator still has not called for a vote on those.

Beyond that, 54 more bills passed under suspension. That means you had to have two-thirds of this body agree. So all totaled, that is 232 of the 332 bills that have passed this body with either no opposition or two-thirds of the body voting in support of that.

I also find it very interesting, and probably some of our Democrat colleagues would like to join us in our Special Order tonight, because 55 of these bills—55 of these bills—were authored by Democrats. I am certain that they would like to see the majority leader take up their bills and push them through.

Mr. Speaker, when you are so far behind in your work, you generally work nights and you work weekends. You roll up your sleeves, you buckle down, and you get the job done. But that is not what we are seeing happen coming from the Senate. What we are continuing to see is a resistance, an absolute resistance, to moving forward and taking up these bills.

Now, as we go into our last week next week before our August work period, there are several issues that we would love to see the Senate address. As I said, the issues that are stacked in front of us cover everything that the American people are talking to us about, that our constituents are talking to us about when we go into our town halls.

On the issue of energy, we have 16 bills that deal with the issues of energy, 16 different bills that are right here that would address energy issues. Many people have heard us talk about the Keystone pipeline. Do you realize that the bill that would address the Keystone pipeline approval you are going to find right here in this hefty stack of paper?

For those who are just really concerned about what they are paying at the pump—and I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I have been watching the price of a gallon of gas when I fill up my car, and in the last few months, I have gone from $3.59 to as high as $4.15 to fill that car up—far too much. For people who are paying too much at the pump, there is legislation in here that would get the cost down. It is Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America that Works, getting that price down at the pump.

For individuals that feel like we are paying too much on our electricity rates—and we have all watched these rates go up. You look at that bill every month and you see, compared to last year, you are using fewer kilowatt hours but you are paying more. And you think, how could this be? Well, of course, we all remember the President saying that the prices would necessarily skyrocket under him, and he has made good on that promise. Maybe a lot of promises he hasn't made good on, but, the fact that gas was going to cost us more and electricity was going to cost us more, he is making good on that.

Well, here is a bill, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. All of these are cost-of-living items that we look at in our monthly budgets, energy being one of those that affects us all, everywhere we drive, when we turn on the lights, when we light the fireplace or turn on the burner of the stove to cook lunch. Bills that address those issues, they are found right in front of us.

So there is plenty of work on HARRY REID's desk. HARRY REID has been unwilling to call the vote. I know that my colleagues join me in saying we would love to see him call the vote on one of these 332 bills.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mrs. BLACKBURN for the wonderful leadership that she is providing on this bill this evening.

It really is quite shocking. We have had a conversation this week about all the work that has been done in this Chamber. We have worked really hard. We have been here late at night, and we have been here every day because we know people across the United States are suffering. They are suffering in this economy, as Mrs. BLACKBURN has said. They are suffering from the rising gas prices. They are rising because of joblessness. They are very worried because their children aren't getting jobs. Most particular, the African American youth, it is out of control the number of African American youth who don't have employment, and in the Latino community, as well.

We are heartbroken about that because this is hurting families across the United States, so therefore we have been here doing the work. We have been here passing jobs bill after jobs bill. And this week we learned, as Mrs. BLACKBURN rightly said, that we passed 332 bills out of this Chamber.

Now, we didn't fully expect when we passed these bills that every word and every jot and every title of every bill would be immediately unanimously agreed to by the Senate.

□ 1945

We didn't kid ourselves, but we thought at least let's get started and do the work; 332 bills, and out of those HARRY REID couldn't find one that he could pick up and we could have a conversation about and pass and do something to move this economy forward? The economy is one thing, Mr. Speaker, it is also all of the firefights around the world that are happening. We are concerned about America's national security issues. We are concerned about our allies, like Israel, and what is happening in these countries.

We have bill after bill, scores of bills to address getting our Nation back in order. We want to work with the President. We want to work with the Democrat-controlled United States Senate and with HARRY REID, and what doesn't make one bit of sense to me, Mr. Speaker, when we have all these scandals, whether it is the VA or the IRS that is using the power of the Federal Government to punish innocent American citizens for simply expressing their political beliefs, all of these scandals, and we can't even get the attention of the U.S. Senate?

We have heard about a do-nothing Congress. I think we have to be a little more specific. It is a do-nothing U.S. Senate. There is a distinction here. There is no equivalency. So I wanted to come down to the floor when I heard Mrs. BLACKBURN speaking this evening, I wanted to come to the floor because she is exactly right. I know that many of our colleagues on the floor today agreed with the position Mrs. BLACKBURN is putting forward this evening. Many of our colleagues wanted to be

here because they want to work, and have worked, and now we are saying to HARRY REID with one voice, please come back, we are happy to work with you. There is plenty of time. If you want to come back in August, we will be here. Whatever it takes, we are here to work on behalf of the American people. Why not come and join us?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady.

She mentioned jobs bills. Mr. Speaker, 40 of the bills sitting in this stack are related to jobs. Just the Keystone pipeline bill, there are 42,000 direct and indirect jobs that are related to getting the Keystone pipeline started. So the question becomes: What are you afraid of? What do you fear from taking up some of these bills? Do you fear the American people going to work? Do you fear that things just might get on the right track? That you would find in these 332 bills that we expand some opportunities and the environment for opportunities and the environment for jobs growth to take place? Why is it that the Senate is content with being a do-nothing Senate? Why is it that they are accepting of being a do-nothing Senate? I think we would all like to know the answer to that question. Do they like it? Do they like that they have a stack of work this high sitting on their desk that they are just not able to get around to?

You know, I used to do some door-to-door sales, and we had a little wooden coin and it was called ''a round to-it.'' Any time we felt like procrastinating, any time we felt like we just didn't have the energy to do the heavy lift or make one more sales call or go to another prospect, we would take that round to-it out of our pocket and look at it and remind ourselves, the important thing is to get around to doing the job in front of you.

You know what, Mr. Speaker, I still have my round to-it. I have it on my desk. It is getting old and worn-out, but anytime you think I could just be lazy, I could just not finish this and go do something I want to do, you look at the work in front of you, you look at the fact that you have a cluttered desk, and you look at the fact and consider that people are counting on you to do your job, and you make it a priority to get around to it and to get the job done. That is precisely what the American people have expected of this body, and we have done it. We have done that. And it is frustrating to us and to the American people, and I tell you, we join them in their frustration because look at this, all of these bills, and nothing has been done.

The gentlewoman from Minnesota mentioned the issue of veterans. Do you think it would be considered appropriate to not solve the VA issues and the issues for our Nation's veterans? Of course not.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. There is a heartbreaking story that happened to me this week. I was on the plane, the usual Delta flight that I take out of Minneapolis at 1 p.m. on Monday afternoon when we come back to resume our work here, and a veteran came up to me, a young man who couldn't have been more than 30 years of age. He told me that he had been deployed in the Iraq war. While there, his knee had been shattered in a combat operation in service to his country. He told me that he has been waiting for over 1 year to get an appointment with the VA to go in to have the surgery done to fix his knee with arthroscopy. He called the VA center in Minneapolis to try and get in, and it has been over a year for a young man of maybe 30 years of age, and he can't get in and get his knee taken care of. I think that begs our involvement.

He wasn't even from my district, but I took his name and his address. I took all of his information, and then I took his hand, most importantly. I held his hand in mine and I looked into his eyes and I called him by his name and I said: I promise you I will personally call the VA center and make sure that you get a call back and that you get the appointment you need. And I will make sure that your Member of Congress gets this information and is able to help you because there is not one Member of Congress that I can imagine who wouldn't want to see a veteran get the help he has earned and that he deserves and that he needs. Anyone I believe in this House Chamber would do it, Republican or Democrat, this is not partisan.

But what absolutely floors me, Mr. Speaker, and I think floors Mrs. BLACKBURN, is that we want to help these veterans. How could anyone on the Senate side, anyone, possibly refuse reform of the VA?

Mr. Speaker, I understand and I am sure that Mrs. BLACKBURN is aware that today there was supposed to be a conference committee hearing on the VA reform bill and the Democrats in the Senate chose not to even show up to conference the bill.

Now, how in the world is this young man who is a veteran who served his country honorably supposed to expect that his government cares about him when the Senate won't even show up to talk about VA reform?

That is why I am so proud of the fact that Mrs. BLACKBURN has the physical stack of the work that this body has done, work to help veterans like this young, 30-year-old Iraq veteran. Or the moms that are waiting tables tonight and the dads who are at T-ball games tonight who are asking us, Could you please get the Keystone pipeline bill? Could you please do something about the Tax Code so my business can get up and fly?

That is why we are here tonight, not expecting that the Senate would agree with everything that is in these papers. We do not expect that for a minute. All we are saying is show up to your job, show up and work. We want to talk. We are here. The President is very happy to talk to the terrorist nation of Iran. He has been very willing to negotiate, even to offer them a deal on developing a nuclear weapon, but for some reason, they won't talk to Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on the veterans issue, there are three bills specifically that cover exactly what Mrs. BACHMANN has just mentioned. H.R. 4031, which is the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act, this is something desperately needed. Accountability in the VA, absolutely. Why will the Senate not take this up? Why will they not come to work on this bill?

Another, H.R. 2072, Demanding Accountability For Veterans Act, again languishing on the desk of HARRY REID. Of course the VA should be accountable to the veterans and to the American taxpayer. Why are they not moving this forward so that it gets addressed?

H.R. 4810, Veteran Access to Care, precisely what Mrs. BACHMANN is speaking of, making certain that the veterans are guaranteed that they are seen in a timely manner.

I have one constituent who got on the VA list for a primary physician 15 years ago. Guess what? He is still waiting. I have another constituent who has been on the list for 3 years and has never gotten a call.

This is completely unacceptable, and in this stack of 332 bills, you are going to find bills that will put that accountability in place. Mrs. BACHMANN mentioned also the issue of taxes. We hear about it everywhere we go. People are overtaxed. They are overworked. They realize that they are taxed far too much, and they are tired of it. They want to see the tax rates lowered and the tax burden lowered as well as seeing the regulatory burden lowered.

And on taxes, we have got seven bills, one we passed today, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. We have got permanent Internet tax freedom. It is right here, seven bills that deal with taxes. We also have H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act. Hardworking men and women, small business owners, small business employees, they all want to make certain that we deal with this complicated and overbearing Tax Code. They want to make certain that we are reducing that burden on them.

We could take some steps, not solve all of the problems, but take some steps in that direction if the Senate would show up and take up some of the tax bills that are here and help us lower that burden.

We hear a lot about government spending. You know, government never gets enough of the taxpayers' money

and government spends too much. You give them a little, they are going to take a little more. We have 31 different bills that are in this stack that deal with reining in government spending, that deal with some of the budget reforms that are desperately needed so that we get rid of some antiquated processes and move to a new template for how we need to approach our spending and approach being a good steward of the taxpayers' money; 31 different bills. Pick one. Get going.

It is amazing, once you get going on a task, it is easier. You get momentum, and that is something that we would like to see the Senate get and take up some of these 332 bills that are sitting over on HARRY REID's desk.

Maybe you are aggravated about government waste and you are frustrated with regulatory overreach, and you would like to see a smaller Federal Government, and you would like it if some of these Federal agencies would stop wasting your money.

Well, we have 16 bills in this stack that deal with stopping that overreach and curbing that waste and putting the bureaucracy on the track to being a better steward of the taxpayer money. We have to remember it is not Federal Government money, it is not the money of this Chamber, it is the taxpayers' money. They want these issues addressed.

How about reining in red tape? You know, I talk to lots of small business manufacturers on a regular basis and they will say to me, the red tape is killing us. The regulation and the red tape is just killing us. We spend too much time on compliance. We have four different bills in here that deal with compliance and cutting red tape. That is another way that government can do a better job of responding to the needs of the American people and the taxpayers.

I think everybody, Mr. Speaker, is concerned about national security.

□ 2000

Every time you pick up a paper or you flip on a channel or you turn a page on your iPad and go to a Web site and look at what is happening, whether it is in Ukraine, the belligerence of Russia, whether it is what is happening in the Middle East, and what we see happening in Israel, concerns about Iran, everybody is concerned about foreign affairs and concerned about our Nation's security.

We have six different bills that would deal with these issues of national security. We would appreciate it if the Senate would take up some of these House-passed bills. Again, Mr. Speaker, 178 of these bills—178 of 332 bills have come out of this Chamber with no opposition at all.

Another 54 have passed, 54 have passed, with a two-thirds vote of this Chamber. As I said earlier, that is 232 of the 332 bills. By the way, 55 of the bills out of the 332 bills are bills that have been authored by the Democrats, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about repealing and replacing ObamaCare and making the health care system work, getting it into a healthy, healthy place, so that you are going to see people actually have access to health care.

Right now, we have got a situation where everybody's health insurance costs are going up, and they are concerned about that. Access with these very narrow networks is becoming more difficult. We are hearing of people that are having to travel great distances to get to physicians or they are having longer waits.

We found 11 bills right here that deal with health care. Some of these are repealing and replacing ObamaCare, 11 bills right here that could be taken up that would help with those situations, that would help with the access to health care, access to the doctor.

What we have seen happen with ObamaCare is that people have access to the queue because they have got a health care card, but what they do not have is access to the physician.

By the way, education—I talked to a constituent at the grocery store on Saturday morning, and she said that she was beginning to plan toward back to school for her two children. I said: Oh my goodness, it seems so early to be planning for back to school.

She said: Well, you know, they are going to be starting back to school the end of the first week of August and then into school the second week of August, and there are fees to pay, there are different class fees that have to be paid, sports teams that have to be signed up for, sports physicals that the children have to get, and those beginning-of-school expenses.

So she was beginning to focus on education and asked what were we going to do about letting parents and local school districts and getting rid of common core and replacing it with commonsense and putting parents and teachers in charge of those classrooms.

Well, we could make some progress in that direction. Seven of the bills that we have right here deal with education and with the issues that face parents and students and teachers. We are all concerned about the future and what is going to be there for our children, in making certain that they are prepared for the future and having access to a quality education and having that right there in our neighborhoods and our communities.

We could take some steps in that direction if the Senate would begin to take up some of the legislation that is over there on the Senate desk. As was said earlier, we are facing a do-nothing Senate because they have chosen not to get to work on this stack of legislation that would address some of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, this week, as we have looked at the crisis on the southern border, we have heard quite a bit of talk and conversation about the issues of human trafficking, drug trafficking, the sex trafficking that is taking place in this country.

Many people probably are not aware, and many of our colleagues probably haven't thought about the amount of work that we have done over the past 2 years on this issue, getting ready to address the issue, doing some research and some digging and some education and addressing human trafficking, taking steps to prevent this, to have the ability to do some intervention, penalties, and making certain that we are strengthening the family unit and fighting these trafficking elements.

We have 11 bills specific to human trafficking that are right here, 11 bills that would help hold accountable some of the traffickers and smugglers and put penalties in place, strengthen and shore up families, take care of victims, do some work on prevention. It would be encouraging if the Senate would join us and address those.

There are other bills that are here. We have got bills that deal with innovation. We have got flexibility for working families to make it easier for working moms. All of those issues are issues that could be addressed.

Yes, we have worked in a bipartisan manner. Indeed, we recently—just a few minutes ago, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE was here on the floor talking about some of her work. I thought it was interesting. There was a report earlier in the week. She had had 18 rollcall votes on her amendments in the House in the past year. That is more rollcall votes than all the Republicans in the Senate combined.

She was asked about the amendments in a recent interview, and she said, ''I want to thank the Republicans for their generosity.''

That is the manner in which we have approached our job. As I said, 178 of the 332 bills that you are going to find in this stack, unanimous votes. You have got another 54 bills that are in this stack that had two-thirds majority support.

I thought it was also interesting, in the same article, Senator MANCHIN has not received a rollcall vote on an amendment since June of 2013. He had recently aired his frustration. He said, ''I've never been in a less productive time in my life than I am right now in the United States Senate.''

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that there are many people that probably share that thought over in the Senate because they are looking at the fact that things are not getting done in the Senate. Ninety-eight percent of these 332 bills have passed with support from both Democrats and Republicans.

If we were in school, that would be making an A grade on bipartisan support for legislation that is coming out of this House. Our committee chairmen have worked hard to be able to do that, and we have, in good faith, passed these bills, and in good faith, we have moved these bills to the Senate.

Right now, we are watching these bills sit on HARRY REID's desk. For whatever reason, he is choosing not to take these bills up.

At this time, I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership on this important issue of this do-nothing Senate.

The President likes to refer to us as the do-nothing Congress. Well, tonight, we are presenting 332 reasons why it is actually the do-nothing Senate, as seen by the stack of the bills here on the gentlewoman's desk. This has made it the least productive Congress in history.

332 bills have passed the House and are sitting on HARRY REID's desk. These are not just Republican bills. 178 of these bills passed the House with no opposition at all. In fact, nearly 70 percent of these bills passed with two-thirds support or more. Fifty-five of these House bills were introduced by Democrats—still, HARRY REID refuses to bring these bills up for a vote.

While House Republicans are focused on building up America's middle class, the Senate Democrats are content to let dust gather on hundreds of bills that would grow the economy, reduce the size and scope of an overbearing Federal Government and, importantly, help create jobs in America.

Take the Keystone XL pipeline, for example. This is truly one of those shovel-ready projects that would create more than 42,000 direct and indirect jobs nationwide. Across the political spectrum, there is overwhelmingly support for this project, yet HARRY REID refuses to bring it up for a vote. I have got that bill right here. It is H.R. 3. This is a bill that we passed with bipartisan support, yet HARRY REID refuses to bring it up for a vote.

The Keystone pipeline enters Montana. It is the first State that the pipeline enters after it comes to us from Canada.

I was out in eastern Montana recently, and I was meeting with the NorVal Electric Co-Op. This is a small co-op in Montana that provides electricity to a few thousand Montana families. They told me that if the Keystone pipeline is approved, they will be able to keep electric rates for these Montana families flat for the next 10 years.

If the Keystone pipeline is not approved, the electric rates for these Montana families will go up about 40 percent over the course of the next 10 years because this co-op supplies electricity to one of the pump stations on the Keystone pipeline, and that extra volume will lower the rates for all users.

Sometimes, I wish the President would get out of the White House and come to a place like Montana and talk to those families and have him explain to them why he continues to block the Keystone pipeline. I would like HARRY REID to come out to Montana and explain to these Montana families why the Senate refuses to take up a vote and approve the Keystone pipeline.

The House, we are going to continue enacting solutions to help create jobs and build a healthy economy because that leads to greater freedom and opportunity. We are not going to stop doing our job simply because Senator Majority Leader HARRY REID has stopped doing his. It is time for the Senate to get back to work.

It is interesting, it has been quoted here tonight that SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Democratic congresswoman, who we serve with here in the House, has had 18 rollcall votes on her amendments in the House in the past year.

That is more than all the Republicans in the Senate combined. When asked about those amendments in a recent interview, she said, ''I want to thank the Republicans for their generosity.''

It is time for the Senate to act. The Obama recovery, economic recovery, is 5 years old, and what have we seen? We shared this week the share of adults who are working is back to 1984 levels.

That is the year I graduated from Montana State University, with a degree in engineering. Far more adults have left the workforce than have found new jobs, and it has been said this is the worst recovery ever for long-term employed Americans.

The House has passed dozens of bills to create good-paying jobs and build a healthy economy, bills like the America's Small Business Tax Relief Act, which would lower costs for small businesses to allow them to hire more workers; or the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act, which improves programs that promote economic opportunity and ensures our Nation's vets have the tools and resources they need to find jobs they deserve.

Let me conclude by saying this: it is a shame that HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats won't take up more of these 40-plus bills of these over 300 bills that we have passed that will get our economy moving because it is clear that the President's policies aren't working.

House Republicans have a plan to get America back to work and get our economy moving in the right direction once again.

Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, he doesn't have to agree with our ideas. That is the nature of democracy. That is the nature of having the Senate and the House. We are not expecting him to agree on our ideas, but he does owe them a simple up-or-down vote. If he doesn't owe it to us, he certainly owes it to the American people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman. I love the fact that he talked about Montana and what is going there and the northern route approval, Mr. Speaker, the H.R. 3. I wish he would hold that bill back up.

I will yield to the gentleman. How many pages is actually in that bill that would approve the route for the Keystone pipeline?

Mr. DAINES. I know ObamaCare was over 2,000 pages.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. So it is 2,700 pages.

Mr. DAINES. Here is the H.R. 3, the act to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. It is very simple. In fact, it is two pages and about a third of a bottom of a third page, so call it 2–1/3 pages, and we can approve the Keystone pipeline.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is easy to read, and people could easily read that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that our bills are not 2,000 pages or 2,700 pages or 2,300 pages. You are talking about bills that are readable. They are easy to work through. You can take them up one at a time, get going on them, and get some things done for the American people.

You can see the different bills. This one is two pages. This one can't be more than about 15 or 20 pages.

□ 2015

So this is not too much of a heavy lift. You can look at a bill like the Keystone pipeline bill, H.R. 3. It is simple and easy to read, but yet this would help create the environment for jobs growth. It would put in motion the components that are necessary to get 42,000 direct and indirect jobs started and on the books.

For an electric power co-op in Montana—and I think it is important to realize that co-ops are membership-led and owned organizations; these are the people that live in the communities that own these utilities—it would be able to hold those utility rates flat.

What a boom that would be for those families that are members of that co-op and those small businesses to be able to say, We have got certainty and stability and we have got security of electric power that is going to be predictable and our rates are going to be stable and low for a 10-year period of time.

That helps them to know what to expect, to work those business plans, and develop plans for expansion. That aids job growth. And that is an indirect benefit. It is a positive consequence of taking a step and passing a bill that is not even 3-pages long that would approve a route for a project.

Mr. DAINES. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. On the issue of the Keystone pipeline and the benefits, many of those ratepayers in Montana are hardworking families that live month to month. Many of them are seniors that are living on fixed incomes. And so this President, by stopping the Keystone pipeline and not approving that bill that is just slightly over 2 pages in length, in essence, he is declaring war on the middle class of America that is struggling to make ends meet month to month.

Our daughter just graduated from Montana State University with a degree in elementary education. She is going to be a teacher. If we can approve the Keystone pipeline, we recognize these tax revenues in the State of Montana, and millions of dollars that will help fund our teachers, our schools, our infrastructure in Montana.

These are other benefits of the Keystone pipeline that we need to talk about that affect more than just the jobs. It also the tax revenues, as we talked about, and keeping the electric rates flat for many, many Montanans that live on fixed incomes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is exactly right. And it is about making certain that we get our labor force participation back up in this country. We have the lowest labor force participation rate we have had since the misery index days of Jimmy Carter's Presidency. We would love to see more individuals back into the workforce.

There are 40 bills that would deal with creating the environment for jobs growth to take place. There is opportunity for innovation in some of these bills. There is predictability and certainty in bills as simple as the little bit on the Keystone pipeline. All of it is sitting on HARRY REID's desk.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier tonight, one of the questions many of us in the House are asking is, What is the Senate afraid of? What is it the majority leader and the Senate fearful of? Why does he not take up some of these bills?

We have 332 bills, and 232 passed either unanimously or with a two-thirds vote. That is a pretty amazing record. And in these bills are solutions that the American people are looking for—solutions to jobs, to veterans issues, solutions in certainty for our Nation's economy, for our national security, and opportunity for our children.

Those are the things that our focus is on. It is what our constituents have sent us here to do and the job they have sent us here to do.

So I would encourage my colleagues. And as we move forward, we will continue in the House to do our job and to send bills to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you I think that we would be encouraging of our friends in the Senate to not be a do-nothing Senate—not to be content with that—but to be aggressive in taking up these bills. And as they get ready for August and go back to their districts to work, to get around to it and get to work to clean and organize their desks and do what is right for the American people by addressing the issues that concern them and finding solutions to the issues that they bring to us each and every day.

With that I yield back the balance of my time.

TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is a supreme privilege to be able to stand here in the greatest deliberative body in the world, the well of the United States House of Representatives.

It is a thrill to be able to be here also to be able to stand in defense of our ally, the Jewish State of Israel, which is under attack, even now, as we are here in this Chamber this evening.

As all Americans have seen across the country, the fighting that is going on in the Middle East has been horrific, but we must remember that all of this began with an unprovoked attack by the terrorist organization named Hamas. Hamas is the governing organization over Gaza.

If a person looks at a map of the Middle East, there is the Mediterranean Sea. Just on the easternmost part of the Mediterranean Sea lies the very tiny Nation of Israel, approximately the size of New Jersey. On the southwest corner of Israel is a little area known as Gaza.

In 2005, Israel willingly gave up the area called Gaza. Why? Because the Palestinians that were in the area known as Gaza were continually attacking and causing havoc against the Jews that lived in the Gaza area.

Jews who had businesses, Jews who had homes, as well as synagogues, relinquished those homes and businesses voluntarily in an effort known as ''land for peace.'' So Israel gave up its land to Palestinians, and the Palestinians promised there would be peace.

At that time, Abu Mazen, also known as Abbas, the head of the now Palestinian Authority, had promised that the Gaza region would remain demilitarized. In other words, that there would be no weaponry and no rockets that would be contained in the Gaza region.

This has been a joke and an absolute lie and a fraud from the Palestinians and from the leader Abbas from the beginning in 2005. How do we know? Almost nearly overnight, the Palestinians in Gaza began firing rockets at Israel. That was 9 years ago, in 2005. Today is 2014. Nothing has changed. As a matter of fact, now we are seeing the rise once again from Gaza of rockets being fired into Israel—again, in an unprovoked attack.

We should also recognize Hamas isn't a stand-alone terrorist organization. Hamas is a part of a wider constellation of terrorist organizations—franchises, you might say—under an umbrella. That umbrella is to my left.

That umbrella is known as the international Muslim Brotherhood. It was began in 1928 to reconstitute the Islamic caliphate across the world. Again, the umbrella organization is known as the Ikhwan, the international Muslim Brotherhood.

There are various entities, Hamas being one of those terrorist children, you may say, under the umbrella of this international terrorist organization. It contains individuals who were part of forming and putting together the attack on the United States during 9/11, when our Nation was attacked and the Twin Towers came down, led by Mohammed Atta, and also by the tragic hijacking of an airplane that went into the Pentagon.

Also, one of the earliest terrorist attacks against the Twin Towers in 1993 was masterminded by an individual known as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, now contained at Guantanamo Bay as a detainee for his work in that effort. He also was found guilty for the work he did there.

I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the United States does have an option of aiding and assisting our ally Israel in this horrific tragedy that the world is seeing unfolding right now. And it is this.

As we have seen with this terrorist organization under the auspices of the international Muslim Brotherhood, known as Hamas, Hamas had a very friendly entree when the Muslim Brotherhood was running Egypt, the largest Arab nation in the Middle East region.

The Muslim Brotherhood, under then-President Morsi, had a deal with Hamas; again, the Muslim Brotherhood terrorist organization in Gaza. This was the deal. Hamas was allowed to run smuggling operations through tunnels between Egypt and the Gaza territory. So lucrative was the smuggling business that Hamas was making, it is reported, $2 billion a month.

When the people of Egypt decided to throw off the violent terrorist regime known as the Muslim Brotherhood, literally tens of millions of Egyptians took to the streets and said to the Muslim Brotherhood, You must go, and to Morsi, You must go, because the Egyptian people wanted to stop the slaughter and murder of innocent people, including the Coptic Christians.

Coptic churches were burned in Egypt. Coptic businesses owned by Coptic Christians were also burned and

ransacked. Innocent people like Christians—there are virtually no Jews left in Egypt because they have been run out—and even Muslims considered apostate Muslims were all attacked by the violent terrorists in the Muslim Brotherhood.

As I said, tens of millions of peace-loving Egyptians and Muslims took to the streets and said, We want the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood to leave Egypt. The Muslim Brotherhood had to leave. They no longer had any consent from the Egyptian people to rule. There was no process of impeachment in Egypt. This was the only avenue left to the Egyptian people.

The Muslim Brotherhood left, and in stepped the military led by General al-Sisi. The Egyptian people then conducted democratic elections and General al-Sisi was elected as the first President of the modern state of Egypt. He is the President now.

He has been engaged in a very serious struggle with the Muslim Brotherhood. He has worked with them. Their violent protests continued. Remarkably, now President al-Sisi has been able to bring down dramatically the level of violence from the Muslim Brotherhood. The streets are far safer today in Egypt than they were before. And it came at a price.

It came at a price of many deaths in Egypt, but now we are seeing more peace. It is because of the work of President al-Sisi on the border with Gaza that we have seen a dramatic decrease in weapons, munitions, and most particularly, $2 billion going into Gaza.

How does this frame into what a new alternative solution would be to tamp down this terrorist organization known as Hamas?

□ 2030

The United States Government designated Hamas a terror organization.

Again, let's remember. This is a U.S.-designated terror organization called Hamas, which unilaterally and unprovoked launched thousands of rockets against our ally Israel. Israel did not provoke Hamas. Israel did not send munitions into the Gaza territory. Israel did not fire the first shot against Gaza. It was Hamas that fired the first shot.

Let us not forget that it was Hamas that fired rockets specifically at the greatest number of civilian targets. We even read this last week that Hamas dressed up in Israeli uniforms, IDF uniforms, and went through a tunnel, into Israel, to specifically go to an Israeli kibbutz so that they could slaughter a mass number of innocent Israeli citizens as well as IDF soldiers.

That is what we are dealing with—greater terrorist acts than we have ever seen before.

They are reporting now from Turkey and from other parts in the Middle East region that they are again calling on wiping out the Jewish state—in other words, killing the Jews in the Jewish state and eliminating and annihilating the Jewish State of Israel. This is nothing more than a genocide.

How can we stop this continual slaughter by the terrorist organization known as Hamas?

They were greatly weakened when President al-Sisi did the United States—the world—a favor when they closed those tunnels between Egypt and Hamas. That greatly reduced the income that was coming into this terrorist, corrupt, violent organization under the Muslim Brotherhood umbrella, but it is not enough because, you see, the umbrella is essentially the lifeline economically for the terrorist organization known as Hamas. If you will, the umbrella is the umbilical cord that feeds economically, politically, and with munitions into this violent terrorist organization.

The question then, Mr. Speaker, is: How can we get the Muslim Brotherhood to stop feeding economically to prop up this terrorist organization known as Hamas?

This is how we can do it:

When the United States Government effectively labeled Hamas as a foreign terrorist organization, then any organization or person who tried to offer material support to Hamas was effectively continuing a terrorist enterprise, and, thereby, there would be sanctions, and in fact, there would be convictions that could be brought against those people.

That happened in a charity called the Holy Land Foundation. This charity was directed by the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization. The international Muslim Brotherhood directed the United States' chapter of the Muslim Brotherhood to raise men, raise money, and raise media support for Hamas, the terrorist organization that is now firing rockets unprovoked against Israel.

That charity in the United States was found guilty by a United States Federal court. That happened in 2008. Our Federal Government has already found, through our Department of Justice, that the Muslim Brotherhood has engaged in terrorist activities. We have Federal courts that have also found that the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization, has, in fact, engaged in terrorist activities. Also, our FBI Director in 2011, Robert Mueller, said before the committee of which I am privileged to be a part—the House Intelligence Committee—that the international Muslim Brotherhood has engaged in terrorist activities both abroad and in the United States.

Whether it is through entities, like designating Hamas a foreign terrorist organization, or through our Federal courts, where we have found Muslim Brotherhood charities—in this case, the Holy Land Foundation, a Muslim Brotherhood terrorist organization—our government has found members of the international Muslim Brotherhood to be terrorists who are engaging in the material support for terrorist activities. That would include Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who this night is sitting in Guantanamo Bay, behind bars—where he should be—because his goal was to bring down the Twin Towers in New York City. This was in 1993. We know that the Muslim Brotherhood was successful and brought down the Twin Towers in a horrific display of terrorism on American soil on September 11, 2001.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, it isn't enough for the United States to cripple Hamas, the foreign terrorist organization, by designating them a foreign terrorist organization. That was a good beginning. What this body can do is to pass a resolution to urge President Obama—who has the power to direct the United States Department of State—to now designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization.

If we want Hamas to collapse—to collapse economically, to collapse politically, to collapse because they are bereft of munitions and weapons—what we must do is designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization because then, you see, it would cripple the international Muslim Brotherhood with various economic sanctions. Also, those who are members of the international Muslim Brotherhood would no longer have the ability to be granted visas by the United States Government to come into the United States.

This is the best action that the United States could take today to benefit our ally Israel as they are being mercilessly attacked by the U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization known as Hamas. Cut off the head. Cut off the feeder unit to Hamas. Cut it off, and then we will see Hamas collapse. That is what we could do.

Now, President Obama doesn't need the United States Congress to pass this resolution. He doesn't need that. President Obama, on his own this evening, could designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization, and I call upon our President to do exactly that in order to help our ally Israel.

That would send a resounding signal across the world if the United States took that action because, you see, this has already been done by other countries—by Egypt, led by President al-Sisi. They have already designated the international Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization. Jordan, our ally and friend, has designated the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization. Saudi Arabia sees the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. The United Arab Emirates

sees the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization as does the Jewish State of Israel see the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization.

If the nations that are most impacted by the terrorist activities of the international Muslim Brotherhood could designate this nefarious organization as such after the Muslim Brotherhood's participation in the greatest horrific act on U.S. soil—September 11, 2001—and if we have designated charities and entities of the Muslim Brotherhood and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorists, participating in terrorist activities, why in the world wouldn't the United States join Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia in doing the right thing in designating the international Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization?

You see, once we do that to the umbrella organization, then all of the other organizations that are represented therein are also duly impacted by that designation. That is how we bring peace. That is how we bring peace to Israel. That is how we bring peace to this region.

Just a few years ago, the conventional wisdom here in Washington, D.C., was that the Muslim Brotherhood would be a moderating force in the Middle East and bring democracy to the region. We had great hopes that that is who the Muslim Brotherhood would be. That was the face that they tried to present here in Washington. Tunisia removed their Muslim Brotherhood-led governments because they saw that the Muslim Brotherhood wasn't a moderating force. Hardly. It was a violent terrorist force. As I said, other Middle East nations have taken measures to designate the organization as a terrorist group, and these nations banned the activities of the Muslim Brotherhood completely.

Even our British allies have opened an official investigation into the Muslim Brotherhood's activities and connection to violent terrorism. For the past 20 years and in three different administrations, the United States Government has identified and designated branches of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorist organizations, and its leaders are branded as terrorists. United States Government officials have testified under oath before Congress, here in this building, that the international Muslim Brotherhood has supported terrorism not only here at home but also across the world.

From its earliest days, the Muslim Brotherhood used violence as its strategy. They formed what was called a ''secret apparatus''—that is their term—to attack government officials and foreigners in Egypt, even killing two Egyptian Prime Ministers. Richard Clarke was the counterterrorism czar to both Democrat President Bill Clinton and to Republican President George W. Bush. Richard Clarke testified before the Senate Banking Committee in October of 2003 that the common links that are shared by al Qaeda, by the Islamic jihad and by Hamas were ''the membership and the ideology of the Muslim Brothers.'' As was recognized by our own 9/11 Commission Report, virtually every Islamic terrorist group has built its organization on the ideological bedrock the Muslim Brotherhood established—that is astounding—al Qaeda as well as Hamas.

Some have tried to paint al Qaeda as a great enemy of the Muslim Brotherhood, but whatever differences they have are merely tactical, and there are many reports of the groups cooperating together and endorsing their terrorist activities.

In February 1993, the United States House of Representatives Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare reported that various branches of the international Muslim Brotherhood regularly took part in terror conferences with al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, called the Quds Force. The senior clerical leadership of the Muslim Brotherhood is led by the group's Qatar-based top jurist, Yusuf al-Qaradawi. He issued a fatwa in November of 2004 that authorized the killing of American soldiers and contractors in Iraq while we were conducting that liberation force at that time.

Many of al Qaeda's leaders also came through the Muslim Brotherhood's ranks. Mohamed Atta, as I previously stated, was the ring leader of the 9/11 terrorist attack here in America on our Twin Towers. According to The Washington Post, he was radicalized while he was a part of the Muslim Brotherhood's engineering syndicate in Egypt. It is fair to say that, rather than being opposed to al Qaeda, the Muslim Brotherhood has been an open gateway to al Qaeda.

One of the enduring myths about the Muslim Brotherhood is that the group has renounced violence. Nothing could be further from the truth. Then how can one explain the Muslim Brotherhood's long-time support for the Palestinian terrorist group, Hamas? In fact, Hamas identifies itself in its 1988 Covenant as the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood—in other words, a franchise of the Muslim Brotherhood—in Palestine's own words.

□ 2045

That is a fact that is recognized in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Terrorism. It was President Bill Clinton who designated Hamas a terrorist organization in 1995, and I praised President Bill Clinton for doing that. It was the right thing to do.

Now, President Obama must do the same and also designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization because, you see, Mr. Speaker, it is myopic to look at Hamas, as it rains down thousands of missiles and rockets on our ally, Israel, without considering the Muslim Brotherhood's greater role in the larger context of global jihad.

In fact, our Justice Department, in 2007 and 2008, successfully argued in Federal court that the international Muslim Brotherhood has directed its affiliates here in this country, in the United States, to organize to provide ''media, money, and men'' to Hamas, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization.

As Federal prosecutors showed during the Holy Land Foundation trial, the largest terrorist financing trial in American history, the Muslim Brotherhood's Palestine Committee raised millions of dollars for Hamas here in the United States.

The judge in the case wrote an opinion that there was ''ample evidence'' that establishes the association between Muslim Brotherhood groups here in the United States with Hamas. The convictions of the Holy Land Foundation executives have also been held up by our United States Supreme Court, the highest court in the land.

This was one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the FBI Director, Robert Mueller, testified before Congress in February of 2011 that ''elements of the Muslim Brotherhood both here and overseas have supported terrorism.''

The U.S. Government has designated branches, charities, and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood, as I have pictured on this graphic under the umbrella—branches, charities, and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood.

U.S. Government officials have said, Mr. Speaker, that the Muslim Brotherhood around the world has supported terrorist groups, and the Justice Department has prosecuted elements of the Muslim Brotherhood here in the U.S. for materially supporting terrorism.

It is long overdue to act on what the U.S. Government has already acknowledged. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to designate the Muslim Brotherhood as a terror organization.

I wanted to speak just a little bit, Mr. Speaker, about who some of these people are under the umbrella, if I could have that slide right here.

The umbrella organization, again, is the international Muslim Brotherhood organization. Under that umbrella is an individual known as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was the operations chief under al Qaeda. The 9/11 Commission report said that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, also known as KSM, who is currently detained behind bars in Guantanamo Bay, he was radicalized in the Kuwaiti Muslim Brotherhood—Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, under the Muslim Brotherhood.

Abdullah Azzam is part of the Palestinian Muslim Brotherhood. He is a leader who was the cofounder, both of Hamas and of al Qaeda, also under the international Muslim Brotherhood.

Yusuf al-Qaradawi is the chief jurist of the international Muslim Brotherhood. Some call him the spiritual leader and guide of the Muslim Brotherhood. He has been banned from entering the United States since 1991. He is the first Sunni cleric to endorse suicide bombing.

Then Mohamed Atta, he was the ringleader of the horrific 9/11 attack against the United States of America, the ringleader of bringing down the Twin Towers and also the attack on our Pentagon. He was radicalized in the Muslim Brotherhood-controlled engineering syndicate in Egypt.

Then Hamas, the foreign terrorist organization raining down rockets, even tonight, against our ally, Israel. Hamas is self-identified as the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Then the Union of Good, this is a Muslim Brotherhood charity that was led by Yusuf al-Qaradawi. It was designated by our Treasury Department in November of 2008 for Hamas financing.

Osama Bin Laden—no introduction necessary—he is the al Qaeda cofounder who was radicalized by Muslim Brotherhood leaders at the university in Jeddah.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood has its fingers all over jihad because its mission statement is jihad. It is radical, violent terrorism to achieve its goal of a global caliphate, to have control of all Muslim and all infidels across the globe.

Then Abdul Majeed al-Zindani, he is the head of Yemen's Muslim Brotherhood, al-Islah Party, and he is the mentor of Osama Bin Laden, designated by our Treasury Department in February of 2004.

Ramzi Yousef, he is the convicted leader of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. He is the nephew of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, also radicalized by Kuwaiti Muslim Brotherhood.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if anyone watching this evening would go to the official Muslim Brotherhood Web site today, they would see that the international Muslim Brotherhood is praising Hamas for the killing going on in Jerusalem and in Israel, even today.

This is why the best thing that the United States of America could do—and I call on President Obama to do it, hopefully, with support from both Democrats and Republicans, this is not a partisan issue—we need to stand with our ally, Israel. We need to stand against radical terrorism.

In order to do that, we need to designate the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization, for what it is, a foreign terrorist organization.

Mr. Speaker, I call, again, on President Obama to bring about this designation to bring peace to our world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for this afternoon and the balance of the week on account of a family emergency.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for this afternoon.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 23, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1528. To amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 25, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6575. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in Systemwide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052-AD00) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6576. A letter from the Acting Chief Information Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the ''Department of Defense Next Generation Host-Based Cyber-Security System''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6577. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6578. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Safety and Health Investigations of Places of Employment; Technical Amendments [Docket No.: CDC-2014-0001; NIOSH-271] (RIN: 0920-AA51) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6579. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Residential and Commercial Water Heaters [Docket No.; EEE-2011-BT-TP-0042] (RIN: 1904-AC53) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6580. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnace Fans [Docket Number: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0011] (RIN: 1904-AC22) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0888; FRL-9913-59-Region 5] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0072; FRL-9913-62-OAR] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6583. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Control of Visible Emissions, Record Keeping and Monitoring [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0469; A-1-FRL-9910-12-Region 1] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6584. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Coco alkyl dimethyl amines; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0590; FRL-9911-54] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6585. A letter from the Chief of Staff, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules Governing Qualifying Examination Systems and Other Matters; Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules to Give Permanent Credit for Examination Elements Passes; Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's rules to Facilitate use in the

Amateur Radio Service of Single Slot Time Division Multiple Access Telephony and Data Emissions; Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules Governing Vanity and Club Station Call Signs [WT Docket No.: 12-283] [RM-11629] [RM-11625] [WT Docket No.: 09-209] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6586. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers; Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [WT Docket No.: 10-208] [WC Docket No.: 14-58] [WC Docket No.: 07-135] [CC Docket No.: 01-92] received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6587. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6588. A letter from the Chairperson, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6589. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors [NUREG-0800] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6590. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-10) activities report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Country Reports on Terrorism 2013''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6592. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting the 2013 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6593. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Aged Beneficiary Designation Forms received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6594. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6595. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's annual report for FY 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6596. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6597. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Extension of Expiration Dates for Double-Crested Cormorant Depredation Orders [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0135; FF09M21200-145-FXMB1232099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-Ax82) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6598. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Northern Distinct Population Segment of the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog, and Threatened Species Status for Yosemite Toad [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0100] (RIN: 1018-AZ21) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6599. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No.: 130201095-4400-02] (RIN: 0648-BC90) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6600. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0485] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6601. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Air Travel; Accessibility of Aircraft and Stowage of Wheelchairs [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2011-0098] (RIN: 2105-AD87) received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6602. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annual Filing Season Program (Rev. Proc. 2014-42) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6603. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's ''Major'' final rule — Ninety-Day Waiting Period Limitation [TD 9671] (RIN: 1545-BL97) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3044. A bill to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi (Rept. 113–553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3846. A bill to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–555, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 594. A bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008; with amendment (Rept. 113–556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 669. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; with an amendment (Rept. 113–557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4250. A bill to amend the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 113–558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program; with amendment (Rept. 113–559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3846 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 5184. A bill to establish a National Regulatory Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means,

Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 5185. A bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the definition of ''homeless person'' under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5187. A bill to clarify the meaning of the term ''prevailing party'' with regard to the recovery of attorneys' fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to develop a model form for a disclosure notice that shall be used by depository institutions and credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5189. A bill to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARINO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5190. A bill to authorize assistance for Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for an institution of higher education that has previously filed for bankruptcy to apply for the reinstatement of eligibility for purposes of Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 5192. A bill to provide for incentives for agencies and the judiciary to increase operating efficiency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5193. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct outreach to veterans regarding the effect of delayed payments by the Veterans Integrated Service Networks and to direct the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report regarding such delayed payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5194. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to the Muslim Brotherhood or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5195. A bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 5196. A bill to reduce waste and implement cost savings and revenue enhancement for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an appeal process for designation as qualified census tracts and difficult development areas under the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 5200. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to define care coordination, include care coordination as a fully restorative service, and detail the care coordination functions of the Assistant Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt agricultural loads traveling on Federal highways if State agricultural regulations are met; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5202. A bill to require notification when personally identifying information is disclosed by a Government agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution calling for urgent international intervention on behalf of Iraqi civilians facing a dire humanitarian crisis and severe persecution in the Nineveh Plain region of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 682. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding worker protections in Qatar and the 2022 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 683. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 684. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the life of Maya Angelou; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUIZ):

H. Res. 685. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 686. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2821) to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

278. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 1076 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

279. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 37 supporting legislation that reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank; to the Committee on Financial Services.

280. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1261 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

281. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1261 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

282. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 22 urging the Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

283. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1257 urging the Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses of Currituck County; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

284. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 applying to the Congress to call a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

285. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 urging the Congress to call a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 40 urging the President to take executive action to suspend any further deportations of unauthorized individuals with no serious criminal history; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 urging the timely action by the President and the Congress to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

288. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1256 honoring the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 5184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 5185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 5190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following.

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 5191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 5192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 which provides that ''no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 5194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3; and Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clauses 5 & 18, of the United States Constitution

These state that:

''Congress shall have power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.''

''Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Rule XII.

By Mr. REED:
H.R. 5199.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.
By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 5200.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:
H.R. 5201.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill. The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H.R. 5202.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment 4.
''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 279: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 318: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 411: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 448: Mr. Jolly.
H.R. 506: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 543: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 647: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 690: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 708: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 769: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 789: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 831: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 851: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1015: Mr. BARBER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1070: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1263: Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1387: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1462: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1527: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1563: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1620: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1763: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1812: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2066: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2101: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2103: Mr. SIRES and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2224: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2450: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2529: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2536: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2540: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 2632: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2673: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2727: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2847: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2852: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2856: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2917: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2957: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 2989: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2992: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2996: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2998: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3123: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 3367: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3461: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3486: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3489: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3508: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3538: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3581: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3680: Mr. BARR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3681: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3698: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3717: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3722: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3723: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3837: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3854: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3877: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3902: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3963: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4060: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4068: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4091: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4136: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4143: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4169: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4188: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4190: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4212: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4221: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4234: Mr. COLE and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4258: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4276: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4319: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4351: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4365: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4385: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4440: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4446: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4447: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 4460: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4510: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4521: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4567: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4574: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4607: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4612: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4625: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4628: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4645: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4678: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4682: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 4707: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4716: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4748: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4778: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4793: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4816: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4818: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4855: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4857: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4874: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4885: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4886: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4902: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4915: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4930: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4936: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4952: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4960: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4966: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4986: Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4989: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 5023: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 5026: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 5052: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5062: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 5065: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 5078: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. REED, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 5082: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 5083: Mr. LONG and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 5088: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5089: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5095: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARR, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5101: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 5110: Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 5130: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5137: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5143: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5159: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5177: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LATHAM.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HARRIS,

Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FINCHER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 281: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 411: Mr. CHABOT.

H. Res. 428: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 536: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 543: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COOK, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H. Res. 558: Mr. ENYART.

H. Res. 587: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 623: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 665: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 667: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 675: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H. Res. 679: Mr. RIBBLE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4098: Mr. CLAY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM SUMMER

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Freedom Summer and the significant role of Western College for Women in Oxford, Ohio, now part of Miami University.

In the summer of 1964, college students, civil rights activists, and volunteers joined together to advance the civil rights of African-Americans in Mississippi. The initiative, called the Mississippi Summer Project, was a comprehensive approach to educate and register African-American voters. Hundreds of volunteers assembled in June 1964 at the Western College for Women in Oxford, Ohio for training, learning non-violent methods for dealing with potentially violent opposition.

The memory of Freedom Summer lives on in the account of three brave participants—Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman—who lost their lives in the pursuit of civil rights. These young men departed Oxford, Ohio on June 20, 1964 to investigate a church fire in Mississippi and disappeared shortly thereafter. Burned remains of their car were found on June 23, 1964. The disappearance and deaths of Michael, James, and Andrew brought national attention to Freedom Summer and underscored the obstacles and danger that faced each participant.

I am proud of our community and its meaningful role in Freedom Summer. Throughout 2014, Miami University is hosting a series of activities and events entitled ''Celebrating Freedom: Understanding the Past, Building the Future.'' On October 12–14, 2014, activists and leaders will reunite and join current Miami University students for a national conference to explore the enduring importance of Freedom Summer.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Freedom Summer, it is important to remember this period in our history as more than just a passage in time. Our nation also heralded the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on July 2. The 50th anniversary of these historic events is an opportunity for all Americans to reflect on the Civil Rights Movement and to build on the work of the heroic leaders who came before us.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NIKI TSONGAS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 433, 434, 435, and 436 on July 22, 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all four votes.

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4450, the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014, because the legislation ensures our continued ability to promote the United States as an international travel destination.

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4411, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2014, because it reinforces the United States' position against terrorist organizations. Imposing these sanctions will deter financial institutions and other entities from facilitating financial transactions with Hezbollah.

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2014, because I support permanently authorizing the Department of Energy's Critical Minerals Institute so that the United States can ensure a reliable supply of elements required for a broad range of advanced technologies and better promote research and development in the public and private sectors.

I would have voted in favor of the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3230, because I agree with the Senate's broad-based approach to addressing issues in the Department of Veterans Affairs. At this crucial junction, the Department requires both considerable oversight and support from Congress so that changes are put in place to ensure veterans are receiving the care they have earned and deserve.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF ZETA BETA TAU FRATERNITY, AND HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS ANTECEDENT GROUP PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY

HON. STEVE COHEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, my Brotherhood, and its antecedent group Phi Alpha Fraternity in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Phi Alpha in celebration of the centennial International Convention of Zeta Beta Tau.

Phi Alpha Fraternity was founded at The George Washington University in Washington, D.C., on October 14, 1914, by David Davis, Edward Lewis, Hyman Shapiro, Reuben Schmidt and Maurice Herzmark, who saw the need for an idealistic brotherhood. The first pledge ceremony in February 1915 was followed by the establishment of a chapter house, one of the most luxurious establishments in the nation's capital. At one time, Phi Alpha had chapters at nearly 30 universities, but as with many other fraternities, the Depression and World Wars took their toll. During the uncertain war years, many chapters became inactive when almost all the men in the chapters entered into military service. In April 1959, Phi Alpha Fraternity merged with Phi Sigma Delta Fraternity, creating a combined fraternity with 47 active chapters. In 1969–70, Phi Sigma Delta merged into Zeta Beta Tau.

Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity has convened its International Convention 100 times since the first event was held in 1906 in New York City. The event presents the opportunity to share Fraternity in its truest sense with brothers from around the world. Washington, D.C., has hosted the International Convention four times, in 1937, 1957, 1974 and 2014.

Today, as a brother of Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, I join International President Michael (Mike) D. Cimini, Kappa (Cornell University) '92, and my entire Brotherhood in honoring the men of Phi Alpha Fraternity. We are honored to celebrate our Fraternity's 100th Convention in the nation's capital while honoring Phi Alpha and The George Washington University. I am proud to be a member of the distinguished Brotherhood of Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, an organization of men who dedicate this day and every day to fostering leadership and service and developing the tenets of our Credo—Intellectual Awareness, Social Responsibility, Integrity and Brotherly Love—in all brothers.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF SENIOR AIRMAN TIMOTHY J. WRIGHT OF PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and deep sympathy that I pay tribute to the life and dedicated service of Senior Airman Timothy J. ''Tim'' Wright, of Pensacola, Florida. Tim passed away on July 17, 2014 as a result of injuries sustained during a military readiness exercise at Pope Army Airfield, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Senior Airman Wright, who graduated from the Pensacola Christian Academy in 2003, joined the Air Force in 2009. As a medic, he was first stationed at Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield, California, where he was awarded two medals for Meritorious Service and Outstanding Achievement. He deployed twice to Afghanistan and earned the Air Force Achievement Medal for his service with the 651st Expeditionary Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron in Kandahar and the Air Force Achievement Medal for Outstanding Achievement for his service with the 455th Expeditionary Medical Operations Squadron at

Bagram Airfield. During his deployments, he showed interest in becoming an aeromedical evacuation technician, and after successfully completing his training, Senior Airman Wright was transferred to Pope Airfield where he joined the 43rd Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron in May 2014.

Throughout his career, Senior Airman Wright displayed an unyielding commitment to protect and defend this great country and to care for his fellow warriors. To his parents, David and Sylvia; brothers, Aaron and Mathew; and to all of his family and friends, we owe our eternal gratitude. Tim touched the lives of many and displayed dedication to duty and courage of heart. He will always be remembered for his selfless service to this great Nation, and his life will continue to inspire those who knew him best and those who follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Senior Airman Timothy J. Wright. My wife, Vicki, joins me in offering our most sincere condolences and prayers to his family and friends. May God continue to bless them and the brave men and women of our United States Armed Forces.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DAVID J. WILKIE

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Colonel David J. Wilkie, who is retiring after 30 years of Active Duty Service in the United States Army. The valuable leadership demonstrated in his role as Chief of the Neuroscience and Rehabilitation Center at Dwight David Eisenhower Army Medical Center (DDEAMC) is indispensable. His position there represents the culmination of a career that has been defined by a drive for excellence.

During his time at the United States Military Academy at West Point, COL Wilkie was a four year distinguished cadet, wearing a star on his collar indicating his rank in the top five percent of his class. In 1987, he was elected by his classmates to the position of Chairman of the Cadet Honor Committee and served on the Brigade Staff as a First Class Cadet. He graduated in 1988, receiving the Army Medical Department Award for the highest academically ranking cadet entering the AMEDD and the General McClellan award for the Chairman of the Cadet Honor Committee.

After graduation from West Point, COL Wilkie completed the AMEDD Officer Basic Course at Fort Sam Houston, Texas and earned a degree of Doctor of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in Bethesda, Maryland. From there, he completed his internship and residency in Neurology at Madigan Army Medical Center. COL Wilkie has been Board Certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology since 1997, scoring in the top five percent nationally on his board Certification exam.

An expert in his field, COL Wilkie has served in leadership positions on staff at DDEAMC and Madigan Army Medical Center, on numerous prestigious boards and committees and important response teams. COL Wilkie led the development of the DDEAMC Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) program, and the Level 1 TBI program at DDEAMC was the first program certified by the Office of the Surgeon General in 2009. COL Wilkie was also instrumental in developing the Integrated Pain Management Clinic at DDEAMC, again the first such program active in the Department of Defense.

Additionally, COL Wilkie served as Battalion Surgeon for 2–3 Infantry Battalion in Mosul, Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2004. In 2013, he served as US FORCES–Afghanistan Neurology consultant at Bagram Airfield, Afghanistan during Operation Enduring Freedom. His decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, Army Commendation Medal (3 OLC), Navy Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal (2 OLC), National Defense Service Medal with bronze star, Iraqi Campaign Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary and Service Medals, Army Service Ribbon, NATO Medal, Air Assault Badge and Combat Medic Badge.

COL Wilkie truly has made leadership and service his calling. In his own community, he coaches little league sports, participates in medical education programs, serves on the St. Teresa of Avila Parish Council, and operates the Parish Angel Gabriel Message charity, an organization he founded that supports local families facing childhood cancer.

In a profession that is saturated with talent, intelligence, and leadership, COL Wilkie has managed to distinguish himself among his peers. For this reason, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is my honor to applaud the great work of Colonel David Wilkie following three decades of outstanding service to the United States Armed Forces.

HONORING RENEE THERIAULT WEBBER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Renee Theriault Webber upon her retirement from the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) after thirty years of dedicated service. As the Division Manager for the SCWA's Environmental and Public Affairs Division, Ms. Webber made significant contributions to the conservation and management of environmental resources and water use in Sonoma County.

Ms. Webber has devoted her professional life to environmental conservation. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies from California State University, Sacramento. She is a member of both the Association of Environmental Professionals and the California Native Plant Society.

Among her innumerable contributions while with the SCWA, Ms. Webber coordinated the development of a national coalition to secure Congressional authorization for the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund. Established in fiscal year 2000, the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund aims to protect, restore, and conserve Pacific salmon and steelhead populations as well as their habitats.

In addition to her work with the SCWA, Ms. Webber was also a principal manager of the North Bay Water Reuse Program. This program brings together three counties and ten water and sanitation agencies to address water supply shortages by working to develop recycled water as a new water supply source. When fully implemented, the North Bay Water Reuse Program will produce 33,000 acre-feet of recycled water per year in order to maximize the water supply in the North Bay.

Ms. Weber is credited by her colleagues as being able to see both sides of an issue and then build consensus among those with differing opinions. Ms. Webber's leadership in environmental management and water reuse is greatly appreciated and will certainly be missed. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Webber for her public service and wish her a most enjoyable retirement.

RECOGNIZING JAMES C. McCLOSKEY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career and accomplishments of James C. McCloskey who has served for the past 34 years as the Founder and Executive Director of Centurion Ministries of Princeton, New Jersey, and has been a tireless advocate for people wrongly convicted across our country.

A native of Philadelphia, Jim graduated from Bucknell University in 1964. After three years as a naval officer in Japan and Vietnam, Jim spent 13 years in business in Tokyo and Philadelphia. After his stint in the business world, Jim opted for a change and went to pursue a Masters in Divinity from Princeton Theological Seminary. During that time Jim served as a student chaplain at the Trenton State Prison where he met then inmate Jorge De Los Santos.

After listening to the convicted man's claims of innocence Jim took it upon himself to review the case.

After reading the entire record of the case, he came to believe that Mr. De Los Santos was innocent. Jim then, using his own money, spent the next three years, including a yearlong sabbatical from seminary, investigating Mr. De Los Santos' case. After bringing forward the only witness against Mr. De Los Santos, Jim hired a young lawyer, Paul Casteleiro, to have the case retried. In July 1983 Mr. De Los Santos was exonerated and freed and Centurion Ministries was launched. Jim knew that this was his calling for the rest of his life.

Most of the early cases came from the stories that Mr. De Los Santos had told Jim regarding several other men Mr. De Los Santos believed were innocent. Upon reading their case files Jim came to believe them, too. Jim

worked alone until 1987 when he obtained his fifth exoneration and the general public took notice of this remarkable work he was doing.

He founded Centurion Ministries in order to bring voice to those who have lost all appeals and thus all hope of having their wrongful convictions brought to light. Beginning with a staff of just himself, Centurion Ministries has grown and now has eight full time staff, five part time staff, and a group of 23 part time volunteers who dedicate their time to the cause of the wrongfully convicted.

Centurion Ministries takes on the difficult cases. They do not shun cases that can turn on DNA evidence, but because there are other avenues for inmates whose cases have DNA evidence, Centurion Ministries' focus has been primarily on cases that require a field investigation and a very savvy lawyer. To date Centurion Ministries has overturned the wrongful conviction of 53 individuals who have served a combined 1083 years wrongfully imprisoned, and at any given time is working on 20 or so cases at various stages of investigation.

I cannot stress strongly enough the courage and heart Jim exemplifies in this now crowded field of work. He not only chose to work for people he did not know, but he used his own money to do so. Unlike most of the people doing similar work today who have universities to pay their salaries and give them office and staff, Jim had only himself to rely on. He lived modestly and devoted himself to this cause. His commitment to these individuals he works for does not end with their freedom. They are family.

Although Jim has announced he will no longer have an active role in the day to day operations of Centurion Ministries in the spring of next year, I know that he will continue to be a force for justice for years to come. He is a very special person. I join many admirers of Jim McCloskey in thanking him for his work and wishing him well in the future.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), which helps provide civil legal aid to low-income Americans who otherwise would be unable to afford legal representation. LSC was created in 1974 through a bipartisan effort by Republicans and Democrats in Congress and was signed into law by President Nixon.

Today, LSC provides funding to 134 local legal aid programs, which operate nearly 800 offices in every congressional district around the country. Funding provided through LSC supports low-income Americans, including women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned and seniors defending against consumer scams, among other cases. LSC-funded attorneys help parents obtain and keep custody of their children, assist parents in enforcing child support payments and help women who are victims of domestic violence. In fact, three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities.

As chairman of the House Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations subcommittee from 2001–2006 and again since 2011, I have worked closely with the LSC leadership to support these programs and ensure that funding is spent efficiently and appropriately. I have also worked with my colleagues in Congress and LSC leadership to mitigate partisan issues that undermine support for this program. Through these efforts, we have been able to ensure that LSC funding is focused on supporting legitimate civil legal aid needs by those Americans who need it most.

Over the past several years, I have encouraged LSC to do more to engage law firms and bar associations to expand pro bono services in coordination with the corporation. In response, the LSC board created a Pro Bono Task Force in 2011 and produced a comprehensive report with innovative ideas to bolster national pro bono efforts. I want to credit LSC Board Chairman John Levi and LSC President Jim Sandman for their leadership on this project, which has the potential to further extend LSC's support for low-income Americans.

Forty years after its creation, the LSC fills a critical gap by providing low-income Americans with legal assistance they wouldn't otherwise have access to. I want to commend the Legal Services Corporation and the attorneys working in our communities for the work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel.

IN HONOR OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) on its 40th anniversary. Forty years ago, President Nixon signed into law the LSC Act, establishing the Legal Services Corporation as one of the major sources of funding for civil legal aid. In the time since, LSC has grown to be the single largest funder of civil legal aid for low-income Americans, including many military families and veterans.

Legal Services Corporation-funded legal aid programs continue to make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. LSC funds 134 legal aid organizations that serve hundreds of thousands of low-income individuals, children, families, seniors, and veterans across America. These individuals range from women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, and seniors defending against consumer scams.

Demand for legal services and the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater in this country. In recent years, however, over 1,000 full time employees have been terminated as a result of a continued lack of funding for LSC. So while we reflect on the achievements of LSC over the last forty years, Congress must also renew its commitment to providing LSC the critical resources it needs to assist our most vulnerable.

On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote numbers 433, 434, 435, and 436 on July 22, 2014, and rollcall vote numbers 437, 438, 439, 440, and 441 on July 23, 2014.

I would like to submit how I would have voted:

On rollcall vote No. 433 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 434 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 435 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 436 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 437 I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 438 I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 439 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 440 I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 441 I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP POLICE SGT. MARK WERT

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to offer my congratulations to Middletown Township Police Sgt. Mark Wert for 33 years of outstanding service to the people of my home community and its police department.

As always, the community owes a debt of gratitude to those first responders who, each day, selflessly protect our lives and property. Sgt. Wert began his career on July 15, 1981,

moving to squad supervisor and then administration overseeing the Traffic Safety Unit. He also was the instructor for Emergency Vehicle Operations and one of the department's first Field Training Officers. His dedication is recognized by the responsibilities he took on within the police department and also in the community. He was a director of the Transportation Management Association of Bucks County and active in the community's volunteer fire service—Skyline Fire Association and William Penn Fire Co.

Sgt. Wert's retirement begins on August 1, 2014 and so, on behalf of the grateful community where I live and that I represent in this House, I extend sincere appreciation to Sgt. Mark Wert and wish him many healthy and happy retirement years.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,610,253,000,219.65. We've added $6,983,375,951,306.57 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

STRENGTHENING THE TRANSATLANTIC ALLIANCE IN THE FACE OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, ongoing events in Ukraine, especially the tragedy involving Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17, pose a significant security threat not only to Europe but also the world. Russia's military aggression, its tacit support of pro-Russian Ukrainian separatists, and its use of energy as a political weapon warrant a strong response. The United States and our European allies must take strong and definitive action to strengthen the transatlantic alliance, and stem Russian aggression and its efforts to destabilize the region.

The United States must stand with our European allies and re-emphasize its commitment to a strong security alliance. While I agree with the overall goal of President Obama's European Reassurance Initiative to increase U.S. rotational deployments, allied training, and strategic planning, ultimately this proposal lacks a long-term strategy and commitment to our partnership with Europe. We can and must do more.

That is why I authored H.R. 4433, the Forging Peace through Strength in Ukraine and the Transatlantic Alliance Act, which calls for decisive action to remedy the current crisis in Ukraine and deter greater Russian aggression in Europe. Specifically, the measure would bolster U.S.-Ukraine security relations by seeking to provide technical assistance to the Ukrainian military and increase U.S. intelligence information sharing. H.R. 4433 would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to ensure the operational availability of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense system site in Poland and require the deployment of a short-range air and missile defense system to Poland. In addition, the bill would require the Secretary of Defense to stop plans for the relocation and consolidation of U.S. dual-capable aircraft based in Europe, conduct site studies for the construction of weapon storage and security systems and protective aircraft shelters in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and coordinate with NATO countries to assess the possibility of altering the posture of forward deployed U.S. nuclear weapons. Several of the provisions of my legislation are included in the House-passed version of the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act.

Strengthening the NATO alliance is also a critical component to pushing back against Russian aggression. The partnership between the United States and Europe through NATO has been the bedrock of stability in the region. However, it is clear that Russia seeks to once again destabilize much of Eastern Europe and restore its control over territories lost following the collapse of the Soviet Union. We must provide immediate reassurance to our European allies that the United States remains firm in our commitment to security. We must also make a strong push for the further enlargement of NATO. Specifically, the United States should support the accession of Montenegro, put a full diplomatic press on the issue of resolving the conflict between Macedonia and Greece, seek resolution to the constitutional issues of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and encourage the membership prospects of Georgia through the Membership Action Plan process. In fact, I authored an amendment, which the House approved unanimously, to the House-passed Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act expressing strong support for the ongoing NATO enlargement initiatives.

Bolstering regional and global energy security is another key aspect of the transatlantic alliance. Russia has repeatedly used natural gas pricing to draw governments closer to its orbit and punished West-leaning governments with higher prices. Previous disputes between Ukraine and Russia led to natural gas shutoffs in 2006 and 2009, negatively affecting downstream European countries. In April 2014, Russia's state-owned monopoly, Gazprom, increased the price of natural gas on Ukraine by 80 percent. And in early June 2014, Gazprom cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine.

The United States must continue to support efforts to help our European allies diversify their energy resources. In fact, multiple U.S. Administrations have previously supported initiatives to supply Europe with alternative and reliable sources of energy, such as the Southern Gas Corridor which will bring natural gas from Azerbaijan to Europe. That is why I authored H. Res. 284, a bipartisan resolution which recognizes the importance of the Southern Gas Corridor to energy security and our strategic partnerships.

At the same time, energy diversification initiatives may offer opportunities to benefit the United States economically. For instance, U.S. companies are involved in the development of growing recent natural gas discoveries in the Eastern Mediterranean, which may help countries in the region to bolster political and economic ties and present another source of energy for Europe. And many of our European allies have expressed strong interest in purchasing U.S. natural gas to help diversify their resources and strengthen their independence.

Increasing U.S. natural gas exports, along with development of other sources such as the Southern Gas Corridor and the Eastern Mediterranean, will help diversify world natural gas supplies and create a more competitive, transparent, and diversified global natural gas marketplace. This will help curb the ability of countries like Russia to use energy as a political weapon.

In fact, U.S. natural gas production has already influenced global markets. Natural gas previously destined for the United States, but no longer needed as a result of increased production, was diverted to other markets. This increased supply has made the global natural gas market more competitive, helping to put pressure on contracts indexed to the price of oil and allowing several European countries to successfully renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom.

Lifting self-imposed restrictions on U.S. natural gas exports will emphasize to our allies that the United States is a strong energy security partner and send an immediate signal to markets that new supplies of natural gas will be available, helping to influence prices and new infrastructure construction decisions. And regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply in the global marketplace will help provide international consumers with greater choice and thus increased leverage to negotiate pricing contracts. In fact, Obama Administration officials, including the State Department's energy envoy, Carlos Pascual, have made this very argument.

In addition, fostering a more diverse and competitive global natural gas market can complement U.S. and European sanctions on Russia. Oil and gas receipts constitute more than 50 percent of Russia's federal revenues.

President Obama, in a March 2014 joint statement with European leaders, welcomed U.S. natural gas exports to help our European allies. While I am encouraged by the President's statement, immediate action is needed to put force behind these words.

Over the past several years, I have worked to reduce self-imposed regulatory barriers to exporting U.S. natural gas. Specifically, in the 112th Congress I authored with then-Senator Richard Lugar (R–IN), H.R. 6699, the LNG for NATO Act, which sought to expedite U.S. natural gas exports to NATO countries. In the 113th Congress, I authored with Senator JOHN BARRASSO (R–WY), H.R. 580, the Expedited LNG for American Allies Act, to expedite U.S. natural gas exports to NATO countries, Japan, and other countries of national security interest. I also authored H.R. 4139, the American Job Creation and Strategic Alliances LNG Act, to expedite U.S. natural gas exports to World Trade Organization countries.

And I am an original co-author of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, which the House recently approved with bipartisan support, to require the Department of Energy to consider natural gas export permit applications in a timely manner. It is imperative that the President work with Congress on these energy security initiatives to follow through on his stated support of global energy security and U.S. natural gas exports.

The United States, in partnership with our European allies, must respond strongly to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine. Reinforcing our defense relationships with Europe, particularly Ukraine and Eastern Europe, strengthening our strategic partnerships through NATO, and enhancing European and global energy security are critical components to bolstering the transatlantic alliance and deterring further Russian aggression in the region.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT WILLIAM D. BERNIER AND NINE OTHER BRAVE AMERICANS

HON. STEVE DAINES

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, on April 10th, 1944, as many as 60 B–24 Liberators from the Fifth Air Force attacked enemy anti-aircraft targets and airfields on the northern coast of New Guinea.

One of those heavy bombers, known as ''Hot Garter,'' was hit by flak and went down with its crew of 12. On board was First Lieutenant William D. Bernier from Augusta, Montana.

The remains of nine of these brave Americans, including First Lieutenant Bernier were determined to be ''unrecoverable'' but due to technological advances, his remains were recently identified and will soon be at rest in Montana.

It is the solemn duty of our nation to not leave any behind who have made the ultimate sacrifice. On behalf of the state of Montana, thank you to those who worked diligently to bring William home.

COMMENDING PRIME MINISTER NAJIB RAZAK OF MALAYSIA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Prime Minister Najib Razak of Malaysia for his leadership in negotiating the release of the remains of the victims killed in the downing of flight MH17 in eastern Ukraine.

Prime Minister Najib held a series of secret talks with the separatists to broker an agreement for the return of the bodies and the promise of safe passage for recovery teams going to the crash site. He also secured the return of the black boxes of flight MH17 so that a full investigation may ensue.

Prime Minister Najib's personal involvement in the negotiations sets the standard for diplomacy around the world. I commend Prime Minister Najib for not leaving negotiations to aides.

Some matters in life are sacred, and I am pleased that Prime Minister Najib recognized this situation as such. I thank him for setting aside politics for a higher purpose—to return the bodies of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters to the families who lost and loved them. I praise him for doing what others would not or could not.

My thoughts and prayers are with all those who have been affected by this tragedy. After a full and fair investigation, I am hopeful that those responsible will be held accountable.

HONORING RICH SALVESTRIN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rich Salvestrin, the recipient of the Napa County Farm Bureau's 2014 Agriculturist of the Year Award. Mr. Salvestrin has been, and continues to be, a tireless advocate and fierce supporter of agriculture in the Napa Valley. It is therefore appropriate that we recognize and thank Mr. Salvestrin today for his unwavering support and relentless efforts to preserve and promote agriculture in Napa County.

Mr. Salvestrin was born and grew up in St. Helena, California. His education in agriculture began at an early age. By the time he was ten, he was helping his father and grandfather prune vines on the family vineyard. Mr. Salvestrin went on to attend California State University, Fresno, where he received a Bachelor of Science in Viticulture. After completing his degree, Mr. Salvestrin returned to his family's vineyard, where he applied his education and experience to expand the family business from a grape growing operation to include winemaking.

Mr. Salvestrin has worked with the Napa County Farm Bureau for nearly three decades to advance agriculture in the Napa Valley. Soon after joining the Bureau in 1985, Rich joined the Bureau's Young Farmer and Rancher Program, where he completed the Ag Leadership program in the early 1990s. Rich began serving on the Napa County Farm Bureau's Board of Directors in 1994 and notably, he served as the president of the Napa County Farm Bureau from 1999–2001.

Rich has been a leader in protecting the Napa Valley's farmland and watersheds. He was a crucial supporter of the Napa Green/Fish Friendly Farming Program. He also serves as a board member on the Napa County Winegrape Pest & Disease Control District. And as a member of the Glassy Winged Sharpshooter Action Team, he helped to control an invasive species that threatened the region's livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, Rich Salvestrin's leadership in the wine industry and viticultural preservation is greatly appreciated by the entire Napa community and we wish him further success in an already distinguished career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes Nos. 439–441, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall No. 439, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 440, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

On rollcall No. 441, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECOGNIZING SHIRLEY HAROLD

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Shirley Harold for her hard work and determination in the fight to keep young kids safe around water.

In March 2008, Ms. Harold experienced the pain no parent or grandparent should ever have to. Her 2-year-old grandson J'Mari drowned in a swimming pool.

Since then, her goal has been to educate her community on the importance of swimming lessons, CPR and layers of protection to prevent drowning.

In 2007, I ushered through Congress the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act, the first federal pool and spa safety law on the books in our country.

This law has a specific focus on public swimming pools, which is a key component in the fight against accidental drowning.

But we all know that many of these tragedies are occurring in residential swimming pools as well, which VGB does not cover.

Despite our best efforts to find common sense solutions to these preventable tragedies, we are collectively frustrated and disappointed that we haven't been able to get a better handle on how to resolve what we believe is a preventable crisis.

We have already experienced 7 drowning deaths among children 0–4 years of age in Broward County this year. And that doesn't include the near-drowning victims.

It pains me to say that Florida is leading the nation in drownings under age 14, with 32 deaths between January and May occurring statewide. At this time last year there were 14 deaths.

Since J'Mari's death in 2008, Shirley has become a fierce advocate for pool safety. On Saturday, July 26, her foundation, J'Mari and Friends is holding a community forum. Parents and children will learn CPR and drowning prevention tips.

I commend Shirley's commitment in her dedication to teaching young children to swim.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JAMES LEE MILLER, SR.

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Lee Miller was born and raised in Tutwiler, Mississippi. He was educated in the Mississippi public school system during the 1930's and 1940's. He was baptized, attended the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church and sung with the Delta Big Four Quartet.

In 1947, James married Ms. Essie Davis and they were blessed with four sons. He later united with Charlene Davies and to that union another four children were born. In the midst of his family life, James continued school, became a certified electrician and worked for local electric companies.

For over forty-five years James Miller, Sr. was a businessman and was well-known around Chicago. He was involved in the social entertainment business and that is where many people knew him.

His nightclub, The Texas Lady Lounge, was for many years one of the most popular spots in the community.

As a matter of fact for ten years I lived less than four blocks from the Texas Lady and it was not at all unusual for me and my friends to have our discussions in the lounge over a glass of water, or whatever else we might be drinking.

I have been told that one's impact on the world is measured not only by what they bring but also by what they leave and Mr. James Miller has left a great impact and tremendous legacy, a devoted wife, twelve children, a host of grandchildren, relatives and friends. Prominent among them great preachers and leaders, Johnny Miller, Rev. Dr. Matthew Miller, Pastor Leon Miller and a great hands-on physician whose office I have used Dr. James Miller, Jr.

The Miller family is cherished in our community and this could not have happened without the life and the legacy of Mr. James Miller, Sr., born December 9, 1929.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In 1974, Congress—with bipartisan support, including that of President Nixon—established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

It is LSC-funded attorneys who help parents obtain and keep custody of their children, assist parents in enforcing child support payments and help women who are victims of domestic violence. In fact, three out of four legal aid clients are women, and legal aid programs identify domestic violence as one of their top priorities.

Given the vital role played by LSC-funded attorneys, we need to do better than turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance because of lack of LSC program resources. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel. Every day that a legal aid attorney protects the safety, security and health of our most vulnerable citizens, they bring this nation closer to living up to its commitment to equal justice for all.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor and congratulate the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) as they celebrate their 40th anniversary this Friday, July 25th.

In 1974, Congress established LSC to better ensure equal access to justice under the law. LSC was created with bipartisan support, and the authorizing legislation was signed into law by President Nixon. The goal of the program from the outset has been to ensure access to civil legal assistance to those who are otherwise unable to afford it. LSC does this by distributing federal funding to local legal aid providers who in turn use the funding to address the needs of our constituents. Today, the LSC distributes funding to 134 local providers who have offices in every congressional district in our nation, as well as in the U.S. territories.

The programs make a vital difference in the lives of millions of ordinary Americans each year. Lawyers funded by LSC help families facing unlawful evictions, women seeking protection from abuse, veterans seeking benefits, seniors defending against consumer scams, and mothers seeking child support. In my home town of New York City, LSC funding also provided crucial assistance to low-income individuals who faced problems as a result of Superstorm Sandy and had nowhere else to turn.

For all the good work that LSC-funded programs do, there is still more to be done. LSC funded entities are forced to turn away 50 percent of eligible individuals seeking assistance. This gap, known as the justice gap, shows that we have come a long way, but we must do more to ensure there is adequate funding for LSC and the programs that they serve. As a Member of the Appropriations Committee, I will continue to fight to increase funding for this worthy program

Mr. Speaker, justice should not be limited only to those who can afford it. Equal access to our justice system is at the essence of our democracy. Our court system should allow everyone who has a legitimate grievance to pursue justice with the best possible representation. For the past 40 years, LSC and all of its grantees have helped ensure that our nation lives up to these ideals. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating LSC for their good work over the past 40 years.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe 40 years passing since the division of the island of Cyprus, and to again encourage a final agreement to bring peace and prosperity to all Cypriots.

Every year, many of my colleagues call for the peaceful reunification of Cyprus citing the 1974 military action by Turkey; however, few note what precipitated that act.

Eleven years prior, in 1963, the Partnership Republic of Cyprus crumbled due to a Greek-backed coup and its ensuing violence. And, in 1974, Greek-backed military rules staged another coup in an effort to unify Cyprus and Greece, at the expense of the rights of Turkish Cypriots.

In addition to the 40th anniversary of Cyprus' division, I would like to note that this year also marks the 10th anniversary of the Annan Plan, where Turkish Cypriots showed their good faith to the international community and a desire to move forward to a bi-zonal, bicommunal federation by voting overwhelmingly for the plan. In the years of pessimism that has followed, Cypriots from both communities have maintained the hope that a comprehensive solution can be achieved. And, recent discussions between both parties has given the citizens—and me—renewed hope.

In this air of cautious optimism, I call upon both Cyprus and Greece to redouble their efforts to secure a final agreement. I also want to call on the Administration to do everything within its power to encourage and support this process. I urge my colleagues, who I know wish nothing but the best for the island's peoples, to focus on the need to resolve a problem that has gone on for far too long, for the benefit of all Cypriots.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the founding principles of our republic is equal justice under the law. But the promise of justice for all is an empty one without access to legal assistance. I rise today to honor the Legal Services Corporation, which for 40 years has played a vital role in ensuring all Americans, regardless of income, have proper representation in court.

Studies consistently show that in contested matters in court involving fundamental issues like housing, education and family law, the outcome of the case often turns on whether one has legal representation. And with the growing number of Americans eligible for legal assistance, the need for the Legal Services Corporation has never been greater. That is why it is so important that Congress provides them with the funding they need to get the job done. Thank you to the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel.

H.R. 3393 THE STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT AND H.R. 4935 THE CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3393 the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act and H.R. 4935 the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act.

These bills that come before the House this week continue the weekly pattern of picking and choosing which tax extenders to make permanent. Instead of looking at all of the tax extenders comprehensively Republicans are again picking the extenders that many Members may find easy to support and making them permanent while failing to pay for them. I find it ironic that Representative CAMP has continued to bring permanent extenders to the floor, some of which he chose not to extend at all when he released his plan for comprehensive tax reform earlier this year.

H.R. 4935 expands the tax credit for families making as much as $160,000, families for which the tax credit is not essential. This legislation also changes the nature of the tax credit and will result in a family making as little as $14,500 to receive no tax credit, a credit that they desperately need. We should be expanding tax credits for low income families, not eliminating them.

H.R. 3393 seeks to lessen the burden on students and families seeking a higher education. While this is a noble goal, it does nothing to fix the underlying issue of paying for higher education, student loan debt. The class of 2012 graduated with an average of $29,400 in student loan debt; this legislation does nothing to address this. Instead of giving a tax break on tuition and other expenses we should reduce the need for student loans. We should double Pell Grant Funding. We should permanently extend and double Perkins funding. We should allow students to refinance student loan debt. Any one of these would do more good for student and families than this tax credit.

This Congress cannot continue blindly to pass permanent tax breaks. I have seen firsthand what happens when we take that approach. We did that under President Bush and went from budget surpluses to budget deficits. Deficits that have pushed Congress to reduce investment in our country in recent years.

I look forward to Congress addressing the tax extenders that require action by the end of the year in a serious way, not the way in which they have been brought before us thus far.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DEBBIE SIMMONS

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Debbie Simmons. Ms. Simmons is a native Floridian, born and raised in Miami. In spite of rigid family and societal opposition, she dreamt of marrying and raising a family with her high school girlfriend.

Ms. Simmons moved to Orlando in 1978. Later that same year, Harvey Milk was assassinated, profoundly impacting her life and leading her to extensively educate herself about gay rights, the Stonewall riots and the 1979 and 1987 Marches on Washington. She later attended the 1993 and 2000 March on Washington.

In 1990, she bought her first home with her partner of two years and prepared mock legal and financial documents to mimic a real marriage. In 1991 she walked in the first gay pride parade in Orlando, which marked the beginning of her community activism.

In 1992, she co-founded the Metropolitan Business Association (MBA), Central Florida's LGBT chamber of commerce. She served as the first vice president, and in a few months the board of directors appointed her president. She served in that role for 16 years. During her tenure, she organized six MBA Business Expos, the first of which was in 1994 with 89 vendors. She also produced and published yearly member business directories dubbed the MBA Buyer's Guide.

Her organization also hosted numerous forums and town hall meetings for local political candidates. This political involvement resulted in a change to the City of Orlando's anti-discrimination policy to include sexual orientation, providing protections for 3,200 city employees. The efforts also resulted in policy changes at the Orlando Police Department to end discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Ms. Simmons also co-founded the Orlando Anti-Discrimination Ordinance committee. In 2002, the committee succeeded in its effort when the City of Orlando amended its citywide anti-discrimination policy to include sexual orientation.

In addition, Ms. Simmons created MBA's subsidiary organization, Come Out With Pride. She developed and produced the 2005, 2006 and 2007 Come Out With Pride parade and festival. Additionally, she wrote its logistics manual and served as logistics director in 2008.

Through her work with MBA, Ms. Simmons also developed and produced the Central Florida LGBT History project in 2005, to preserve and chronicle the local LGBT movement. She partnered with the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Student Union (GLBSU) at the University of Central Florida (UCF) to develop future community leaders, new businesses, and lifetime relationships through scholarships, mentoring, and internships. Ms. Simmons has also spearheaded numerous consortiums to build consensus, strengthen leadership, and enrich the community.

I am happy to honor Ms. Debbie Simmons, during LGBT Pride Month, for her leadership and commitment to the LGBT community in Central Florida.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to urge the United States to advocate for a resolution to the ongoing conflict in Cyprus. July 20, 2014 marked the 40th anniversary of the division of Cyprus, and it is in the best interest of the United States to foster a state in which Greek and Turkish Cypriots may peacefully coexist.

In Congress, I have supported legislation that promotes a comprehensive peace agreement between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. I support discussions resuming to finally identify a settlement to this protracted conflict. It is my hope that a peaceful resolution to the territorial dispute will soon become reality and I am pleased with the progress that Cyprus continues to make with the United Nations and the United States. It is encouraging that the President of Cyprus has established several confidence-building measures that could lead to productive negotiations, measures that the United States has endorsed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the State Department to work with the government of Cyprus for the advancement of democracy, human rights, and the interests of the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on July 22, 2014, I missed four recorded votes

on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 433, "yea" on rollcall 434, "yea" on rollcall 435, and "nay" on rollcall 436.

TRIBUTE TO CARL F. AYLESTOCK

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the esteemed military career of Transportation Corporal Carl F. Aylestock. Corporal Aylestock's service and devotion are to be commended, and the people of West Virginia and the United States owe him an immense debt of gratitude.

Corporal Carl Aylestock began serving his country in 1941 when he enlisted in the United States Army during the Second World War. He went overseas in 1942 with the 29th Infantry Division for 18 months of rigorous training in England, specializing in amphibious operations. The 29th was one of the first divisions to arrive in the European theatre.

After landing on Omaha Beach during the Normandy invasion, serving in the Battle of the Bulge and participating in the occupation force in Germany, Corporal Aylestock was honorably discharged from service. In honor of his accomplishments, Corporal Aylestock was awarded a series of awards and decorations including: the Good Conduct Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Ribbon with a Bronze Arrowhead, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge with three stars. In addition, his regiment was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation for their valor on D–Day.

Now, 70 years later, Corporal Aylestock lives in Jane Lew, West Virginia, and is about to turn 100 years old in September. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the State of West Virginia and the United States of America, I would like to thank Corporal Carl Aylestock for his years of selfless service to our State and country.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF REVEREND FATHER CHRISTIAN R. ORAVEC

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Reverend Father Christian R. Oravec and to remember this dedicated man of faith who did so much for the people of Pennsylvania.

Father Oravec made it his life's work to give back to the community through service. He was a respected leader, serving as President of St. Francis University for 27 years. During that time he was instrumental in driving the school's continued growth, as well as offering guidance to generations of students as they passed through the university's doors each year. His leadership allowed St. Francis to thrive, and his frequent sightings across campus were a cherished part of the college experience for countless students. He was someone that students could look to for guidance, and was a person that they knew they could trust.

Father Oravec's leadership extended far beyond campus. He maintained a deep commitment to the community, serving as a leader and role model with involvement in over 16 different civic organizations. He was a devout man who dedicated his life to humbly serve a higher calling, and ministered at parishes both in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown and overseas in Europe. With Father Oravec's passing, Pennsylvania has lost one of its most beloved sons, but the memory of his work will remain with all those whose lives he touched. I invite my colleagues to join me in commemorating the life of Father Oravec and remembering the lasting difference that he made for so many.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF PINEVILLE CITY MARSHAL, LARRY JEANE

HON. VANCE M. McALLISTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. McALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Pineville City Marshal, Larry Jeane, who recently passed away at the age of 68.

A resident of Pineville, Louisiana for more than 45 years, Mr. Jeane's service to his local community earned him numerous honors and awards. He served as City Marshal for 17 years and spent 24 years working in the criminal justice, public safety and corrections field where he received the Charles Dunbar Career Civil Service Award for his service. Mr. Jeane was an active member of Sacred Heart Catholic Church in Pineville and an avid supporter of his alma mater, Louisiana College, where he was heavily involved in the athletic department.

Mr. Jeane exemplified strong leadership and dedication to all who had the honor of knowing him. I am grateful for his years of dedicated service to his community and for the pride he brought to the City of Pineville. It is with great pride that I recognize the life of such an accomplished and admirable man, and I ask my colleagues to join me today in commemorating Mr. Larry Jeane and his achievements.

HONORING RETIRED U.S. AIR FORCE MAJOR GENE EARDENSOHN

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember retired U.S. Air Force Major Gene Eardensohn of Charlotte, Vermont who passed away this year on the 29th of June. Major Eardensohn dedicated his life to the defense of our country. After college, he joined the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. He served as a pilot and flew combat missions throughout the war. He later served in the Korean War and the Vietnam War. He fought as a command pilot, flying both B–47 and B–52 aircrafts; later becoming an instructor in 11 different aircrafts. He retired having performed an impressive 29,000 flying hours. Major Eardensohn defended his country through three wars; but he was also a father of four children and a grandfather of seven grandchildren. Since retirement his family and friends nicknamed him, "Pilot Extraordinaire" and that is exactly what he was, extraordinary. His courage, devotion and patriotism are now forever preserved in our country's history.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 435, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL LYNCH

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a fellow community member and small business leader, Michael Lynch. Mr. Lynch's exemplary contributions to Turlock and surrounding communities in my district have earned him recognition by the Turlock Chamber of Commerce. Not only has the Turlock Chamber of Commerce recognized Mr. Lynch, CalChamber, California's statewide Chamber of Commerce, has awarded him the Small Business Advocate of the Year Award. This award was created in 1996 by CalChamber to recognize small business owners who have dedicated themselves to small business advocacy not only at a local and state level, but also at a national level.

In 1973, immediately after graduating from Santa Clara University, Mr. Lynch, began his long career of public service by becoming the Administrative Assistant to Sacramento County Supervisor Pat Melarkey. Mr. Lynch worked for Mr. Melarkey for five years before accepting a position at a law firm as a consultant.

After a short time in the private sector, Mr. Lynch accepted the Principal Consultant position at the California Assembly Office of Majority services in 1980. After his service at the California Assembly office, in 1984, he accepted a position as Chief of Staff for California Assemblyman Gary Condit, where he served for 13 years improving the lives of California citizens.

In 2004, Mr. Lynch became the Chief Operating Officer of Great Valley Center. Founded in 1997, the Great Valley Center is an organization whose mission it is to engage the public to take an active role and participate in local government. As the COO of Great Valley Center, Michael Lynch advised and oversaw the

organization's efforts in the California Central Valley to promote their mission. One of Mr. Lynch's greatest accomplishments while in office at the Great Valley Center was the merging of the organization with the University of California, Merced. After the successful integration of the university, Mr. Lynch returned to the private sector to found his own consulting firm. Although he runs his own firm, he still finds the time to advance the mission of the Great Valley Center by advocating for small businesses and bringing critical issues to the forefront of public discussions.

In order to effectively promote small business issues, Michael Lynch volunteered as Chairman of the Turlock Chamber of Commerce Government Relations Committee. As chair of the committee, Michael invites experts to discuss issues with local small business owners in order to keep his community informed. In addition, Mr. Lynch informs the general public and the national small business community about issues affecting Americans by being published in newspapers and business journals.

With his success as Chairman of the Government Relations Committee, the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors took notice of his expertise and appointed Mr. Lynch to serve on the County Water Advisory Committee. As part of the committee, he has been a strong advocate for small businesses who are dependent on the water supply. One of the highlights of his service on the advisory committee was the scheduling of regional water issues forums focused on the challenges that face Stanislaus County. Along with scheduling speakers for the forum, Mr. Lynch led conference calls and other outreach activities in order to secure the support and participation of key organizations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating with the Turlock Chamber of Commerce in honoring Michael Lynch; not only for being awarded the CalChamber Small Business Advocate of the Year Award, but also for continuing to volunteer his services to empower citizens and businesses in the Central Valley. California and the members of my district appreciate the 30 years of service Mr. Lynch has put into our great state and community and look forward to his continued support in the future. Thank you Michael Lynch.

IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL FRANK E. PETERSEN JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant General (LtGen) Frank E. Petersen Jr., the first African-American to serve as a three-star general officer in the U.S. Marine Corps. At the time of his retirement after 38 years, LtGen Petersen was the senior ranking aviator in the U.S. Marine Corps and the U.S. Navy with the respective titles of ''Silver Hawk'' and ''Gray Eagle''. He will be honored on July 28, 2014 for his selfless acts and lifetime of dedication to the Marine Corps and his country.

A Topeka, Kansas native, LtGen Petersen enlisted in the United States Navy in 1950 as a Seaman Apprentice where he served as an Electronics Technician. One year later, he entered the Naval Aviation Cadet Program, earning his commission and the rank of Second Lieutenant with the U.S. Marine Corps upon the completion of flight school in 1952. LtGen Petersen served during the Korean War, where his first tactical assignment was with Marine Fighter Squadron 212. After flying over 64 combat missions, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross for his combat leadership and bravery on June 15, 1953. He also flew 250 combat missions during the Vietnam conflict, receiving the Purple Heart after enemy anti-aircraft fire brought down his F–4B over the demilitarized zone. In addition, the Marine Corps Aviation Association honored his Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 314 (VMFA–314) with the inaugural Robert M. Hanson Award for best fighter attack squadron during the Vietnam conflict.

LtGen Petersen was the first African-American to command a Marine Fighter Squadron, a Marine Air Group, a Marine Aircraft Wing, and a major Marine base. On February 23, 1979, he was promoted to Brigadier General, becoming the first African-American general of the Marine Corps. Prior to his retirement, he served as the Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff and Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command in Quantico, Virginia.

Upon his retirement from the Marine Corps on August 1, 1988, LtGen Petersen concluded a military career of remarkable ''firsts''. He commanded at every level of command and stood as a trailblazer for all Marines. His autobiography, ''Into the Tiger's Jaw'', is known as the story of the modern U.S. Marine Corps, providing vital insight into the history of Marine aviation as well as the racial integration of the Marine Corps. Throughout the book's narrative, LtGen Petersen reflects on key moments that defined his life's sacrifices, triumphs, and key personal moments in addition to unequivocally chronicling the racial integration of the Marine Corps.

Throughout his career, LtGen Petersen confronted racism inside and outside the Marine Corps. Nevertheless, as he reflects in his book, the Marine Corps ethos enabled Marines to ultimately triumph over racism. Indeed, his life's commands illustrate the Marine Corps' triumph. In 1970, as deteriorating race relations threatened to rend the nation asunder, LtGen Petersen became the Special Assistant for Minority Affairs to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. His guidance to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense served the Marine Corps and the country well during this challenging period.

LtGen Petersen spent his civilian years as vice president of corporate aviation for du Pont de Nemours, Inc. He was also appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Education to serve as a Board Member of the Educational Credit Management Corporation.

LtGen Petersen's personal awards and decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal; Legion of Merit with Combat ''V''; Distinguished Flying Cross; Purple Heart; Meritorious Service Medal; Air Medal; Navy Commendation Medal with Combat ''V''; Air Force Commendation Medal; Robert M. Hanson Award for the Most Outstanding Fighter Squadron while assigned in Vietnam, 1968; Man of the Year, NAACP, 1979; Honorary Doctorate, Virginia Union University, 1987; and the Gray Eagle Trophy, August 21, 1987–June 15, 1988.

LtGen Petersen has certainly accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his wife of 39 years, Alicia, and his children; Frank III, Gayle, Dana, and Lindsey.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, the United States Marine Corps, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation to Lieutenant General Frank E. Petersen Jr., a pioneering leader who, in addition to achieving the distinction of a number of ''firsts'' for African-Americans, has the respect, admiration, and affection of his fellow Marines and leaves behind an outstanding legacy of service and leadership in the Marine Corps of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 24, 2014, I was unavoidably detained attending to representational activities in my congressional district, including attendance at the memorial service of a distinguished educator and community leader, and thus unable to return in time for rollcall votes 442 through 450. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

1. On rollcall No. 442 I would have voted ''no.'' (Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 4935 and H.R. 3393.)

2. On rollcall No. 443 I would have voted ''no.'' (H. Res. 680, Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 4935, Child Tax Credit Improvement Act and H.R. 3393 Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.)

3. On rollcall No. 444 I would have voted ''yes.'' (Kilmer/Hinojosa/Bachus/Petri/Tsongas Amendment to H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act, ensuring each individual is aware of financial management resources provided by the Treasury Department's Financial Literacy and Education Commission.)

4. On rollcall No. 445 I would have voted ''yes.'' (Motion to Recommit H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act.)

5. On rollcall No. 446 I would have voted ''yes.'' (Final Passage of H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act, Rep. GUTHRIE—Education and the Workforce.)

6. On rollcall No. 447 I would have voted ''yes.'' (H.R. 5111, To improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking Rep. BEATTY—Education and the Workforce.)

7. On rollcall No. 448 I would have voted ''yes.'' (Motion to Recommit H.R. 3933, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.)

8. On rollcall No. 449 I would have voted ''no.'' (Final Passage of H.R. 3393, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, Rep. BLACK—Ways and Means.)

9. On rollcall No. 450 I would have voted ''yes.'' (Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3230, Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014. Motion offered by Mr. PETERS of California would instruct conferees to recede from disagreement with section 702 of the Senate Amendment, which is related to the approval of courses of education provided by public institutions of higher learning for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program conditional on in-State tuition rates for veterans.)

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF RON LEGLER

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Ron Legler.

Ron is President and CEO of Florida Theatrical Association (FTA). Of his many accolades, Ron was recently recognized as Orlando Business Journal's Most Influential Businessman (Non-Profit) and the Downtown Orlando Partnership's Downtowner of the Year (DOTY). The Metropolitan Business Association of Orlando also awarded him the Debbie Simmons Community Service Award in 2013.

Ron is extremely active in the Orlando community. He serves as a Mayor-appointed Board Member of See Art Orlando. He is also a member of Leadership Orlando—Class of 55 and the Broadway League. Ron has previously served as an Arts Groups Advisory Board member at the Downtown Performing Arts Center, Vice President of the Central Florida Performing Arts Alliance, Chairman of the Downtown Arts District, Vice President of the Central Florida Performing Arts Alliance, and Vice Chairman of Orlando's International Fringe Festival.

Aside from his work with FTA, Ron has helped to spearhead the revitalization of the South Eola district of downtown by purchasing 25,000 square feet of space in The Sanctuary. Ron developed new offices in this space and opened two amazing new entertainment venues, The Abbey and The MEZZ. He formed a partnership with the surrounding businesses and branded the new area ''Eola Square.'' Ron has worked with the Orlando Ballet, Orlando Philharmonic and the Central Florida Jazz Society to develop intimate programs in The Abbey and The MEZZ that attract new patrons and give donors a closer look into the artistic side of the organizations, all in a risk-free rental environment.

In his more than 13 years as the leader of FTA, Ron has doubled the number of season ticket holders, making Orlando one of the country's top one-week Broadway markets. He also works with Broadway producers to attract the best possible touring shows to the Orlando market.

I am happy to honor Ron Legler, during LGBT Pride Month, for his work to further the arts in Central Florida.

HONORING ART IBLETO

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Art Ibleto for his induction into the Sonoma County Farm Bureau Hall of Fame. Art's contributions to our community are innumerable and far-reaching; therefore, it is appropriate that we honor and recognize him today.

Art was born and raised in Sesta Godano, Italy, which is where he first cultivated his lifelong love for good Italian cooking. When World War II erupted, Art served as a young demolition specialist in Italy, planting explosives under bridges, railroads and in highway tunnels to hinder the Nazi advance. After the war, Art made his way to Sonoma County in search of a brighter future and immediately immersed himself in the Sonoma County agriculture community. When he first arrived in the U.S., Art worked in the field picking vegetables at the Ghirardelli Ranch in Petaluma, which is where he met his wife, Vicki Ghirardelli. Since then, he has gone on to contribute to our agriculture community in many ways. From being an experienced meat cutter and farmer, to growing quality grapes and making superb wines, it's hard to think of an area of agriculture that Art hasn't left an indelible mark on.

In addition to his agricultural endeavors, Art is perhaps best known for his role as the beloved ''Pasta King''. For the past fifty years, Art has shared his gift for cooking authentic Italian food through his renowned Pasta King catering business. Art the Pasta King has been by my side at more of my events than I can count. He volunteers to cook at more community events and for more charitable causes than I could possibly list here. Art is truly committed to giving back to our community, to an extent that most of us will only ever hope to emulate. Art's unwavering passion and dedication to our community is an inspiration to all. And in turn, Art is beloved by all in our community.

But most importantly, I know Art as my friend who loves his family, his friends and our community. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure and honor to recognize my good friend Art Ibleto today.

H.R. 3136 AND H.R. 4984

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the two bipartisan higher education bills we are considering this week—the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act (H.R. 3136) and the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act (H.R. 4984).

H.R. 3136, on the floor today, allows schools to pilot new competency-based education programs to give students more flexibility to pursue their educations. By exploring new options to measure student growth, rather than relying solely on completed credit hours, we can reduce costs and time to degree for non-traditional students.

H.R. 4984, which we will consider tomorrow, increases financial counseling for students and parents to ensure that they understand any lower-cost options that are available before turning to more expensive loans, have an accurate picture of their debt and obligations, and can predict and manage their monthly payments upon graduation.

While I support both of these efforts, much more needs to be done to ensure that students have access to affordable education and address college debt, which has now surpassed $1 trillion. I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis to reauthorize the Higher Education Act and give America's students the opportunity to pursue the skills and education they need without accumulating debt they can't afford.

SUICIDE PREVENTION AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4870 DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2014, I offered an amendment to this legislation to address another facet of a national tragedy: the epidemic of suicide among our soldiers and veterans.

In March of this year, zero U.S. troops died in combat. In that same month, almost 700 soldiers and veterans died at their own hand.

This bill takes really enormous strides to treat the mental health problems underlying this epidemic. It provides tens of millions of dollars for therapy, outreach, and peer-to-peer support—and for that, the chairman and the ranking member, all the committee members, have my sincere praise and gratitude.

Suicide and the decision to take one's own life is complex and often mysterious, but we err if we think suicide is only a mental health problem. In truth, suicide is often the desperate act of a soldier or veteran in a desperate situation—and one important component of that desperation is financial stress.

My amendment has been endorsed by the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention. It would set aside up to $1 million to study these issues: to improve our understanding of the links between financial stress, financial abuse, and military suicide, and generate recommendations to fix these interlinked problems.

A few years ago, Army Sergeant Angelo Stevens was living with $100,000 in debt. He had just been told that, because of his deteriorating finances, he was at risk of losing his security clearance. If he lost his clearance, he

would lose his job—which would make his debt even more unmanageable.

Sergeant Stevens met with a military financial planner. He left feeling hopeless and humiliated. He told a reporter, ''I walked out thinking, 'If I'm dead my family can get $500,000 in life insurance, but I have to kill myself.' ''

Now, Sergeant Stevens ultimately found help and survived, but he was far from alone in his desperation. According to the Defense Department's Suicide Event Report, in 2011, almost one in three military suicides was linked to workplace or financial problems. About one in 10 was directly associated with excessive debt or bankruptcy. Nearly half were associated with family or legal stress that might also be related to financial stress. These numbers surely underestimate the problem, as financial data wasn't even collected for many suicide deaths.

So we know, through personal stories like Sergeant Stevens' and through existing data, that financial stress is a major contributor to military suicide. But here's what we don't know.

We don't know, in many cases of military suicide, whether financial stress contributed to the soldier's decision to take his or her own life.

We don't know how many soldiers lose their security clearances because of personal financial problems, nor how the loss of a clearance contributes to mental health problems or suicide.

We don't know, in any evidence-based way, whether existing military financial planning programs are working to alleviate financial stress, financial abuse, mental health problems, or suicide risk.

We need to understand the effects of financial stress and financial abuse on mental health problems, including suicide, among our soldiers. We need to understand how effectively the Defense Department is providing adequate, unbiased, comprehensive financial planning and financial counseling—and we need to understand the obstacles that prevent military personnel from seeking these services.

We need to understand how effectively the suicide prevention programs at the Defense Department, the VA, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau are working together, and how they could work together better.

And we need to build connections between the mental health professionals and the financial planning professionals who serve our soldiers. Mental health problems and financial problems both contribute to suicide, and we should explore ways to treat these problems together rather than separately.

Earlier, I told the story of Sergeant Angelo Stevens. He was one of the lucky ones. A financial planner overheard his accounting of his struggles, and on her personal time, she helped him put his financial life back together. With a lot of help, Sergeant Stevens stepped back from the abyss.

But he got that help only by coincidence, not by design. We can do better. We can design our military to be more responsive, compassionate, and helpful to soldiers like Sergeant Stevens. We can pull more soldiers back from the abyss.

I appreciate my House colleagues' support for this amendment, and I hope that in any House-Senate conference on the final DoD appropriations bill this amendment will be retained. We need this information. It will help us save lives.

TRIBUTE TO THE JEMISON FAMILY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, family reunions are a way of staying connected, keeping relationships intact, strengthening bonds and recognizing heritage.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the Jemison family on the occasion of their family reunion which is being held at the Best Western in Hillside, Illinois on July 24, 2014 through July 27, 2014. I commend you for the research done to establish your family tree and trust that you have a wonderful weekend.

There is nothing quite like a family reunion, there is nothing quite like seeing relatives that you have not seen for a while and there is nothing like sharing the joy of fellowship, love, and precious memories that family reunions generate. Therefore, I commend and congratulate you and pray that you have a wonderful weekend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, July 25, 2014*

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 25, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Please hear our prayers for the Members of this assembly, upon whom the authority of government is given. Help them to understand the tremendous responsibility they have to represent both their constituencies and the people of this great Nation of ours.

This is a great but complex task. Grant them as well the gift of wisdom to sort through what competing interests might exist to work a solution that can serve all of the American people.

Finally, give each Member peace and equanimity, and give all Americans generosity of heart to understand that governance is not simple but difficult work, at times requiring sacrifice and forbearance.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE AMNESTY PRESIDENT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the border crisis continues with the influx of migrants, mostly Honduran teenagers. Rather than quickly reuniting recent migrants with their homeland, the President is considering giving them refugee status.

The amnesty President again is going to go his own way. Obviously, he doesn't understand the consequences of his newly proposed executive mandate made from behind the White House fences.

The migrants are coming to the United States illegally because the President has sent the word out far and wide that he will not enforce the border security laws.

The President of Honduras, whom I met with in January, said as much again yesterday. He said the minors are coming because the drug cartels, who smuggle the minors for a hefty fee, tell them that this President will let them stay in the United States.

So now Americans who are struggling to take care of their own families will be expected to permanently pay for the housing, education, and health care of these individuals.

The rule of law seems to be a mere suggestion to the amnesty President. This crisis—that is the President's doing—will just continue.

And that is just the way it is.

POVERTY SIMULATION

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Representatives BARBARA LEE, CHRIS GIBSON, RICHARD HUDSON, and I hosted a Poverty Simulation for Members of Congress and their staffs here on Capitol Hill. Run by Entergy and Catholic Charities USA, this poverty simulation provided a way for policymakers and their staffs to experience poverty in a new and different way.

This simulation allowed participants to experience firsthand what it is like to be poor in America. Far too often, we talk about poverty, but we don't understand it. Being poor is hard work. It is hard to figure out how to stretch your food dollar and get from home to school to work with limited transportation, for example, when you are poor and are living on a limited income.

This simulation is one step in understanding how we end hunger and poverty. We can't begin this fight if we can't come together as Republicans and Democrats, and simulations like this could prove to be the way we all start working together on this common goal.

THE ERADICATION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, Pope Francis has spoken about the conditions in Iraq for Christians.

Now His Grace Bishop Angaelos, General Bishop of the Coptic Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom, said the following today:

As the widespread violence and aggression facing Christians and minority groups in Mosul, Iraq, intensifies, it is increasingly evident that the fundamental right and freedom to practice one's faith and belief is—and continues to be—grossly violated.

We are currently witnessing an unacceptable widespread implementation of extremist religious ideology that threatens the lives of all Iraqis who do not fit within its ever-narrowing perspective. While this situation stands to eradicate centuries of coexistence and culture in the region, it also threatens to significantly and negatively impact these communities for generations to come. If left unchallenged, it is not Iraq alone that is at risk, but the potential is intensified for the replication of this ideology as a viable and legitimate model for others across the Middle East.

He then thanked the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies and its chairman, His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan bin Talal of Jordan, for expressing his concern about the current situation in Mosul.

Everyone—the President, the Congress, religious leaders—should speak out on the eradication of Christianity in the Middle East.

VETERANS' CARE AND CONGRESS' AUGUST RECESS

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge congressional leaders to keep the Senate and House in session and to forgo the August recess until both Chambers come together and pass compromise legislation to help our veterans get access to the timely and quality health care they have earned and deserve.

In light of the serious allegations of wrongdoing within the Department of Veterans Affairs, in addition to unacceptably long wait times at the VA medical facilities, it is urgent that a fix be put in place now.

Last month, both the Senate and House passed legislation that would expand veterans' ability to seek care at non-VA facilities under certain conditions, strengthen Congress' oversight of the VA, and eliminate performance-related bonuses for VA employees. Since then, the Conference Committee, tasked to work out a compromise between the two bills, has yet to do so.

I know I speak for many when I say the health of the veterans who have served us so bravely should not be placed on hold while Congress is away in August. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in calling on Congress to stay in session until we do right by our veterans.

PASSAGE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the National Defense Authorization Act and to call on Congress to come together and pass this important bill so that our troops have the support they need to succeed in the field and so that our military commanders and policymakers have the certainty they need to conduct our Nation's national security affairs.

This year's NDAA has already been voted on by the House, passing with bipartisan support.

In addition to keeping troops adequately equipped and trained, this year's legislation also includes a piece of legislation called the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members Act, or MEPS Act, which is a bill I introduced that will help our military move toward a more comprehensive and effective approach to suicide prevention and detection.

While our military has made great strides to address issues of mental illness, it is tragic events such as those at Fort Hood that remind us we must do better.

Madam Speaker, I am calling on the Senate to move forward on this legislation so that we can fulfill our commitment to those who serve in uniform. They deserve as much.

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, as a former State supreme court justice and now as the ranking Democrat on a subcommittee whose responsibilities include child well-being, I ask my colleagues to avoid the easy political path advanced by those who claim they would help vulnerable children by deporting them. We must say ''no'' to those who would hold up needed Homeland Security funding unless we agree to blame the victims—stripping these desperate children of their vital right to be heard.

Let's heed the good counsel of ABA President James R. Silkenat. He says:

The U.S. finds itself at a critical crossroads. The American Bar Association has long recognized the special vulnerabilities of children. We oppose any diminution in the rights available to Central American children under the law. It is imperative that children's immigration cases be conducted in the presence of an adjudicator. In addition, added resources are needed to reform and bolster our system for immigration adjudication, a system that has been severely short-funded for many years.

Shortcutting justice for children cuts short justice for abuse.

WORLDWIDE DAY OF PRAYER FOR CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, moments ago, the House opened in prayer. Today, I am rising in solidarity with those who are calling for a worldwide day of prayer for Christians suffering in Iraq, Syria, Egypt, and across the Middle East.

Radical Islamists have a phrase: ''first the Saturday people, then the Sunday people.''

Those who call for Israel's destruction are the same radicals who are persecuting Christians throughout the Middle East. Reported cases of Christians killed for their faith doubled worldwide from the previous year. Others have been kidnapped, forcibly converted, or exiled, while churches and holy sites have been destroyed.

Iraq's Christian community has dropped from 1.5 million people in 2003 to only 200,000 today, and in Mosul—home of one of the world's oldest Christian communities—ISIS militants have overrun the city. They are using this Arabic symbol and are painting it on homes to identify Nazarenes, or Christians, who are told to convert to Islam, pay a religious tax, or be executed. Now almost no Christians remain in Mosul, a city with a 2,000-year relationship with the Christian faith. The situation is also dire in Syria and elsewhere.

Middle East Christians need our prayers, our support, and our voices, and I am proud to stand with those who follow the Nazarene.

AMERICA STANDS WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, the war in Gaza continues. Every human life that is killed is a tragedy, particularly those of civilians, but I think it is important to put it in perspective. The fight is not between Israelis and Palestinians. The fight is between Israelis and Hamas, which is a terrorist organization.

Week after week, month after month, year after year, Hamas has lobbed missiles into the Israeli civilian population—killing Israelis, maiming Israelis. Israel is fighting back in order to try to stop the onslaught of Hamas.

What would we do, Madam Speaker, if missiles came over the border from Canada or from Mexico, attacking population areas of the United States? Of course, we would go over the border and attempt to stop the terrorists who were doing that to our civilians.

That is precisely what Israel is doing, and quite frankly, the media coverage of the war in Gaza has been absolutely one-sided against Israel and absolutely disgraceful.

Hamas uses its people as human shields. They build bomb factories and missile factories in heavily populated civilian areas. So, when civilians are killed, it is the fault of Hamas, not the fault of Israel, which has tried to defend its way of life and defend its citizens.

I am proud that America stands with Israel, and we will continue to do so.

□ 1015

LET'S GET THE CHILDREN OUT OF HARM'S WAY IN GAZA

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, last night, on the national news I saw the terrible agony and tears of a man whose children had been, according to the report, blown to pieces when a school was hit in Gaza.

Hamas started this war. Israel certainly has a right to defend its people.

In today's Washington Post, Michael Oren, the former Israeli Ambassador to

the U.S., said it is ''indeed agonizing'' to watch the images of the dead and wounded and, I might add, especially the children.

Israel agreed to an Egyptian-sponsored cease-fire. Hamas did not. I rise today to plead for both sides in this war to at least let the little children get out of the war zone.

The United Nations has never been very effective, but it should at least attempt to lead in an effort to get children out of harm's way.

If this fighting, unfortunately, has to continue, our President and State Department should at least do everything possible to get little children out of Gaza and to some safe place away from the bombs and the rockets.

REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of July 23, 2014, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the amendment numbered 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is adopted, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION REGARDING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Nothing in this concurrent resolution supersedes the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and to submit any extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I very much appreciate the way in which Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, the bipartisan leadership of the House, and the staff of the committee have worked through this issue to bring us here this morning. I thank all of the Members. I also think all of the Members of this body can support this motion.

Earlier this week, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard testimony from senior officials from the Departments of State and Defense on the situation in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the situation in this critical Middle Eastern country is precarious. The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, an al Qaeda offshoot, has taken over most of western Iraq, it has turned its sights on Baghdad, and it may be preparing to launch attacks against the United States.

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled such a large, resource-rich safe haven as ISIS does today. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry, the cash, the personnel that ISIS does today, which includes thousands of Western passport holders.

What started as a crisis in Syria has become a regional disaster with serious global implications, including credible threats of international terrorism, humanitarian disaster, and upward pressure on energy prices in a fragile global economy.

The top State Department official told our committee that ISIS represents a growing threat to U.S. interests in the region, local populations, and the homeland, calling it a vital national security challenge. This is a common assessment outside of government as well.

As part of the response to this threat, the Obama administration has deployed additional military assets and up to 475 troops to secure our Embassy, our personnel. A few hundred U.S. military advisers are evaluating how we might best train, advise, and support the Iraqis to take on ISIS.

As the Department of Defense testified this week, these small teams are ''armed for self-defense, but do not have an offensive mission.'' It was noted, these teams are not unlike the missions being carried out by U.S. forces around the world. U.S. forces currently maintain these types of troops in more than 70 countries, in Africa, the Americas, and Asia.

Now, if the President did decide to take more aggressive action in Iraq, Members on both sides of the aisle would be deeply split. Some don't see any role for the U.S. military. Others believe we should be more active in this region, believing that our absence has contributed to a vacuum that is churning the entire region.

But where I think all Members can agree is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body.

That is the text before us today:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

At the same time, this text preserves the flexibility the President may need to respond to the rapidly evolving national security in order to protect our Embassy, to conduct search and rescue, or target an al Qaeda-type terrorist who poses an imminent threat to the United States, among other things.

Nothing in this text impacts the War Powers Resolution which, of course, requires the President to withdraw U.S. forces from hostilities within 60 to 90 days after introduction, absent an authorization from Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts brings a critical issue to the House floor: the use of force by U.S. Armed Forces, and the appropriate role for the Congress in that decision.

Any military officer will tell you that the support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously, and it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 105. It reaffirms our belief that U.S. troops should not be deployed in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific congressional authorization.

Since last December, the terrorist group ISIS has marched across Iraq with lethal efficiency. Fallujah, Ramadi, and Mosul have fallen to their control. Thousands of Iraqi soldiers have been killed or have laid down their weapons. The military equipment they left behind, some supplied by the United States, is now in the hands of these fanatics.

After erasing the border between Iraq and Syria, ISIS has advanced toward our ally, Jordan. And the leaders of ISIS have declared an Islamic caliphate, promising to rule with a brand of barbarism, such as mandatory female genital mutilation, more suited to the Dark Ages than the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is real. Iraq is teetering on the brink, and we cannot allow that country to become a safe haven for terrorists that could be used to launch another 9/11.

While the Hamas terrorists are pushing forth in Gaza, the ISIS terrorists are pushing forth in Iraq.

At the same time, however, we need to make clear to the American people and to the Iraqi government that the U.S. combat mission in Iraq is over. After losing more than 4,000 American lives and spending more than $1 trillion, we cannot allow ourselves to be sucked into another sectarian quagmire.

The crisis in Iraq cannot be solved through military means alone. The solution will be rooted in real political changes in Iraq, more inclusive policies, and a greater effort to avoid sectarian conflict.

President Obama removed the last American combat troops from Iraq on December 18, 2011, under an agreement reached by the Bush administration, and he has no intention of sending them back, a position with which I firmly agree.

As the President said last month: ''American forces will not be returning to combat in Iraq, but we will help Iraqis as they take the fight to terrorists who threaten the Iraqi people, the region, and American interests as well.''

In the last several weeks, the President has expanded intelligence and surveillance efforts. He has sent a contingent of troops to protect our diplomatic personnel at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, and he has deployed small military assessment teams to get information about the threat that ISIS poses to Iraq, to the region, and to American interests.

I support these measures. They represent the sort of security cooperation with the Iraqi government that we should be offering to support our own national security interests. But they don't require a sustained presence of American combat troops in Iraq.

At the end of the day, we all know it is past time for the Iraqi government to confront some serious challenges. These will require an Iraqi solution, one based on respect for each other and the rule of law.

I would like to thank Representative MCGOVERN, Representative JONES, and Representative LEE for their tenacity and leadership in sparking this important debate. They have worked with us in the Foreign Affairs Committee, constructively with me and Chairman ROYCE both, along with the House leadership on both sides of the aisle, to ensure that the amendment we are considering today would enjoy broad bipartisan support.

So I hope that the process which brought about today's bill will serve as an example of bipartisan cooperation for the House to follow in the days to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the House is debating H. Con. Res. 105. I want to thank the Republican leadership for working with Mr. JIM MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and myself and our staffs to get this language so that we could debate it today.

As James Madison said: ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.''

Unfortunately, we in Congress have for too long abdicated our constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of military force.

This began, for me personally, with my vote for the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq, which is one of the biggest regrets during my tenure of Congress in voting for that.

With that vote, we gave up our constitutional authority on one of the most important decisions a Member of Congress can make: the decision to send American men and women into war to possibly die.

□ 1030

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that one day, we in Congress will repeal the 2001 and the 2002 AUMF. Until that time comes, I believe that today represents a strong step toward reclaiming the constitutional power that we each have and are entrusted with, to make decisions about going to war or declaring war.

I cannot emphasize enough that no decision is more important for a Member of Congress than a vote to send young men and women to fight and to die for our country.

The main text of this resolution is simple. The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.

Madam Speaker, this is what Madison meant when he said, ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JONES. The legislature is us, the Congress. This is a monumental step toward reclaiming our constitutional authority.

In closing, I want to thank Representatives MCGOVERN and LEE and all my friends in both parties who have fought with me for the right of Congress to declare war. For years, we have been calling for a debate on the floor of the House with regard to the use of our military.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and their staffs for this opportunity today.

May God continue to bless our troops, their families, and may God continue to bless America.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 105, as amended. This important bipartisan bill asserts the important constitutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace, and it is my sincere hope that every single Member of this institution will vote in favor.

It is important for our colleagues to know that this resolution is the result of open discussion and dialogue between both sides of the aisle, and it is an example of what can happen when Members come together and decide they want to accomplish something meaningful.

I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leadership, Leader PELOSI and Minority Whip HOYER, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, and I want to thank my good friends who have helped lead this effort, my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for working together on the language of this resolution.

I want to send a special thanks to all the staff who spent many hours listening to the views and concerns that spanned the political spectrum of this House about America's engagement in Iraq.

In particular, I want to thank Jen Stewart, Rob Karem, Emily Murry, Wyndee Parker, Dan Silverberg, Doug Anderson, Tom Sheehy, Ed Burrier, Jason Steinbaum, Janice Kaguyutan, Doug Campbell, Mira Resnick, Ed Rice, Jirair Ratevosian, Dan Zisa, Ray Celeste, Cindy Buhl, and Keith Stern on my own staff. I am very grateful for how hard each of them worked to achieve a consensus.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is quite straightforward. It requires an authorization from Congress, should the President determine that the United States should escalate its military presence in Iraq.

It does not change the President's existing authorities to protect and ensure the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, and it does not alter the requirements of the War Powers Resolution.

This resolution makes one clear statement: if the President decides we should further involve our military in Iraq, he needs to work with Congress to authorize it. I don't know how Congress would respond and vote on such a request. For the record, I want to state in the strongest possible way that I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to reengage militarily in Iraq.

I want to make clear that the intent of this resolution is not to criticize

President Obama. I believe him when he says that he has no intention of significantly expanding our military presence in Iraq, and so far, in each of the three recent deployments to Iraq that he has announced, the President rightfully and formally informed Congress ''consistent with the War Powers Resolution.''

Nor is this the intent to criticize the Republican leadership—rather, the intent of this resolution is to begin to reestablish Congress' rightful role, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, when it comes to matters of war and peace.

I believe there is broad bipartisan and growing concern that over the past several decades, Congress has ceded far too much of its power to the executive branch. It has happened under Democratic and Republican Presidents. It has happened under Democratic and Republican control of the House and Senate. It is not really a partisan issue. It is an institutional one. We simply haven't done our job.

My concern all along is that Congress has not lived up to its constitutional responsibilities to debate and authorize the introduction of U.S. forces where they are engaged in roles related to combat.

So while this resolution clearly puts the President on notice, it also reinforces the institutional role of Congress in matters of war and peace.

Madam Speaker, the time to debate our reengagement in Iraq—should it come to that—is before we are caught in the heat of the moment, not when the first body bags come home, not when the first bombs start to fall, not when the worst-case scenario is playing out on our TV screens.

The time to debate Iraq is when we can weigh the pros and cons of action, the pros and cons of supporting the violent and sectarian policies of the Maliki government or whatever government is cobbled together should Maliki be forced to step down.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that further deployment of U.S. troops in Iraq receives the careful debate and authorization it deserves. We owe as least that much to our men and women in uniform and their families, and we owe at least that much to our democracy and democratic institutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS MASSIE.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105. Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution gives the sole power to declare war to Congress, not the President.

The situation in Iraq is deteriorating as we speak. ISIS, a group of violent fundamentalist Islamic thugs, is terrorizing the people of Iraq and destroying the ancient culture of Mosul.

Some have called for the U.S. to interfere once again, but if we are to do so and to send our brave men and women into harm's way overseas, we must honor the Constitution. Congress must authorize any such military action. It would be illegal for the President to do so alone.

Any future military action in Iraq would constitute a new war, with new enemies—ISIS—and would require a new congressional authorization. The President cannot use the 2002 authorization for the use of force in Iraq to justify any new action.

It is important for those who are quick to rush into another war to remember that wars often have unintended consequences. Iraq is a prime example.

In a recent article in The Telegraph, historian Dr. Tim Stanley pointed out that prior to the 2003 Iraq war, there were 1.5 million Christians in Iraq. Today, there are only 400,000.

As Dr. Stanley writes, ''The lesson is: 'either leave other countries alone or, if you must intervene, do so with consistency and resilience.' The consequences of going in, messing things up, and then quitting with a weary shrug are terrible for those left behind.''

If we are going to go to war, we must follow the Constitution, have Congress declare it, and fight to win. Anything else is illegal, unconstitutional, and likely to lead to unintended, horrific consequences. That is why I support H. Con. Res. 105, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of the leaders on this resolution.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding, but also for his tireless leadership on this very important issue.

I am proud to join Congressman WALTER JONES and Congressman MCGOVERN in introducing this bipartisan resolution, and I thank them for their consistent support and work, as great Americans, to address these serious issues of war and peace.

This resolution simply prohibits the President to deploy armed services or to engage in combat operations in Iraq without specific debate and authorization from Congress, but this resolution also seeks to reclaim a fundamental congressional responsibility, the constitutionally protected right for Congress to debate and to determine when this country enters into war.

I also am personally concerned about mission creep. We hear many of the same voices who championed the unnecessary war in Iraq, once again, beating the drum for a renewed war in Iraq today.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support, supported by attack helicopters and drones. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

Now, I, too, believe President Obama does not intend to send ground troops to Iraq, but we need to make sure that Congress reasserts its constitutional responsibility on this grave issue.

After more than a decade at war in Iraq and Afghanistan, with thousands of United States lives and billions of dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

Let me remind you, it was this absence of full debate that led to Congress passing the overly broad 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in the wake of 9/11. This law has been used to justify everything from the war in Afghanistan, warrantless domestic and international surveillance, holding prisoners indefinitely in Guantanamo, and conducting drone strikes in countries that we are not at war with.

I couldn't vote for that resolution because I have always believed that such consequences are grave for the United States' national security interests unless we fully debate these issues and, of course, to our standing in the world. We did not debate that resolution any more than 1 hour, and I have continued to attempt to repeal and address the problematic actions justified under this law ever since.

On July 16, Congressmen MCGOVERN, JONES, RIGELL, myself, and others—over 100 Members of Congress from both parties wrote a letter—and we signed that letter—to President Obama to come to Congress for an authorization before any military escalation in Iraq, exactly what this resolution would do.

I will insert the letter into the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 02, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join you and with those in the international community who are expressing grave concern over the rise in sectarian violence in Iraq over the last days and weeks. The consequences of this development are particularly troubling given the extraordinary loss of American lives and expenditure of funds over ten years that was claimed to be necessary to bring democracy, stability and a respect for human rights to Iraq.

We support your restraint to date in resisting the calls for a ''quick'' and ''easy'' military intervention, and for your commitment not to send combat troops back to Iraq. We also appreciate your acknowledgement that this conflict requires a political solution,

and that military action alone cannot successfully lead to a resolution.

We do not believe intervention could be either quick or easy. And, we doubt it would be effective in meeting either humanitarian or strategic goals, and that it could very well be counter-productive. This is a moment for urgent consultations and engagement with all parties in the region who could bring about a cease fire and launch a dialogue that could lead to a reconciliation of the conflict.

Any solution to this complex crisis can only be achieved through a political settlement, and only if the process and outcome is inclusive of all segments of the Iraqi population—anything short of that cannot successfully bring stability to Iraq or the region.

As you consider options for U.S. intervention, we write to urge respect for the constitutional requirements for using force abroad. The Constitution vests in Congress the power and responsibility to authorize offensive military action abroad. The use of military force in Iraq is something the Congress should fully debate and authorize. Members of Congress must consider all the facts and alternatives before we can determine whether military action would contribute to ending this most recent violence, create a climate for political stability, and protect civilians from greater harm.

We stand ready to work with you to this end.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lee; Sam Farr; James P. Moran; Janice Hahn; Peter A. DeFazio; Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.; Michael M. Honda; Scott E. Rigell; Chellie Pingree; Betty McCollum; John Garamendi; James P. McGovern; Richard M. Nolan; Beto O'Rourke, Members of Congress.

Katherine Clark; Zoe Lofgren; Earl Blumenauer; George Miller; Anna G. Eshoo; Julia Brownley; Hakeem S. Jeffries; Chris Gibson; Jackie Speier; John J. Duncan, Jr.; Judy Chu; Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott; Alan Grayson; James A. Himes, Members of Congress.

Michael H. Michaud; John B. Larson; Mark Pocan; Reid J. Ribble; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Karen Bass; Maxine Waters; John Conyers, Jr.; Walter B. Jones; Peter Welch; Jared Huffman; John P. Sarbanes; Ed Pastor; Grace F. Napolitano, Members of Congress.

Alcee L. Hastings; John Lewis; José; E. Serrano; Nydia M. Valázquez; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Andre Carson; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Jim McDermott; Keith Ellison; Lloyd Doggett; Rush Holt; Bobby L. Rush; Emanuel Cleaver; Bennie G. Thompson, Members of Congress.

Lois Capps; Kurt Schrader; Jerrold Nadler; Mark Takano; Collin C. Peterson; Ann McLane Kuster; Justin Amash; Charles B. Rangel; Raul M. Grijalva; Niki Tsongas; Kathy Castor; Michael E. Capuano; Yvette D. Clarke; Matt Salmon; Kyrsten Sinema; Donald M. Payne, Jr.; Lois Frankel; Rosa L. DeLauro; Richard E. Neal; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Alan S. Lowenthal; Stephen F. Lynch, Members of Congress.

Paul Broun; Cheri Bustos; Marcy Kaptur; Sheila Jackson Lee; John Tierney; Henry Waxman; James R. Langevin; Thomas Massie; Carolyn B. Maloney; Tony Cárdenas; Steve Cohen; Howard Coble; Donna F. Edwards; David Cicilline, Members of Congress.

Ann Kirkpatrick; Donna Christensen; William Pascrell; Luis V. Gutiérrez; Robin L. Kelly; Marcia L. Fudge; Dave Loebsack; Paul D. Tonko; Mike Doyle; Jan Schakowsky, Chaka Fattah; Suzanne Bonamici; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; William R. Keating, Members of Congress.

Ms. LEE of California. Also, let me remind you that last month, we debated the Defense Appropriations bill. Over 150 bipartisan Members supported my amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

This resolution, which is bipartisan, merely requires the President to come to Congress, should he decide to engage in an escalated combat role in Iraq.

The reality is, though, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were enflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides.

The change Iraq needs must come from Iraqis rejecting violence in favor of a peaceful democracy and respect for the rights of all citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the American people agree. After more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives lost, and billions of dollars spent, the American people are rightfully weary.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibility and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq.

Of course, after we pass this resolution, I urge the Republican leadership to bring up our bill, H.R. 3852, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I want to, once again, thank Congressman MCGOVERN for staying the course. He was one of the first Members calling for an end to the war in Iraq and to bring our brave troops home. He has provided tremendous leadership through a variety of legislative efforts. This is just another one of those efforts. So I want to thank you again, Congressman MCGOVERN and Congressman JONES.

I thank all of the Members who are supporting this, including our leadership. Congress should never allow war authorizations to remain on the books in perpetuity. We don't do this for the farm bill. We don't do this for the transportation bill. Sooner or later, we need to repeal the initial authorization.

□ 1045

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ADAM KINZINGER, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to say thank you to the chairman for yielding me this time. Thank you to both sides for your hard work. It is rare that we get compromises in Washington, and I appreciate the work you have put in, but I cannot, in good conscious, support this.

I am a veteran of Iraq. I saw many people that fought hard to bring the Iraqi people freedom, and I saw a war that was won in 2011. What we are watching happen in Iraq right now is the worst-case scenario in the Middle East. There is a march of jihadism and extremism that makes al Qaeda look like puppy dogs that is happening in Iraq, a President that is indecisive on what to do. We have genital mutilations ordered in Mosul just the other day by ISIS, and we are here in Washington, D.C., debating what we need to do to hamstring the President who is already indecisive enough about this.

When American military—American Marines and Army—get themselves into sustained combat, they often call on strong air support to help them win the fight. And that is why—as well as the strong Marines and Army we have, that is why we are so good at what we do. We are asking the Iraqi military to take back their country and take land but yet not providing them substantial air power that is needed to destroy this very evil cancer that is growing in the Middle East.

That is what we ought to be here discussing today is how to stop this cancer of jihadism and ISIS that is growing in the Middle East, how to stop that from growing, and ultimately prevent it from coming here to the United States of America and potentially to our allies.

So while I, again, strongly respect and fully understand what my chairman is doing here and appreciate his hard work, I think instead of giving the President an ability to blame Congress for his indecisiveness, I think it is time that we stand up and say we have to defend our interest and defend people that want to defend themselves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments and for his service to our country. But the gentleman should draft an authorization for war and ask for his leadership to bring it up. That is what the Constitution tells us to do.

What this resolution is about today is not a vote on getting out of Iraq or staying in Iraq or expanding our role in Iraq. This is a vote on whether or not we are going to live up to our constitutional responsibility. This should not be controversial no matter what one's views are on military reengagement in Iraq.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), who has been a leader on this issue.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 105 having already taken action on this issue that has every American gravely concerned. I opposed our involvement in Iraq in 2002. I opposed it last month, and I oppose it today.

While I intend to support the resolution at hand, I believe we should have required the President to recall any troops that are not in Iraq strictly for diplomatic security. This was the original version of this resolution. Notwithstanding, it is very significant that this House of Representatives will probably pass overwhelmingly this resolution that takes a very firm stand that Congress should be authorizing any further military action in Iraq. We owe it to the people of this Nation.

Let's be clear. The President invoked the War Powers Act under the guise of protecting our embassy. There are now nearly 1,000 U.S. troops in harm's way—Apache helicopters and drones, just to name a few—and we are taking sides in a sectarian civil war. Let's not forget that that is what we are doing.

Congress must reject a new war in Iraq. I urge my colleagues to demand further action and to take further action to withdraw our troops now before our men and women in uniform are again asked to pay too high a price for our inaction.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Joseph Cirincione wrote an article in Defense One, and I want to quote a part of it. He says:

The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work, and hundreds of billions of dollars cannot build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game. There is not a quick fix to this problem. The hard truth is that, like the collapse of the Diem government in South Vietnam a generation ago, there is little we can do to prop up this government. As military expert Micah Zenko tweeted, ''Unless the U.S. has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into Prime Minister Maliki, air strikes in Iraq would be pointless.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I commend the authors of this resolution, Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE, for their leadership on this issue of war and peace.

The topic of limiting our future military involvement in Iraq deserves more than 1 hour. It deserves an entire legislative day to discuss this resolution and the larger question: the issue of the war-making powers of Congress. The history of our involvement in Iraq and exactly how we came to this point is of paramount importance in understanding why it is vital that the House pass this resolution. But since time is limited, let me come to the point: no more American soldiers should kill or be killed in Iraq to redeem our past mistakes.

The United States has spent years and billions of dollars trying to rebuild Iraq's armed forces, to no end. Sending 300 or 3,000 or 30,000 advisers to Iraq would be a pointless exercise when the Iraqi Army continues to melt away in the face of rebels.

Unless the Iraqi Government can inspire confidence in Kurds, Sunni, and Shi'a that it is a fair, legitimate government concerned with the welfare of all Iraqis, no amount of money or American advisers will save it. We have already lost more than 4,000 Americans in one war in Iraq. Let's not invoke the insidious and fallacious argument that our previous heavy investment justifies further heavy investment.

Had America not waged an unnecessary war in Iraq starting in 2003, there would be no need for us to debate this resolution now. Like so many misguided military interventions in our history, America's misguided war with Iraq unleashed forces that we cannot now control. We should not compound that error by squandering more lives and money in Iraq.

I hope we can have, beyond this moment now, a fuller debate of the war-making powers of Congress. I hope, as Representative LEE said a few moments ago, that we can have a debate on the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force that was the excuse for much military, paramilitary, and domestic intrusive activities in this country.

But for now we should, I think, recognize the good acts of Representatives MCGOVERN, JONES, and LEE in bringing this resolution to the floor. I think it will help further the debate greatly. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I am going to reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from 33 national organizations in support of this resolution.

JULY 23, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: Representatives Jim McGovern, Walter Jones and Barbara Lee have introduced H. Con. Res. 105, a privileged resolution to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year. We urge you to co-sponsor and support this important resolution.

This resolution, which provides an exception for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel, is likely to be voted on in the full House before the end of July. The sponsors are using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution that requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days.

Last month, President Obama announced that 300 personnel would be sent to Iraq, including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance support, augmented by Apache attack helicopters and drones, after military aggression by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. A few days later, he announced another 200 personnel were soon to be deployed. There are promises to send many additional Hellfire air-to-surface missiles.

As the United States knows from past, bitter experience in Vietnam, a small military engagement can escalate into a major military war that is disastrous for the United States. There is little a few hundred or a few thousand troops can do in Iraq that 140,000 could not do at the height of American involvement in Iraq.

President George W. Bush signed an agreement before leaving office to withdraw all American forces from Iraq by 2011. That decision should not be reversed.

Congress has the constitutional responsibility to debate the merits of American military involvement in Iraq before the first American casualties. Whatever your position on Iraq or this resolution, the measure provides an opportunity for sorely needed debate on a very critical issue.

We urge you to co-sponsor and support the resolution, and to oppose what is likely to be a tabling motion before the end of July.

Sincerely,

Fred Azcarate, USAction; Medea Benjamin and Jodie Evans, CODEPINK; Becky Bond, CREDO; Simone Campbell, SSS, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Angela Canterbury, Council for a Livable World; Jeanne Dauray, Progressive Democrats of America; Carolyn Rusti Eisenberg, United for Peace and Justice; Michael Eisenscher, U.S. Labor Against the War; Jenefer Ellingston, DC Statehood Green Party; Hannah Frisch, Civilian Soldier Alliance; Anna Galland, MoveOn.org; William Hartung, Center for International Policy; Susan Henry-Crowe, M.Div., DD, The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; Matt Howard, Iraq Veterans Against the War; Rev. Linda Jaramillo, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Kevin Kamps, Beyond Nuclear; Aura Kanegis, American Friends Service Committee; David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Rabbi Michael Lerner, Tikkun Magazine's Network of Spiritual Progressives; Paul Kawika Martin, Peace Action.

Stephen Miles, Win Without War; Andrea Miller, Progressive Democrats of America; Robert Naiman, Just Foreign Policy; Jim O'Brien, Historians Against the War; Jon Rainwater, Peace Action West; Diane Randall, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Susan Shaer, Women's Action for New Directions; Alice Slater, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, NY; Guy Stevens, PeacePAC; Paul Walker, Green Cross International; Jim Wallis, Sojourners; Rabbi Arthur Waskow, The Shalom Center; Jim Winkler, National Council of Churches, USA.

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

Regarding the term ''sustained combat role,'' this resolution specifically states that nothing in this language supersedes the War Powers Resolution. The War Powers Resolution lays out very clear timeframes, beyond which we should consider troops to be deployed for a sustained period. ''Combat

role'' implies the many roles that our troops might be engaged in or supporting combat operations in Iraq. I think, however, that this resolution is based on the President and the Congress acting in good faith and working together to authorize any deeper involvement in the ongoing conflict in Iraq.

I want to again acknowledge that this is an important resolution, and this is an important moment for this institution. We have bipartisan collaboration on this language. We have bipartisan agreement that we ought not to give up our constitutional responsibilities when it comes to declaring war or getting into wars.

Again, I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER. I want to thank Leader PELOSI, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and everybody who is involved in working together and understanding that no matter what your view is on what we should be doing in Iraq, that we all agree that we have a responsibility here and that we matter in this debate.

I think it is also important to realize that we are coming together to acknowledge that it is important to debate this issue before we get into the heat of battle, and I hope that it never comes to that. For too long, I think this institution has not done what it is supposed to do when it comes to war, both under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents.

As I said in the beginning, this is not a critique of President Obama. I believe the President when he says he does not want to see any more combat troops deployed in Iraq. I believe him when he says he does not want to reengage militarily in yet another war. But I also know from history that there is such a thing called the slippery slope and there are events that happened that sometimes overtake people's original positions, and then we find ourselves in a situation that we did not expect to be in.

What we are saying here is that, if, in fact, the President, for whatever reason, decides to escalate our military involvement, Congress needs to debate it and Congress needs to authorize it. It is that simple.

This resolution is not as strong as some of us would want it to be, and it is not as weak as some would want it to be. This represents a compromise. I also think it is important to point out that every once in a while this place works; and I think this is one of the moments where we can point to that the Congress is working, and we are working on an issue that I think is of incredible importance.

Madam Speaker, I will just close by saying, like so many of my colleagues here, I have been to countless funerals of soldiers who have been killed not only in Iraq but in Afghanistan. I have talked to parents, I have talked to brothers and sisters, and I have talked to grandparents during very difficult times when they have lost a loved one.

It is important that we recognize that going to war, deploying our troops in hostilities, is a big deal. We ought to be very clear that this is important and that we ought not to go down that road lightly. I am grateful that this resolution makes it clear that we are going to debate these issues, that we are going to authorize these issues, and that we are going to respect the Constitution.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ROYCE. I want to thank everybody who has been involved in this. This is an important statement, and I am very hopeful that we will get strong, bipartisan support.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' spirit of cooperation. Mr. MCGOVERN and I have worked on a number of issues from victims' rights to trying to stop the exploitation of child soldiers in Africa, and so I appreciate that spirit on his part.

As I noted in my opening testimony, my opening statement here, the threat of ISIS is real, and I do think we should reflect on that as we debate this issue.

□ 1100

Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled so much territory, especially such a large, resource-rich safe haven, as ISIS has in this caliphate, as they perceive it, now. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry and cash and personnel as ISIS does today, and this includes thousands of Western passports and thousands of individuals who are passport holders from the West.

One militant engaged in this battle recently returned to Europe and attacked a museum in Brussels, so more of that is coming as a result of ISIS. And let's not take this debate to mean that we should not be doing anything to offset that organization.

I think the President has failed U.S. national security interests by not, for example, authorizing or accepting the request made by the government in Iraq and by our personnel in our Embassy for drone strikes on these terrorist ISIS camps. Remember, this is a situation where the drone can actually see the ISIS combatants with the black flag of al Qaeda waving as they move across the desert or as they are encamped. This was an opportunity to hit them when they were vulnerable, before they began that city march across the desert, as they began to take those cities with their armed columns.

I do think, as the U.N. reported yesterday, that there are going to be consequences to these fatwas that come down from ISIS. The one yesterday specifically—according to the U.N., ISIS is requiring female mutilation in the new caliphate it is establishing, at least in the Mosul area and around that area. That is about 4 million females that would be subject to this, if they are as doctrinaire as they have been on other issues. So we will be wrestling with what to do about ISIS, what we can do.

What this resolution says, and I think the overwhelming majority of us in Congress agrees with this, is that if the President of the United States ordered U.S. Armed Forces into sustained combat in Iraq, then he should be coming to Congress to seek an explicit statutory authorization and the backing of this body, and that is the text before us today.

It says, again:

> The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of adoption of this concurrent resolution.

That is the position of the Members of Congress, as the representative body, frankly, and as any military officer will tell you, support of the people is critical to the success of a sustained combat operation. As the representative body, that responsibility falls to us. It is an obligation that I know all of my colleagues take seriously. And, again, it is why I expect overwhelming passage of this motion this morning.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 105, a resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in sustained combat roles in Iraq unless specifically authorized by Congress by statute enacted after the date of adoption of the resolution.

The war in Iraq caused a lot of unearned suffering in Iraq and here at home. This is the same war, Madam Speaker, whose proponents misrepresented to the nation would last no more than six months and likely less than six weeks.

This same war in Iraq, we were led to believe by the Bush Administration, would cost less than $50 billion and would be paid out of the ample revenues from Iraq's oil fields. The war in Iraq, the American people were promised, should have ended years ago with Americans troops greeted as liberators by jubilant Iraqis throwing rose petals at their feet.

As I and my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus and the Out of Iraq Caucus forecast at the time, the starry-eyed, rosy scenarios laid out by President Bush, Vice-President Cheney, and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld would come to pass in fantasy land, but not in the cold, hard world of reality which they refused to live in.

The war in Iraq lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history. But there was a

difference. The Second World War ended in complete and total victory for the United States and its allies.

But then again, in that conflict America was led by FDR, a great Commander-in-Chief, who had a plan to win the war and secure the peace, listened to his generals, and sent troops in sufficient numbers and sufficiently trained and equipped to do the job.

As a result of the colossal miscalculation in deciding to invade Iraq, the Armed Forces and the people of the United States suffered incalculable damage.

The war in Iraq claimed the lives of 4,484 brave servicemen and women. More than 24,600 Americans were wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries. American taxpayers paid more than $800 billion to sustain this misadventure.

The depth, breadth, and scope of the misguided, mismanaged, and misrepresented war in Iraq is utterly without precedent in American history. It was a tragedy in a league all its own.

And it must never be repeated. That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 105 and urge all my colleagues to join me.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 105. From day one, I have used my voice and my vote to promote peace in Iraq. Now, more than ever, that country and its citizens deserve peace. Accordingly, any decision to escalate our military involvement in this war-torn country must be careful, deliberative, and include Congress. I was proud to be one of the first cosponsors of H. Con. Res. 105, which stipulates that ''the President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in the Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.''

There is no question that sectarian violence in Iraq poses a grave danger to both the country and region's stability. But before military options are put on the table, we must exhaust every possible diplomatic solution. Diplomacy and debate leads to lasting peace and stabilization, and at this point, I do not believe that sending more of our brave women and men to Iraq will win the peace. And I know I am not alone in this call for peace. But while it is one thing to express the desire for peace, it is a perhaps more daunting task to do what it takes to achieve peace. Change is afoot in Iraq's leadership, and I am hopeful they can move swiftly towards a more inclusive government that reflects the diversity of religions and prioritizes the meaningful stability and security for all citizens.

I will continue to watch this situation closely and insist that Congress be consulted for any matter involving U.S. military involvement. The stakes are too high and the cost is too great. I strongly urge you to vote in favor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 680, I call up the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 680, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–54 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4935

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN CHILD TAX CREDIT; INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS IN CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY.—Section 24(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''means—'' and all that follows and inserting ''means $75,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT AND PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS.—Section 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, the $1,000 amount in subsection (a) and the $75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2013' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—Any increase determined under paragraph (1) shall be rounded—

''(A) in the case of the $1,000 amount in subsection (a), to the nearest multiple of $50, and

''(B) in the case of the $75,000 amount in subsection (b)(2), to the nearest multiple of $1,000.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's social security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the social security number of either spouse is included on such return.''.

(b) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct social security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN required under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of such Code is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4935.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, if one thing has been consistent about the Obama administration, it is the failure of its economic policies. The President's economic policies make it harder for American families to get by every day. A record number of Americans are unable to work, and those who can find work are unable to secure full-time employment and instead are forced to accept only part-time jobs. This last quarter, the economy actually shrunk, and real wages—what Americans use to pay their mortgages and put their kids through school—are continuing to fall.

Worse yet, the cost of raising a family is only getting more expensive. The

cost of clothing, food, child care, and schooling all continue to climb. According to the Department of Agriculture, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by about 4.4 percent per year. But more recently, since 2004, the cost of children's clothing has gone up 89 percent; the cost of food since then 21 percent; and the cost of child care since 2004 107 percent. And since then, the child tax credit has remained unchanged.

Currently, our Tax Code helps ease some of this burden by providing a child tax credit. The credit, which has been around since the 1990s, now provides a $1,000 tax credit for each child. Unfortunately, that credit is not, and has not, been indexed for inflation. So while the cost of raising children continues to rise, the value of the child tax credit actually decreases.

Today's legislation, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, will fix this problem by indexing the child tax credit to inflation. Making a commonsense change like this will ensure that families can make every dollar count. The current child tax credit also disadvantages those who file jointly compared to those who file as single individuals, creating what is known as a marriage penalty. This bill would eliminate the marriage penalty embedded in the child tax credit, helping millions of families across the country.

The Family Research Council, which supports this bill, notes the importance of the child tax credit. They say:

This tax credit recognizes the important contribution of the family and children to our country and starts to address a problem with our Tax Code today, the marriage penalty. A fair system of taxation does not penalize marriage and family.

In addition, this bill contains strong antifraud provisions to ensure that the child tax credit goes to those who are truly deserving. The bill would require one parent to submit a Social Security number to qualify for the refundable portion of the child tax credit. According to a report by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, the number of filers for the additional child tax credit without a Social Security number grew from 62,000 filers—claiming $62 million in benefits—in 2000 to 2.3 million filers—claiming $4.2 billion in benefits—in 2010.

This is a commonsense provision that will help safeguard taxpayer dollars from fraud and put it in line with other refundable tax credits, like the earned income tax credit, which requires a Social Security number.

I hear too many stories about families struggling to afford basic necessities to care for their children. It is time we make some simple improvements to the child tax credit so it keeps up with the cost of raising children.

Improving the child tax credit would give moms and dads nationwide needed relief at a time when their budgets are tight and they are forced to make difficult choices about how to spend their money. This provision has earned bipartisan support for years, so let's vote ''yes'' on this opportunity to help American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Yesterday on the topic of poverty, Congressman RYAN spoke. Today, he and his House Republican colleagues, will vote. Actions speak louder than words. And at every turn over the last 3 years, the actions House Republicans have taken have cut programs for low- and middle-income families.

Funding for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program—slashed in the Ryan Republican budget.

Social services block grants—eliminated.

Food assistance, Pell higher education grants, job training, and housing assistance—dramatically scaled back.

And extension of unemployment insurance and a raise in the minimum wage—both blocked by House Republicans.

The new Republican rhetoric on poverty is no match for the deeply troubling actions they have repeatedly taken, and continue to take with this legislation today.

This bill leads to harm for millions of low- and middle-income families and their kids. It completely ignores the need to extend the 2017 expiration of the expanded refundable portion of the child tax credit, which, if allowed to occur, would push 12 million people, including 6 million children, into poverty or deeper into poverty, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Republicans may say that such an extension could be done later, as they claimed in our discussion at the Rules Committee, but that talk about future action is made incredulous when Republicans this week add another $187 billion to the deficit, bringing the total they have passed in unpaid-for tax cuts to more than $700 billion. This comes after Republicans have slashed nondefense domestic discretionary spending to its lowest level on record as a percentage of GDP.

In contrast, this bill expands and makes permanent the availability of the child tax credit to many new, upper middle-income families whose incomes are too high to qualify under current law. Under this legislation, a married couple making $160,000 with two kids would get an additional $2,200 in their 2018 tax refund, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, while a single mother of two making $14,500 would see her refund cut by $1,750.

But it gets still worse.

Republicans this week inserted a provision into this legislation requiring recipients of the child tax credit to provide their Social Security number, a change that could lead to the loss of this credit for families of 5 million children, 4 million of whom are U.S. citizens. In all, 400,000 veterans and Armed Forces families will lose all or part of their credit. That is the reason that the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes this requirement, because it is deeply flawed and would leave millions of families with children behind.

Ben Franklin once said:

Well done is better than well said.

Today it is even truer that well said cannot obscure what is harmfully done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

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

I feel compelled to correct the record here. The opponents make a false claim that somehow this bill eliminates benefits for millions of low-income families, and that is just wrong because the provision he is talking about is, frankly, the failure of the Obama administration to make that provision permanent. The provision he refers to does not expire until 2017. So what they are saying is, in a word, ''nonsense.''

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that Ms. JENKINS control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this particular issue.

We are a Nation that is struggling to make ends meet. The rising cost of everyday essentials, such as gas, groceries, and electricity, all continue to rise, while household incomes remain stagnant.

There is no need to compound these problems with a Tax Code that punishes working parents by making it hard for them to keep up with the rising costs of raising a family.

The child tax credit was originally enacted in 1997 to ease the financial burden on families. Over time, the original credit amount was eventually increased and made partially refundable to help more families. However, since being expanded to $1,000 back in 2004, the child tax credit has failed to keep pace with costs.

Kids are expensive: diapers and car seats, haircuts, toothbrushes, books, clothes, and even sporting equipment. A recent study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that for a middle-income couple, it will cost over

$240,000 to raise a child until 18 years of age.

I did the calculation for a middle-income two-parent household with three kids. According to the USDA calculator, the average household will spend $3,500 on food, $4,000 on transportation, $1,600 on clothing, and nearly $7,000 on child care and education for a total of over $30,000 annually.

Contributing the most to these rising costs are items such as spending on education and child care. In fact, since 2000, the cost of child care has increased twice as fast as the median income of families with children.

The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act, which is before us today, indexes the credit and the limitations to inflation to help parents keep more of their hard-earned money to use for the mounting expenses of parenting.

In addition to indexing the credit and limits to inflation, the bill also eliminates the marriage penalty by increasing the joint filing phaseout threshold to exactly double that of single filers. Removing marriage penalties and indexing for inflation have become a recognized part of our tax system.

The lack of indexing of a particular provision to inflation means that a provision is worth less to taxpayers every year. In the case of the child tax credit, this means working low and middle class families.

This legislation essentially removes the annual hidden tax placed on these families and recognizes that $1 of income in 1998 and in 2004 is not the same as $1 of income in 2014.

Similar tax credits that Congress has smartly indexed to inflation include the adoption tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and education tax credit. All of these tax credits make it easier on working families to put money aside and save for the future.

Increasing the phaseout level is a family-friendly change that greatly simplifies the code for middle class parents currently forced to perform a complicated computation and increases the fairness across the Code.

It also includes an antifraud provision championed by Congressman SAM JOHNSON, seeking to curtail tax fraud by requiring a Social Security number to be eligible for this tax credit. It is a simple principle also supported by Democrat United States Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL. Simply put, if you are breaking the law by working illegally in our country, you should not be getting a tax benefit for it.

This is sensible legislation that will help hardworking families keep more of their paychecks and help pay for the rising costs of raising a family. A vote for this bill will give Americans more freedom to save their own money and help struggling families who are just trying to get by.

I urge everyone to support H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, because when working families succeed, the Nation's economy succeeds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear the debate. I wonder if the gentlewoman believes the analogy she made in terms of the cost of living applies to the minimum wage as well, and if she does, I would ask her to urge her leadership to bring the minimum wage bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which takes from those who have little in order to give to those who have more.

For many working families, the child tax credit helps parents keep their children and themselves out of poverty. It is a program that Ronald Reagan liked, it is a program that works, and it is a program that we ought to reform and expand.

Sadly, this Republican bill would allow provisions that most directly support low-income working parents to expire, while expanding the credit to families making up to three times what an average household brings home—how perverse, how predictable.

It will do so by adding $115 billion to our deficit. In a time of economic recovery, Mr. Speaker, we should be doing the opposite, providing a leg up for struggling families while paying for what we buy.

Members on both sides of the aisle agree that the right way to do this is comprehensive tax reform. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP—again, I commend him for putting on the floor—or putting on the table at least—a comprehensive tax reform bill.

He showed courage and good sense. That was done just a few months ago. It showed the difficult choices that are necessary. This bill makes no choices. It just borrows more and puts us more in debt while hurting families.

I don't agree with all of what was in Mr. CAMP's bill, but it was a starting point that, through a bipartisan process of amendment, could provide a path to where we all know we need to go. This bill shirks that responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. This bill, this bill shirks that responsibility, adds $115 billion to the deficit, and will make the children of low-income working parents less economically secure—how sad.

Reject this bill. Vote ''no.''

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would also like to thank Chairman CAMP for including in this bill my commonsense measure to require tax filers to provide their Social Security number in order to claim the $1,000 refundable child tax credit, formerly known as the additional child tax credit.

My measure would save $24.5 billion. Now, that is real money. Sadly, there has been a lot of misinformation about this commonsense measure. I would like to clear that up.

First, this is basically a benefit check handed out by the IRS. Second, this measure is based on the good work of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

Right now, the IRS is providing this refundable child tax credit to those who are here illegally, but don't take my word for it. This is what the IG said about the refundable tax credit:

> Although the law prohibits aliens residing without authorization in the United States from receiving most Federal public benefits, an increasing number of these individuals are filing tax returns claiming the additional child tax credit, ACTC.

Notice the IG refers to this as a public benefit. The IG also points to an increase in the number of illegal immigrants claiming this benefit. I would add that some are claiming children who don't even live here.

Third, and even more troubling in light of the border crisis, is that the IG says this credit can encourage individuals to come illegally to the United States.

The last thing we need is to continue to encourage folks from Central America to make the dangerous and life-threatening trek to Texas.

Accordingly, the IG has recommended the IRS require Social Security numbers. Why is that? Because Social Security numbers are provided to those who can legally be in the United States.

Additionally, this credit is based on earned income, income that should be earned by those who have Social Security numbers, period.

Fourth, it is not just Republicans who have expressed concern and the need to take action, but also Democrats—yes, Democrats—about the IG's work. For instance, following the 2011 IG report, Democrat Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL from Missouri demanded answers from the IRS and, more importantly, vowed to end payments to individuals without Social Security numbers.

Also, then-Finance chairman and Democrat Senator Max Baucus from Montana, along with other Finance Committee members, fired off a letter expressing serious concern to Treasury and the IRS.

Fifth, requiring tax filers to include their Social Security numbers for the $1,000 refundable child tax credit is a longstanding commonsense idea. For instance, the IRS requires Social Security numbers for the earned income tax credit, a similar refundable credit for low-income families.

Congress included this antifraud measure in the 1996 welfare reform law signed by Democrat President Bill Clinton. Democrats, such as then-Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator HARRY REID, and Congressman STENY HOYER, voted for that law.

Now, let me ask: Do Democrats now oppose requiring Social Security numbers for the earned income tax credit?

In 2008, 215 House Democrats voted for the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, which provided tax rebates to individuals and children. Guess what? That bill also required Social Security numbers. Do Democrats now regret supporting that policy back in 2008?

What is going on here is that President Obama and his Democrat allies in Congress are now playing politics with taxpayer dollars. It is wrong and irresponsible. There is no policy reason for this opposition.

Bottom line, my measure is about protecting the hard-earned taxpayer dollars of Americans, especially those who are struggling to make ends meet in this economy.

It is time to stop playing politics with this. It is time to stand up for the American taxpayer.

I thank the chairman again for working with me on this important taxpayer measure.

□ 1130

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to my friend from Texas, this isn't politics. This is 5 million children, and the estimate is that 4 million are citizens of the United States.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, Republicans are offering a bill that claims to help families but actually does great harm to low-income families with children.

It is really quite a surprising piece of legislation, actually, because it is a backdoor pay increase for Congressmen and Congresswomen who have children. We don't give ourselves any kind of cost-of-living increase, but this is a backdoor pay increase put forward by the Republicans.

Under this bill, couples making between $150,000 and $205,000 would be newly eligible for the child tax credit. So that is all of us, folks. Thank the Republicans for this.

This bill does not, however, make permanent a key provision made to the law in 2009 that is set to expire in 2017. This improvement expanded the refundable portion of the tax credit for millions of hardworking, low-income Americans. Under H.R. 4935, families making minimum wage would lose a portion of their tax credit in 2018. This means that a single mother in South Lake Union, Seattle, working full-time, making $14,500 a year, struggling to support two children, will lose $1,725 in 2018.

In addition, this bill requires one of the taxpayers claiming the child tax credit to have a Social Security number. This provision will harm millions of American kids who are United States citizens living in immigrant families. These children and their families will be cut off from crucial tax relief if this becomes law. That is why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes this bill's Social Security number requirement. They recognize what you are doing. You are going after people at the bottom to give a pay increase to Congressmen. Vote ''no.''

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

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for recognizing that this does put more money back in the pockets of hardworking Americans, but I just want to correct the record that this is in no way, shape, or form a tax increase.

There certainly have been a lot of inaccuracies and highly misleading statements from the other side of the aisle about this bill this morning. This bill does not end the credit for low-income working families. It is not a tax increase on them. It certainly does not cast millions of children deeper into poverty.

The tax provision in this bill originated from the stimulus bill. It was extended back in 2013 for 5 additional years. So it is not currently expiring, and it will not expire until 2018.

All H.R. 4935 does is it keeps that in place and does not even address that particular provision. It does not call for ending that provision. It does not call for reducing or altering that provision. Rather, this bill deals with the immediate concern, and that is the erosion of the value of the child tax credit for every family struggling today.

So following this absurd logic from the other side, every single bill and amendment that comes to the House floor that fails to address or does not extend their provision is a tax increase.

This bill before us today will have and deserves bipartisan support. It is unfortunate that some have resorted to recycled talking points and outright falsehoods to conjure up some reason to oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

What you say is totally wrong. You make permanent under your provision a child tax credit for a couple making $160,000, while you do not make permanent the refundable tax credit for families making much, much, much less. That is a fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. To the Chair, I ask that perhaps we can ask someone from the majority as to whether or not the accusation made by the ranking member of the Ways and Means is correct.

To the Chair, I ask that the attention of the majority be given to the speaker at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. LEVIN has said that this change in the law and to remove the marriage penalty allows people making between $150,000 and $205,000 to become eligible for the tax credit. It also says that a family making $160,000 a year would receive a new tax cut of $2,200.

It just seems to me that the majority in this House is not going to allow this to stand unchallenged, and I would hope that either those that are controlling the time or the staff have enough interest to protect the integrity of the Ways and Means Committee to say that these child tax credits are for the working people that need the assistance that they can't get except through the Tax Code.

If we are going to go near a trillion dollars in extending tax credits and extending our national debt, we certainly shouldn't do this for the benefit of the higher-income middle class people. So please don't let this debate close without hearing an answer as to why in the world would we extend the deficit for the benefit of people that are making up to $200,000 a year to receive benefits for child credits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair will remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us actually evens the playing field. If two people are single and have children at the income levels the previous speaker just mentioned, they get the credit. Under current law, if they are married, they don't get the credit.

So what this bill does is actually extends the benefit that goes to singles to married people. We do away with what is called the marriage penalty.

I don't know why the other side is opposed to people getting married, but what is really important about this credit is that it helps middle class families who have seen the credit erode over the years as the cost of food,

clothing, housing, and schooling have gone up.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, across America, there are many young couples devoting time to determining the name of their newborn—a happy experience—but I can tell you there is no couple in America that devotes more time to selecting names than our Republican colleagues.

Much of this session, that name-making has been about naming post offices, because if they weren't naming post offices and beginning to rename post offices, they would run out of excuses for doing nothing on the great challenges that our country faces. But the essence of Republican name-making creativity is directed toward bills like this. They are so good at applying names to their bills and so sorry at what goes in the bills.

Today's Child Tax Credit Improvement Act only lacks the fact that it represents no improvement for the working poor. It neither improves the child tax credit nor improves the lives of millions of children living at or near poverty.

Under this bill, a single mom with two children who works full-time at the minimum wage loses almost $2,000 a year. This bill does deserve a name. I think the best one would be the ''Pushing More People Into Poverty Act,'' since its net effect is to push 12 million people, including 6 million children, right into poverty or deeper into it. That includes 400,000 veteran and Armed Forces families who would lose all or part of their child tax credit.

The Republicans may curse Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty on this big anniversary for it, but they continue to wage a war on those in poverty, especially America's most needy children.

A leading advocacy group, First Focus Campaign for Children, reports that our Federal investment in our children has fallen 60 percent faster than overall Federal spending. This analysis shows that small children are the big losers in the Federal budget battle because their voices aren't heard the loudest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. We know that every single dollar that these Republicans add to the national debt—and they propose to add about a trillion dollars to the national debt with these unpaid tax breaks—every one of those dollars is another trillion dollars of excuses when it is time to renew the Child Health Insurance Program next year, or CHIP; when it is time to invest in early education and Head Start; and when it is time to invest in preventing child abuse, strengthening our adoption system, and having a family-nurse partnership to work with these young families. Those are the excuses, while one House Republican group calls all of these welfare.

Let's vote for children and against this act.

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

I am just puzzled by this logic that the minority is concerned about a provision that expires in 4 years. They are worried about that today, but yet they are not worried about the loss of buying power for hardworking American families starting next year. They are willing to give up helping families next year, and they want to debate an issue that we aren't going to even address for another 4 years.

As it relates to their charge that this in some way helps the wealthy, I would like to point out that a foundational principle of the Tax Code is that it should be, at worst, neutral toward the decision to get married. It should not be a deterrent. Certainly, it should not make taxpayers worse off merely by making the decision to marry and start a family. Marriage is beneficial to society and something that we have and should continue to encourage.

Removing the marriage penalty is about one thing, and that is fairness. This is especially true for today's two-earner households where both spouses have to work just in order to make ends meet.

Congress has had the wisdom to remove the marriage penalties from many other parts of the Tax Code, including the standard deduction. A deduction for married couples is twice the amount for single filers, and in tax brackets the income range of 10 to 15 percent brackets for couples is twice that of individuals, as it should be.

□ 1145

We are asking for that same parity to be afforded in the child tax credit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), another distinguished member of our committee.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been described by the Republican majority as an extension—an improvement—of the child tax credit, important to many American families, but the fact is this bill is deeply flawed. At a cost of nearly $100 billion, it increases the child tax credit for those with higher incomes while failing to extend needed relief for lower-income families.

Consider the consequences.

A single mother, with two children, working full time at minimum wage, earns just $14,500 annually. She will see a tax increase of $1,725. A lance corporal in the Marine Corps, with 2 years of service, married, with two children, earns about $23,000 a year in base pay. This family will see its taxes go up by $750. Yet those with higher incomes, including Members of Congress, who earn $174,000, and who have two children, will receive a tax cut of $1,600. Then in a hastily added provision, a child who is a legal resident or is a U.S. citizen and whose parent uses an individual tax ID number rather than a Social Security number will be denied the child tax credit no matter what the level of income.

As a result of this legislation, 6 million children will fall into—or deeper into—poverty. In my own home State of Pennsylvania, families making less than $40,000 a year will see their taxes increase by an average of $456, while families making more than $100,000 will see their taxes cut by $685.

This bill ignores these harmful consequences. It will hurt too many hardworking families and children in our Nation. It is wrong. It is a bill that is fiscally irresponsible, and it is morally reprehensible. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with dozens of religious, child, tax, and poverty organizations to strongly oppose H.R. 4935 because it would push an estimated 12 million people, including 6 million children, into deeper poverty.

The child tax credit is one of the most effective tax benefits for families with children and is a shining example of smart Federal investment. The credit encourages work, raises millions of children from poverty, and helps grow economies and support businesses.

Rather than strengthening this anti-poverty program, the bill will take away—eviscerate, wipe out—benefits for the most vulnerable Americans, denying financial assistance for basic necessities, like rent and food, and eliminating an average of $1,800 from low-wage families per year.

The child tax credit was designed to help hardworking, low-income families meet the needs of their children, but this child tax credit bill harms these families and threatens the well-being of millions of American children. In reality, the bill does exactly the opposite of what the child tax credit was designed to do. In essence, you could really call it the ''Reverse Robin Hood Child Tax Credit'' bill—take from the poor, benefit the more affluent.

I urge that we vote ''no.''

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the child tax credit, and I support expanding and strengthening the child tax credit.

The problem is this bill does just the opposite for the most needy families with kids in the United States. They don't get a tax cut under this bill. In fact, they get deliberately left behind because this bill fails to extend a critical improvement to the tax credit that is only currently temporary in law, and they don't extend that.

I heard the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee earlier blaming that on the President, once again, as if the President made our Republican colleagues not include that provision in their bill. Extending the child tax credit is in the President's budget. Extending the child tax credit is in the House Democratic budget. Extending that child tax credit enhancement is not in the House Republican budget, and that is why it is not here today.

What is the impact of this?

The impact is to hurt our low-income families with kids. As Mr. LEVIN pointed out earlier, it is really ironic that, just yesterday, the chairman of the Budget Committee gave a big talk in Washington about how he wanted to ''start a conversation about poverty'' and ''help families get ahead.'' That was yesterday. Those were words. Here we are on the floor of the House today with an actual deed, an actual act—a vote that will put 12 million more Americans into poverty or deeper into poverty, 6 million of them children.

The President in his budget extends those benefits—those tax strengthening, tax-cut provisions—and pays for them by getting rid of some of the big tax breaks for corporations. The Republican approach has been just the opposite. In the last 6 weeks, they have permanently extended tax breaks for big corporations, but today, when it comes to the kids, they leave them behind. They don't extend those enhancements.

Who are these individuals? Let me point out to our colleagues the folks who are being left behind:

A single mother of two, working full-time at minimum wage, will lose a tax credit of $1,725. This is an individual who is making about $15,000 a year. These are the people we are trying to help with the child tax credit. Yes, we would love to expand it, but not at the expense of this single mom. Who else gets left behind? It would be an Army private E–1—married, one child. They are going to lose $229 in their child tax credit because this Republican bill refuses to extend those enhancements.

Mr. Speaker, yes, let's strengthen it, but not at the expense of those most vulnerable families. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am just amazed by the other side's doing time travel 4 years into the future when a lot of hardworking families are struggling every day—right now—to deal with this economy, and that needs to be the focus of this debate.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman BRADY, a fine member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the leadership of Congresswoman JENKINS' on such an important issue for families.

We have two young boys. It is expensive raising kids—it just is—all across America. I don't care what you make or where you live. This is about making it a little easier to raise your children.

You have heard today that everyone is for the child tax credit except, of course, when they have to vote for the tax credit. Then you hear every excuse in the world.

Let's look at what this bill does:

First, it makes permanent this child tax credit so people can count on it. It is indexed for inflation, so that means, when your dollar buys less and less, you shouldn't be punished by Uncle Sam because inflation is going up. It is so families can more closely keep up with the real costs of raising their kids. It eliminates the marriage penalty so Uncle Sam doesn't punish you—so the Federal Government doesn't punish you—simply because you are married and are raising your children. We think it is important that married couples who are struggling to raise families aren't punished by Uncle Sam, and it makes sure more Americans can take advantage of this.

Here is what it doesn't do:

It doesn't include the same failed stimulus programs the White House brought down upon America. As you know, we were promised the economy would be roaring. America normally bounces back from tough economic times, but not this time. This is the worst economic recovery in more than half a century.

To President Obama's unfortunate example, the worst economic recovery in this President's lifetime is his economic recovery. We are missing almost $1.5 trillion out of our economy. We are missing jobs for 5.8 million people. To put that in perspective, if the President had, like an average President, just led a C-grade type of recovery, everyone looking for work in 44 States could have a job today.

Also, as a result of this very weak recovery, do you know what a family of four in America is missing each month from its wages? $1,120. That is $1,120 that should be in a family's pocketbook to pay the rent or utilities or food or all of that. It is missing today because of this poor recovery. Some people say let's stay the course and do more of it. This bill says, no, let's change course and get people back to work, and let's help them raise their children.

The final point I would make is of this provision, including the key anti-fraud provision by Congressman SAM JOHNSON of Texas. What we know is that billions of dollars each year are being sent to people whose children don't exist. Their children don't exist. Some of the children live outside the country. Others aren't eligible for this at all. Yet Washington sends them a check—your hard-earned tax dollars. They are people who don't deserve this. Congressman JOHNSON's provision says you will actually give us the Social Security number—an accurate one—of that child you are seeking the help for so that we make sure the money goes to those who are eligible for it.

I don't understand sort of the pro-fraud lawmakers who say we don't need to do this, and we don't need to save those dollars. The truth is, for as hard as you work for your money—for the dollars that are out of your paycheck each week or each month—and for what you pay on April 15, your money should go to help people who deserve the help, not to children who don't exist, not to families who don't exist. This is a critical part. It saves billions of dollars.

Let's help families raise their children. Let's help our tax dollars go to the people who actually need them, and let's save some money for Uncle Sam. This bill deserves our support.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when I go home, I often hear people who are disillusioned with politics in America. Some even say that they don't really see a difference between Democrats and Republicans.

Today, my Republican colleagues are demonstrating just how significant the differences really are between Republicans and Democrats, especially when it comes to who is looking out for corporate America and who is looking out for hardworking, middle class America.

This bill claims to do a lot of things, but what it really does is shifts the tax burden away from large multinational corporations and puts it on the backs of working families with children.

Now, they are going to tell you that they are fighting fraud, but that is not what this bill is about today.

If my Republican colleagues wanted to crack down on fraud, they would have joined with Democrats in closing loopholes that provide tax breaks to large companies that shift American jobs overseas, but they haven't done that. They would also join Democrats in cracking down on multinational corporations that avoid paying their fair

share of taxes by simply changing the address of a headquarters to a post office box on the Cayman Islands.

I will tell you, if middle class Americans could change their post office boxes to the Cayman Islands, my Republican colleagues would have a bill on the floor to stop that, but they don't have that luxury.

□ 1200

Hardworking Americans can't change their address to a Cayman Island address, so they are just flat out of luck.

Where is the outrage from our Republican colleagues, from my friends, on these abuses?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, there simply isn't any outrage. In fact, the House has taken more than a dozen votes to end these abusive practices, and the majority of my Republican colleagues have opposed each and every one of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. The contrast between Republicans and Democrats could never be more clearer than it is right now. Republicans continue to want to protect corporate America, and Democrats want to protect, average, hardworking middle class Americans. That is the clear distinction, once again being demonstrated by this bill on the floor.

Vote ''no'' on this bill. It is time to tell our Republican colleagues to put the interests of the middle class before corporate American interests.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition against this cruel half-measure by the House Republican majority.

The bill is a boon for upper middle class families, but failing to extend the child tax credit expansion for lower-income families means 12 million Americans will be plunged deeper in poverty. That includes six million children, infants, and toddlers. It also includes 400,000 veterans and members of the armed services, men and women who are giving their lives and sacrificing their families for this Nation.

Yesterday, in an article, Bob Woodson, the president of the Center For Neighborhood Enterprise and, I might add, a mentor for Chairman PAUL RYAN, my Republican colleague, he told The Wall Street Journal that we cannot and should not—and this is a quote—''should not generalize about poor people. There are the deserving poor, and there are the undeserving poor.''

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in this Republican majority, you tell me which are the infants and the toddlers who are the deserving poor and those infants and toddlers who are the undeserving poor?

This is not right. I have always been a strong supporter of the child tax credit. Research has shown that this sort of income support for parents, it boosts employment, increases earnings and income, reduces poverty, and improves kids' school performance.

I have worked hard to pass the expansion of the child tax credit in the recovery act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. I have long called for the lowering of the eligibility threshold to zero, so that more families in need could benefit. But, like so much else from this majority, this bill unnecessarily leaves working families who are struggling behind. I cannot, in good conscience support it, nor should any of my colleagues support it.

Oppose this cruel, cruel elimination of a child tax credit for deserving families.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and will be prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member for yielding and for your tremendous support on so many issues that affect working men and women, the middle class, the working poor, and the poor. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4935, which is the so-called Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an improvement at all. This bill fails to make permanent a key child tax credit improvement for working families earning as little as $3,000 a year. Instead, this bill permanently extends it to higher income families.

A permanent child tax credit must address the needs of all families, but especially the ones who earn the least. Extending a permanent child tax credit that helps wealthy families while failing to make permanent the credit for those living in poverty is just not fair. It is un-American.

This failure would have a devastating impact on more than 5 million families that are already struggling to make ends meet and who need the credits the most.

The President clearly understands this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Ms. LEE of California. In the Statement of Administration Policy, it is clear that the President understands this. Actually, he understands that this also not only affects the 5 million families, it cuts it for an additional 6 million families. And so I am very pleased that the White House has advised that they do not support this and, hopefully, a veto threat would come if it ever got that far.

Now, yesterday, I might say, Chairman RYAN—and I have to remind us that he rolled out his plan to reduce poverty. Yet, today we see this bill, which would increase poverty.

I am not sure what is going on, Mr. Speaker. We are here to protect all families, particularly those living in poverty. Why in the world would we try, or the Republicans, at least, try to put a compassionate voice and face on such draconian policies?

The rhetoric of yesterday, as it relates to the Ryan rollout of the anti-poverty program, is totally inconsistent with the reality of what we are dealing with and seeing today.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

So under the Republican approach here, they make permanent a child tax credit for families making $150- to $205,000, while refusing to do the same, a refundable tax credit for 12 million people, including 6 million kids, and 400,000 veterans and their families, and they make permanent cutting off another 5 million kids. The estimate is 4 million of them are American citizens.

This is why the Statement of Administration Policy says this: ''If the President were presented with H.R. 4935, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.''

What the Republicans are doing, making permanent a tax cut for families making $150- to $205,000 while refusing to do that for families making much less, this takes the mask off of their rhetoric about poverty. It takes off that mask.

Vote ''no.''

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. One goal of tax policy is to strengthen the economy so that there are more jobs and bigger paychecks for American families. Today, we have an opportunity to put more money in the pockets of hardworking families.

This commonsense bill reforms the child tax credit so that it can keep up with the rising cost of living, and eliminates the current marriage tax penalty.

I have a letter of support that says it best, and I quote:

Representative Jenkins' bill indexes the credit and income limits for inflation. Inflation erodes the value and purchasing power of the U.S. dollar and, as a result, a dollar is worth less today than it was years ago. This important piece of legislation adjusts the credit for inflation to ensure that the value of the credit continues to maintain its value.

We know that family and marriage is beneficial to society, and the Federal Government ought to promote economic policies that allow families to thrive. This tax credit recognizes the important contribution of the family and children to our country and starts to address a problem with our Tax Code today, the marriage penalty. A fair system of taxation does not penalize marriage and family.

With that, I would ask the body to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, to honor families with children.

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this Republican-led House has recently been in the habit of passing extraordinarily expensive corporate and business tax provisions, making each permanent.

However, we are here today to follow a completely different track. Today, we will leave countless single mothers and fathers, struggling to support a family, without the certainty we rushed to provide corporations.

Honestly, I'm dumbfounded by this. I'm dumbfounded and frustrated by a Majority that can find it in their hearts to make corporate provisions like R&D—which I support—permanent, but can't find that same heart for hardworking Americans.

It is truly disgraceful.

While there are a few good provisions in the bill before us, we are leaving the most vulnerable taxpayers out in the cold. Literally. Parents will have to choose between heating their home in the dead of winter and putting food on the table for their kids when we take roughly $1,700 out of their pockets.

Kids are not cheap and this bill doesn't come close to addressing the price of raising healthy, successful children. As a working mom, I understand the struggle to raise a family. And I'm one of the lucky ones.

Many of my constituents—and constituents of each one of us here today—aren't so lucky. These aren't lazy people, expecting a government handout, but hardworking parents.

I cannot support a bill to increase poverty across the country.

On top of all this, at the eleventh hour, the Majority tossed in a devastating amendment to this bill. An amendment that denies millions of children a tax benefit their parents deserve and have paid for. Parents who have worked long hours and paid their fair share of federal taxes will no longer be able to claim the refundable child tax credit. Seriously? You are going to pull the rug out from under struggling families? You have got to be kidding me.

If we can pass permanent tax law for corporations, we can certainly tackle permanent policy for people straining to make ends meet.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 4935, The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

The Child Tax Credit Improvement Act indexes the credit and the limitations to inflation to help parents keep more of their hard earned money to use for the mounting expenses of parenting. Under the bill, the amount of the child tax credit would be indexed for inflation and the marriage penalty would be eliminated by increasing the joint filing phase-out threshold to exactly double that of single filers.

A product of the 1997 Tax Act, the Child Tax Credit complements the Earned Income Tax Credit and helps to further buttress the case that the road to prosperity winds through the tax code by reducing poverty, encouraging work, and strengthening families with children.

The changes proposed earlier this year by both President Obama and Chairman CAMP highlight some of the challenges that these programs face including the complexity surrounding combining work and child tax incentives, definitions of qualifying children, and some of the deficiencies these tax benefits have with respect to childless workers.

But the version of the bill reported by the Ways & Means increases the deficit by $114.9 billion. In addition, a provision was added in the Rules Committee requiring taxpayers to have a Social Security Number to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit, reducing the value of the underlying bill by $24.5 billion.

As a result, the final version of the bill increases the deficit by $90.4 billion.

I want to continue to work on tax legislation which benefits the 18th District and enhances the Child Tax Credit, so that the working families across this great nation you have advocated for may lift themselves out of poverty, and seek the American Dream but this version is not an improvement but instead is a step back.

In fact Mr. Speaker, while I proudly serve on the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, in April, I hosted a briefing on the Child Tax Credit and the Earned Income Tax Credit, which demonstrates the importance of this provision in helping to fight poverty and allowing many Americans in Texas and elsewhere to have a better shot at the American Dream.

This briefing was led by two experts, Elaine Maag from the Urban Institute and Margot Crandall-Hollick of the Congressional Research Service which was organized, along with two other briefings on International Taxation and Retirement Tax provisions, by my Economic Policy Counsel, Darrell Rico Doss. And in spite of the fact that it took place during recess and we did not serve food—my staff assures me that we had an excellent turnout and an even better briefing because of Elaine and Margot who addressed a spellbound audience of Hill staff and others on the intricacies of the two tax credits.

Why? Because the Child Tax Credit was significantly expanded by the Bush tax cuts, and further expanded, especially for low-income taxpayers, by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Many, though not all of these expansions were subsequently made permanent by the American Taxpayer Relief Act. That expansion of the credit occurred under two presidents—illustrating its bipartisan nature.

But only in this Congress—led by an intransigent GOP Majority would this critical poverty-busting tax provision be politicized to the point that I suspect the vote will largely be along party lines.

Today, as the House considers this GOP child tax credit bill which does the opposite of what is needed: it would provide permanent tax cuts to many affluent families, while letting the Child Tax Credit disappear for many low-income working families after 2017.

After 2017, H.R. 4935 would effectively eliminate the Child Tax Credit for 5 million families, while cutting it for 6 million more. A single parent with two children working full-time at minimum wage would lose her entire tax credit of $1,725.

Meanwhile, a couple with two children with income of $150,000 would receive a Child Tax Credit $2,200 larger than today. In addition, H.R. 4935 would immediately eliminate the Child Tax Credit for millions of American children whose parents immigrated to this country, including U.S. citizen children and ''Dreamers,'' and would push many of these children into or deeper into poverty.

Here are the three key features of this GOP child tax credit bill (more information about each of these features is below):

It fails to make permanent a key improvement in the Child Tax Credit enacted in 2009 that makes more low-income working families eligible for the credit and that will expire in 2017 unless Congress acts.

It indexes the current maximum credit of $1,000 per child to inflation, which benefits only those with incomes high enough to receive the maximum benefit.

It extends the Child Tax Credit up the income scale—on a permanent basis—so more families with six-figure incomes will benefit.

So, today after Rep. PAUL RYAN unveiled his so-called ''antipoverty'' plan, my Republican colleagues bring up this bill that is estimated to result in pushing 12 million people—including 6 million children—into or deeper into poverty, by failing to extend the key 2009 Child Tax Credit improvement which will expire in 2017.

First, this bill hurts low-income working families by failing to make permanent the key provision enacted in 2009 that made more low- and moderate-income working families eligible for the CTC and enlarged the CTC for others who had been receiving only a partial credit. This provision expires in 2017. If this provision expires on schedule, as this GOP bill allows:

A single mother with two children in Houston who works full time throughout the year at the minimum wage and earns $14,500 would lose $1,725 in 2018, as her Child Tax Credit would be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, about 12 million people including 6 million children in 2018 will be pushed into, or deeper into, poverty.

Again, it is hypocritical of House Republicans—who have let emergency unemployment insurance expire for more than 3 million Americans, refused to provide a permanent fix to the sustainable growth rate (SGR) for Medicare payments to doctors, and failed to replace the irrational, across-the-board spending cuts imposed by the sequester all on arguments over offsets—to bring this bill to the Floor without paying for it.

As I cast my vote this morning the fact is not lost on me—and I am sure many other Members in this body—that four months ago the Republican Leadership let emergency unemployment insurance expire for more than 1.3 million Americans—many at the end of their proverbial economic rope.

Many of these unemployed live in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, comprising Houston and outlying areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than irresponsible but recklessness in the guise of looking out for families.

I have to ask a burning question—what happened to deficit reduction?

However, the choice made by House Republicans to address these provisions one by one, while adding their cost to the deficit, represents an irresponsible approach that will only make fixing our broken tax system harder and put further fiscal strain on federal, state, and local programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for children and families—but this bill must be paid for—because if they are not—future generations will suffer because of the unsustainable debt.

Let us get back to being fiscally responsible and helping America's families by enacting smart, pragmatic tax policy.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act. Under current law, the child tax credit is not indexed for inflation. The bill before us today would index the child tax credit for inflation, as well as achieve the important step of abolishing the so-called ''marriage penalty'' in current tax code.

Importantly, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act also contains a provision to require those filers claiming the refundable portion of the tax credit to provide a Social Security Number. This seems like pure common sense, but right now, the IRS accepts the use of the Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) to get this credit. An ITIN number demonstrates only that someone has taxable income, not that they are in the country legally. In fact, a 2011 Treasury Inspector General report found that $4.2 billion in refundable tax credits were issued to individuals not authorized to work in the United States.

In this Congress and in the 112th Congress, I cosponsored legislation to require the inclusion of a Social Security Number on a tax return as a prerequisite to receiving the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and I am glad to see the inclusion of that language in the bill before us today.

Mr. Speaker, while we must take steps to reduce the burden on hardworking parents in this nation, I also believe that we must work to ensure that people do not abuse our tax system to receive tax credits for which they are not eligible. The legislation before us today accomplishes both of those goals.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4935 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Con. Res. 105, adoption of the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5081.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 173, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—237

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Noem
Amash	Gosar	Nugent
Amodei	Gowdy	Nunes
Bachmann	Granger	Olson
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barletta	Grimm	Pearce
Barr	Guthrie	Perry
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Peters (CA)
Barton	Hanna	Peters (MI)
Benishek	Harper	Peterson
Bentivolio	Harris	Petri
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Bishop (GA)	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Black	Hensarling	Posey
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Boustany	Holding	Rahall
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Reed
Braley (IA)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Ribble
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Roby
Brownley (CA)	Issa	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Bustos	Jolly	Rokita
Byrne	Jordan	Rooney
Calvert	Joyce	Roskam
Camp	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Cantor	King (IA)	Rothfus
Carter	King (NY)	Royce
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Ruiz
Chabot	Kline	Runyan
Chaffetz	Kuster	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	Labrador	Salmon
Coffman	LaMalfa	Sanford
Cole	Lamborn	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Lance	Schneider
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Schock
Conaway	Latham	Schweikert
Cook	Latta	Scott, Austin
Cotton	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Loebsack	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Lucas	Shuster
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Daines	Lummis	Sinema
Davis, Rodney	Maffei	Smith (MO)
Dent	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Massie	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	McAllister	Stewart
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Enyart	McCaul	Stockman
Farenthold	McClintock	Stutzman
Fincher	McHenry	Terry
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McKeon	Thornberry
Flores	McKinley	Tiberi
Forbes	McMorris Rodgers	Tipton
Fortenberry	Meadows	Turner
Foxx	Meehan	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Wagner
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walberg
Gallego	Miller (FL)	Walden
Garamendi	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Garcia	Miller, Gary	Weber (TX)
Gardner	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gerlach	Murphy (FL)	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gibson	Neugebauer	Williams
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Olson	Wittman
Gosar	Palazzo	Wolf
Gowdy	Paulsen	Womack
Granger	Pearce	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Perry	Yoho
Griffin (AR)	Peters (CA)	Young (AK)
Grimm	Peters (MI)	Young (IN)
Guthrie	Peterson	
Hall	Petri	
Hanna	Pittenger	
Harper	Pitts	
Harris	Poe (TX)	
Hartzler	Posey	
Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)	
Heck (NV)	Rahall	
Hensarling	Reed	
Herrera Beutler	Reichert	
Holding	Renacci	
Hudson	Ribble	
Huelskamp	Rice (SC)	
Huizenga (MI)	Roby	
Hultgren	Roe (TN)	
Hunter	Rogers (AL)	
Hurt	Rogers (KY)	
Issa	Rohrabacher	
Jenkins	Rokita	
Johnson (OH)	Rooney	
Johnson, Sam	Roskam	
Jolly	Ross	
Jordan	Rothfus	
Joyce	Royce	
Kelly (PA)	Ruiz	
King (IA)	Runyan	
King (NY)	Ryan (WI)	
Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon	
Kline	Sanford	
Kuster	Scalise	
Labrador	Schneider	
LaMalfa	Schock	
Lamborn	Schweikert	
Lance	Scott, Austin	
Lankford	Sensenbrenner	
Latham	Sessions	
Latta	Shimkus	
LoBiondo	Shuster	
Loebsack	Simpson	
Long	Sinema	
Lucas	Smith (MO)	
Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	
Lummis	Smith (NJ)	
Maffei	Smith (TX)	
Maloney, Sean	Southerland	
Marino	Stewart	
Massie	Stivers	
Matheson	Stockman	
McAllister	Stutzman	
McCarthy (CA)	Terry	
McCaul	Thompson (PA)	
McClintock	Thornberry	
McHenry	Tiberi	
McIntyre	Tipton	
McKeon	Turner	
McKinley	Upton	
McMorris Rodgers	Wagner	
Meadows	Walberg	
Meehan	Walden	
Messer	Walorski	
Mica	Weber (TX)	
Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)	
Miller (MI)	Wenstrup	
Miller, Gary	Westmoreland	
Mullin	Whitfield	
Mulvaney	Williams	
Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)	
Murphy (PA)	Wittman	
Neugebauer	Wolf	
Noem	Womack	
Nugent	Woodall	
Nunes	Yoho	
Olson	Young (AK)	
Palazzo	Young (IN)	
Paulsen		

NAYS—173

Bass	Grijalva	Nolan
Beatty	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Becerra	Hahn	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Bonamici	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Butterfield	Holt	Perlmutter
Capps	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Hoyer	Pocan
Cárdenas	Huffman	Polis
Carney	Israel	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Chu	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kind	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Costa	Langevin	Schrader
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cummings	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sherman
DeGette	Lowenthal	Sires
Delaney	Lowey	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Speier
Denham	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maloney, Carolyn	Takano
Diaz-Balart	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Tierney
Doyle	McDermott	Titus
Duckworth	McGovern	Tonko
Edwards	McNerney	Valadao
Ellison	Meeks	Van Hollen
Engel	Meng	Vargas
Eshoo	Michaud	Veasey
Esty	Miller, George	Vela
Farr	Moore	Velázquez
Fattah	Moran	Visclosky
Foster	Nadler	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Waters
Fudge	Neal	Waxman
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	Welch
Grayson	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Pingree (ME)	
Grijalva	Pocan	
Gutiérrez	Polis	
Hahn	Price (NC)	
Hanabusa	Quigley	
Hastings (FL)	Rangel	
Higgins	Richmond	
Himes	Ros-Lehtinen	
Hinojosa	Roybal-Allard	
Holt	Ruppersberger	
Horsford	Rush	
Hoyer	Ryan (OH)	
Huffman	Sánchez, Linda T.	
Israel	Sanchez, Loretta	
Jackson Lee	Sarbanes	
Jeffries	Schakowsky	
Johnson (GA)	Schiff	
Johnson, E. B.	Schrader	
Jones	Schwartz	
Kaptur	Scott (VA)	
Keating	Scott, David	
Kelly (IL)	Serrano	
Kennedy	Sewell (AL)	
Kildee	Shea-Porter	
Kilmer	Sherman	
Kind	Sires	
Kirkpatrick	Slaughter	
Langevin	Smith (WA)	
Larsen (WA)	Speier	
Larson (CT)	Swalwell (CA)	
Lee (CA)	Takano	
Levin	Thompson (CA)	
Lewis	Thompson (MS)	
Lipinski	Tierney	
Lofgren	Titus	
Lowenthal	Tonko	
Lowey	Valadao	
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Van Hollen	
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Vargas	
Lynch	Veasey	
Maloney, Carolyn	Vela	
Matsui	Velázquez	
McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky	
McCollum	Walz	
McDermott	Waters	
McGovern	Waxman	
McNerney	Welch	
Meeks	Wilson (FL)	
Meng	Yarmuth	
Michaud		
Miller, George		
Moore		
Moran		
Nadler		
Napolitano		
Neal		
Negrete McLeod		

NOT VOTING—22

Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	Pompeo
Campbell	Graves (MO)	Rigell
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Rogers (MI)
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Tsongas
Clyburn	Honda	Wasserman Schultz
Coble	Kingston	Yoder
DesJarlais	Marchant	
Fleischmann	Nunnelee	

□ 1237

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PEARCE and GIBSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 40, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—370

Amash	Costa	Green, Al
Amodei	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bachmann	Cramer	Grijalva
Bachus	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barber	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Barletta	Cuellar	Hahn
Barr	Culberson	Hall
Barrow (GA)	Cummings	Hanabusa
Barton	Daines	Hanna
Bass	Davis (CA)	Harper
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Harris
Becerra	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Benishek	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bentivolio	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (NY)	Denham	Higgins
Black	Dent	Himes
Blackburn	DeSantis	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Deutch	Holding
Bonamici	Diaz-Balart	Holt
Boustany	Dingell	Horsford
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Hudson
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Huffman
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Edwards	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Hurt
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers	Israel
Buchanan	Engel	Issa
Bucshon	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Eshoo	Jeffries
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (GA)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Fattah	Jolly
Camp	Fincher	Jones
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Capuano	Fleming	Joyce
Cárdenas	Forbes	Kaptur
Carney	Fortenberry	Keating
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Carter	Foxx	Kennedy
Cassidy	Frankel (FL)	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Chabot	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Kline
Chu	Gallego	Kuster
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Labrador
Clarke (NY)	Garcia	LaMalfa
Clawson (FL)	Gardner	Lamborn
Clay	Garrett	Lance
Cleaver	Gerlach	Langevin
Cohen	Gibbs	Lankford
Cole	Gibson	Larsen (WA)
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Larson (CT)
Conaway	Goodlatte	Latham
Connolly	Gowdy	Latta
Conyers	Granger	Lee (CA)
Cook	Graves (GA)	Levin
Cooper	Grayson	Lewis
Lipinski	Nugent	Schweikert
LoBiondo	Nunes	Scott (VA)
Loebsack	O'Rourke	Scott, Austin
Lofgren	Olson	Scott, David
Long	Owens	Sensenbrenner
Lowenthal	Pallone	Serrano
Lowey	Pascrell	Sewell (AL)
Lucas	Pastor (AZ)	Shea-Porter
Luetkemeyer	Paulsen	Sherman
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Payne	Shuster
	Pearce	Simpson
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pelosi	Sinema
	Perlmutter	Sires
Lummis	Perry	Slaughter
Lynch	Peters (CA)	Smith (MO)
Maffei	Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)
Maloney, Carolyn	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
	Petri	Smith (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Marino	Pittenger	Southerland
Massie	Pitts	Speier
Matheson	Pocan	Stewart
Matsui	Poe (TX)	Stockman
McAllister	Polis	Stutzman
McCarthy (CA)	Posey	Swalwell (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Price (GA)	Takano
McCaul	Price (NC)	Terry
McClintock	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Rahall	Thompson (PA)
McDermott	Rangel	Thornberry
McGovern	Reed	Tiberi
McHenry	Reichert	Tierney
McIntyre	Ribble	Tipton
McKeon	Rice (SC)	Titus
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Tonko
McMorris Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Turner
	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Valadao
Meadows	Rokita	Van Hollen
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
Meeks	Ross	Veasey
Meng	Rothfus	Vela
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Michaud	Royce	Visclosky
Miller (FL)	Ruiz	Wagner
Miller (MI)	Runyan	Walden
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Walz
Miller, George	Rush	Waters
Moore	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Moran	Salmon	Webster (FL)
Mullin	Sánchez, Linda T.	Welch
Mulvaney		Wenstrup
Murphy (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Williams
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
Napolitano	Scalise	Wittman
Neal	Schakowsky	Wolf
Negrete McLeod	Schiff	Woodall
Neugebauer	Schneider	Yarmuth
Noem	Schrader	Yoho
Nolan	Schwartz	Young (AK)

NAYS—40

Aderholt	Johnson (OH)	Schock
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Cartwright	King (IA)	Stivers
Coffman	King (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Walberg
Cotton	Messer	Walorski
Crawford	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Duffy	Renacci	Westmoreland
Flores	Richmond	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Roby	Womack
Griffin (AR)	Rooney	Young (IN)
Grimm	Roskam	
Hunter	Ryan (WI)	

NOT VOTING—22

Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	Pompeo
Campbell	Graves (MO)	Rigell
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Rogers (MI)
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Tsongas
Clyburn	Honda	Wasserman Schultz
Coble	Kingston	
DesJarlais	Marchant	Yoder
Fleischmann	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1243

Mrs. WALORSKI changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''A concurrent resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific, subsequent statutory authorization.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452, I inadvertently voted ''nay.'' My intent was to vote ''yea.''

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 193, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—213

Barber	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Barr	Clay	Enyart
Barrow (GA)	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bass	Cohen	Esty
Beatty	Connolly	Farr
Becerra	Conyers	Fattah
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Foster
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Crowley	Fudge
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gabbard
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gallego
Braley (IA)	Daines	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Garcia
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Gardner
Burgess	DeFazio	Gibson
Bustos	DeGette	Grayson
Butterfield	Delaney	Green, Al
Capps	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Capuano	DelBene	Grijalva
Cárdenas	Dent	Gutiérrez
Carney	Deutch	Hahn
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Hanabusa
Cartwright	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Cassidy	Doyle	Heck (NV)
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Higgins
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Himes
Chu	Ellison	Hinojosa
Clark (MA)	Ellmers	Holt

Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—193

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Bishop (UT)
Buchanan
Campbell
Capito
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Fleischmann
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Heck (WA)
Honda
Kingston
Marchant
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Quigley
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1251

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

Messrs. JONES, ROYCE, and CASSIDY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5081) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—399

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz

Runyan	Simpson	Vargas
Ruppersberger	Sinema	Veasey
Rush	Sires	Vela
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Velázquez
Ryan (WI)	Smith (MO)	Visclosky
Salmon	Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (TX)	Walberg
	Smith (WA)	Walden
Sanford	Southerland	Walorski
Sarbanes	Speier	Walz
Scalise	Stivers	Waters
Schakowsky	Stockman	Waxman
Schiff	Stutzman	Weber (TX)
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Webster (FL)
Schock	Takano	Welch
Schrader	Terry	Wenstrup
Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Scott (VA)	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Sensenbrenner	Tierney	Wittman
Serrano	Tipton	Wolf
Sessions	Titus	Womack
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Woodall
Shea-Porter	Turner	Yarmuth
Sherman	Upton	Yoho
Shimkus	Valadao	Young (AK)
Shuster	Van Hollen	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—33

Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Rigell
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Rogers (MI)
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Capito	Heck (WA)	Smith (NE)
Cicilline	Honda	Stewart
Clyburn	Huizenga (MI)	Tsongas
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Wasserman Schultz
DesJarlais	Kingston	
Fattah	Marchant	Yoder
Fleischmann	Nunnelee	
Gardner	Pompeo	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1258

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 680, H.R. 4935 is laid on the table.

□ 1300

UNLOCKING CONSUMER CHOICE AND WIRELESS COMPETITION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 517) to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 517

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF EXISTING RULE AND ADDITIONAL RULEMAKING BY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

(a) REPEAL AND REPLACE.—As of the date of the enactment of this Act, paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended and revised by the Librarian of Congress on October 28, 2012, pursuant to the Librarian's authority under section 1201(a) of title 17, United States Code, shall have no force and effect, and such paragraph shall read, and shall be in effect, as such paragraph was in effect on July 27, 2010.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights, who shall consult with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and report and comment on his or her views in making such recommendation, shall determine, consistent with the requirements set forth under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code, whether to extend the exemption for the class of works described in section 201.40(b)(3) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended by subsection (a), to include any other category of wireless devices in addition to wireless telephone handsets. The determination shall be made in the first rulemaking under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code, that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) UNLOCKING AT DIRECTION OF OWNER.—Circumvention of a technological measure that restricts wireless telephone handsets or other wireless devices from connecting to a wireless telecommunications network—

(1)(A) as authorized by paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as made effective by subsection (a); and

(B) as may be extended to other wireless devices pursuant to a determination in the rulemaking conducted under subsection (b); or

(2) as authorized by an exemption adopted by the Librarian of Congress pursuant to a determination made on or after the date of enactment of this Act under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code,

may be initiated by the owner of any such handset or other device, by another person at the direction of the owner, or by a provider of a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service at the direction of such owner or other person, solely in order to enable such owner or a family member of such owner to connect to a wireless telecommunications network, when such connection is authorized by the operator of such network.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as expressly provided herein, nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter the scope of any party's rights under existing law.

(2) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—Nothing in this Act alters, or shall be construed to alter, the authority of the Librarian of Congress under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COMMERCIAL MOBILE DATA SERVICE; COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICE.—The terms ''commercial mobile data service'' and ''commercial mobile radio service'' have the respective meanings given those terms in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.—The term ''wireless telecommunications network'' means a network used to provide a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service.

(3) WIRELESS TELEPHONE HANDSETS; WIRELESS DEVICES.—The terms ''wireless telephone handset'' and ''wireless device'' mean a handset or other device that operates on a wireless telecommunications network.

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

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MOLDOVA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 562) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for Moldova's territorial integrity, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 562

Whereas the United States has enjoyed good relations with the Republic of Moldova since the Republic of Moldova's independence in 1991;

Whereas since the Republic of Moldova's independence, the United States has provided financial assistance to support the people of Moldova's efforts to build a prosperous European democracy;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Moldova further strengthened their partnership through the launching of a Strategic Dialogue on March 3, 2014;

Whereas the Republic of Moldova is due to sign an Association Agreement containing comprehensive free trade provisions with the European Union on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States Government supports the democratic aspirations of the people of the Republic of Moldova and their expressed desire to deepen their association with the European Union;

Whereas in a judgment in 2004, the European Court of Human Rights found that Transnistria was set up with the support of the Russian Federation and considered it ''under the effective authority or at least decisive influence of Russia'';

Whereas the United States supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and on that basis participates as an observer in the ''5+2'' negotiations to find a comprehensive settlement that will provide a special status for the separatist region of Transnistria within Moldova;

Whereas the leaders of the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova requested to postpone the ''5+2'' round of talks scheduled to take place in April 2014;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation banned the import of Moldovan wine in 2013 and has threatened to ban Moldovan agricultural products, curtail the supply of energy resources to Moldova, and impose stricter labor migration policies on the people of Moldova;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation maintains a contingent of Russian troops and a stockpile of Russian military equipment and ammunition within the Moldovan region of Transnistria;

Whereas the Government of Russia has been actively issuing Russian passports to the residents of the Transnistria region;

Whereas the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Government of Moldova have called upon the Government of the Russian Federation to remove its troops from the territory of the Republic of Moldova;

Whereas authorities in the Republic of Moldova's Transnistria region have restricted access to the region by OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors, preventing the Mission from providing impartial reporting on the security situation in the region;

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate both passed by an overwhelming majority, and the President signed into law, S. 2183, providing for a United States international broadcasting programming surge to counter misinformation from Russian-supported news outlets and ensuring that Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine and Moldova have access to independent news and information; and

Whereas Moldova has been a valued and reliable partner in promoting global security by participating in U.N. peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and the inviolability of its borders by other nation-states;

(2) supports the Strategic Dialogue as a means to strengthen relations between the Republic of Moldova and the United States and enhance the democratic, economic, rule of law, and security reforms already being implemented by the Republic of Moldova;

(3) encourages the President and the Department of State to enhance United States cooperation with the Government of Moldova and civil society organizations and focus assistance on justice sector reform, anti-corruption efforts, strengthening democratic institutions, domestic energy development, diversification of energy supplies and energy efficiency, as well as promoting trade and investment opportunities;

(4) encourages the President to expedite the implementation of Public Law 113-96, especially for populations in Ukraine and Moldova;

(5) affirms the Republic of Moldova's sovereign right to determine its own partnerships free of external coercion and pressure, and affirms Moldova's right to associate with the European Union or any regional organization;

(6) calls upon the Government of Russia to fulfill its commitments made at the OSCE's Istanbul summit in 1999 and to withdraw its military forces and munitions from within the internationally recognized territory of the Republic of Moldova;

(7) calls upon the Government of Russia to refrain from economic threats and pressure against Moldova and to cease any and all actions that support separatist movements on the territory of Moldova;

(8) supports constructive engagement and confidence-building measures between the Government of Moldova and the authorities in the Transnistria region in order to secure a peaceful resolution to the conflict;

(9) supports efforts to resolve the Transnistria issue through a comprehensive settlement that affirms Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while providing a special status for the Transnistrian region within Moldova;

(10) urges officials in the Transnistrian region to allow OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors unrestricted access to the region;

(11) urges all parties to refrain from unilateral actions that may undermine efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution, as well as the agreements already reached, and encourages leaders of the Transnistrian region to resume negotiations toward a political settlement; and

(12) affirms that lasting stability and security in Europe is a key priority for the United States and that these can only be achieved if the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European countries is respected.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for House Resolution 562, which expresses the sense of the House with regard to the United States' special relationship with the Republic of Moldova. I am especially pleased to join my colleague, Congressman JOE PITTS, with whom I co-chair the Congressional Moldova Caucus here in the House, and with whom I am proud to have coauthored the resolution before us here today.

Mr. Speaker, the United States and Moldova have enjoyed a strong and evolving friendship for many years. Since its independence following the fall of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Moldova—like all nascent democracies—has weathered the at-times uncertain path toward a stable, certain future. But the remarkable progress of the past several decades is a testament not only to the tenacity and spirit of the Moldovan people, but also to Moldova's promise and potential as a strong, independent nation in the future.

In the past several years, we have seen Moldova reach a number of milestones on the path toward broader and more comprehensive engagement with Europe—and with the United States. Our House Democracy Partnership witnessed the country's progress first-hand on a 2007 visit. I was pleased to join Congressman PITTS and more than 360 of our colleagues at the end of the last Congress to support a bill that finally removed unnecessary trade barriers between the Republic of Moldova and the United States.

And we were heartened last fall by the initialing of the Association Agreement between Moldova and the European Union in Vilnius—an Agreement that, as noted in the Resolution under consideration here today, was formally signed by the parties on June 27, 2014, just a few weeks ago. This enhanced Association is especially timely given the role played by the Russian Federation in neighboring Ukraine, where the fomenting of unrest and rebellion has ominous implications for the region as a whole.

Lastly, I am particularly pleased to note that the bond between Moldova and the United States lies not just at the national level; North Carolina and Moldova enjoy a significant friendship as ''sister states,'' through the North Carolina-Moldova Partnership. Our National Guard works closely with their counterparts in Moldova through the Guard's State Partnership Program. This close relationship between my state and the Republic of Moldova has brought our citizens together and promises cultural and economic benefits to come.

I congratulate the Republic of Moldova, and the Moldovan people, and look forward to our continued friendship.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and the inviolability of its borders by other nation-states;

(2) supports the Strategic Dialogue as a means to strengthen relations between the Republic of Moldova and the United States and enhance the democratic, economic, rule of law, and security reforms already being implemented by the Republic of Moldova;

(3) encourages the President and the Department of State to enhance United States cooperation with the Government of Moldova and civil society organizations and focus assistance on justice sector reform, anti-corruption efforts, strengthening democratic institutions, domestic energy development, diversification of energy supplies and energy efficiency, as well as promoting trade and investment opportunities;

(4) encourages the President to expedite the implementation of Public Law 113–96, especially for populations in Ukraine and Moldova;

(5) affirms the Republic of Moldova's sovereign right to determine its own partnerships free of external coercion and pressure, and affirms Moldova's right to associate with the European Union or any regional organization;

(6) calls upon the Government of Russia to fulfill its commitments made at the OSCE's Istanbul summit in 1999 and to withdraw its military forces and munitions from within the internationally recognized territory of the Republic of Moldova;

(7) calls upon the Government of Russia to refrain from economic threats and pressure against Moldova and to cease any and all actions that support separatist movements on the territory of Moldova;

(8) supports constructive engagement and confidence-building measures between the Government of Moldova and the authorities in the Transnistria region in order to secure a peaceful resolution to the conflict;

(9) supports efforts to resolve the Transnistria issue through a comprehensive settlement that affirms Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while providing a special status for the Transnistrian region within Moldova;

(10) urges officials in the Transnistrian region to allow OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors unrestricted access to the region;

(11) urges all parties to refrain from unilateral actions that may undermine efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution, as well as the agreements already reached, and encourages leaders of the Transnistrian region to resume negotiations toward a political settlement; and

(12) affirms that lasting stability and security in Europe is a key priority for the United States and that these can only be achieved if the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European countries is respected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the text be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the United States has enjoyed good relations with the Republic of Moldova since the Republic of Moldova's independence in 1991;

Whereas since the Republic of Moldova's independence, the United States has provided financial assistance to support the people of Moldova's efforts to build a prosperous European democracy;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Moldova further strengthened their partnership through the launching of a Strategic Dialogue on March 3, 2014;

Whereas the Republic of Moldova is due to sign an Association Agreement containing comprehensive free trade provisions with the European Union on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States Government supports the democratic aspirations of the people of the Republic of Moldova and their expressed desire to deepen their association with the European Union;

Whereas in a judgment in 2004, the European Court of Human Rights found that Transnistria was set up with the support of the Russian Federation and considered it ''under the effective authority or at least decisive influence of Russia'';

Whereas the United States supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova and on that basis participates as an observer in the ''5+2'' negotiations to find a comprehensive settlement that will provide a special status for the separatist region of Transnistria within Moldova;

Whereas the leaders of the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova requested to postpone the ''5+2'' round of talks scheduled to take place in April 2014;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation banned the import of Moldovan wine in 2013 and has threatened to ban Moldovan agricultural products, curtail the supply of energy resources to Moldova, and impose stricter labor migration policies on the people of Moldova;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation maintains a contingent of Russian troops and a stockpile of Russian military equipment and ammunition within the Moldovan region of Transnistria;

Whereas the Government of Russia has been actively issuing Russian passports to the residents of the Transnistria region;

Whereas the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Government of Moldova have called upon the Government of the Russian Federation to remove its troops from the territory of the Republic of Moldova;

Whereas authorities in the Republic of Moldova's Transnistria region have restricted access to the region by OSCE Mission to Moldova monitors, preventing the Mission from providing impartial reporting on the security situation in the region;

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate both passed by an overwhelming majority, and the President signed into law, S. 2183, providing for a United States international broadcasting programming surge to counter misinformation from Russian-supported news outlets and ensuring that Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine and Moldova have access to independent news and information; and

Whereas Moldova has been a valued and reliable partner in promoting global security by participating in U.N. peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the preamble text be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 653) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 653

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Near East and South Central Asia Religious Freedom Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ENVOY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President may appoint a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (in this Act referred to as the ''Special Envoy'') within the Department of State. The Special Envoy shall have the rank of ambassador and shall hold the office at the pleasure of the President.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Special Envoy should be a person of recognized distinction in the field of human rights and religious freedom and with expertise in the Near East and South Central Asia.

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Special Envoy shall carry out the following duties:

(1) Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.

(2) Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(3) Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities.

(4) Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

(5) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(6) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Special Envoy shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees and Migration, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and other relevant Federal agencies and officials.

SEC. 4. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.

Subject to the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, the Special Envoy is authorized to represent the United States in matters and cases relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia in—

(1) contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, and specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(2) multilateral conferences and meetings relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATIONS.

The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on October 1, 2019.

SEC. 7. FUNDING.

Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary of State for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, the Secretary of State is authorized to provide to the Special Envoy $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year for the hiring of staff, the conduct of investigations, and necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

ASSESSING PROGRESS IN HAITI ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1104) to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1104

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On January 12, 2010, a massive earthquake struck near the Haitian capital city of Port-au-Prince, leaving an estimated 220,000 people dead, including 103 United States citizens, 101 United Nations personnel, and nearly 18 percent of the nation's civil service, as well as 300,000 injured, 115,000 homes destroyed, and 1,500,000 people displaced.

(2) According to the Post Disaster Needs Assessment conducted by the Government of Haiti, with technical assistance from the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and the European Commission, an estimated 15 percent of the population was directly affected by the disaster and related damages and economic losses totaled $7,804,000,000.

(3) Even before the earthquake, Haiti had some of the lowest socioeconomic indicators and the second highest rate of income disparity in the world, conditions that have further complicated post-earthquake recovery efforts and, according to the World Bank, have significantly reduced the prospects of addressing poverty reduction through economic growth.

(4) According to the World Food Programme, more than 6,700,000 people in Haiti (out of a population of about 10,000,000) are considered food insecure.

(5) In October 2010, an unprecedented outbreak of cholera in Haiti resulted in over 500,000 reported cases and over 8,000 deaths to date, further straining the capacity of Haiti's public health sector and increasing the urgency of resettlement and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) efforts.

(6) The international community, led by the United States and the United Nations, mounted an unprecedented humanitarian response in Haiti, with donors pledging approximately $10,400,000,000 for humanitarian relief and recovery efforts, including debt relief, supplemented by $3,100,000,000 in private charitable contributions, of which approximately $6,400,000,000 has been disbursed and an additional $3,800,000,000 has been committed as of September 30, 2013.

(7) The emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the United States Southern Command, as well as of cities, towns, individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States, was particularly swift and resolute.

(8) Since 2010, a total of $1,300,000,000 in United States assistance has been allocated for humanitarian relief and $2,300,000,000 has been allocated for recovery, reconstruction, and development assistance in Haiti, including $1,140,000,000 in emergency appropriations and $95,000,000 that has been obligated specifically to respond to the cholera epidemic.

(9) Of the $3,600,000,000 in United States assistance allocated for Haiti, $651,000,000 was apportioned to USAID to support an ambitious recovery plan, including the construction of a power plant to provide electricity for the new Caracol Industrial Park (CIP) in northern Haiti, a new port near the CIP, and permanent housing in new settlements in the Port-au-Prince, St-Marc, and Cap-Haïtien areas.

(10) According to a recent report of the Government Accountability Office, as of June 30, 2013, USAID had disbursed 31 percent of its reconstruction funds in Haiti, the port project was 2 years behind schedule and USAID funding will be insufficient to cover a majority of the projected costs, the housing project has been reduced by 80 percent, and the sustainability of the power plant, the port, and the housing projects were all at risk.

(11) GAO further found that Congress has not been provided with sufficient information to ensure that it is able to conduct effective oversight at a time when most funding remains to be disbursed, and specifically recommends that a periodic reporting mechanism be instituted to fill this information gap.

(12) Donors have encountered significant challenges in implementing recovery programs, and nearly 4 years after the earthquake, an estimated 171,974 people remain displaced in camps, unemployment remains high, corruption is rampant, land rights remain elusive, allegations of wage violations are widespread, the business climate is unfavorable, and government capacity remains weak.

(13) For Haiti to achieve stability and long term economic growth, donor assistance will have to be carefully coordinated with a commitment by the Government of Haiti to transparency, a market economy, rule of law, and democracy.

(14) The legal environment in Haiti remains a challenge to achieving the goals supported by the international community.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support the sustainable rebuilding and development of Haiti in a manner that—

(1) promotes efforts that are led by and support the people and Government of Haiti at all levels so that Haitians lead the course of reconstruction and development of Haiti;

(2) builds the long term capacity of the Government of Haiti and civil society in Haiti;

(3) reflects the priorities and particular needs of both women and men so they may participate equally and to their maximum capacity;

(4) respects and helps restore Haiti's natural resources, as well as builds community-level resilience to environmental and weather-related impacts;

(5) provides timely and comprehensive reporting on goals and progress, as well as transparent post program evaluations and contracting data;

(6) prioritizes the local procurement of goods and services in Haiti where appropriate; and

(7) promotes the holding of free, fair, and timely elections in accordance with democratic principles and the Haitian Constitution.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that transparency, accountability, democracy, and good governance are integral factors in any congressional decision regarding United States assistance, including assistance to Haiti.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and annually thereafter through December 31, 2017, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake recovery and development efforts in Haiti.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of ''Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity'', including any significant changes to the strategy over the reporting period and an explanation thereof;

(2) a breakdown of the work that the United States Government agencies other than USAID and the Department of State are conducting in the Haiti recovery effort, and the cost of that assistance;

(3) an assessment of the progress of United States efforts to advance the objectives of the ''Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity'' produced by the Department of State, compared to what remains to be achieved to meet specific goals, including—

(A) a description of any significant changes to the Strategy over the reporting period and an explanation thereof;

(B) an assessment of progress, or lack thereof, over the reporting period toward meeting the goals and objectives, benchmarks, and timeframes specified in the Strategy, including—

(i) a description of progress toward designing and implementing a coordinated and sustainable housing reconstruction strategy that addresses land ownership, secure land tenure, water and sanitation, and the unique concerns of vulnerable populations such as women and children, as well as neighborhood and community revitalization, housing finance, and capacity building for the Government of Haiti to implement an effective housing policy;

(ii) a description of United States Government efforts to construct and sustain the proposed port, as well as an assessment of the current projected timeline and cost for completion; and

(iii) a description of United States Government efforts to attract and leverage the investments of private sector partners to the CIP, including by addressing any policy impediments;

(C) a description of the quantitative and qualitative indicators used to evaluate the progress toward meeting the goals and objectives, benchmarks, and timeframes specified in the Strategy at the program level;

(D) the amounts committed, obligated, and expended on programs and activities to implement the Strategy, by sector and by implementing partner at the prime and subprime levels (in amounts of not less than $25,000); and

(E) a description of the risk mitigation measures put in place to limit the exposure of United States assistance provided under the Strategy to waste, fraud, and abuse;

(4) a description of measures taken to strengthen, and United States Government efforts to improve, Haitian governmental and nongovernmental organizational capacity to undertake and sustain United States-supported recovery programs;

(5) as appropriate, a description of United States efforts to consult and engage with Government of Haiti ministries and local authorities on the establishment of goals and timeframes, and on the design and implementation of new programs under the Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy: Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity;

(6) a description of efforts by Haiti's legislative and executive branches to consult and engage with Haitian civil society and grassroots organizations on the establishment of goals and timeframes, and on the design and implementation of new donor-financed programs, as well as efforts to coordinate with and engage the Haitian diaspora;

(7) consistent with the Government of Haiti's ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, a description of efforts of the Governments of the United States and Haiti to strengthen Government of Haiti institutions established to address corruption, as well as related efforts to promote public accountability, meet public outreach and disclosure obligations, and support civil society participation in anti-corruption efforts;

(8) a description of efforts to leverage public-private partnerships and increase the involvement of the private sector in Haiti in recovery and development activities and coordinate programs with the private sector and other donors;

(9) a description of efforts to address the particular needs of vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, women, children, orphans, and persons with disabilities, in the design and implementation of new programs and infrastructure;

(10) a description of the impact that agriculture and infrastructure programs are having on the food security, livelihoods, and land tenure security of smallholder farmers, particularly women;

(11) a description of mechanisms for communicating the progress of recovery and development efforts to the people of Haiti, including a description of efforts to provide documentation, reporting and procurement information in Haitian Creole;

(12) a description of the steps the Government of Haiti is taking to strengthen its capacity to receive individuals who are removed, excluded, or deported from the United States; and

(13) an assessment of actions necessary to be taken by the Government of Haiti to assist in fulfilling the objectives of the Strategy.

SEC. 6. STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, acting through the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, shall coordinate and transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a three-year Haiti strategy based on rigorous assessments that—

(1) identifies and addresses constraints to sustainable, broad-based economic growth and to the consolidation of responsive, democratic government institutions;

(2) includes an action plan that outlines policy tools, technical assistance, and anticipated resources for addressing the highest-priority constraints to economic growth and the consolidation of democracy, as well as a specific description of mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating progress; and

(3) identifies specific steps and verifiable benchmarks appropriate to provide direct bilateral assistance to the Government of Haiti.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) should address the following elements:

(1) A plan to engage the Government of Haiti on shared priorities to build long-term capacity, including the development of a professional civil service, to assume increasing responsibility for governance and budgetary sustainment of governmental institutions.

(2) A plan to assist the Government of Haiti in holding free, fair and timely elections in accordance with democratic principles.

(3) Specific goals for future United States support for efforts to build the capacity of the Government of Haiti, including to–

(A) reduce corruption;

(B) consolidate the rule of law and an independent judiciary;

(C) strengthen the civilian police force;

(D) develop sustainable housing, including ensuring appropriate titling and land ownership rights;

(E) expand port capacity to support economic growth;

(F) attract and leverage the investments of private sector partners, including to the Caracol Industrial Park;

(G) promote large and small scale agricultural development in a manner that reduces food insecurity and contributes to economic growth;

(H) improve access to potable water, expand public sanitation services, reduce the spread of infectious diseases, and address public health crises;

(I) restore the natural resources of Haiti, including enhancing reforestation efforts throughout the country; and

(J) gain access to safe, secure, and affordable supplies of energy in order to strengthen economic growth and energy security.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In devising the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary should—

(1) coordinate with all United States Government departments and agencies carrying out work in Haiti;

(2) consult with the Government of Haiti, including the National Assembly of Haiti, and representatives of private and nongovernmental sectors in Haiti; and

(3) consult with relevant multilateral organizations, multilateral development banks, private sector institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and foreign governments present in Haiti.

(d) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, shall provide a quarterly briefing that reviews progress of the implementation of the strategy required under subsection (a).

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

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014''.

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

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sean Goldman, a United States citizen and resident of New Jersey, was abducted from the United States in 2004 and separated from his father, David Goldman, who spent nearly 6 years battling for the return of his son from Brazil before Sean was finally returned to Mr. Goldman's custody on December 24, 2009.

(2) The Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, which serves as the Central Authority of the United States for the purposes of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (referred to in this Act as the ''Hague Abduction Convention''), has received thousands of requests since 2007 for assistance in the return to the United States of children who have been wrongfully abducted by a parent or other legal guardian to another country.

(3) For a variety of reasons reflecting the significant obstacles to the recovery of abducted children, as well as the legal and factual complexity involving such cases, not all cases are reported to the Central Authority of the United States.

(4) More than 1,000 outgoing international child abductions are reported every year to the Central Authority of the United States, which depends solely on proactive reporting of abduction cases.

(5) Only about one-half of the children abducted from the United States to countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention are returned to the United States.

(6) The United States and other Convention countries have expressed their desire, through the Hague Abduction Convention, ''to protect children internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention and to establish procedures to ensure their prompt return to the State of their habitual residence, as well as to secure protection for rights of access.''

(7) Compliance by the United States and other Convention countries depends on the actions of their designated central authorities, the performance of their judicial systems as reflected in the legal process and decisions rendered to enforce or effectuate the Hague Abduction Convention, and the ability and willingness of their law enforcement authorities to ensure the swift enforcement of orders rendered pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(8) According to data from the Department of State, approximately 40 percent of abduction cases involve children taken from the United States to countries with which the United States does not have reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or other arrangements relating to the resolution of abduction cases.

(9) According to the Department of State's April 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, ''parental child abduction jeopardizes the child and has substantial long-term consequences for both the child and the left-behind parent.''

(10) Few left-behind parents have the extraordinary financial resources necessary—

(A) to pursue individual civil or criminal remedies in both the United States and a foreign country, even if such remedies are available; or

(B) to engage in repeated foreign travel to attempt to obtain the return of their children through diplomatic or other channels.

(11) Military parents often face additional complications in resolving abduction cases because of the challenges presented by their military obligations.

(12) In addition to using the Hague Abduction Convention to achieve the return of abducted children, the United States has an array of Federal, State, and local law enforcement, criminal justice, and judicial tools at its disposal to prevent international abductions.

(13) Federal agencies tasked with preventing international abductions have indicated that the most effective way to stop international child abductions is while they are in progress, rather than after the child has been removed to a foreign destination.

(14) Parental awareness of abductions in progress, rapid response by relevant law enforcement, and effective coordination among Federal, State, local, and international stakeholders are critical in preventing such abductions.

(15) A more robust application of domestic tools, in cooperation with international law enforcement entities and appropriate application of the Hague Abduction Convention could—

(A) discourage some parents from attempting abductions;

(B) block attempted abductions at ports of exit; and

(C) help achieve the return of more abducted children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should set a strong example for other Convention countries in the timely location and prompt resolution of cases involving children abducted abroad and brought to the United States.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect children whose habitual residence is the United States from wrongful abduction;

(2) to assist left-behind parents in quickly resolving cases and maintaining safe and predictable contact with their child while an abduction case is pending;

(3) to protect the custodial rights of parents, including military parents, by providing the parents, the judicial system, and law enforcement authorities with the information they need to prevent unlawful abduction before it occurs;

(4) to enhance the prompt resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) to detail an appropriate set of actions to be undertaken by the Secretary of State to address persistent problems in the resolution of abduction cases;

(6) to establish a program to prevent wrongful abductions; and

(7) to increase interagency coordination in preventing international child abduction by convening a working group composed of presidentially appointed and Senate confirmed officials from the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Justice.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABDUCTED CHILD.—The term ''abducted child'' means a child who is the victim of international child abduction.

(2) ABDUCTION.—The term ''abduction'' means the alleged wrongful removal of a child from the child's country of habitual residence, or the wrongful retention of a child outside such country, in violation of a left-behind parent's custodial rights, including the rights of a military parent.

(3) ABDUCTION CASE.—The term ''abduction case'' means a case that—

(A) has been reported to the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the resolution of an abduction; and

(B) meets the criteria for an international child abduction under the Hague Abduction Convention, regardless of whether the country at issue is a Convention country.

(4) ACCESS CASE.—The term ''access case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a parent seeking rights of access.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''Annual Report'' means the Annual Report on International Child Abduction required under section 101.

(6) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the application required pursuant to article 8 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the formal document required, pursuant to the provisions of the applicable arrangement, to request the return of an abducted child or to request rights of access, as applicable; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the formal request by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country requesting the return of an abducted child or for rights of contact with an abducted child.

(7) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(8) BILATERAL PROCEDURES.—The term ''bilateral procedures'' means any procedures established by, or pursuant to, a bilateral arrangement, including a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country, to resolve abduction and access cases, including procedures to address interim contact matters.

(9) BILATERAL PROCEDURES COUNTRY.—The term ''bilateral procedures country'' means a country with which the United States has entered into bilateral procedures, including Memoranda of Understanding, with respect to child abductions.

(10) CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Central Authority'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the meaning given such term in article 6 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the official entity designated by the government of the bilateral procedures country within the applicable memorandum of understanding pursuant to section 103(b)(1) to discharge the duties imposed on the entity; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the foreign ministry or other appropriate authority of such country.

(11) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who has not attained 16 years of age.

(12) CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''Convention country'' means a country for which the Hague Abduction Convention has entered into force with respect to the United States.

(13) HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION.—The term ''Hague Abduction Convention'' means the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague October 25, 1980.

(14) INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''interim contact'' means the ability of a left-behind parent to communicate with or visit an abducted child during the pendency of an abduction case.

(15) LEFT-BEHIND PARENT.—The term ''left-behind parent'' means an individual or legal custodian who alleges that an abduction has occurred that is in breach of rights of custody attributed to such individual.

(16) NON-CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''non-Convention country'' means a country in which the Hague Abduction Convention has not

entered into force with respect to the United States.

(17) OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''overseas military dependent child'' means a child whose habitual residence is the United States according to United States law even though the child is residing outside the United States with a military parent.

(18) OVERSEAS MILITARY PARENT.—The term ''overseas military parent'' means an individual who—

(A) has custodial rights with respect to a child; and

(B) is serving outside the United States as a member of the United States Armed Forces.

(19) PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''pattern of noncompliance'' means the persistent failure—

(i) of a Convention country to implement and abide by provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(ii) of a non-Convention country to abide by bilateral procedures that have been established between the United States and such country; or

(iii) of a non-Convention country to work with the Central Authority of the United States to resolve abduction cases.

(B) PERSISTENT FAILURE.—Persistent failure under subparagraph (A) may be evidenced in a given country by the presence of 1 or more of the following criteria:

(i) Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases.

(ii) The Central Authority regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to—

(I) the Hague Abduction Convention; or

(II) any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country.

(iii) The judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention country or a bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable.

(iv) Law enforcement authorities regularly fail to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases.

(20) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—The term ''rights of access'' means the establishment of rights of contact between a child and a parent seeking access in Convention countries—

(A) by operation of law;

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(21) RIGHTS OF CUSTODY.—The term ''rights of custody'' means rights of care and custody of a child, including the right to determine the place of residence of a child, under the laws of the country in which the child is a habitual resident—

(A) attributed to an individual or legal custodian; and

(B) arising—

(i) by operation of law; or

(ii) through a judicial or administrative decision; or

(iii) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(22) RIGHTS OF INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''rights of interim contact'' means the rights of contact between a child and a left-behind parent, which has been provided as a provisional measure while an abduction case is pending, under the laws of the country in which the child is located—

(A) by operation of law; or

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(23) UNRESOLVED ABDUCTION CASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''unresolved abduction case'' means an abduction case that remains unresolved for a period that exceeds 12 months after the date on which the completed application for return of the child is submitted for determination to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, in the country in which the child is located.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CASE.—An abduction case shall be considered to be resolved if—

(i) the child is returned to the country of habitual residence, pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or other appropriate bilateral procedures, if applicable;

(ii) the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the government of the country in which the child is located has implemented, and is complying with, the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or other bilateral procedures, as applicable;

(iii) the left-behind parent reaches a voluntary arrangement with the other parent;

(iv) the left-behind parent submits a written withdrawal of the application or the request for assistance to the Department of State;

(v) the left-behind parent cannot be located for 1 year despite the documented efforts of the Department of State to locate the parent; or

(vi) the child or left-behind parent is deceased.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

SEC. 101. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an Annual Report on International Child Abduction. The Secretary shall post the Annual Report to the publicly accessible website of the Department of State.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each Annual Report shall include—

(1) a list of all countries in which there were 1 or more abduction cases, during the preceding calendar year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States, including a description of whether each such country—

(A) is a Convention country;

(B) is a bilateral procedures country;

(C) has other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) adheres to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(2) for each country with respect to which there were 5 or more pending abduction cases, during the preceding year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States—

(A) the number of such new abduction and access cases reported during the preceding year;

(B) for Convention and bilateral procedures countries—

(i) the number of abduction and access cases that the Central Authority of the United States transmitted to the Central Authority of such country; and

(ii) the number of abduction and access cases that were not submitted by the Central Authority to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of such country;

(C) the reason for the delay in submission of each case identified in subparagraph (B)(ii) by the Central Authority of such country to the judicial or administrative authority of that country;

(D) the number of unresolved abduction and access cases, and the length of time each case has been pending;

(E) the number and percentage of unresolved abduction cases in which law enforcement authorities have—

(i) not located the abducted child;

(ii) failed to undertake serious efforts to locate the abducted child; and

(iii) failed to enforce a return order rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of such country;

(F) the total number and the percentage of the total number of abduction and access cases, respectively, resolved during the preceding year;

(G) recommendations to improve the resolution of abduction and access cases; and

(H) the average time it takes to locate a child;

(3) the number of abducted children whose habitual residence is in the United States and who were returned to the United States from—

(A) Convention countries;

(B) bilateral procedures countries;

(C) countries having other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) countries adhering to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(4) a list of Convention countries and bilateral procedures countries that have failed to comply with any of their obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, with respect to the resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) a list of countries demonstrating a pattern of noncompliance and a description of the criteria on which the determination of a pattern of noncompliance for each country is based;

(6) information on efforts by the Secretary of State to encourage non-Convention countries—

(A) to ratify or accede to the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) to enter into or implement other bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, with the United States; and

(C) to address pending abduction and access cases;

(7) the number of cases resolved without abducted children being returned to the United States from Convention countries, bilateral procedures countries, or other non-Convention countries;

(8) a list of countries that became Convention countries with respect to the United States during the preceding year; and

(9) information about efforts to seek resolution of abduction cases of children whose habitual residence is in the United States and whose abduction occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Unless a left-behind parent provides written permission to the Central Authority of the United States to include personally identifiable information about the parent or the child in the Annual Report, the Annual Report may not include any personally identifiable information about any such parent, child, or party to an abduction or access case involving such parent or child.

(d) ADDITIONAL SECTIONS.—Each Annual Report shall also include—

(1) information on the number of unresolved abduction cases affecting military parents;

(2) a description of the assistance offered to such military parents;

(3) information on the use of airlines in abductions, voluntary airline practices to prevent abductions, and recommendations for best airline practices to prevent abductions;

(4) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train domestic judges in the application of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(5) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train United States Armed Forces legal assistance personnel, military chaplains, and military family support center personnel about—

(A) abductions;

(B) the risk of loss of contact with children; and

(C) the legal means available to resolve such cases.

(e) REPEAL OF THE HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 2803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 11611) is repealed.

(f) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON COUNTRIES IN NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall include, in a separate section of the Annual Report, the Secretary's determination, pursuant to the provisions under section 202(b), of whether each country listed in the report has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance in cases of child abduction during the preceding 12 months.

(2) CONTENTS.—The section described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall identify any action or actions described in section 202(d) (or commensurate action as provided in section 202(e)) that have been taken by the Secretary with respect to each country;

(B) shall describe the basis for the Secretary's determination of the pattern of noncompliance by each country;

(C) shall indicate whether noneconomic policy options designed to resolve the pattern of noncompliance have reasonably been exhausted, including the consultations required under section 203.

SEC. 102. STANDARDS AND ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of State shall—

(1) ensure that United States diplomatic and consular missions abroad—

(A) maintain a consistent reporting standard with respect to abduction and access cases;

(B) designate at least 1 senior official in each such mission, at the discretion of the Chief of Mission, to assist left-behind parents from the United States who are visiting such country or otherwise seeking to resolve abduction or access cases; and

(C) monitor developments in abduction and access cases; and

(2) develop and implement written strategic plans for engagement with any Convention or non-Convention country in which there are 5 or more cases of international child abduction.

SEC. 103. BILATERAL PROCEDURES, INCLUDING MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall initiate a process to develop and enter into appropriate bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, as appropriate, with non-Convention countries that are unlikely to become Convention countries in the foreseeable future, or with Convention countries that have unresolved abduction cases that occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States or that country.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall give priority to countries with significant abduction cases and related issues.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The bilateral procedures described in subsection (a) should include provisions relating to—

(1) the identification of—

(A) the Central Authority;

(B) the judicial or administrative authority that will promptly adjudicate abduction and access cases;

(C) the law enforcement agencies; and

(D) the implementation of procedures to ensure the immediate enforcement of an order issued by the authority identified pursuant to subparagraph (B) to return an abducted child to a left-behind parent, including by—

(i) conducting an investigation to ascertain the location of the abducted child;

(ii) providing protection to the abducted child after such child is located; and

(iii) retrieving the abducted child and making the appropriate arrangements for such child to be returned to the child's country of habitual residence;

(2) the implementation of a protocol to effectuate the return of an abducted child identified in an abduction case not later than 6 weeks after the application with respect to the abduction case has been submitted to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of the country in which the abducted child is located;

(3) the implementation of a protocol for the establishment and protection of the rights of interim contact during pendency of abduction cases; and

(4) the implementation of a protocol to establish periodic visits between a United States embassy or consular official and an abducted child, in order to allow the official to ascertain the child's location and welfare.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall submit written notification to the Member of Congress and Senators, or Resident Commissioner or Delegate, as appropriate, representing the legal residence of a left-behind parent if such parent—

(1) reports an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States; and

(2) consents to such notification.

(b) TIMING.—At the request of any person who is a left-behind parent, including a left-behind parent who previously reported an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, the notification required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as is practicable.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 201. RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote the best interest of children wrongfully abducted from the United States by—

(A) establishing legal rights and procedures for their prompt return; and

(B) ensuring the enforcement of reciprocal international obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or arrangements under bilateral procedures;

(2) to promote the timely resolution of abduction cases through 1 or more of the actions described in section 202; and

(3) to ensure appropriate coordination within the Federal Government and between Federal, State, and local agencies involved in abduction prevention, investigation, and resolution.

(b) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO UNRESOLVED CASES.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—For each abduction or access case relating to a child whose habitual residence is in the United States that remains pending or is otherwise unresolved on the date that is 12 months after the date on which the Central Authority of the United States submits such case to a foreign country, the Secretary of State shall determine whether the government of such foreign country has failed to take appropriate steps to resolve the case. If the Secretary of State determines that such failure occurred, the Secretary should, as expeditiously as practicable—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202; and

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that foreign country to directly address the resolution of the case with senior officials in the foreign government.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State may delay any action described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an additional period of time, not to exceed 1 year, will substantially assist in resolving the case.

(3) REPORT.—If the Secretary of State delays any action pursuant to paragraph (2) or decides not to take an action described in subsection (d) or (e) of section 202 after making the determination described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, not later than 15 days after such delay or decision, shall provide a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details the reasons for delaying action or not taking action, as appropriate.

(4) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.—At the request of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed briefing, including a written report, if requested, on actions taken to resolve a case or the cause for delay.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary of State should—

(A) take 1 or more actions that most appropriately respond to the nature and severity of the governmental failure to resolve the unresolved abduction case; and

(B) seek, to the fullest extent possible—

(i) to initially respond by communicating with the Central Authority of the country; and

(ii) if clause (i) is unsuccessful, to target subsequent actions—

(I) as narrowly as practicable, with respect to the agencies or instrumentalities of the foreign government that are responsible for such failures; and

(II) in ways that respect the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary of the country, as applicable.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—In addition to the guidelines under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, in determining whether to take 1 or more actions under paragraphs (5) through (7) of section 202(d) or section 202(e), shall seek to minimize any adverse impact on—

(A) the population of the country whose government is targeted by the action or actions;

(B) the humanitarian activities of United States and nongovernmental organizations in the country; and

(C) the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) RESPONSE TO A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to oppose institutional or other systemic failures of foreign governments to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, to resolve abduction and access cases;

(2) to promote reciprocity pursuant to, and in compliance with, the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as appropriate; and

(3) to directly engage with senior foreign government officials to most effectively address patterns of noncompliance.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall—

(A) review the status of abduction and access cases in each foreign country in order to determine whether the government of such country has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance during the preceding 12 months; and

(B) report such determination pursuant to section 101(f).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—The Secretary of State shall seek to determine the agencies or instrumentalities of the government of each country determined to have engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under

paragraph (1)(A) that are responsible for such pattern of noncompliance—

(A) to appropriately target actions in response to such noncompliance; and

(B) to engage with senior foreign government officials to effectively address such noncompliance.

(c) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO A COUNTRY WITH A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days (or 180 days in case of a delay under paragraph (2)) after a country is determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A), the Secretary of State shall—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsection (d);

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that country to directly address the systemic problems that led to such determination; and

(C) inform senior officials in the foreign government of the potential repercussions related to such designation.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary shall not be required to take action under paragraph (1) until the expiration of a single, additional period of up to 90 days if, on or before the date on which the Secretary of State is required to take such action, the Secretary determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such additional period is necessary—

(A) for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the government of a country described in paragraph (1) in order to bring about a cessation of the pattern of noncompliance by such country;

(B) for a review of corrective action taken by a country after the designation of such country as being engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A); or

(C) in anticipation that corrective action will be taken by such country during such 90-day period.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR ADDITIONAL ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall not be required to take additional action under paragraph (1) with respect to a country determined to have been engaged in a persistent pattern of noncompliance if the Secretary—

(A) has taken action pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (d) with respect to such country in the preceding year and such action continues to be in effect;

(B) exercises the waiver under section 204 and briefs the appropriate congressional committees; or

(C) submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(i) indicates that such country is subject to multiple, broad-based sanctions; and

(ii) describes how such sanctions satisfy the requirements under this subsection.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the Annual Report, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the specific actions taken against countries determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under this section.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COUNTRIES.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the actions by the Secretary of State referred to in this subsection are—

(1) a demarche;

(2) an official public statement detailing unresolved cases;

(3) a public condemnation;

(4) a delay or cancellation of 1 or more bilateral working, official, or state visits;

(5) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States development assistance in accordance with section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n);

(6) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States security assistance in accordance with section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304);

(7) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of assistance to the central government of a country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(8) a formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(e) COMMENSURATE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Secretary of State may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (d) if the Secretary determines that such action—

(A) is commensurate in effect to the action substituted; and

(B) would substantially further the purposes of this Act.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If commensurate action is taken pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) describes such action;

(B) explains the reasons for taking such action; and

(C) specifically describes the basis for the Secretary's determination under paragraph (1) that such action—

(i) is commensurate with the action substituted; and

(ii) substantially furthers the purposes of this Act.

(f) RESOLUTION.—The Secretary of State shall seek to take all appropriate actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncompliance, as applicable.

(g) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

As soon as practicable after the Secretary of State makes a determination under section 201 in response to a failure to resolve unresolved abduction cases or the Secretary takes an action under subsection (d) or (e) of section 202, based on a pattern of noncompliance, the Secretary shall request consultations with the government of such country regarding the situation giving rise to such determination.

SEC. 204. WAIVER BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State may waive the application of any of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202 with respect to a country if the Secretary determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country—

(A) has satisfactorily resolved the abduction cases giving rise to the application of any of such actions; or

(B) has ended such country's pattern of noncompliance; or

(2) the national security interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date on which the Secretary of State exercises the waiver authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

(2) provide such committees with a detailed justification for such waiver, including an explanation of the steps the noncompliant government has taken—

(A) to resolve abductions cases; or

(B) to end its pattern of noncompliance.

(c) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall ensure that each waiver determination under this section—

(1) is published in the Federal Register; or

(2) is posted on the Department of State website.

(d) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State may limit the publication of information under subsection (c) in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the Secretary determines that the publication of such information would be harmful to the national security of the United States and would not further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Any specific action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of State submits a written certification to Congress that the government of such country—

(1) has resolved any unresolved abduction case that gave rise to such specific action; or

(2) has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct such country's persistent pattern of noncompliance that gave rise to such specific action, as applicable.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

SEC. 301. PREVENTING CHILDREN FROM LEAVING THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF A COURT ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 433. PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

''(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—The Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as 'CBP'), in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a program that—

''(1) seeks to prevent a child (as defined in section 1204(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from departing from the territory of the United States if a parent or legal guardian of such child presents a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction prohibiting the removal of such child from the United States to a CBP Officer in sufficient time to prevent such departure for the duration of such court order; and

''(2) leverages other existing authorities and processes to address the wrongful removal and return of a child.

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction. The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

''(A) the Department of State;

''(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official within the Department of Defense—

''(A) to coordinate with the Department of State on international child abduction issues; and

''(B) to oversee activities designed to prevent or resolve international child abduction cases relating to active duty military service members.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 432 the following:

''Sec. 433. Prevention of international child abduction.''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall seek to provide training, directly or through another government agency or nongovernmental organizations, on the effective handling of parental abduction cases to the judicial and administrative authorities in countries—

(1) in which a significant number of unresolved abduction cases are pending; or

(2) that have been designated as having a pattern of noncompliance under section 202(b).

(b) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements under this section.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY IN HONOR OF FALLEN HEROES OF 9/11.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on September 10, 2014, for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. Con. Res. 103) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On October 3, 2014, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 29th annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') may be run through the Capitol Grounds to carry the Special Olympics torch to honor local Special Olympics athletes.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3486

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3486.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider a package of bills to ensure transparency and accountability within the Endangered Species Act. Included in this package are H.R. 4315, the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, authored by Chairman DOC HASTINGS; H.R. 4316, the Endangered Species Recovery Transparency Act, authored by Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS; H.R. 4317, the State, Tribal, and Local Species Transparency Act, authored by Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER; and H.R. 4318, the Endangered Species Litigation Reasonableness Act, authored by Representative BILL HUIZENGA.

The House will also consider House Resolution 676, which provides for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that the House may also consider legislation to deal with the ongoing crisis on the border.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As the gentleman knows full well, we have 3½ days next week. We have, I guess, 9 full days and 3 half days scheduled in September and the first couple of weeks in October, assuming that we meet in that last week of September.

There have been some rumors. My Members have been asking me about whether or not there is serious consideration being given to not using the last week scheduled in September. Does that have any credence?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Currently, there have been no changes to the schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

In any event, as the gentleman knows, in the very short period of time that we have left before the election—and there is a lot of very substantive work that, in my view, still needs to be done and that we feel very strongly about on this side of the aisle—the gentleman posits that we have four endangered species bills on the floor. Frankly, they probably could all be done by suspension on Monday, but I understand it is going to be under a rule.

In addition to that, we have legislation which is designed to authorize a suit against the President of the United States for trying to do things when we can't get the Congress to act on them, so that there can be some movement forward on behalf of the American people.

Does the gentleman believe there is any possibility of bringing up comprehensive immigration reform—either a comprehensive immigration reform bill that the majority supports, individual bills which are passed out of committee, border security which is passed out on a bipartisan way out of your committee here on this side of the House—on this side of the Capitol, or legislation which we believe would have had a direct effect on the crisis to which the gentleman refers may be addressed next week?

It is not scheduled. I understand that the majority leader's party is divided on the issue of what ought to be done to meet this crisis, but there is no doubt, Mr. Leader, that there are going to be additional resources necessary to meet the challenge that we are confronting now.

The administration has requested, as the gentleman knows, some $3.7 billion. The Senate, as I understand it, is suggesting $2.7 billion. Part of that, of course, is to meet the needs of fighting wildfires. In the Senate bill, there is also money for Iron Dome—to beef up Iron Dome in Israel, but we don't have any language, if language is contemplated.

So I am hopeful that language will not be included in any effort that is made next week on meeting this. You referred to it as a crisis. Whether you refer to it as crisis, challenge, whatever, we know that resources are needed. Everybody seems to agree on that.

Unfortunately, we have not had that bill on the floor now, so we can get it over to the Senate and get it to the President before we leave. We are at risk, in my view, Mr. Leader, of leaving here without addressing this issue.

Furthermore, last week, as the gentleman knows, I suggested that if we included legislative language on that bill, it would be almost impossible to get to the administration the resources it needs to comply with the law and to meet the challenge that has been presented.

□ 1315

Does the gentleman have any expectation that we will consider a comprehensive immigration bill that has resources and will be Senate-passed? We have a bill here, as the gentleman knows, that we introduced many, many months ago, which is a bipartisan bill. All the provisions have been supported in a bipartisan fashion—some in the Senate, some here in the House committee—unanimously.

Does the gentleman have any belief that we will consider next week a clean funding bill at such level as is necessary, at least until the end of the fiscal year, and/or some comprehensive immigration bills which will meet the issue and establish a process, the lack of which clearly is causing people to take actions which we do not approve of and not agree with, but are manifesting the frustration of a broken system remaining broken?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I mentioned in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. Once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing on the measure to determine the process by which the bill will be brought before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Does the gentleman contemplate that that bill will include substantive changes in law or will it simply be restricted to additional resources necessary to meet the crisis that confronts this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I said earlier, you should be prepared for a possible consideration. Once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing to announce the process.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the process will come from the Rules Committee. There is no text, Mr. Leader. We have seen no text to apparently amend legislation which was adopted overwhelmingly by this House and signed by President Bush.

We need resources today—and we will certainly need them next week—and we are going to go on a 5-week recess work period, at which point in time we will come back here and meet for a very brief period of time, and we don't have any text in this very substantive, very consequential area of the law, which obviously was adopted overwhelmingly, and we have no text.

I understand the process in the Rules Committee. There have been no hearings, no debate in committee, no subcommittee, no full committee hearings on any legislation.

As I suggested to you last week, Mr. Majority Leader, if you put legislation out there, you and I both know that inevitably that legislation will not be able to pass within the timeframe necessary to meet the crisis.

So the responsible thing, I suggest to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, is to provide the resources necessary to meet the challenge right now. And then, if hearings show substantive changes in the law are needed or further show what substantive changes ought to be made and can be considered in a thoughtful, effective fashion, we can then move forward at some point in time, perhaps as soon as September, on that legislation. But to do otherwise will put at great risk the ability of the administration and this country to respond consistent with the law that we passed and that was signed by President Bush.

I yield to my friend if he wants to comment further.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his passion on the crisis, just as we have on this side.

Since we have taken the majority, we made a pledge to America that we post bills with a 3-day process. So, as I mentioned in the schedule announcement for next week, Members should be prepared for possible consideration of legislation to address the ongoing border crisis. Once the timing is finalized, the Rules Committee will announce a hearing on the measure to determine the process by which the bill will be brought before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader for that information, and I am glad that he brought up the processes that are going to be followed.

I want to quote to him something Speaker BOEHNER said on January 5, 2011, when he took the gavel:

> But you will always have the right to robust debate in an open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives and be heard.

The gentleman has told me now three times that the Rules Committee hearing is going to be open and they will

decide the process under which a bill is going to be considered. Apparently, I am presuming the gentleman does not know what the substance of that process will be. I don't know the substance. I don't know any language that is being proposed. No Member on our side of the aisle knows what language is being proposed. Maybe Members on your side of the aisle know.

So what you are apparently telling me is that we will have the Rules Committee solely for the purpose of learning what substantive changes are suggested in the law. And I suggest to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the case, we will not be able to thoughtfully debate it, we will not be able to have a process that is open, and we will not have a process which allows us to make our case, offer alternatives, or be heard.

I would predict, as has happened 67 times to date, this is going to be a closed rule. One of my staffers, by the way, suggested that perhaps open rules ought to be included in the endangered species bills that we are considering. We are doing so many closed rules, open rules seem to be an endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the leader to please report if we are going to consider, as I think we should, a supplemental next week that gives our country the resources to meet the crisis to which you referred?

It is our responsibility to consider it. It is our responsibility to give the resources. We passed the law, which is being implemented by the administration. We passed it overwhelmingly. It was sponsored by a gentleman who just spoke on this floor a short time ago to try to prevent and ameliorate human trafficking.

A number of bills we passed this week on human trafficking were passed unanimously. That bill that passed overwhelmingly was also about human trafficking. And I tell my friend, we need the resources. It is the responsibility of the majority party and the minority party to join together to give the administration the necessary resources to respond to carrying out the law that we passed.

If we want to change that law, that is also our responsibility. But I tell my friend it cannot be done in the timeframe that is available to us. We have delayed this so long, there is no time. And the gentleman keeps responding to me that the Rules Committee will decide the process.

The Rules Committee normally does not decide the substance of legislation. It decides the process under which we will consider the substance. Authorizing committees, as my friend so well knows, decide the substance of that legislation.

But we will have no opportunity to see that, apparently, until perhaps this weekend, at the earliest, or next week. That does not give us time to debate it and it certainly, as everybody knows, does not give it time to go to the Senate and be debated. I think they will disagree, perhaps, on the language that is suggested. I don't know what it is, but there is a high probability of disagreement. Conference will have to occur, and then it will have to get to the President. And both the Senate and the House are leaving next week for their district work period.

I would urge the majority leader to make every effort with his party to bring what I think ought to be our obligation: a bill which provides the resources necessary—and we may differ on that number—to carry out our responsibilities to implement the law that we passed.

If the gentleman wants to respond further, I yield. If not, I will go on.

Mr. Speaker, we have five appropriations bills which have not been brought to the floor. The Ag bill was on the floor. It was pulled. It has not been brought back. The Labor, Health and Human Services bill, the Interior bill, the Homeland bill, and the Foreign Ops bill have not been brought to the floor, nor has the gentleman indicated any of those are going to be brought to the floor next week.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is any plan to bring those bills to the floor in the 3 weeks that we will be back in September?

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know we originated this for the schedule for next week. As the gentleman knows, the House has passed seven of the 12 appropriations bills in an open process.

To the fact that even one of your Members, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, has had 50 percent more amendments offered on this floor than the entire Republican Conference in the Senate for the last year, we are very proud of the open process we have brought back to the floor.

While the House is not scheduled to consider a regular appropriations bill next week, as the gentleman knows and as I stated already, the House may consider a supplemental appropriation request next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, but that does not give me any clarity in terms of the five appropriations bills. The supplemental appropriation bill, of course, is not a part of those bills, although, obviously, Health and Human Services is being put under a great deal of pressure by carrying out the terms of the law that we passed in 2008 signed by President Bush. They need resources. The supplemental is to give them the resources.

This is a scheduling conference. It is not just now, in my view, limited to next week, because we are not going to be here for 5 weeks thereafter, and Members want to know what they should anticipate as substantively going to be on the agenda in the 3 short weeks that we will have left, essentially, before the election.

So I can't tell from the gentleman's answer, Mr. Speaker, whether or not any of those five appropriations bills—I know seven have passed—are intended to be brought to the floor.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman initiated this with inquiring about the schedule for next week. As I stated earlier, in the schedule for next week we do not have anything considered in the regular appropriations process, but we could possibly have a supplemental appropriation next week.

Mr. HOYER. Maybe I can just print that out and I will just read it, Mr. Speaker.

We have an Export-Import Bank that is going to expire very shortly. It is of great concern to many people on both sides of the aisle. Forty-one Republican Members, Mr. Speaker, have signed a letter urging that this be brought to the floor. It is a very timely, critical issue for the competitiveness of our country. It has been twisting in the wind for this entire year. I worked, Mr. Speaker, with the leader's predecessor to see whether or not we could get this bill to the floor.

I know what the schedule is for next week, so he doesn't need to repeat that for me—and I thank him very much—but does the majority leader have any idea whether we are going to consider the Export-Import Bank before the election?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As my friend, the gentleman knows, this is in regard to the schedule for next week. And it is not scheduled for next week. If there will be any consideration, we will notify you.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask the majority leader any more questions because I am not going to get any answers.

The American people have a right to those answers. The American people need to have transparency, which was going to be brought to this body, frankly, by the young guns, and they need a right to debate, right to anticipate, right to participate, but the answer I get is, It's not scheduled for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not scheduled for next week. Critical legislation was not scheduled last week, the week before that, the week before that, the week before that, the week before that, and every week before that—critical legislation supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

□ 1330

I am simply inquiring of the majority leader: Is there any contemplation of bringing that legislation to the floor before this Congress leaves for the election so the American people who are going to either reelect this Congress or seek new leadership have an opportunity on which to make an informed decision, which, of course, is what the Speaker said we would have?

Certainly, we ought to have equal consideration for the American people as well so they have the right to robust debate and an open process and so it allows them to understand what we are doing.

I regret that the majority leader in critical issues, like the Export-Import Bank, which relate to the competitiveness of this country, and like Make It In America legislation that we defeated last week on suspension, which we agreed upon—the majority leader voted for it and I voted for it. I presume—I will ask him anyway. I said I wasn't going to ask him: Is there any contemplation of bringing that bill, which got 260 votes on this floor, back to the floor, under a rule which provides again for America's determining whether or not we can find additional rare earth, which is so necessary to be competitive in international markets?

I know it is not on the schedule, so he doesn't have to repeat that litany to me, because I get it. I have heard it now four or five or six times. I get it that it is not on the schedule for next week.

So the question I ask is: Is there any contemplation of bringing that bill, which has 260 people who voted for it, back to the floor, under a rule, so we can provide for a better opportunity to make it in America and to be competitive internationally?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this colloquy is always based upon the schedule for next week, and I would very proudly like to lay out the schedule for next week.

As the gentleman raised the question, he very well knows we did agree on that bill just as we agreed on quite a few bills. As of today, there are 333 bills that have passed this House that have gotten stuck in the Senate. Of those 333 bills, 40 of them are jobs bills. We know we linger in a very tough economy, and the gentleman voted for a few of those 40 bills. So let me repeat: the 40 jobs bills are still stuck in the Senate. We want to encourage economic growth and innovation. We can ensure a robust American manufacturing sector and put Americans back to work.

As the gentleman knows, as we sat down to lunch, we want to work together on that, but as of right now, it is not scheduled for next week. It was on this week. Unfortunately, it did not pass, but I look forward to continuing working with the gentleman, and, hopefully, we could work together to make the Senate move on those 40 jobs bills and those 333 bills that the American public would like to see move forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have worked together, and we have sat down for lunch. We agree on the bill that I mentioned, Mr. SWALWELL's bill, to try to make America more competitive by producing more rare earth here in this country—so essential in the electronics industry and in other places.

I can't control the Senate, Mr. Speaker. The majority leader cannot control the Senate. What the majority leader and I can do is control what we do here in this House to which we were elected. We can control either urging or, in the majority leader's case—and as the former majority leader of this House, I can tell you I could put a bill on the floor if I thought it was important for the American people and in the best interests of our country. I think the Export-Import Bank falls in that category. I think minimum wage falls in that category. I think comprehensive immigration falls in that category. I think jobs bills fall in that category. I think make it in America—the Swalwell bill—fell in that category.

We cannot control what the Senate does, but we can control what we do. We can move in a responsible fashion, which the American people, Mr. Speaker, expect us to do and not blame some outside group, whether it is the administration or the United States Senate, for our lack of addressing important issues.

TRIA is an important bill, Mr. Speaker. It is not on the schedule. I presume, if I asked the majority leader about TRIA, he would tell me it is not on the schedule next week. That would not come as a news flash to me, Mr. Speaker, because he has told me that now seven times.

I believe, if the House is going to act in a collegial manner and in a constructive manner and in a manner that the American people want us to act, that we will exchange information not just on what is on next week—there is not much on next week, Mr. Speaker. I know that. There is, in my opinion, a political bill to sue the President of the United States. The American people don't think that is a very good idea. That is on the calendar. So we are using the few short minutes that we have available to do the people's business on four bills, to send a message, that we could pass in, frankly, a very short period of time on Monday night on endangered species. We are filling time. We are treading water, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude with this. You have put the possibility that we are going to have a bill on the floor next week dealing with the crisis—your word—at the border. When will we see text of that legislation that might possibly be on the floor?

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern on the crisis. It is not just my word. It is the American word.

If it were not a crisis, we would not have three Presidents from Central American countries here today to talk about the crisis. We would not have three Presidents who are asking to reunite their children with their families in their countries. If it were not a crisis, you would not have a task force that was introduced by this Speaker on this side to address it. If it were not a crisis, you wouldn't even have Members on your side of the aisle partnering with their Senators from another party, sitting in the Senate, to address the crisis.

Now, many Members of this House have gone there to see the crisis. Some in the administration have not. This House is committed to addressing it as soon as it is available.

We take great pride in changing this House. As the majority leader knows, he cares about the institution; but when the majority changed over here, one of the number one things we said we would do is a 3-day process, as you would know in importance, so people can read the bill, because too many times I have been to this floor when thousands of pages have come out at 2 a.m. and have been voted on that day. We made a commitment to the American people, and we have kept our commitment just as we will keep our commitment that we will end this crisis no matter what it takes. This House will act.

Mr. HOYER. When it is available. That was the answer to my question. We don't know when it is going to be available. We don't know what it will be. We don't know, really, whether it will be considered, because the majority leader tells me, Mr. Speaker, that it may be on the floor. We know that it hasn't gone to committee. We know that there is no subcommittee hearing that has been held. We know that there is no committee hearing that has been held.

The gentleman talks about thousands of pages. We can get into that debate at some other time. I know which he refers to, a bill that had literally more consideration than any other bill I have seen considered by the Congress of the United States—the Affordable Care Act, which is having, in my view, a very positive effect. We don't need to debate that today.

I would tell the majority leader, if the crisis were going to be addressed,

the first step is having the resources necessary to carry out the law, then, if the law needs to be changed, deciding how it should be changed, having debate on that, bringing it to this floor out of committee, and considering that legislation. There are differences of opinion on that. I recognize that. The gentleman has pointed that out. That would be the way to do it. That is the regular order of which you spoke and you promised.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that that could be followed. There are many of us who believe it is not being followed, and that is to the denigration of not only this body but to the American people's ability to see what we are doing, how we are doing it, when we are doing it.

Unless the gentleman has something further to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 28, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 28, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 203 of the Senate amendment (relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House has just finished its rollcall votes for this week. With the conference committee at an impasse on H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act, hope is fading that any legislation will be enacted this summer to address the urgent needs at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This is truly shameful, and as an American, I think this is shameful. It is beyond me to understand why our legislative branch of government cannot get this done.

It is true that this body has taken some modest steps toward improvements, like allowing veterans to seek care at non-VA providers when they cannot get medical appointments. I have supported that effort. That is fine where private sector health providers are available, but for elderly veterans in rural areas, where travel is difficult and costly, where physician shortages and medically underserved areas are abundant, like in southern West Virginia, that doesn't help much.

My State's VA facilities need funding to hire doctors—lots of them. We need primary and specialty care providers and mental health specialists. We need the resources to train and recruit health professionals and to pay them competitive salaries.

Our VA health providers, many of them veterans themselves, have a unique understanding of our veterans' needs. That expertise cannot be duplicated in the private sector.

The VA health system is designed to take care of elderly veterans with special needs. It is designed to treat combat wounds, physical and psychological—something not commonly seen in the private sector.

The VA health system is designed so that doctors can build long-term relationships with their patients and can build expertise in illnesses unique to veterans. Clearly, a Vietnam veteran who is suffering from exposure to a toxic substance like Agent Orange could expect to find a greater depth of knowledge and experience with the particular infirmities from the VA than from a private sector facility.

□ 1345

My State needs VA doctors. We need VA specialty care providers. We need VA facilities.

The veterans bill in conference can provide relief to our veterans in need of care, but it remains stuck in conference, frustratingly hung up in partisan politics.

When it comes to the shortage of health providers in general, that is not a local problem affecting only my State. The Association of American Medical Colleges estimates a nationwide doctor shortage of more than 91,500 physicians by the year 2020. The shortage will grow to more than 130,000 by 2025.

The impact is most severe in rural States, so any notion of private sector medical care serving as a backstop to the VA is completely wrongheaded.

This is not a new problem either. We all know it has been projected going back years, before this administration, before the Affordable Care Act, to the Bush administration and beyond.

Baby boomers are getting older. Doctors are retiring. More patients require specialized and extended care.

We, this Congress, must address this crisis, and it is a crisis. But the House stands immobilized, ''frozen in the ice of its own indifference,'' as a great American President, Franklin Roosevelt once said.

So today, I am calling upon this House, I am imploring this House to put politics aside, advance the work of the ongoing conference, and get this bill done.

This motion calls for the House to recede from disagreement with section 203 of the Senate amendment relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration; and recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all instances.

I urge the House to support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct would instruct the House conferees to recede from disagreement with the Senate with respect to section 203 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3230, which would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to use unobligated balances to hire additional health providers.

It would also instruct the House conferees to recede to the Senate position on all other matters.

This is the fifth such motion that has been introduced in the last 10 days. None of them have brought us any closer to reaching the compromise our veterans deserve in the fiscally responsible manner that respects the rights of our taxpayers.

In addition, none of them have brought us any closer to correcting the systemic bureaucratic deficiencies that have led to thousands of veterans waiting for weeks, months, or even years to get the care that they need.

Today, our attention is best spent devoted on working in tandem with our Senate counterparts to find a true compromise. Instead, here we are, yet again, debating an unnecessary, unhelpful, and unbinding motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday afternoon, Chairman MILLER offered a formal proposal to the conference committee that would do the following:

First, it would accept title I through title VII of the original Senate bill,

along with additional amended language to include the Oklahoma lease authorization that was included in the House-passed bill, H.R. 3521, but that was left out of the Senate language.

Second, it would provide the VA with $102 million for fiscal year 2014 to address the Department's internal funding shortfalls.

Third, it would provide $10 billion of no-year, mandatory emergency funding to cover the cost of the Senate's choice provision, with the remaining Senate provisions subject to appropriations on an annual basis.

I am supportive of Chairman MILLER's proposal, and I, like him, continue to remain optimistic that the House and Senate conferees will be able to successfully accomplish our mission and come to an agreement in advance of the August district work period which is scheduled to begin next week.

There are many important aspects of the bill where the House and the Senate do agree. Recently, however, Senator SANDERS, who is the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and the cochair of the conference committee, has indicated his desire to expand the scope of the conference to include the VA's recent request for as much as an additional $17.6 billion.

The VA health care system has not yet proven itself able to make effective use of the resources that it has been provided. Increasing those resources significantly at this time would be irresponsible, particularly in light of the insufficient details that the VA has provided about how it arrived at this request and how, specifically, this money would be used to increase access for our Nation's veterans and increase accountability for VA bureaucrats.

This summer, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has received hours of testimony from VA leaders and key outside stakeholders in an effort to thoroughly understand and evaluate the access and accountability failures of the VA and, by extension, our Nation's veterans, the problems that they have been experiencing.

Those hearings have confirmed that the problems the VA is facing today require long-term and large-scale reform that more money, more people, and more buildings will not bring, by themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are continually trying to work out a deal with the Senate, and I would argue that these motions to instruct have become not just tiresome but, in fact, they have become very counterproductive.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to instruct, and to allow the conference committee the time and the latitude to work and reach the best possible compromise for the benefit of America's veterans. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK), a true leader on veterans issues and a member of the VA conference committee.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Congressman RAHALL, thank you for your strong support of one of the most important provisions in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3230.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this motion to instruct the conferees. Both the Senate and the House amendments will expand access to non-VA care for veterans, but this program will only last for 2 years.

It will only address the current emergency by ensuring those veterans who are waiting too long for appointments receive timely care. If we do not address the VA's doctor, nurse, and medical support staff shortage now, we will face the same crisis again in 2 years.

Just yesterday, I learned that the one physician serving the community-based outpatient clinic in Flagstaff, Arizona, where I live, is leaving, and there is no physician identified as his replacement.

In another VA clinic in my district, the one doctor there is planning to retire, without a replacement doctor identified.

Our rural veterans struggle to access care, and VA hospitals and clinics must be able to recruit and retain doctors and nurses to serve veterans in rural and underserved communities.

Currently, 10 percent of all health care provider positions in the VA remain unfilled. By ensuring that the VA has the ability to quickly hire doctors and nurses and fill these positions, we help the VA ensure it has the capacity to provide timely, world-class care to our veterans before this 2-year program ends.

As a member of the conference committee, I strongly believe that the negotiations between the House and the Senate must continue. We need to put political differences aside and maintain our focus on the veterans we are here to serve.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity.

I am constantly frustrated in this Chamber by our inability to come to an agreement. And today, we stand here arguing about whether a Senate position is better or whether a House position is better.

The truth is that the American people want action. One of the basic things that we can all agree on is that we do not have enough medical providers in our system. We see a lot of veterans, and we try to force a lot of veterans through a very small funnel with very few providers.

In fact, if you look at the data recently, as men and women come back from different places across the world, like Iraq and Afghanistan, we have a much higher pronounced need than ever before for physicians to treat PTSD. And yet, we have fewer physicians able to do that because, in that area of specialization, we do not have enough medical care providers in the VA.

It seems pretty basic that one of the things that we ought to be able to agree on is the fact that we need more health care providers in our system. You can leave aside the issue of construction or leave aside the issue of technology or any of those kinds of things.

The fact is that when a person, a patient, comes into the VA system, he needs a health care provider to be able to see him or her, and we do not have enough health care providers. That fact is inescapable.

Today's motion, essentially, seeks to take care of that one issue, and that one issue is that we need more health care providers.

It makes no difference to me, to the American people, to anyone that I know, whether we adopt the Senate position or the House position. The idea that we are arguing about that, about whether the Senate does this or the House does that is, frankly, ludicrous.

We should all come together on that one point. We should all understand that we need more health care providers. Our veterans deserve it. Our veterans need it. They are asking for that. The American people are demanding it. And Congress needs to be able to respond.

How should they respond?

They should respond through this motion to instruct the conferees so that we can agree on a very limited provision of the bill, a limited provision that says, regardless of all of the disagreements, regardless of all these side fights, we will agree on this one area, and that one area would be, we need more health care providers.

PTSD isn't the only thing where we are short of physicians. We are short of cardiologists, we are short of a lot of things. And if the VA has the opportunity and the permission to go forward and look for additional health care providers now, then we will be up and running much earlier than if we wait and wait and wait.

The challenge with Congress: manana seems to be the busiest day of the week here. We wait until tomorrow and tomorrow, and maybe next week there will be an agreement or maybe the week after that there will be an agreement. We need an agreement today, and this is our opportunity to do that.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to know that politics have not been part of this discussion in the conference committee, and any assertions to that standpoint are not true.

In terms of the manana comment, I will say this. We have worked diligently on the conference committee, on both sides of the aisle, to try to get to a solution with the Senate. We will continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a doctor.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman RAHALL for yielding, and for your leadership on this issue to make sure our veterans get the health care that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Rahall motion to instruct our conferees. I look at this issue, not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor who has worked in the VA system.

Now, these are men and women who stepped up to answer the call to duty, to protect our freedoms, American freedoms, and we need to give them that same duty when they return. That is why we need to have enough doctors, nurses, and health care professionals in the VA system.

It has been reported, many of these men and women, needing necessary care, often have to wait 30 days, 60 days. That is unconscionable.

This isn't a Democratic or Republican issue. This is an issue of getting our men and women, our veterans, the necessary health care that they need.

And as a doctor, you have to have a work force. You have to have necessary health care professionals that can address these needs in a timely manner.

This is a very simple section of the Senate bill that Congressman RAHALL is suggesting we move forward, section 203. It would directly address the workforce shortage and the doctor shortage in the VA by targeting funding to hire additional health care providers and prioritizing these additional providers for the facilities that need them most.

It is common sense. It is the right thing to do to serve our men and women, to serve our veterans. Accepting these provisions is just one of many steps that we must do to ensure that they get the care that is necessary.

There are other things that we can do, but this is something we can do immediately, and we shouldn't delay it another week, another year. Let's take care of our veterans.

□ 1400

There is other legislation out there. We have a bipartisan bill, the Doctors Helping Heroes Act. It is Democrat and Republican. It is common sense.

Once we get section 203 passed, let's do more to train those necessary doctors. We can do it, and we have got the will, and I really commend my colleague from West Virginia, Congressman RAHALL, for taking the lead here. Let's do what is necessary to serve our men and women, our veterans, and let's move section 203 forward.

Mr. FLORES. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Military Construction-VA Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding and for his leadership in offering this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has a sacred obligation to provide for those who served and sacrificed for this country. Just as the military leaves no soldier behind on the battlefield, we must leave no veteran behind when they return home, and yet, Mr. Speaker, as too many veterans and their families can attest, our collective efforts often fall short.

The recent revelations of deceptive and dishonest scheduling practices at the Phoenix VA and elsewhere throughout the country have underscored a much more ominous reality: serious structural systemic problems at the VA that must be addressed immediately. We clearly have work to do.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for funding military construction projects and the Department of Veterans Affairs, my colleagues and I have fought for years to ensure that the Department has the resources it needs to provide for our Nation's veterans.

While money alone is not a guarantor of timely access to quality care, a Department tasked with as monumental an undertaking as providing for millions of veterans, generations of veterans—from World War II to the current conflict in Afghanistan—must be ably prepared and equipped from the inside out, from top to bottom, with the resources it needs to get the job done.

Financial resources must translate into human resources. As the head of any large organization can tell you, it is the people who comprise the organization that ultimately make the difference.

That is why I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker. My district in North Carolina is home to tens of thousands of veterans who rely on the VA medical centers in Durham and Fayetteville or one of the many smaller facilities throughout the region for care.

I know firsthand the importance of an organization like the Department of Veterans Affairs, tasked with providing comprehensive medical care for so many veterans and for having sufficient staff on hand to do that, and too many VA facilities around the country don't have sufficient staff. They face glaring shortfalls of key medical personnel, particularly primary care and mental health professionals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the bad actors within VA management? They have received much attention since the current scandal broke. For certain, there is no question that bad actors within the Department must face the consequences of their actions. Those who bent or broke the rules have to be reprimanded or, in egregious cases, terminated.

This body has passed a bill that would provide the Secretary more authority to do just that, but too often overlooked are the tens of thousands of men and women—many, themselves, veterans—at the Department of Veterans Affairs who work tirelessly every day, often long hours, to ensure that our veterans receive the care they have earned and that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers and on both sides of the aisle: lay off the shots at ''VA bureaucrats,'' set aside partisan differences, work together to solve this crisis. We must address these shortcomings by enacting comprehensive VA reform legislation that is worthy of the men and women who have sacrificed so much.

That is why it is critically important, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs has the authority and the resources required to hire and employ sufficient numbers of medical professionals. This motion would do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a profound comment, and that is that money alone is not a guarantee of quality care for veterans, and that is one of the issues at stake here in the negotiations.

The Senate has decided to use this crisis to grab more money for the VA, when we are not sure the VA can handle the money it has appropriated today, which is substantial.

We want to make sure that we fix the VA right and do it right the first time. That is the crux of the issue. That is the objective that really gives our veterans the quality care that they deserve, and that is what the conference committee is committed to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. LOIS CAPPS, and commend her for her leadership on this issue as well.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from West Virginia for yielding me the time and for offering this motion to encourage conferees to swiftly settle their differences on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman RAHALL's motion to instruct conferees, so that our veterans are assured the care that they have earned.

For far too long, we have heard stories of men and women facing unacceptable wait times at the VA, and we have heard even more disturbing accounts of misconduct in the very organization our veterans should be most able to trust. In response to this scandal, both Chambers of Congress have passed bipartisan bills to hold the VA and its leadership accountable.

I was encouraged to see this body act quickly to address a very real problem and was pleased to support bipartisan legislation to help solve this crisis, but we cannot allow this momentum to fade or allow disagreement to stand in the way of our veterans getting the care they have earned and so clearly deserve.

This motion to instruct simply urges the conferees to move past disagreements that are stalling this critical bill. It would ensure that the VA can use resources it already has to hire additional health professionals to meet the needs of our veterans. Doing this will enable the VA to cut down on excessive and unacceptable wait times.

As a nurse, I know the importance of having adequate staffing levels filled with our Nation's best health care providers. We need to encourage the VA to bring these experts into the VA to treat our vets in need, and most importantly, the motion supports actions to give VA the resources it needs to improve care and responsiveness at every level while finding appropriate areas to cut back.

We owe it to our veterans to work tirelessly to finish this bill before we leave Washington. Veterans have already waited long enough. Let's not allow this critical bill to stall any longer. It is time to finish the job.

Mr. FLORES. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. May I have a time check, please, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Reserving my right to close, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge all Members to oppose the motion to instruct. The conference committee is working diligently on both sides of the aisle to try to reach agreement with the Senate, and we want to do it in a responsible manner that puts the interests of our Nation's veterans at the forefront of the negotiations, but also is respectful of the resources required from our taxpayers to meet that objective.

So, again, I urge Members to oppose the motion to instruct. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, America's veterans deserve the very best care our Nation can muster. The gentleman from North Carolina said it well. Many Americans have said it well. Every one of our soldiers knows it is their motto to leave no soldier behind. Therefore, we, as Americans, should have as our creed and our basic principle guiding us that we leave no veteran behind.

That prescription begins with the very best corps of physicians that we can assemble. Time alone will not heal the wounds of war that our veterans have suffered. They are our true American heroes.

We have, time and time again, mustered the budgetary resources to deploy and support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and lands beyond, and we salute those of our Armed Forces serving as we speak for defending this great Nation of ours.

America's sons and daughters, those who have volunteered to defend our national causes, did not hesitate for an instant to go. They went. They served. They suffered. They sacrificed their good health. They gave their all.

We are proud in West Virginia, as a strong, patriotic State, to serve up there at the top of the 50 States, on a per capita basis, of our number of young men and women that answer the call of duty for all wars.

Now, the bill for war has come due; but, alas, where has all of this body's patriotic fervor gone? It appears to be buried beneath a mound of budgetary spreadsheets and handwringing about deficits, about the need to trim back, about the need to cut back on deficits.

I say this House ought to take a different course, one in which we can stand united with those who fought with meritorious service on behalf of a grateful Nation. Let us pay the medical bills of America's sons and daughters. Let us do so with dispatch. Let us hire the doctors that America's sons and daughters deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about this issue over the last several months. We know it is not a new issue. We have heard that it has been going on through several different administrations, but that should not hinder us from stepping up to the plate and doing what is necessary today, not after we come back from our so-called vacation in August, but we should address it today before we go home.

So I urge that this motion to instruct conferees be accepted by this body, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE DONALD NASSHORN

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence has awarded its prestigious Bronze Key Award to an outstanding community servant and leader in my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Judge Donald Nasshorn, for his outstanding contribution in the field and with the affiliated Council of Southeast Pennsylvania, Inc., where he was a member of the council's board of directors for 27 years and president of its board for 16 years.

During this time, Judge Nasshorn led the council through periods of growth and expansion of its services, including chairing the council's building committee, as it purchased three buildings to accommodate council programming, and for many years, he has been recognized as a champion of early intervention and recovery support services to those involved in the criminal justice system.

Currently, Judge Nasshorn chairs a Bucks County overdose prevention task force, and so we join in honoring Judge Nasshorn for his years of outstanding leadership, for his advocacy, for his compassionate service to our community, and for setting an example for others to follow.

SOLAR ENERGY AT THE TOLEDO ZOO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Toledo Zoo, recently voted the best zoo in America, on its dedication of a new 2.1-megawatt solar array.

The project is a win for everyone involved. It embraces the future. It will supply 30 percent of the zoo's electricity needs, and it makes use of a vacant brownfield site in the city that would otherwise be a financial and environmental burden.

It serves as a wonderful educational tool for the zoo's more than 800,000 annual visitors.

Unfortunately, this is success story that will be difficult to replicate in Ohio due to the backward energy policy recently enacted by Ohio's Governor and State legislature.

As America strives to regain energy security, we must embrace all energy options, especially innovative, renewable energy sources that will power our future into and beyond the 21st century.

Hats off to the Toledo Zoo for serving as a national leader in advancing this goal.

Madam Speaker, I will include for the RECORD a recent article from the Toledo Blade detailing this really incredible success.

[From the Blade, July 22, 2014]

RUDOLPH/LIBBE PROJECT: SOLAR ARRAY TO SUPPLY POWER TO TOLEDO ZOO

BROWNFIELD SITE WILL AGAIN BE PRODUCTIVE

(By Tom Henry)

A massive, 2.1-megawatt solar array that has put 22 acres of vacant South Toledo land back into production is to be dedicated today. It's the kind of comeback that supporters believe will become less common across Ohio because of a recent bill Gov. John Kasich signed into law discouraging investments in renewable power.

The ceremony for the Rudolph/Libbe project near the Toledo Zoo is expected to draw a contingent of area business and government leaders interested in seeing how land contaminated by past industrial practices, known as brownfield sites, can go back on the tax rolls and generate clean energy while reducing blight.

In this case, a group of local investors led by Rudolph/Libbe Cos.—a limited liability company called Anthony Wayne Solar Number 1—is doing that for one of the region's largest employers and one of its most popular destinations, the Toledo Zoo.

The solar array and property, adjacent to the north side of the zoo's main parking lot between Anthony Wayne Trail and Spencer Street, are owned by those investors, who have a long-term contract in place to sell electricity generated at the site exclusively to the zoo.

The project, developed by Rudolph/Libbe and a sister company, GEM Energy, will generate about 30 percent of the Toledo Zoo's annual electricity needs, Jason Slattery, director of solar for Rudolph/Libbe Inc., said.

''This project is a great example of the public and private sectors working together to benefit the zoo and the community,'' Mr. Slattery said. ''We took a contaminated brownfield site, a financial burden for the city, and turned it into a win for the city of Toledo and the Toledo Zoo.''

He and other supporters believe such projects will be harder to come by now, though, because of the two-year legislative freeze on renewable-energy mandates that Mr. Kasich has signed into law.

That legislation, known as Senate Bill 310, applies only to utilities, not companies such as Rudolph/Libbe. But Ohio became the nation's first state with renewable-energy mandates to enact a two-year timeout.

A 2008 law requires utilities doing business in Ohio to steadily invest more in renewable power through 2025, when at least 12.5 percent of the electricity they provide is supposed to come from clean sources such as wind and solar energy.

Renewable energy advocates fear that two-year hiatus will put out a message to the business community that Ohio is no longer receptive to such investments.

Rudolph/Libbe, one of the region's largest contractors, expects to be doing more work in Michigan and New York, which have strong incentives for solar projects, Mr. Slattery said.

The solar industry has had setbacks from the failure of a high-profile manufacturer, California-based Solyndra, as well as the deep financial troubles of local manufacturers such as Xunlight and Willard & Kelsey.

But Rudolph/Libbe's an installer, not a manufacturer.

Growth in solar nationally has transformed the company's business model.

Since 2008, Rudolph/Libbe went from virtually no involvement in solar to having 10 percent of its revenue come from it.

It believes solar-installation projects will eventually become the backbone of as much as 30 percent of Rudolph/ Libbe's revenue.

Although Rudolph/Libbe will likely have to rely on states other than Ohio for that sort of push, it still expects to line up some Ohio contracts during the two-year freeze and hopes state legislators regain their interest in what the company sees as a budding industry, Mr. Slattery said.

''We think the costs of doing solar is an unstoppable train and it's not getting off the tracks,'' he said.

Rudolph-Libbe's costs for solar projects have come down from $9 per watt to $2 per watt since 2008. More affordable prices have resulted in more business, Mr. Slattery has said.

For the project near the zoo, investors worked with the Lucas County Land Bank, an agency that strives to repurpose vacant land, he said.

The site, formerly in receivership, was once home to a Haughton Elevator Co. factory, but it has not been used since the early '90s.

There are 28,500 solar panels on 15 of the site's 22 acres. Additional panels could be put on some the remaining seven acres in the future. Officials first want to assess the viability of adding more, after examining the amount of shade cast off nearby homes along Spencer Street during the four seasons, Mr. Slattery said.

The site is believed to be one of the nation's largest solar installations generating power for a zoo.

''This solar array supports the zoo's mission by using cleaner and greener energy, reducing reliance on nonrenewable energy while providing an inspiring example for zoo visitors,'' Jeff Sailer, Toledo Zoo executive director, said.

Rudolph/Libbe also developed the zoo's 1,400-panel walkway, called SolarWalk, which was installed in 2010, as well as multiple other projects with the Ohio Air National Guard and ones with the city of Bryan and First Solar LLC of Perrysburg in recent years.

The zoo also has a wind turbine generating power for its main parking lot, and geothermal wells to heat and cool the aquarium.

Bill Rudolph, chairman of Rudolph/Libbe Cos., said the companies are ''honored to support the Toledo Zoo's mission of environmental stewardship through this project.''

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources has planted trees and shrubs near the fences to create a visual buffer and spruce up the aesthetics for area residents. Plans also call for native grasses to be planted across the site.

Union labor from northwest Ohio was used to build the project, which created about 60 temporary construction jobs.

PORT OF SAVANNAH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time and for being down here with me today.

I hate that you can't see my charts today. They are not particularly colorful or exciting, but they are important in that they are going to tell the story of something that we have gotten done together.

Now, I don't want you to think I am just making something up down here on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker. I know you are probably thinking about 326 bills that we have passed here in the House that are still sitting over there in the Senate gathering dust, having received no action whatsoever.

You might be thinking about the work going on in the Rules Committee, where we are suing the President for his failure to implement the law as he crafted it, drafted it, and signed it. You might be thinking about the border crisis that is happening right now that has been marked by so much inaction.

I don't mean to say that there are not lots of things that need to be worked on in this body. There are.

□ 1415

I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to talk about some of the rare successes that we have had, and it is a success that is a long time coming.

I represent Metro Atlanta, Mr. Speaker, kind of the northeastern suburbs there in Metro Atlanta, and right down I–75 and then down I–16, you get to the great and historic city of Savannah. Folks think about Savannah for all sorts of different things. Whether it is Oglethorpe and his arrival, whether it is dyeing the river green on St. Patrick's Day, or whether it is the birth of the Girl Scouts in Savannah, lots of things do bring it to mind. But folks don't often think about the economic driver that the Port of Savannah is for the entire southeastern United States.

So often we talk about constituent interests on the floor, Mr. Speaker, what is good for this one district in Alabama or this one district in New York. What I want to talk about is the impact of the Port of Savannah on the economy of the entire southeastern United States.

You might not know, Mr. Speaker, from your part of the world, that it is the fourth largest container terminal in the Nation, and the largest single terminal operation in all of North America, the single terminal, one long dock there in Savannah. It handles 3 million container equivalents absolutely every cycle. Volume is up 7 percent this year alone.

When we talk about the number of folks it impacts, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 21,000 companies from

across the United States of America bring their commerce in and out of the Port of Savannah. Here is what is so important about our ports, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if everyone internalizes their values. Savannah is a great example. Forty-eight percent of the container traffic in that port are imports coming into America, goods and services that American consumers want to buy, but 52 percent of the traffic coming in and out of that port are exports. Forty-eight percent are things that we are buying from folks overseas, but 52 are goods that were manufactured with American hands, putting paychecks into Americans' pockets and shipping those goods right back out overseas—48 percent imports, 52 percent exports.

Now, why am I talking about that? We have got an exciting opportunity going on in this hemisphere, Mr. Speaker. You may have heard the term Panamax ships. The new Panama Canal—and you won't be able to see these numbers, Mr. Speaker, so I will just go through them briefly. The new Panama Canal is going to accommodate ships that carry not twice the number of containers that ships carry today, not three times the containers, but almost 3½ times more containers than ships carry.

What does that mean? That means if you are the fourth largest container port in the country, as Savannah is, if you are the fastest growing container port in the country, as Savannah is, you had better get to work making sure that your equipment—your port, your docks, and your channel—can accommodate the newer, larger ships.

Today, the draft on the ships coming through the Panama Canal, Mr. Speaker, is just under 40 feet. The new drafts of these Panamax ships are going to be 50 feet—10 feet more, 25 percent more. It requires major changes and renovations in our ports. And guess what. When the State of Georgia recognizes that we have a critical economic engine driving our economy, a critical economic engine to the entire Southeastern United States, we can't just get together as the State of Georgia and decide we are going to do some dredging and make sure that our port is ready for these newer, modern, larger ships. We are not allowed to.

Why? Well, it has a lot to do with this building, the one down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and a couple over in southwest D.C. at the EPA and our friends over at the Corps of Engineers. There is Federal law after Federal law after Federal law that says to the State of Georgia, no, you cannot expand your port without our permission.

Now, that would be a source of great difference of agreement in this body about whether we ought to have the kind of Federal regulatory burden that we do in order to make those decisions, but, in fact, that is the law of the land today and so we must deal with it.

We are talking about deeper channels, and we are talking about wider docking berths. We are talking about trying to move, again, not twice as many, not three times as many, but three-and-a-half times as many containers tomorrow as we were moving yesterday. And we have been battling as Georgians—as folks from the Southeast United States, as people trying to grow the economy—we have been battling the Federal red tape machine not for a week, not for a month, not for year, but almost a decade.

I say ''almost a decade.'' It has really been more than a decade, Mr. Speaker. But it has been going on for a decade in earnest, and we have finally gotten to the finish line. We have finally gotten to a place where the paperwork has been signed and the checks are being written, where we are going to be able to do the kind of dredging and modernization that is necessary to continue the economic engine here in the country.

What we are going to do is deepen our port from 42 feet to 47. Now, I mentioned to you the draft of these ships is 50 feet. We couldn't get permission to dredge deep enough to actually handle the 50-foot depth there. If we can't handle that draft, then these boats are going to have to unload some of their cargo either in Charleston or down in Jacksonville, and they are going to have to come into Savannah light.

I couldn't make it happen that we could organize our port to actually handle the fully loaded ships in the new Panamax model, but we are going to deepen to 47 at a cost of about $700 million. Now, that is real money. It is real money, and it is real money that is coming in a cost share agreement. The State of Georgia is picking up more than $200 million of that. The Federal Government is also picking up a share, recognizing the importance of economic development across the region.

Cost shares are important, Mr. Speaker. I have been talking to some of our colleagues, and you may have had the same conversation. There is really no limit to the number of folks who are willing to take free money. If you offer free money, if there is a grant proposal that is just going to give you something, folks are willing to raise their hand and say: Yes, give it to me.

If you ask people to put some skin in the game, then it creates a completely different dynamic for who is on board and who is thinking they want to opt out this time around.

Georgia is on board to the tune of $200 million because it is important. When things are important, we ought to be able to come together and get those things done. Again, this Port of Savannah, this Corps of Engineers project, this bit of the WRDA bill authorized in the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act, a rare episode of folks coming together and getting things done.

When we talk about what this means, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 11,000 jobs nationwide—11,000 jobs nationwide. I say ''nationwide,'' Mr. Speaker. Only about 2,400 of those jobs are going to be local jobs there around the port. But we can't get wrapped up in what is good for me and what is good for my community to the exclusion of what is good for us. We are all in this together.

Is Savannah going to have a disproportionate benefit for the investment in this port? Of course it is. They are also going to be disproportionately burdened. Their streets are going to be more crowded, and their housing prices are going be to affected. Everything is affected. But this is not a local concern. This is a national concern.

Mr. Speaker, the world is changing. The world is a dynamic place. Again, it doesn't take much to see that what was the amazing engineering marvel that was the Panama Canal has been set aside now as being too old, too antiquated, and too small to handle modern needs. We are now talking about this Panamax canal that is going to bring ships the size of which you and I have never seen, Mr. Speaker, to American ports in record time, saving fuel, making a difference to the energy economy, and making a difference to price for American consumers.

I am a conservative Republican from the Deep South, Mr. Speaker. I have a vision of what this country ought to look like, and it is a vision of a country where every man or woman can follow his or her own hopes and dreams, wherever those hopes and dreams may take them. It is a vision where the government doesn't put its foot on the throat of those young Americans who want to pursue those dreams.

But it doesn't mean that there is no role for government at all. When it comes to big infrastructure projects, the interstate highway system, for example, that transportation bill that just passed this House 2 short weeks ago, when it comes to our ports, when it comes to those big issues of infrastructure that matter to us all that aren't just about jobs in our local area but about jobs across this country, we have to come together to make a difference in those ways.

For those of us in Georgia, for those of us in the Southeast, this brought Democrats and Republicans together, Mr. Speaker. This brought State legislators together with the executive branch. This brought folks together from Alabama, South Carolina, Florida, and more. We can do those big things that matter. They are not easy. Sometimes they take a year or 2 or 3. But in my 3 years of service in this institution, Mr. Speaker, I have never

seen anything get done that was worth doing that didn't involve someone working awfully hard to make it happen. And more times than not, it wasn't one person working awfully hard, it was two of us or three of us or ten of us or 100 of us who got together to make these things happen.

I am grateful to my colleagues for working with me to make sure the Port of Savannah is a success—again, not just a success for the city of Savannah, not just a success for the State of Georgia, but a success for the United States of America. It is an example of the kinds of partnerships that we can create and the kinds of differences we can make in the pocketbooks of families back home.

There are going to be families who receive paychecks that would not have received those paychecks otherwise because of our cooperation and success. There are going to be consumers who are saving money at the cash register each and every day because we were able to come together and build this much-needed infrastructure project.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is virtually mandatory that I come to the floor this afternoon because the two most serious, antidemocratic, and antihome rule amendments are pending in this House. I am very hopeful that they will not be sustained when the full Congress gets a look at them, but they certainly have passed this House: an amendment from Representative THOMAS MASSIE of Kentucky that attempts to wipe out, eliminate, all the gun laws of the Nation's Capital—the Nation's Capital, a prime terrorist target; the Nation's Capital, where Cabinet members lunch in our public places, go to our theaters, and walk in our streets; the Nation's Capital, where there are 650,000 residents; the Nation's Capital, one of the big cities of America, and it is those big cities where gun violence is most likely to occur. That is the amendment from Representative MASSIE.

Then there is another amendment from Representative ANDY HARRIS, an amendment that flies in the face of what is occurring across the country, of course, as 18 States long before the District of Columbia decriminalized their marijuana laws. So, too, has the District of Columbia. But this Member is seeking to meddle in the affairs of the District of Columbia—the local affairs, local matters—and to somehow keep the local legislature from passing a local law just like the laws of those 18 States.

Now, I hasten to add that the Senate, the comparable subcommittee in the Senate, has considered this matter, and the Senate has passed what we call a clean bill, a clean appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

Of course, there is a kind of anomaly here. Why am I talking about the District of Columbia at all? Well, that is an anomaly that allows the District's budget—every cent of it raised in the District of Columbia—to somehow come here to be approved by Members that are unaccountable for having raised a cent of that budget.

□ 1430

So, yes, the Senate had to consider the District's budget. By the way, our D.C. budget is balanced. The D.C. budget has a large amount of revenue in excess of its annual taxes, a rainy day fund that would be the envy of most Members of this House, and yet it has to come to a House that has hardly been able to pass bills much less balance its budget.

So the Senate says we recognize you can handle your own affairs, like any other American jurisdiction, and they have quickly passed or approved the District's local budget. In addition, the Senate has also given the District both autonomy over its own budget so it wouldn't have to come the Congress in the first place, and what we call legislative autonomy.

In addition to having to bring its local budget here, the residents of the District of Columbia, when they pass their local laws, those local laws have to rest here for a certain period of time to see if there is any Member who wants to jump up and ask to overturn them. However, usually the process of overturning a local law of the District of Columbia does not come through regular order, through the House and Senate, although there is such a process that is allowed. It usually comes in the way in which Representative MASSIE and Representative HARRIS have interfered with the District. They simply try to use an amendment to an appropriation bill in order to overturn a District law, a kind of shortcut method.

Of course, if one looks at why the District budget is over here, the American people would be, I think, pleased to know that no one, not one Member looks at the budget. They recognize that they are incompetent to do so, not because they are inherently incompetent, but because nobody would want to look at somebody else's budget if they have not had the opportunity to go through what they have gone through, and that is all of the hearings and the rest of it. So Congress doesn't care about the budget. They have the budget here in order to use it as a vehicle to overturn local laws, and that is what has happened with the gun amendment and with the marijuana decriminalization amendment.

Now, I want to speak about both responses from residents and about what these Members have done. The gun amendment is the most serious because what Representative THOMAS MASSIE from Kentucky has tried to do affects the lives and the public safety of the residents of this city. This is something you don't fool with. The reason that the Framers left such local matters, public safety, to local people, is because of what is at stake. Nobody in Washington, that is to say official Washington, can tell anyone in someone's hometown anything that they should want to hear about their own local public safety.

As it turns out, the District of Columbia is very proud of its low crime rate, its low gun violence rate, because like other big cities, earlier on, within the last 15 or 20 years, it was like other big cities. It had high gun violence rates, but those have been brought down.

And you can imagine that in a big city, keeping the city safe from gun violence is a very big deal, particularly when that city turns out not to be just any city, when it turns out to be the Capital of the United States. And yet what Representative MASSIE has done would make the District of Columbia the most permissive gun jurisdiction in the United States. What is almost laughable, if it weren't so tragic, is that, were his amendment to become law, the District of Columbia would have a more permissive set of gun laws than Representative MASSIE's own district in Kentucky. This gentleman lives in a county of 17,000 people. He is a cattle farmer. That is a different culture that I respect in his county, and yes, in his State.

All the people of the District of Columbia are demanding is the same kind of respect, reciprocal respect, and that is what you don't get when a Member decides not to attend to the business of his own State, but knowing nothing about your State, saying not one mumbling word to you, who represent the District, the only Member who represents this district, or to any local official, when you then decide in the most tyrannical way to use authority that essentially even this Congress never intended you to have because 40 years ago the Congress passed the Home Rule Act.

It recognized when the country was, frankly, being criticized for not using the same standard with its own Capital that it demands of the rest of the world. Its own Capital didn't even have a local government, a home rule government. It was ruled by three commissioners. The people of the District couldn't elect their government. It had

no Member of Congress. What kind of democracy is that in your Nation's Capital? Well, Congress said that is not democracy.

So Members can cite all they want about the Constitution, which indeed said that because it is the Nation's Capital, there is jurisdiction in the Congress. But nothing in the Constitution said that Congress had to keep that jurisdiction and could never give the District democracy, and so it did. The Home Rule Act of 1973, with that act, from this Congress, this Congress said we shall no longer be the tyrannical lawmakers for people unaccountable to us, making laws for people who can't vote for us or against us. We give that up because it is inconsistent with our values of democracy, and we say it to the world: we give it up now. And so they did.

So any Member who tries to say we have the authority, it is like any tyrant in the world who says because I can do it, I am going to do it. Yes, you can do it if you want to betray your own principles.

Now, I note for the RECORD that these Members profess to be Tea Party Republicans. Their major standard in this Congress is that power, even power that the Federal Government legitimately has, shall be devolved, sent back to local jurisdictions and to States.

How can you call yourself a small government, local government, states' rights Republican and then be instrumental in putting the big foot of the Federal Government on a local jurisdiction—as it turns out, your own Nation's Capital—and just to make this more absurdly antidemocratic, in a Congress where that Member cannot even vote up or down on the Harris amendment or on the Massie amendment.

If, my friends, that is not tyranny, then the word has no meaning. Unaccountable, and you stand in the way of making the only Member who represents the District, where you are interfering, making her unaccountable too with no vote on this floor—is this America? No, it is the Tea Party Republican Congress.

The gun amendment that has been introduced by Representative MASSIE as a bald attempt to score political points, and he says so—I will quote from his own statement shortly—to make political points at the expense of states' rights, the rights of my own constituents, and most seriously, at the expense of their public safety.

What is Representative THOMAS MASSIE trying to do here in Washington, instead of finding things to do for the people of Kentucky? Well, this is what he is trying to do in the Nation's Capital: to allow carrying on the streets a gun, open or concealed, of any kind; assault weapon, any kind, no holds; allowing assault weapons, including .50-caliber sniper weapons, to be possessed; allowing magazines holding an unlimited number of bullets to be possessed.

Do you know how many motorcades of cars go through the streets of the Nation's Capital every single day carrying dignitaries at every level of government from across the world? They stop the traffic because the safety of these officials is so important to the Nation and to the world. So we are not only talking about our own Cabinet officials, we are talking about 20 million people who visit this city, prime ministers, heads of states.

Let me go on about what kind of gun atmosphere Mr. MASSIE wants here in the Nation's Capital.

Private sale of guns without any background checks. Any Tom, Dick, or Harry, rogue or criminal, could get a gun and bring it into the Nation's Capital.

The purchase of guns with no waiting period.

The purchase of an unlimited number of guns in one day.

That is what he wants here in one of the big cities, the Nation's Capital.

Well, all he has done is bring unintended confusion. He certainly has gotten a response from the city. The mayor of the city, the police chief was out of town but her assistant chief came to this House and held a press conference about the outrage of interfering with the chief and most important duty of the mayor and the police chief: keeping the streets of the District safe.

But this amendment isn't quite doing what Mr. MASSIE intended. In fact, both of these amendments, the Harris marijuana decriminalization amendment and the Massie amendment, show why amendments to appropriations bills really aren't the way to proceed. It is true that you can try to introduce a bill to accomplish the same thing, but amendments to appropriations contain a few words and they end up doing things you never expected. This was a 69-word appropriation rider that tries to overturn four complicated laws; you just can't do it with an amendment and get done what you are trying to do.

□ 1445

This is what we found. We are still looking at the implications of the Massie amendment. It appears that THOMAS MASSIE has made some of our laws less restrictive and some more restrictive.

Then there is another interpretation that says that the city may be left with only laws that have been declared unconstitutional, and of course, those are unenforceable.

Then looking at the language, another reading says that the amendment has not only blocked the four complicated gun laws intended, but has also blocked enforcement of laws that these laws amended, and these laws amended laws that have been found unconstitutional. That is just how complicated this is.

Now, what I think I have shown is that it is technically impossible to do what THOMAS MASSIE tried to do in 69 words. Never mind, though, if all you are bent on is undemocratically poking, inserting yourself into a district not your own, you are bound to make mistakes.

In order to do what THOMAS MASSIE wanted to do, he would have had to write a law as complicated as the District of Columbia's own carefully-wrought laws—gun laws are. Remember, their laws had to be redeveloped because of the Supreme Court decision that said that D.C.'s original laws were not constitutional, so they went back and revised their laws, and they came up with, yes, strict gun laws.

There have been challenges to those gun laws. The Federal courts have upheld the District's gun registration requirement, the Federal courts have upheld the District's assault weapons ban, and the Federal courts have upheld the District's ban on large-capacity ammunition feeding devices.

Why in the world would anyone have gone to court against those in the first place, I am not sure, but anybody who reads the Supreme Court decision as saying you can carry any gun, anywhere you want to, ought to read it again.

All the Supreme Court said was that you are allowed to have and own a gun in your own home, period. That is all the Supreme Court has said—not to carry those guns into the streets of big cities where gun tragedies occur on a frequent basis.

I make no challenge to where my colleagues stand on guns. I believe in a country full of diversity of all kinds. If you look at the great United States from East to West, with its extraordinary diverse geography, you can understand why there would be vast differences among residents on issues like guns.

Why in the world would we not want to respect those differences? This is the United States of America. It means, in the States & D.C., we have the freedom to entertain differences and to carry them out there. That is all the residents of the District of Columbia are asking—indeed, demanding.

Wherever you stand on guns is no business of mine, and I will never try to convince you in your own State how to behave with those guns. All that the people I represent are asking is that we be accorded the same respect.

Representative MASSIE came on this floor initially with a version of his gun amendment. The Speaker sitting there before him found his amendment to be out of order. It was unartfully written.

Normally, if your own party—the Speaker in the chair is from his party,

the majority controls the floor—if your own Speaker says that your amendment is out of order, that is the end of it.

To understand the kind of Member we are dealing with—his own Speaker had ruled his amendment out of order—the sensible thing to do is what he was finally forced to do, go back, go to the staff who knows how to write these amendments, and say: write me an amendment that won't be out of order.

Instead, he stood his ground and said he wanted a vote to overrule his own Speaker, that his amendment was out of order. That so embarrassed his colleagues on the other side that people gathered around him trying to convince him he really didn't want to do that, there was another way, go back and rewrite your amendment.

What began as stubbornness was becoming a matter of embarrassment for the Republican majority because a vote to overrule the Speaker demands an immediate vote of the House. It was now 7 or 8 at night.

Members had been told there would be no more votes, so they were scattered throughout the region, in Maryland, in Virginia, and the far reaches of the District of Columbia. Had, indeed, they been called back, the most angry Member would not have been me, it would have been his own colleagues.

Finally, unable to convince him to accept the ruling of the Chair—and the people of Kentucky ought to know what kind of Member they sent here and perhaps do something about it—instead of accepting the technical problem and going back forthrightly and dealing with it, he demanded a vote anyway.

The vote could only be called a humiliation of the Member because the votes were by voice and both sides voted against the Member's amendment, including his own side over there, and the only one to vote for his amendment was him.

So what he did finally is what he had to do. He went back, and he rewrote his amendment, and, of course, he has come back, and it passed, but with the unintended and confused consequences I just indicated.

This is a Member, I say to the people of Kentucky, who has introduced all of six bills—just by way of comparison only, because you can't be judged by the number of bills you introduce—but he has introduced six, I have introduced 64. The difference is I have spent my time asking: What do my constituents need?

I bet the people of Mr. MASSIE's district in Kentucky need more than an amendment likely not to prevail at the end of the Congress that overturns all the gun laws in the Nation's Capital. Indeed, I want to know what that does for one single resident of THOMAS MASSIE's district.

He was asked by the press: Why would you do this? He said: Because I want to try to restore gun rights anywhere I can.

He thinks he can here, despite the Home Rule Act, where Congress gave up the authority to pass laws for the District of Columbia.

Well, he had an opportunity twice since the D.C. amendment passed to try to restore gun rights any way he could. A congressional staff member was arrested here in the House just a few days ago for bringing a gun into the Capitol complex. This person has been arrested. I can't believe, since he is a staffer, he intended to bring it here, but the law is the law, whether you are a staffer or a visitor.

Why hasn't THOMAS MASSIE introduced a bill here where nobody could say he lacks jurisdiction, a bill to allow guns to be brought into the House of Representatives? I challenge him, if he means what he says, that he wants to at least try to restore gun rights ''anywhere I can,'' then he must begin where he lives, right here on the House floor, so that no staff member will be embarrassed again. Here, at least, those who would be affected are accountable to him, as the residents I represent are not.

It looks like—if you were to judge by these incidents all within a week's time—there are people who believe that Representative MASSIE meant what he said because just a couple of days ago, a man—yet again, from South Carolina—brought a loaded Ruger LC9 semiautomatic pistol with a round in the chamber, into the Capitol complex, and he too was arrested, because it is a Federal law, 40 U.S.C. 5104, which makes it an offense to carry a gun in the Capitol complex with a penalty up to 5 years of imprisonment.

Do you want to do something for the people of Kentucky who may visit here or the people of America? Here is a law that THOMAS MASSIE has full jurisdiction to overturn, so I challenge him—if THOMAS MASSIE is looking for a way to restore gun rights ''anywhere I can,'' I challenge you to at least introduce such a bill here, if for no other reason, for consistency's sake.

Don't think that what Mr. MASSIE has done has not been noted in Kentucky. I am quoting from a Kentucky TV station—and maybe this is partly inexperience because we don't see more experienced Members who may agree with Mr. MASSIE coming forward so recklessly—but this Kentucky staffer says:

> First-term Republican Representative Thomas Massie said it is his business to try to overturn Washington, D.C.'s gun control laws.

Then it says—and this is a straight-out news report:

> Massie's congressional district stretches from eastern Jefferson County, Oldham, Shelby, and Spencer Counties, all the way to the West Virginia border.
>
> If the libertarian Republican has his way, his influence will stretch to the District of Columbia's gun laws.

□ 1500

That is how it was reported in Kentucky. There is an irony here that is not lost in his home State. Take the Courier-Journal in Kentucky, which ran an editorial that was headlined, ''Big foot government.''

It says, ''A couple of Members of Kentucky's congressional delegation who claim to want government out of our lives want to force more of it on the District of Columbia. Tea Party favorites''—they also name RAND PAUL because he has introduced a bill (not an appropriation amendment) that has been set back in the Senate, but his is an entire bill to overturn the gun laws of the Nation's Capital.

RAND PAUL wants to be President of the United States, and he is putting in bills, by the way, that are far softer than the gun bill—bills that you might expect from the Democratic side—in order to try to make Independents and Democrats think that he is more acceptable than his words have indicated he is in the past.

Continuing, The Courier-Journal, the biggest newspaper in Kentucky, says that the two of them, ''libertarian-leaning Republicans, are pushing measures in Congress to roll back Washington, D.C.'s strict gun laws adopted by its officials to try to reduce gun violence in the nation's capital.''

It goes on, but let me quote from another part of that editorial. ''Too bad their concern doesn't extend to the right of residents of Washington to have a vote in Congress. The delegate from Washington has no floor vote, which means Ms. NORTON could only complain about the gun measure, but not vote against it. That sounds like taxation without representation, something anyone who purports to love liberty ought to oppose.''

Mr. Speaker, not only taxation without representation, but the people I represent pay the highest taxes per capita to the Federal Government, $12,000 per resident, which is the highest in the United States.

One ought to understand our outrage when people from Kentucky or Maryland or anywhere else in the country who pay less taxes try to tell us how to conduct our local affairs.

The gun amendment certainly riled D.C. residents, but that amendment is one of only two such amendments. The other, of course, is the marijuana decriminalization law that I mentioned when I began.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when the marijuana decriminalization law passed, along with the gun law, The Associated Press had an apt headline: ''Guns Okay, Pot Dangerous.'' That tells you something about the Republican House of Representatives.

The residents of this region—where we have lived as one region—have built the same Metro and use the same

Metro with taxes coming from the entire region, and even though we have differing views on many issues, we try to live as one region and not meddle into the affairs of our neighbors, so this marijuana amendment was a particular outrage because it came from a Maryland Representative.

The first thing that the largest D.C. rights organization in D.C. did was to call for a boycott of the Eastern Shore, which Mr. HARRIS represents. The Eastern Shore lives off of Maryland, Virginia, and D.C., in the summertime. They have got to make it then, or the Eastern Shore isn't going to make it for the rest of the year.

When D.C. Vote called for a boycott, it suggested that residents choose Rehoboth Beach, Delaware; or Chincoteague Island, Virginia; but not the Eastern Shore because it said: They don't support us; why should we support them?

Of course, there will be allies across the region who will hear that call and who will not go to the Eastern Shore this summer.

Residents continue to try in other ways to say to Representative HARRIS: stay out of our affairs, attend to your own.

Two dozen residents came here this week to file complaints with Representative HARRIS. They say he is acting like he is a member of the city council, so we are going to treat him like he is a member of the city council.

So they brought their complaints one by one, and Representative HARRIS' chief of staff had to stand there to receive these complaints from the residents of the District of Columbia.

Nathan Harrington, who is a teacher in the District of Columbia, said, now that he sees who has the power, he is coming to Rep. HARRIS because there are some vacant houses in his neighborhood and he demands that Representative ANDY HARRIS take care of those vacant houses, right away. ANDY HARRIS has got the power. He has shown us he has got the power.

Mr. Harrington said: either he represents us or doesn't. If he doesn't, then stay out of our business. If he does, take care of those vacant houses.

Representative HARRIS did not come forward to receive these complaints, but his chief of staff did stand there, with civility, and receive these office-hours complaints from D.C. Vote residents.

There were a number of other complaints that came to Mr. HARRIS' office. A resident said they wanted more visible street signs. One resident said they want more bike lanes. If you have got somebody who can put the big foot of the Federal Government on your back, then surely he can do little things like get you some bike lanes.

This may be tongue-in-cheek, but it does show you the residents of the District of Columbia are going to come at you in more ways than one, and yes, there is a sense of humor here, and then there is something very serious, like that boycott.

To its credit, when the boycott of the Eastern Shore was initiated by D.C. Vote, it sent word to its local chamber of commerce and to its local commercial section that it had absolutely nothing against them, that many of us had enjoyed the Eastern Shore, but essentially, we were powerless here.

I could note vote against the Harris amendment. I don't expect the residents of the District of Columbia to sit around and take it. You want to mess with us, we are going to mess with you. We are going to mess with you in your district, we are going to mess with you here.

We are first-class American citizens. We are not going to take it. We are going to do everything we can to blanket your State about how you are meddling in our affairs, instead of taking care of your state's business.

I didn't organize any of this. I am expressing the outrage of the people I represent, and let me tell you, while they made light with this constituent services day in Representative HARRIS' office, this is dead serious for us because our marijuana amendment wasn't passed because of some college students—and this is a big college town—lobbied the council about pot.

It was passed in the wake of two studies by very reputable organizations, The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the American Civil Liberties Union. They found that in this progressive town, 90 percent of those arrested for smoking marijuana were Black.

I can't tell you exactly why, but it probably has a lot to do with where the police presence is most likely to be, but these figures fly in the face of figures that show that Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate.

I don't know whether Members appreciate what a ''drug'' offense—and that is what a marijuana offense is—means to a Black kid. It is the end of his working life. He is likely to carry around a stereotype based on his color and often his gender, if he is a Black boy or Black man. He won't be able to explain away this drug offense—marijuana offense.

That is what got the city council to pass this law. So anyone who interferes with us on this issue is meddling with a serious racial issue in the District of Columbia, and we are demanding that you stay out of this very serious affair.

The amendment was passed to combat racial injustice. Twenty-three States have legalized medical marijuana, 18 have decriminalized marijuana, and two States have legalized marijuana. We will not be treated differently from any other State in the Union. The one thing we demand is equal treatment.

I must note that there is a growing sense among my Republican colleagues in this Congress that marijuana should no longer be criminally treated. We don't treat alcohol, which does far more harm, in a criminal fashion. While I am the last one to say smoke weed or cigarettes, I don't think people should get a criminal record for having done so.

We do not see any consistency among my Republican colleagues. When the Harris amendment came in committee, Republicans voted for it, and I want to say something about those Republicans.

KEN CALVERT of California, JEFF FORTENBERRY, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, DAVID JOYCE, DAVID VALADAO, ANDY HARRIS—of course—and MARK AMODEI, these members, along with Mr. HARRIS, violated their own limited, small government, local control, states' rights principles by voting in committee for the Harris amendment.

I want to say a special word about MARK AMODEI of Nevada because he exceeded other Members in hypocrisy. He joined a majority last month on the floor in favor of an amendment blocking the Federal Government from interfering with medical marijuana in those States which allow it—because Nevada allows it.

□ 1515

He didn't want the Federal Government interfering with what had been sanctioned by his own state, but he was quick to interfere with the local affairs on a related substance right afterwards.

I call on my Republican colleagues to at least abide by their own principles and to show some consistency of principle.

Also passed recently was an amendment that prevents the Federal Government from penalizing financial institutions that provide services to legal marijuana businesses. If you have got a marijuana business in your State and the State says it is okay, then the Federal Government cannot keep financial institutions from dealing in bank transactions with these local marijuana businesses.

Forty-five Republicans voted for that amendment that passed. That is a large number of Republicans to cross the aisle in this House. The House has also voted to block the Drug Enforcement Administration from using funds to target medical marijuana operations in States where those operations are legal. Forty-nine Republicans voted for that.

Be consistent. If you are going to vote to keep the Federal Government out of matters involving marijuana where your State has sanctioned its use, then apply that same principle to the District of Columbia. That is why the Associated Press said: ''House GOP to D.C.: Guns OK, pot dangerous.''

Like the Massie gun amendment, the Harris amendment had unintended consequences, too. The District of Columbia marijuana decriminalization is legal because the law has passed its layover period of 60 legislative days. At the end of that 60 days, the law became legal. Now, the Harris amendment—seeks to overturn it. What happens when you use a pre-loaded Federal political bomb against a local jurisdiction is clear from what has happened with Representative HARRIS' amendment. That amendment now would not only block the District from enforcing its laws, it would block the District from issuing the fines that, with a sense of responsibility, were put in the law for those who, for example, smoke marijuana on the streets. There are unintended consequences because you don't know what you are doing when you meddle in the business, the local business, of another jurisdiction.

It is remarkable that Mr. HARRIS is a Club for Growth, Tea Party acolyte, who was known before he came here and is known now for his support of states' rights more than he is known for anything else; and it is remarkable to note that his own State, Maryland, has decriminalized marijuana. He is a Member who has the power in Maryland. Yet, he could not keep his own State from decriminalizing marijuana. So he tries to do in the District what he could not do in the State where he is accountable to the voters.

A recent article on Mr. HARRIS and the District of Columbia when these residents Constituent Services Day in Representative HARRIS' office:

I thought this media stunt was going to be a colossally goofball effort that had little to no effect on Harris or his views, and we still don't know if it will, but on that day, his employees were clearly rattled, so mission accomplished.

Moreover, Harris—who also has said that, to District residents, Congress is their local legislature—missed an opportunity to come across as something beyond another guy stuffed in a suit, overreaching his boundaries. By leaving the completely manageable demonstration to his marginally prepared aides, his stance on what the city's drug policies should be came across as even more aloof and more nonsensical than ever.

Look at how you are viewed. Think before you decide to insert yourself against your own professed—and often announced—principles into the affairs of a local jurisdiction not your own.

I am here this afternoon to serve notice on these two Members—and we are not through with them yet—or on any other Members who come forward that, yes, you can vote when I can't, but you cannot keep the residents of the District of Columbia from doing what they can to show you and to show America that we will not be treated as second-class citizens in our own country, not by THOMAS MASSIE, not by ANDY HARRIS, not by any Member of the House or Senate. Don't expect us to just lie down and take it. No red-blooded American would take what these Members have tried to do to this city with the gun amendment and with the marijuana decriminalization amendment.

In the name of your own principles—principles on which I agree that matters in the States and localities are for them, and my friends, maybe even some of the things we do here can better be done in the States—there is a democratic way to accomplish that mission, but it is not by an act of profound congressional bullying where you exert power to which even the local Member cannot respond except on this floor, with her voice—not even with a vote.

When THOMAS MASSIE decided that he wanted to overrule his chair, they didn't pull him off the floor. They let him have a vote. I will not have a vote on any matter affecting the District of Columbia. In the name of decency, if you are not going to give me a vote, stay out of the affairs of the District of Columbia.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family obligations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 10 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 24 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 4 and 5, 2013, February 10, 2014, March 4, 2014, and April 9 and 10, 2014 on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6604. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas in New Jersey [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0078] received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6605. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment of Imports (2014 Amendment) [Doc. No.: AMS-CN-13-0100] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6606. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Acting, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002][Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8337] received July 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6607. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0018] [CDFA Number: 84.133E-4.] received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6608. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [ED-2014-OSERS-0047] [CDFA Number: 84.133B-8] received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6609. A letter from the Electronics Engineer, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proposed Amendments to the Service Rules Governing Public Safety Narrowband Operation in the 769-775/799-805 MHz Bands; The Development of Operation, Technical and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Communications Requirements Through the Year. [PS Docket No.: 13-87] [WT Docket No.: 96-86] [RM-11433]. received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6610. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Tohatchi, New Mexico) [MB Docket No.: 13-250] (RM-11705) received July 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6611. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Digital Television Table of Allotments (Seaford, Delaware and Dover, Delaware) [MB Docket No.: 13-40] (RM-11691) received July 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6612. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 21, 73, 74 and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Series in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands [WT Docket No.: 03-66] [RM-11614] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6613. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final

Policy on Interpretation of Phrase ''Significant Portion of Its Range'' in the Endangered Species Act's Definitions of ''Endangered Species'' and ''Threatened Species'' [DOC Docket No.: 110131072-4385-02] [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0031] (RIN: 1018-AX49; 0648-BA78) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6614. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yellow-Billed Parrot With Special Rule, and Correcting the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo Special Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0075]; [4500030115] (RIN: 1018-AY28) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6615. A letter from the Regulations Specialist; FWS-Office of Subsistence Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2014-15 and 2015-16 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2012-0104;FBMS#4500065668] (RIN: 1018-AY85) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6616. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Gulf of Mexico Hammerhead Shark Management Groups [Docket No.: 130402317-3966-02] (RIN: 0648-XD281) received June 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6617. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: San Francisco Independence Day Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0283) (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6618. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Celebrate The Amboys Fireworks; Raritan Bay, Perth Amboy, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6619. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Freeport Chamber of Commerce Fireworks Display; South Oyster Bay; Freeport, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0240] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6620. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0501] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6621. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Summer Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0476] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6622. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0522] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6623. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bullhead City River Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0359] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6624. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Tennessee River, Mile 256.0 to 257.5; Florence, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0277] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6625. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0160] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6626. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Water Ski Show, Fox River, Green Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0536] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6627. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0377] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6628. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Menominee Fireworks; Green Bay, Menominee, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0539] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6629. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0482; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-17290; AD 2012-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6630. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0724; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-17299; AD 2012-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6631. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0416; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-17303; AD 2012-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6632. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — The New York North Shore Helicopter Route [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0302; Amdt. No. 93-97] (RIN: 2120-AJ75) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6633. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1419; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-281-AD; Amendment 39-17297; AD 2012-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6634. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0036, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC09) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6635. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Signal Systems Reporting Requirements [Docket No.: FRA-2012-0104, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC44) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6636. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0063 (HM-250)] (RIN: 2137-AE38) received July 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6637. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting by Passport Applicants [TD 9679] (RIN: 1545-AJ93) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6638. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — IRS Truncated Taxpayer Identification Numbers [TD 9675] (RIN: 1545-BJ16) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6639. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2014-0034] (RIN: 0960-AH67) received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 5203. A bill to enhance the operation of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5204. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to improve recreation opportunities and increase consistency and accountability in the collection and expenditure of recreation fees collected on public lands and forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5205. A bill to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAYSON (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5206. A bill to allow Foreign Service and other executive agency employees to designate beneficiaries of their death benefits; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5207. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the John P. Parker House in Ripley, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5208. A bill to make technical corrections to the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 5209. A bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5210. A bill to prohibit providing Federal funds for the National Endowment for the Humanities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5211. A bill to amend section 811 of Public Law 111-84 to apply that section to all contractors for all sole-source contracts exceeding $20,000,000; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 687. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the President's responsibility to address the border crisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BASS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HALL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 688. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in poor countries have access to vaccines and immunization through the GAVI Alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 689. A resolution supporting an end to the ethnic and politically fueled violence in South Sudan and the successful implementation of a transitional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 690. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 691. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

289. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution No. 1256 honoring the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PETE P. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 148: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 292: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 303: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 404: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 411: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 460: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 494: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 517: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 519: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 595: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 628: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 647: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 792: Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 847: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 956: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1070: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1150: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1226: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1478: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1518: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1652: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1666: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1733: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1812: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1861: Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 1943: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1953: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1975: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1976: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2028: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2313: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2366: Mr. STEWART, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DENT, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BARBER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2453: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2457: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2529: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2536: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2594: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2654: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2656: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2673: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2738: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2761: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2780: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2835: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2917: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2959: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2996: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3155: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3333: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 3456: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3465: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3489: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3560: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3662: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3670: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3680: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3708: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3747: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3775: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3782: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 3991: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4137: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4148: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4158: Mr. REED and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4188: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4190: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4227: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4240: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4319: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4370: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4430: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4515: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4577: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4578: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4582: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4618: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4626: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4674: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4682: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4740: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4741: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4771: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4793: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4814: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4815: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4818: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4828: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4829: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 4853: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 4878: Mr. LONG and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4886: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4888: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4916: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4920: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4948: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4960: Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4964: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4966: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4979: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4989: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5005: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5007: Ms. KUSTER and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 5024: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5041: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 5043: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5044: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5052: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 5059: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5060: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5062: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5069: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 5071: Mr. NUNES and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 5083: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5086: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5088: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5094: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5114: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5126: Mr. POCAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5127: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5128: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5129: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5156: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 5159: Ms. CHU and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 5160: Mr. YOHO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5182: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5200: Ms. MATSUI.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. BARR.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.J. Res. 119: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Con. Res. 107: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 208: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 281: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 431: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H. Res. 522: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Res. 587: Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 620: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 640: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Res. 644: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 667: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 679: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3486: Mr. MEADOWS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

90. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Springfield, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 5836 supporting the Youth PROMISE Act (H.R. 1318 and S. 1307); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

91. Also, a petition of the City of Napoleon, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 041-14 urging state legislators to reject HB 5 and Senate Bill 282; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. Also, a petition of the California State Lands Commission, California, relative to a resolution opposing the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act (S. 2094); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 10 by Mr. PETERS on H.R. 3992: Jim Cooper, Gene Green, Bill Foster, Mike Thompson, Alan Grayson, John Conyers, Jr., Raúl M. Grijalva, Richard E. Neal, Michael F. Doyle, Brad Sherman, David Scott, Filemon Vela, Tulsi Gabbard, David Loebsack, Corrine Brown, John Barrow, Ed Pastor, Sean Patrick Maloney, Terri A. Sewell, Colleen W. Hanabusa, John C. Carney, Jr., and Eliot L. Engel.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROUND LAKE AREA PARK DISTRICT

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor the Round Lake Area Park District, and to commemorate its 40th Anniversary. For four decades, the Round Lake Area Park District has been an integral part of the surrounding community, providing unique recreational and environmental opportunities as well as important support programs and services.

In March 1974, members of the Round Lake, Round Lake Beach, Round Lake Heights, Round Lake Park and Hainesville communities banded together to create the Round Lake Park District. In the forty years that followed, the Round Lake Park District has expanded dramatically, increasingly assuming more land, constructing new facilities and providing a greater number of programs and recreational opportunities.

Along with the public parks, golf courses and green spaces, the Round Lake Area Park District offers a tremendous amount of services and opportunities that reflect the values of our communities. In the 1980s, the park district expanded recreational services to individuals with disabilities. In the 1990s, it created facilities to promote the importance of environmental sustainability. In the 2000s, it increased the resources and programs available to local teens, and established the Huebner Fishery Management Foundation.

For forty years, the Round Lake Park District has been a tremendous source of pride for the Round Lake area, fostering a profound sense of community, harmony and cultural understanding. I am confident that it will continue to serve this vital purpose for decades to come.

IN HONOR OF STARR SEIP'S PROMOTION TO COLONEL IN THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL GUARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Starr Seip of Pine Grove, Pennsylvania, on her promotion to Colonel in the U.S. National Guard, for which a ceremony will occur tomorrow, July 26.

LTC Seip has served our country honorably, having been assigned to the 28th Division Support Command (DISCOM) in the International Zone of Baghdad at the Embassy of the United States during Operation Iraqi Freedom. In preparation for that military assignment, LTC Seip left home for training at Fort Dix in New Jersey on Mother's Day 2006. Upon the completion of her training, she returned home for a brief period before leaving for Iraq on Memorial Day 2006.

Additionally, LTC Seip served as the mayor of the Ocean Cliff section of Baghdad and had an integral role in the preparation of the mass casualty plan for the Embassy. LTC Seip's deployment ended on July 14, 2007 and, upon her return, she was greeted on the Pennsylvania House Floor along with her colleague Captain Cara Walters.

LTC Seip is the youngest of 5 children born to Frank and Patricia Dubbs. She is married to Tim Seip and is mother to Elisa Seip. LTC Seip's current assignment is to be the Deputy Commander for the 28th Division Medical Detachment.

On behalf of all of the citizens of Pennsylvania's 17th Congressional District, I offer my thanks for impressive and dedicated service in the defense of our country, I congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Seip on her promotion, and ask all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring our invaluable service members like Starr Seip.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 406, I was unable to get back in time to vote because my daughter was very ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING HEAVENLY ANGELS DAYCARE CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center.

The Heavenly Angels Daycare Center opened on August 8, 2006 with Mrs. Emma Bell as owner and director, in Port Gibson, Claiborne County, Mississippi on Church St.

Mrs. Bell loves children and started Heavenly Angels Daycare Center with 8 enrolled from 6 months to 3 years old. She also had an After School Program with 6 children up to 12 years old.

Through the years, the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has grown and in 2008 a Pre-K Center was included to better equip children who started in the center to be able to successfully start 1st grade.

Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has been progressing for 8 years with a current full capacity of 87 children, who are enjoying the process of learning and the After School Program has 27 children.

Mrs. Bell, because of her hard and diligent work at Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has received a trophy honoring her as Businesswoman of the Year.

Mrs. Bell has been married for 25 years to a husband that loves and supports her. They have 5 children: 4 boys and 1 daughter, Janice, who has worked with Heavenly Angels Daycare Center since its opening and graduated from Jackson State University with a Business Degree.

Heavenly Angels Daycare Center's slogan is: To look, listen and learn and every child succeeds. Mrs. Bell stated that "When they come through our doors, we make sure that they get the learning that they need. They all are smart children."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center for caring and educating children.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC).

LSC was established by Congress in 1974 to provide civil legal aid to millions of Americans who would otherwise be unable to afford it. Congress gave the Corporation the mission of ensuring equal access to justice for all Americans, and the Corporation has worked tirelessly to achieve that goal. With nearly 800 offices serving every Congressional district and U.S. territory, LSC offers support to mothers trying to obtain child support, veterans seeking the benefits they earned, and to many other individuals facing an array of issues.

It is noteworthy that three out of four legal aid clients are women, and domestic violence is one of the top issues LSC clients face. Without the efforts of legal counsel from LSC, victims across the country would have no way to seek legal recourse for domestic disputes, enforcing child support payments, or maintaining custody of their children.

In addition, during Superstorm Sandy, when thousands of Americans had their homes and belongings damaged, LSC provided storm-related services to low-income victims to assist in filing claims with insurance companies and help retrieve documents such as insurance

and mortgage paperwork that had been lost or damaged in the storm.

Mr. Speaker, every American, regardless of wealth, deserves quality representation before the courts. The work that LSC does to ensure that those most in need receive legal counsel and due process before the courts is invaluable. I am proud to recognize the Legal Services Corporation and LSC-funded attorneys for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who desperately need their counsel. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring their tremendous accomplishments.

ENDING GLOBAL CORRUPTION

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Judge Mark L. Wolf in the July 23rd Washington Post. Entitled ''Ending Global Corruption,'' the article describes the adverse effect that grand corruption by high officials has not just on matters of governance, but on the basic human rights of a nation's citizens Judge Wolf proposes establishing an international court on corruption as a possible solution. This is a proposal that merits our close attention and investigation. We must find better means to address massive corruption, and the impunity and human rights abuses required to sustain it. I submit the article in its entirety.

ENDING GLOBAL CORRUPTION

(By Mark L. Wolf)

It was hard to miss Daria at the World Forum on Governance in Prague in April. The 28-year-old lawyer and mother from Kiev was wearing a ''Ukraine: [expletive] Corruption'' T-shirt. Such a frank message was understandable. Indignation at ''grand corruption''—the abuse of public office for personal profit by a nation's leaders—inspired Daria and many others to risk their lives in the Maidan protests that toppled President Viktor Yanukovych in February.

In too many nations, corruption is endemic at the highest levels of government. Then-U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan was correct in characterizing such behavior as an ''insidious plague'' in his 2003 statement upon the adoption of the U.N. Convention Against Corruption.

Corruption is extraordinarily costly, consuming more than 5 percent of the global gross domestic product. Developing regions lose more than 10 times in illicit financial flows than what they receive in foreign aid. Russia's corruption-fueled ''shadow economy'' makes up an estimated 44 percent of its GDP.

Corrupt governments also often provide havens for international criminals, including drug lords in Mexico and terrorists in countries such as Afghanistan and Yemen.

Nevertheless, the most serious consequence of grand corruption is that it destroys democracy and devastates the human rights that governments are constituted to protect. Countries recognized as among the world's most corrupt—including Somalia, Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq and Syria—repeatedly violate the human rights of their citizens. The poor and powerless are victims of corrupt regimes throughout the world.

As Ukraine and Egypt exemplify, opposition to grand corruption is destabilizing many countries and, indeed, the world. International efforts to combat grand corruption have obviously been inadequate. Similar circumstances concerning the evils of genocide and other intolerable human rights abuses led to the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002. An International Anti-Corruption Court (IACC) is now equally necessary.

Grand corruption depends on the culture of impunity that exists in many nations. An IACC would provide an alternative and effective forum for the enforcement of the laws criminalizing grand corruption that exist in virtually every country, while giving force to the requirements of treaties such as the U.N. Convention Against Corruption and the obligations of organizations such as the World Trade Organization. Like the ICC, an IACC would operate on the principle of complementarity, meaning that only officials from those countries unable or unwilling to prosecute grand corruption properly would be subject to prosecution. This would give many nations a significant incentive to strengthen and demonstrate their capacity to combat grand corruption.

An IACC would be comparable to the approach that has served the United States well. In the United States, we do not depend on elected state prosecutors to address corruption by state and local officials because such prosecutors are often part of the political establishment they would be called upon to police and, in any event, generally lack the necessary legal authority and resources. Instead, we rely primarily on federal investigators, prosecutors and courts to deal with corrupt state and local officials.

Similarly, an IACC would employ an elite corps of investigators expert at unraveling complex financial transactions and prosecutors experienced in preparing and presenting complicated cases. It would also include experienced, impartial international judges.

The IACC's impact would be enhanced if, like federal courts in the United States, it were also empowered to hear civil fraud and corruption cases. An international ''whistleblower'' statute enforceable at the IACC would increase the resources that would be devoted to combating fraud and corruption and enhance the potential for restitution for victims.

Notably, an IACC should have strong support from the United States. U.S. companies generally behave ethically and, in addition, are significantly deterred from paying bribes by the threat of prosecution for violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. They would benefit from the more level playing field an IACC would create.

Finally, an IACC would provide the potential for more effective prosecution and punishment of corrupt officials who commonly abuse human rights. Fraud, corruption and associated money laundering can often be proved based on documentary evidence, which is easier to acquire than eyewitness testimony of victims of human rights abuses, who are unlikely to have knowledge of the criminal responsibility of their nation's leaders.

There are practical impediments to establishing an International Anti-Corruption Court and principled concerns to be addressed. But the status quo is intolerable. An IACC could erode the widespread culture of impunity, contribute to creating conditions conducive to the democratic election of honest officials in countries with a history of grand corruption and honor the courageous efforts of the many people, like Daria, who are exposing and opposing corruption at great personal peril.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,599,231,161,990.50. We've added $6,972,354,113,077.42 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, I was unable to get back in time to vote due to my daughter being very ill.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

THE CHICAGO DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF OLDER PERSONS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Marshall Law School in Chicago for spearheading a critical discussion about the needs and rights of older persons. Along with Roosevelt University in Chicago, John Marshall Law School has led the drafting of a model international convention to provide legal protections and guarantee human rights for older people. That model convention, the Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons, will be presented on August 1 before the 5th Session of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing at the United Nations.

According to Ralph Ruebner, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at John Marshall and a leader of the effort, ''It is vital that the world's aging citizens receive comprehensive legal protections and support under international law. This proposed convention will go a long way in helping achieve this.'' The drafting of the document involved months of work by experts and advocates in Chicago and from around the world, including Australia, Canada, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Paraguay, and United Kingdom.

On July 10 & 11, 2014, the 21st Belle R. and Joseph H. Braun Memorial Symposium

hosted by John Marshall Law School, together with East China University of Political Science and Law and Roosevelt University, brought elder law and policy experts from around the world to Chicago to discuss issues from social protection and income security to fighting elder abuse to health care and caregiving.

As co-chair of the House Democratic Caucus Seniors Task Force, I work hard every day to ensure that older Americans can remain productive, participate in their communities, and age with dignity. I also know the importance of ensuring that ageism and other forms of discrimination are addressed and that legal rights are incorporated within a comprehensive framework. The Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons embodies those concepts, and I hope that next week's meeting in New York furthers movement toward an international convention.

To give a sense of the importance and scope of this initiative, I am including Article 1, Purpose and Core Principles, and Article 2, Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Older Persons. I encourage my colleagues to read them, learn more about the Chicago Declaration, and join in the fight to promote the rights of older Americans.

The following are excerpts from the Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons.

ARTICLE 1—PURPOSE AND CORE PRINCIPLES

(a) The purpose of this Declaration is to provide, advance, and promote a basis for the development of a convention on the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by older persons, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity.

(b) The principles recognized by this Declaration are:

1. Respect for inherent dignity;

2. Respect for individual autonomy, including the freedom to make one's own choices;

3. Respect for the independence and capabilities of older persons;

4. Respect for interdependence and caring relationships;

5. Respect for non-discrimination and equality under law;

6. Respect for family relationships and intergenerational solidarity;

7. Respect for full and effective participation and inclusion in society;

8. Respect for and recognition of older persons as part of human and cultural diversity; and

9. Respect for aging as an integral and continuous part of life.

ARTICLE 2—HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS OF OLDER PERSONS

Older persons have the following rights and nothing in this Declaration diminishes any greater rights granted to them that may be contained in local, national, regional, or international law.

(a) Equality, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity: Discrimination against older persons on the basis of age is prohibited.

(b) Quality of Life

1. Older persons have the right to the effective enjoyment of the right to life, to live with dignity in old age, and to make decisions about the quality of their lives.

2. Older persons have the right to support in making decisions regarding their present and future circumstances.

(c) Liberty

1. Older persons have a right to liberty and security of person.

2. Old age should never justify a deprivation of liberty.

3. Older persons have the right to personal mobility with the greatest possible independence.

4. Older persons have the right to liberty of movement, freedom to choose their residence, and the right to a nationality.

(d) Equality Before the Law

1. Older persons have the right to equality before the law.

2. Older persons have the right to access to justice on an equal basis with others.

3. Older persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection and equal benefits of the law.

4. Denial of legal capacity on the basis of old age is prohibited.

5. Older persons have the right to assistance and support in the exercise of their legal capacity.

(e) Health and Long Term Care

1. Older persons have the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and long term care without discrimination on the basis of age, including access to public health, preventive medicine, palliative care, and rehabilitation.

2. Older persons have the right to the benefits of scientific progress and health and long term care related research.

3. Older persons have the right to self-determination in health and long term care related matters and to make such decisions based on informed consent.

4. Older persons have the right to dignity, privacy, and autonomy in making health and long term care related decisions.

5. Older persons have the right to express their wishes and preferences regarding future health and long term care related decisions and to have those expressions respected.

6. Older persons have the right to assistance and support in receiving, understanding, and processing information in making informed health and long term care related decisions.

(f) Adequate Standard of Living: Older persons have the right to an adequate standard of living, including the right to food, water, clothing, and housing, and to improve their living conditions without discrimination on the basis of age.

(g) Housing

1. Older persons have the right to adequate housing.

2. Older persons have the right to choose on an equal basis with others their place of residence, the persons with whom they may live, and they are not obliged to live in any particular living arrangement.

3. Older persons have the right to security of tenure free from disproportionate interference.

(h) Living Independently and Being Included in the Community

1. Older persons have the right to live independently and to make choices to facilitate their full inclusion and participation in the community.

2. Older persons have the right to access and choose a range of in-home formal or informal care and other community support services. This includes personal assistance necessary to support independent living and inclusion in the community and to prevent isolation or segregation from the community.

3. Older persons have the right to community services and facilities that are responsive to their needs.

4. Older persons have the right to participate fully in all aspects of life, including equal access to the physical environment, transportation, information, communications, technology, and other facilities and services open to the public.

(i) Education: Older persons have the right to education, training, and life-long learning without discrimination.

(j) Work and Employment

1. Older persons have the right to work, including the right to participate in a workforce that is open, inclusive, and accessible to persons of all ages.

2. Mandatory retirement based on age is prohibited.

(k) Land and Other Property

1. Older persons have the following rights without discrimination on the basis of age or gender: to use, own, transfer, inherit, and participate in the redistribution of land and other property.

2. Older persons have the right to exercise self-determination with respect to their property and the right not to be arbitrarily or unlawfully deprived of their property.

(l) Freedom from Torture or Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: Older persons have the right to be free from torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(m) Freedom from Exploitation, Concealment, Violence, Abuse, and Neglect

1. Older persons have a right to be free from all forms of exploitation, concealment, violence, abuse, and neglect.

2. Older persons have the right to recovery and reintegration when exploitation, concealment, violence, abuse, or neglect is committed against them.

3. Older persons have the right to recovery and reintegration in an environment that fosters dignity, health, well-being, self-respect, and autonomy, and is sensitive to self-identification and personhood.

4. Older persons have the right to be free from medical abuse, including nonconsensual treatment, medication, experimentation, and hospitalization.

5. Older persons may not be denied medical treatment or have medical treatment limited on the basis of age.

(n) Freedom of Expression and Access to Information: Older persons have the right to freedom of expression and opinion, including, the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas on an equal basis with others and through all forms of communication of their choice.

(o) Freedom of Association: Older persons have the right to freedom of association and to create their own associations.

(p) Respect for Privacy: Older persons have the right to privacy, in all aspects of their lives, including, in their home, family life, communications, intimacy, health, and financial matters.

(q) Social Protection: Older persons have the right to social protection, including income security, without discrimination on the basis of age or gender.

(r) Participation in Social, Political, and Cultural Life

1. Older persons have the right to participate in cultural life, recreation, leisure, and sport.

2. Older persons have the right to exercise political rights, including the right to vote, stand for office, and participate in the political process.

(s) Right to Assistance: Older persons have the right to assistance in exercising the rights in this Declaration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast roll call votes on the afternoon of July 23, 2014. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall 442, Ordering the Previous Question during consideration of H. Res. 680, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall 443, on H. Res. 680, the rule to consider H.R. 3393, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall 444, on the Kilmer of Washington Part B Amendment ''no.'' 2 to H.R. 4984, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall 445, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 4984, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall 446, on passing H.R. 4984, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall 447, on passing H.R. 5111, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall 448, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 3393, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall 449, on passing H.R. 3393, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall 450, on the Motion to Instruct Conferees on considering H.R. 3230, I would have voted ''yes.''

HONORING MOUNT ZION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church Canton, Mississippi.

The population of Madison County, Mississippi has been predominantly African-American since 1840. Prior to 1865, some members of the African-American population, most of whom had arrived in the county as slaves, were permitted to attend worship services, to be baptized and to be married in the area churches. They were also allowed to join established white congregations.

Early county records indicate that slaves were a part of the church communities. The Old Madison Presbyterian Church, the First Presbyterian, and the First Baptist listed a total membership of one hundred and thirty-four. One hundred were slaves and the other thirty-four were whites.

After the Civil War and freedom, African-Americans naturally desired to establish their own houses of worship. In 1865, the newly freed members of the congregation of First Baptist, with encouragement and financial assistance from their white counterparts, organized Mount Zion Baptist Church. Rev. T. J. Drane, pastor of the white church, served as minister receiving for his services a monthly salary of one dollar.

In 1870, Drane and R. B. Johnson donated two acres of land on the northern boundary of the plantation to Mount Zion. The first church was erected on Freedman Hill, located at the corner of North Railroad and Bowman Streets, according to the 1898 George and Dunlap map of Canton. Rev. Drane called for a meeting with council along with Mr. Will Powell from the white Baptist Church to help establish the church.

In addition to serving as pastor, Rev. Drane ran a day school and was assisted by Lillian Highgate, a white female. Rev. Drane received an additional $1.50 a month for his services. He also organized and maintained the first Sunday school class. All other organizations came into existence after Rev. Drane's resignation. Rev. Jordan Williams replaced him.

Newspapers frequently carried announcements concerning Mount Zion's activities. For example, ''Several converts at the Colored Baptist Church were baptized at the railroad culvert,'' or ''Rev. Williams, pastor of the Colored Baptist Church, immersed ten converts last Sunday night''. The second church site was across the street where the TWL parking lot is now located.

The third and fourth pastors were Reverends Mass and Davis. The fifth pastor, Rev. R.T. Sims, served for eighteen years and Rev. W. L. Varnado for seven. The seventh through the tenth pastors were as follows: Rev. Bradley, Rev. Morris, Rev. Drew, and Rev. A. D. Purnell.

By the 1920's, the congregation had outgrown the church and Rev. Purnell, along with members, began raising money for a larger building. The new lot for our present church was purchased from Jack Warren. Rev. Purnell asked Mr. S. M. Reddrick, Vice President of Madison County Bank, to serve as custodian over the church's building funds. He also asked if he would direct the building of the church and issue bonds to underwrite construction costs.

The bank issue $14,000 in bonds. Raymond H. Spencer was the architect of the neoclassical brick structure. He also designed the First Methodist Church of which Reddick was a member. The building was erected in 1929 at the cost of $35,000. The congregation moved into the new structure February 1930.

Rev. P. F. Parker, the eleventh pastor, with the help of God and members, burned the mortgage. Under his leadership the church grew. For example, the following organizations played an active role in missionary work: Senior Missionary Society, Junior Matrons, Young Woman's Auxiliary, Red Circle/Sunshine Band, Sunday school, Baptist Training Union, Senior Choir, Gospel Chorus, Junior/Beginner's Choir, New Membership Club, Pastor's Aide, Boys' Bible Club and Usher Board. Rev. Parker served until his death in 1970.

Mount Zion continued to serve the African-American community religiously and socially. During the summer of 1964, Mount Zion was the location of a pivotal moment in our state's civil rights struggle. In her autobiography, Coming of Age in Mississippi, Ann Moody notes that Mount Zion was the biggest Negro church in Canton and the center of the local marches.

On Friday, May 29, 1964, on the church lawn, six hundred community and church members witnessed the near death beating of McKinley Hamilton, a young African-American man. As a result, eighty church members marched on the Madison County jail in one of the first protest marches in Canton. Mount Zion became known as the ''Church of Refuge''. In 1968, twelve hundred students from Rogers High School marched because they were outraged over the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. A group of parents led them to Mount Zion. Rev. Parker opened the doors of the church to them, thus saving them from injury by law enforcement officers waiting for them on Hickory Street in front of High's Funeral Home.

Dr. W. L. Johnson, our twelfth and present pastor, has served for twenty-nine years. His words have power through the Holy Spirit. Under Dr. Johnson's leadership, the church has continued its growth. For example, the church has been air-conditioned, carpeted throughout, a fellowship hall and recreation center built and equipped, four parking lots purchased and surfaced, restrooms were remodeled, a lounge installed, pews padded, a new intercom system purchased, speakers installed in the pulpit and choir loft, additional chairs purchased for the choir and seating areas in the wings, two new copiers, a computer, storage room, and a fifteen passenger van and twenty-seven passenger bus were also purchased. The stained glass windows were repaired, and the pastor study was moved upstairs.

We now have a summer recreation program Our membership is approximately 500 and still growing. The church is one of the most monumental, intact, and historic resources associated with the Canton African-American Community. As a result of this, the church was recently placed on the registry of Historical Buildings.

Our aim is to give every God-seeking person an opportunity to receive salvation. The church clearly reflects the importance of the social and religious life of the African-American community from its birth in 1865 up to the present. Let us resolve to make service to Christ a priority in our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNUAL BRONX DOMINICAN DAY PARADE

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Bronx Dominican Day Parade (La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx) which will take place on Sunday, July 27th, 2014. This is the 25th year of this important community event, which celebrates the heritage and culture of the Dominican community in New York City. It is one that is eagerly anticipated by the Dominican and Bronx communities each year.

As the second largest Latino community in New York City, Dominicans have made invaluable contributions to New York City, and to the Bronx in particular. While Northern Manhattan is perhaps best known for their large Dominican community, I am proud to say that Census Bureau statistics now show that the Bronx

is home to the largest Dominican community in New York City. And I am even prouder to represent a community that has enriched our borough with a unique culture, spirit, and drive to live the American Dream.

The Dominican community is an important part of the diverse tapestry that makes up New York City. Thousands of Dominican professionals and students have served as community leaders in the Bronx in many different areas, including government, law, media, science, and technology, and sports, among many other fields. Their contributions to the culture and success of the Bronx, New York City, and to the United States is worthy of celebration and immense pride.

The Bronx Dominican Day Parade is an exceptional event that brings together the diversity of New York City, where Dominicans and those of other heritages can gather to celebrate the successes and identity of one of the city's most important communities. The parade was created to honor the vibrant Dominican community in the Bronx, and Felipe Febles and Rosa Ayala, the parade's organizers, have worked hard to make the event the extraordinary celebration that it is today. The strong sense of unity that the parade brings to the Bronx is immeasurably important. As a Bronxite and New Yorker, I am delighted to see this event grow every year, and I am honored to march alongside the accomplished Dominican men and women in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I always look forward to this fantastic community event, and I am excited to marching in the twenty-fifth annual Bronx Dominican Day Parade on Sunday. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing this important occasion, and I am confident that this event will continue to be a landmark celebration for both the Dominican and Bronx communities for many years to come.

JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY POLICE OFFICER MELVIN SANTIAGO

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when danger occurs, when disaster happens, when 911 is called, it is the first responders who heed the emergencies.

While most of us flee danger, the men and women who are the thin blue line head toward danger.

They are America's finest.

They are the peace officers.

Officer Melvin Santiago was just 23 when he was gunned down and assassinated for sport by a fugitive, an outlaw.

Santiago was going about his duties as a Jersey City, New Jersey police officer responding to a disturbance at a local drugstore.

When he arrived he was shot multiple times before even exiting his patrol car.

The name of the cold blooded killer who murdered rookie Jersey City police officer, Melvin Santiago shall not be mentioned.

This cowardly murderer thought he would become famous by killing a cop.

The gunman was lying in wait to murder a peace officer.

The criminal was killed by police.

He has gone to meet his Maker.

I doubt the meeting will be pleasant.

Officer Santiago wanted to fight crime and protect the citizens in the toughest neighborhoods.

He wanted to make a difference.

The west section of the city was where he thought he could do that best.

This was not just a job for Officer Santiago; it was a goal he had worked toward.

He excelled in his entrance exam with a score of 98.

This first responder wanted to be like his Uncle Frank, a retired detective.

Santiago looked up to his uncle and often sought his advice.

Officer Santiago graduated from the police academy in December, patrolling the area that he knew he could help turn around, when his life was stolen from him by a worthless criminal.

Law enforcement officers are a special kind.

They put their lives on the line every single day to ensure the safety of their communities.

There aren't many other professions where a person willingly puts themselves at risk on a daily basis in order to protect others.

Mr. Speaker, as a former prosecutor and criminal court judge in Texas for over 25 years, I have known a lot of men and women who have worn the badge—the shield—or the star over their heart.

These are symbols of their willingness to put our safety above theirs.

Unfortunately, I have known and attended funerals of first responders like Santiago who gave their lives in an effort to make our communities safer.

We as a society should never forget the true sacrifice first responders and their families make for our nation.

Officer Santiago went above and beyond to make his hometown of Jersey City, the state of New Jersey, and his country a better place.

Over a thousand officers joined Officer Santiago's family and friends to honor his life and lay him to rest on July 18th, where he was posthumously promoted to detective and given the Jersey City Police Department Medal of Honor.

In his short time on the squad, he quickly gained the respect of many.

We remember his hard work and commitment to family and community.

I commend Detective Melvin Santiago for his service to the people of New Jersey.

Our thoughts and prayer are with Jersey City Detective Melvin Santiago's family, the local peace officers, and the community of Jersey City.

Peace officers stand between the law and the lawless.

Peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens.

Mr. Speaker, peace officers are a rare breed.

Melvin Santiago was one of those individuals.

General George Patton said it quite appropriately when talking about his young troops killed in battle: While we mourn the loss of these men. We should thank the Good Lord that such men ever lived.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF STEPHEN BERO AND HIS OUTSTANDING IMPACT IN THE WARREN-NEWPORT COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor Stephen Bero, an exceptional public servant who, for more than 20 years, worked in library administration and for the last nearly 10 served years as the Executive Director of the Warren-Newport Public Library District (WNPLD) in Gurnee, IL.

When Steve formally retires at the end of July, he will complete what has been a truly remarkable career in service to his community. During his tenure as Executive Director, Steve presided over the WNPLD during a period of remarkable growth and financial stability. Steve successfully shepherded an $8.7 million expansion and renovation project, securing a AA+ bond rating from Standard & Poor's as well as favorable financing options that made the project possible.

In addition to his many noteworthy financial accomplishments, Steve fostered an incredibly positive environment at the library that earned the recognition and appreciation of his colleagues and the surrounding community. Steve's colleagues noted his successful leadership during the construction, along with his decision to reinstate the Youth Services department.

Under Steve's stewardship, WNPLD has become one of the most popular public libraries in all of Lake County.

In a fitting conclusion to Steve's tenure at WNLPD, the Illinois Library Association named him the 2014 Librarian of the Year. The entire Warren-Newport community is lucky to have enjoyed Steve Bero's service.

IN TRIBUTE TO JENNY CONTOIS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep gratitude to pay tribute to a colleague, a friend, and a trusted deputy, Jenny Contois, who retired last month after serving seven and half years as my District Director in Connecticut's Second District.

Even more than a traditional District Director for a Member of the House, I considered Jenny to be a Co-Member of Congress. Whenever I was called to Washington for legislative duty, I had unshakable confidence in Jenny's abilities to handle all challenges in Connecticut. Jenny's executive experience, honed over 15 years as First Selectwoman of Colchester prepared her to lead my Connecticut office and to expand her area of responsibility from one town to 64 towns of the Second District.

Jenny combined a passionate commitment to public service with an unshakable determination to solve problems that lay before her. When it came to finding a loan for a struggling small business, securing a rural development grant for a town in need, badgering a recalcitrant federal agency to fulfill a previous obligation, or begging and borrowing to get an Army Corps boat to dredge a coastal harbor, Jenny's tenacity was unparalleled and her success rate unmatched.

At no time did Jenny shine brighter than during a crisis. Whether in the aftermath of a winter storm that left residential and commercial power lines down or in the wake of a summer storm that brought extensive flooding to our shores, Jenny rose to the challenge time and time again. Immediately after a blizzard or tempest hit, Jenny would work by my side to rally fellow municipal leaders and emergency responders to expedite the assessment and repairs. After the storms subsided, she worked painstakingly with families and businesses to help them secure the recovery funds and assistance they so desperately needed.

She accomplished all of this with a winning smile and a hearty laugh. By the time that her seven and a half years as District Director had concluded, Jenny in many ways had evolved from the First Selectwoman of Colchester to the First Selectwoman of eastern Connecticut.

This weekend, Jenny's many colleagues, friends, and family will celebrate her service to the Second District of Connecticut at a gathering in her hometown. Jenny will spend her duly earned retirement with her beloved husband Frank, her daughter Amy, and her latest arrival, her grandson Jack.

I will miss Jenny's day-to-day counsel and friendship in the future, but I am heartened and grateful to remember her invaluable assistance in launching my new office almost eight years ago and achieving the success we had together.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting one of eastern Connecticut's finest, Jenny Contois.

ISRAEL HAS THE RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, Hamas, which was designated as a terrorist organization by the United States under President Bill Clinton, has a history of using schools, hospitals, and civilian areas as staging grounds and launch sites for their attacks against Israel. They have also built a network of tunnels under those locations to facilitate the movement of soldiers and weapons for use against Israel. When Israel responds to these attacks by specifically targeting the missile launchers, Hamas uses human shields—many times children—as propaganda tools. The civilized world should be horrified at such tactics by Hamas and condemn them absolutely.

Just recently, I cosponsored a resolution that reaffirms Israel's right to defend itself, and I would note that they have shown incredible restraint in fighting back. They give ample warning prior to an attack, advising all innocent parties to flee. In truth, if Israel were as indiscriminate as Hamas and used all the military might at their disposal, Gaza would be a smoking wasteland within hours. That this has not happened is testament to Israel's care in targeting only areas that have been used as attack launch points. The United States must speak with one voice on this issue and stand with our strong ally Israel.

HONORING JUDGE IVORY E. BRITTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Ivory Britton, a Justice Court Judge of District 2, who is a native Jacksonian.

Judge Britton was reared on Tougaloo Street in the Virden Addition Community.

Judge Britton attended Brinkley Elementary School, which is now Walton Elementary School, and graduated from Brinkley High School. He attended: the University of Judicial Court, National Judicial College, Reno, NV, National Judges Association, American Judges Association, and National Center for State Courts.

As a Justice Court Judge, Britton works hard to ensure fair and equal treatment for all litigants of his court. He has increased his knowledge of the judicial process to enable citizens to easily use the Justice Court System. Judge Britton will continue to be fair and accessible to all citizens and be knowledgeable and obedient to the laws of The State of Mississippi.

Judge Britton is married to Liza Britton and they have three children: Perry, Dexter and Tabathia. He is a member of Cade Chapel M. B. Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Judge Ivory E. Britton.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed one vote on July 24. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 449, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, I would have voted ''aye.''

HONORING MS. LUCY COFFEY, AMERICA'S OLDEST LIVING FEMALE VETERAN

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor America's oldest living female veteran, Ms. Lucy Coffey of San Antonio, TX.

Ms. Coffey, who is 108 years old and lives in my Congressional district, is in Washington today and tomorrow to visit the WWII Memorial, the Women's Veterans Memorial and Arlington Cemetery.

Ms. Coffey served honorably in the Women's Army Corps during WWII. Serving mainly in the Pacific theater, she was awarded two Bronze Stars for valor. After the war, she continued serving her country, working at Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio for twenty years until retiring in the early seventies.

The United States is stronger today because of the sacrifices all our veterans have made. And Ms. Coffey exemplifies what is best about our veterans and our great nation.

It is with great appreciation and admiration that today we recognize and honor Ms. Lucy Coffey.

HONORING DR. VINCENT HARDING

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Dr. Vincent Harding. Known throughout the country as a scholar, activist, father, friend and former speechwriter for Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King Jr., Dr. Harding has left an indelible mark on our national discourse. With his passing on May 19, 2014, we look to the outstanding quality of his life's work and the inspiring role he played in the Civil Rights Movement.

Born on July 25, 1931 in Harlem, New York, Dr. Vincent Harding began his education by attending New York public schools, graduating from Morris High School in 1948. After high school, he obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in History from the City College of New York, and in the following year, he graduated from Columbia University, earning a Master's degree in Journalism. Dr. Harding went on to serve our country in the United States Army from 1953 to 1955.

In 1958, Dr. Harding met Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. who urged him to move to the South to join in the Civil Rights Movement. Once in Atlanta, Dr. Harding and his wife, Rosemarie, founded the Mennonite House, an interracial service center and began engaging in a wide variety of social and political campaigns. Dr. Harding worked closely with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Student Nonviolent Coordination Committee to challenge segregation in the South.

As Dr. Martin Luther King's speechwriter, Dr. Vincent Harding drafted the famous and highly controversial speech, ''Beyond Vietnam: A Time to Break Silence.'' Dr. Vincent Harding was a strong opponent to the Vietnam War and, as Chair of the History and Sociology Department at Atlanta's Spelman College, Dr. Harding was concerned that students were not aware of the situation in Vietnam. He worked to ensure that students and other Americans were aware of the atrocities occurring during the war in Vietnam.

Dr. Vincent Harding founded the Veterans of Hope Project in 1997, which is a multifaceted

educational initiative encompassing the topics of religion, culture and participatory democracy. His work through Veterans of Hope emphasized the importance of nonviolence and a grass root approach to social change.

After the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968, Dr. Vincent Harding worked with Coretta Scott King to establish the King Center in Atlanta, serving as the Center's first director. In addition, Dr. Vincent Harding wrote several books reflecting on the Civil Rights Movement and Martin Luther King Jr., including ''Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero'' and ''Hope and History: Why We Must Share the Story of the Movement.'' Dr. Harding was deeply passionate about public service and impacted countless lives with his theology, activism and scholarly efforts. Dr. Harding once wrote that ''we are all a part of one another, and we are all part of the intention of the great creator spirit to continue being light and life.''

On a personal note, Dr. Harding was a loyal friend for over 30 years. During the late 1970's, I worked on Capitol Hill for Congressman Ron Dellums while raising two sons as a single parent. My sons wanted to attend the Penn Relays in Philadelphia, but we did not have a place to stay. A mutual friend called Vincent and Rosemarie to ask if we could stay with them. With no hesitation, they said yes, not knowing me and on short notice. I will always remember that weekend in their beautiful, warm home and their delicious meals. They treated us like family and our spirits connected. I did not see Vincent and Rosemarie again until the late 1990's when, as a Member of Congress, I attended a retreat in Santa Barbara sponsored by the Faith and Politics Institute. The Harding's led this retreat, which renewed my spirit, challenged my intellect and warmed my heart.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding Civil Rights leader and social activist, Dr. Vincent Harding. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the nation. I join all of Vincent's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIVISION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, July 20th marked the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus. At this time, the need for reunification becomes even more apparent.

Although negotiations between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots have been occurring since 2008, the two sides have been unable to reach an agreement that would reunite the country. Both sides must come to the table and discuss key status issues, including the right to return, future governance structures, and the citizenships status of Turkish settlers. As a member of the European Union, a united Cyprus can act as a stable and democratic strategic partner for the United States in a volatile region.

Unfortunately, while these unsuccessful negotiations have been taking place, many Greek Cypriots face continued discrimination and obstruction. A number of Greek Cypriots have been unable to return to their homes in northern Cyprus, and their property is often illegally confiscated and sold without their consent. They live in fear of the Turkish military troops that still occupy the island and are unable to determine the fate of those who have been missing since the 1974 division. Greek Cypriots are denied access to religious sites and a number of important sites have been looted and destroyed. The discovery of gas fields off the coast of the island has been complicated due to territorial disputes between the communities. It is unlikely these issues will be resolved unless a final resolution is agreed upon by both sides.

In February, with help from the United States, the negotiation proceeded when leaders of the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots reached an agreement regarding the language of the ''joint declaration,'' which identifies the goals both sides hoped to reach by the end of the negotiations. Negotiations have resumed since the ''joint declaration'' was established and must continue until there is a consensus on the final status of the island.

Vice President Joe Biden's visit to Cyprus in May underscored U.S. support for negotiations and the importance of Cyprus as a key partner in the region. The United States must uphold its commitment to helping the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots reach an agreement regarding the reunification of their country. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing continued support for the people of Cyprus as negotiations continue.

IRAQI CHRISTIANS DRIVEN OUT OF MOSUL

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, we have learned that radical militants—the Islamic State terror group ISIS—are systematically targeting Christians in Iraq.

Ten years ago, there were 60,000 Christians in the city of Mosul.

Today there are none.

Through violence, slaughter, and intimidation, the Christians have been murdered or driven out of the city—simply because they are Christians.

In a civilized world, we cannot let this stand.

The United States of America cannot and should not try to solve every world problem.

But when we withdraw completely, we leave a vacuum of leadership—and bad people will do bad things if given the opportunity.

I join with my colleagues in condemning these atrocious actions.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS DOUGHERTY

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the accomplishments and life of Dennis Dougherty who passed away last February at the age of 70. As his friends and loved ones gather to celebrate his life, he deserves our recognition as a distinguished veteran, businessman, community leader, advocate and philanthropist.

Dennis was dedicated to improving life for so many through both local and national politics as well as community organizations. He had a profound impact on countless lives, particularly on the young people of Colorado, and he was the recipient of numerous awards, including the 2005 Equality in Business Award from the Human Rights Campaign and the Matthew Shepard Foundation's Essential Peace Award.

Born in 1943 in Omaha, Nebraska, Dennis was drafted to fight in Vietnam at the age of 21. As a proud veteran and patriot, he led the charge for progress in the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender community, and his influence was a guiding force for public policy and opinion. He testified before Congress on the military's ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'' policy, and he mentored several young men who served in the armed forces.

Dennis relocated to Denver after his service in the military. He was the founder and CEO of the technology company Visual Electronics. His business success gave him the means to become a generous philanthropist, contributing to causes that ranged from disabled skiers to homeless youth. Moved by the story of Matthew Shepard, the gay college student who was tortured and killed near Laramie, Wyoming, Dennis became a major supporter and board member of the foundation started on Matthew's behalf. An unwavering and unapologetic voice in the community as an openly gay veteran, Dennis wanted to fight against the challenges he faced in his youth.

Dennis had a heart of gold. Every year he cleaned out his closet to donate to an organization that helped homeless vets get back on their feet. He always felt that a good suit gave them a better shot at a new start. In each jacket he put a note that read ''someone loves you.''

I am one of those lucky enough to call Dennis a friend as well. I know and have worked with numerous others who were touched by Dennis' efforts or encouragement in some way, and many have gone on to do great things for our community. I have fond memories of the times he and I rode together in his pride and joy—his red convertible—in Denver parades.

Please join me in paying tribute to the life of Dennis Dougherty. Every day he fought to expand opportunity, equality and freedom. His determination sustained him through many challenges—with tremendous results for our community. He leaves behind a legacy of charity and compassion and serves as a role model for all who believe as he did: that ''we are one tribe, y'all.''

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, July 25, 2014 marks the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Legal Services Corporation, a private, nonprofit corporation tasked with ensuring equal justice for all Americans who are unable to afford legal representation. The creation of LSC was long-championed by President Richard Nixon who ultimately signed its enabling legislation on July 25, 1974 with bipartisan support from the Congress. Federally-funded, LSC awards grants to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and the U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs provide vital civil legal assistance to the needy, including women seeking protection from domestic abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking benefits duly earned, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

Unfortunately, because of a decrease in its federal funding over the last several Congresses, LSC-funded programs have had to turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients seeking assistance. With the growing number of Americans eligible for services and increased demand for legal services, the need for legal aid attorneys has never been greater. We should do more to support this vital program and protect our fellow Americans.

As President Nixon said in support of his legislation creating LSC, ''[W]e must provide a mechanism to overcome economic barriers to adequate legal assistance.'' On this 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, we should recommit ourselves to the founding principle and continue to ensure that LSC can fulfill its critical mission through sufficient funding.

I commend LSC and its grantee programs for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel and for continuing its mission of equal justice for all.

HONORING MRS. TAKIYA FRYE-LEWIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable educator in Cleveland, Mississippi.

Mrs. Takiya Frye-Lewis is the daughter of Ms. Carolyn Frye and the late Mr. Levester Frye, Sr. She is married to Mr. Casey T. Lewis and is the mother of two girls; Ciera and Keziah and is expecting a son in July of 2014 who will be named Casey, Jr. Although born in Ypsilanti, Michigan, Takiya Frye-Lewis has been a resident of Bolivar County, Mississippi for 17 years and she considers herself a ''transplanted native.''

Mrs. Lewis graduated from Willow Run High School in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1997 and received her Bachelors of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education from Mississippi Valley State University in 2005 and her Master of Arts in Criminal Justice in 2008 from Mississippi Valley State University.

Mrs. Lewis serves in the capacity of a Pre-K teacher at the Coahoma Opportunities Incorporated Head Start Center in Clarksdale, Mississippi. During her 7 years of teaching diverse socio-economic youths ranging in the ages of 3 to 5 years old, she has found it challenging and rewarding. She desires that all of the children in her classroom and care receive the necessary tools to advance their understanding, knowledge of all subject matter which is taught, even devoting time for individualized coaching and tutoring.

Mrs. Lewis loves teaching and believes in helping children and adults strive towards their life endeavors. Her future objectives are to take the teachers exam and become a kindergarten teacher in a public school district.

Mrs. Lewis devoted endless hours to running errands, home care needs, feeding and clothing the less fortunate. Also, she is active in her church by serving as Vice President of the Youth Department, President of the Purity Class, and President of the Youth and Adult choirs.

Mrs. Lewis is a member of the NAACP and Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON's Bi-Monthly Municipal Meetings which is hosted by his Mound Bayou District Office where she is outspoken on issues which affects her community and our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing Head Start professional for her dedication and service to educating the youths.

IN MEMORY OF C. DAVID CAMPBELL AND HIS LIFELONG COMMITMENT TO PHILANTHROPY AND FOUNDATION WORK IN THE GREATER DETROIT COMMUNITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to mark the passing of an incredible philanthropic leader of the Greater Detroit community and a dear friend, Mr. David Campbell. As the President and CEO of the McGregor Fund, David devoted many years of his professional life to building a brighter future for the residents of Southeast Michigan.

As a lifetime resident of Michigan, David grew up with a deep affection for his state. After graduating from Midland High School and obtaining Bachelor's Degree from our shared alma mater, Alma College, David went on to obtain his Master's Degree from Central Michigan University. David was later bestowed an honorary Doctor of Philosophy Degree from Madonna University for his work as a passionate advocate for higher education.

David's incredible journey in Southeast Michigan began when he and his wife, Susan, moved to Detroit in 1980 for him to assume the role of Dean of Students for the College of Creative Studies. While at CCS, David earned a reputation as an empathetic and thoughtful leader that sought to uphold the highest standards of integrity. After six years at CCS, David brought his passion for helping others to the Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan, where he served as Vice President of Programs for eight years. In 1995, David continued to expand his impact on the Greater Detroit community when he accepted the position of Executive Director for the McGregor Fund, a foundation dedicated to promoting the well-being of mankind. David later went on to serve the McGregor Fund as its CEO, President and Trustee. In his nearly twenty year tenure at the helm of the McGregor Fund, David oversaw the awarding of more than $150 million in grants to Detroit area nonprofits in the areas of human services, education, healthcare, arts and culture, and public benefit.

It is hardly surprising, given his reputation and passion, that David felt compelled to broaden the range of his impact on the Southeast Michigan community. In addition to his primary work with the Community Foundation and the McGregor Fund, David was an active leader on boards for many non-profit organizations. His volunteer work included service as a founding member on the boards of: the Detroit Riverfront Conservancy, City Year Detroit, City Connect Detroit, Detroit Local Initiatives Support Coalition, Excellent Schools Detroit and Michigan Future Schools. Thanks to David's work at the Conservancy, Detroit is realizing so many gains from its unique position within the Great Lakes. His record of service included work on the boards of New Detroit, the New Economy Initiative of the Community Foundation and the Greater Downtown Partnership. In these roles, David was integral to developing the infrastructure and securing the creation of endowments that are empowering the creative entrepreneurs of today and for succeeding generations to move their ideas from concept to reality.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to an incredible record of philanthropic leadership and service to the Greater Detroit region, David was a devoted family man. David's family was an immense source of pride for him, and my thoughts are with Susan, and their daughter, Morgan, his parents: Charles and Margaret, and his siblings: Sandra and Kevin, during this difficult time. My family and I were fortunate to call David a friend and we will greatly miss his ceaseless passion and determination for improving the well-being of the Greater Detroit region. Even as the community mourns his loss, we can all take pride in his accomplishments, his legacy of service and his vision of a prosperous Greater Detroit community—a vision which will continue to inspire current and future generations of leaders to invest deeply into the Southeast Michigan region and create the innovations that are putting the Detroit community at the forefront of the 21st Century economy.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS, AND EXPRESSING HOPE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 40th anniversary of Turkey's occupation of Cyprus. In July 1974, Turkish forces invaded the Republic of Cyprus under the auspices of protecting Turkish Cypriots, dividing the nation and assuming control of one-third of the island.

During the occupation, more than 5,000 Cypriots died and approximately 170,000 Greek-Cypriots fled their homes, forced to abandon their property and sacrifice many of their possessions. In the wake of the invasion, more than 1,500 Greek-Cypriots remained missing. To this day, Cyprus continues to try and locate the remains of the missing and provide some closure to the families.

Despite the international community's expressed opposition to Turkey's invasion, the self-proclaimed ''Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'' has declared independence from the Republic of Cyprus for 40 years. The status quo is untenable. Cyprus must achieve a resolution satisfactory to all Cypriots, which invariably necessitates a unified republic, free from foreign occupation.

I applaud the Cyprus Government's recent attempt to reignite the negotiating process by proposing a series of bold, innovative confidence building measures. I call on Turkish Cypriots to abandon their intransigence and begin working constructively to achieve a comprehensive settlement.

For more than fifty years, Cyprus has been an invaluable, reliable American ally in the Middle East. We must stand with Cyprus and support its efforts to retain its rightful sovereignty.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT MCCARTHY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Robert McCarthy upon his retirement as the Register of Probate of Plymouth, Massachusetts after over four decades of public service.

During his long and noteworthy career, Mr. McCarthy served in a number of positions in Massachusetts, including East Bridgewater Selectman, Chairman on Taxation, State Representative, and State Senator. In the 1970s, Mr. McCarthy worked alongside Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis, quickly becoming a widely beloved and trusted leader in the community. Mr. McCarthy became the Plymouth County Register of Probate in 2000, where his many accomplishments have been invaluable to the people he has served. His colleagues and friends who have worked with him throughout the years agree that he will be sorely missed as he steps down from this position.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to honor Mr. Robert McCarthy upon his retirement. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Mr. McCarthy for his many years of public service.

A TRIBUTE TO MARY W. BOGER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Boger, who has dedicated her life to community service and has been a tremendous force in education. Mary, a long time Glendale resident along with her husband, Dr. Donald Boger, is retiring from her civic responsibilities and moving to New Bedford, Massachusetts.

A strong and passionate advocate of education and children, Mary began serving on the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) Board of Education in 2002. She has held the positions of Clerk, Vice President, and has been Board President many times, a position that she currently holds. In addition to serving as a Board Member of the GUSD, Mary has served as Vice President of the California School Boards Association and a Board Representative for the Five Star Education Coalition.

Mary's accomplishments in community service are nothing short of extraordinary. Over the years, she has tirelessly served on numerous boards and committees. Mary has served as President of the Glendale Council Parent Teacher Association, Glendale Healthy Kids, the National Charity League, Inc.—Glendale Chapter, and Las Candelas, which provides services to emotionally disturbed children and provides financial support to the facilities in which the children reside. Mary has also served as Chair of the City of Glendale Blue Ribbon Panel on Parks, Co-Chair of the City of Glendale Citizens' Memorial Advisory Committee, and on the Board of Directors for the Glendale YWCA, Prom Plus, Crescenta Valley Fireworks Association and the Glendale Symphony Orchestra.

Mary has received numerous awards and recognition, including the Business Life Magazine Women Achievers in 2009, the Glendale Chamber of Commerce Woman of the Year in 2009, the Glendale YWCA Woman of Heart & Excellence in 2008, and California's Twenty Ninth Congressional District Woman of the Year in 2003.

I have worked with Mary for years, and know that her passion for education and young people is unequalled. No one has left a bigger or more positive impact on education in our region, or has commanded greater respect from parents, teachers and students. I am so proud to call her my friend and so grateful for her service. I ask all Members to join me in thanking Mary Boger for her unwavering commitment to the children of our community, and wish her well in all future endeavors.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2807, CONSERVATION EASEMENT INCENTIVE ACT

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2807, the Conservation Easement Incentive Act. This important legislation would make the current tax deduction for the contribution of conservation easements permanent, affording landowners the stability and certainty needed to complete the long term planning necessary for either continued agricultural production or conservation work. Since being signed into law in 2006, the enhanced tax incentive for conservation easements has boosted donations of conservation easements by a third—to a total of over a million acres a year.

The Hudson Valley is a national treasure that must be preserved, and we owe it to our children and grandchildren to protect the places New Yorkers cherish and depend on. In the Hudson Valley, a landowner in my district is struggling to preserve his thirty five acre homestead, which he has lived on for over 40 years. The land dates back to the original family farmsteads and orchards that have dotted the Hudson Valley for generations. Many of those farmsteads have since been sold to developers, but not his. The parcel of land he is fighting to protect and preserve is not only precious in its heritage and conservation value, but in its current use as a trail, which connects several larger land preserves in the region. While he would like to donate a conservation easement and receive the much needed tax deduction, there is considerable financial pressure on him to sell the land to developers. If that happens—the land is lost. And as my friend and President of the Westchester Land Trust, Lori Ensinger, put it—when the land is lost, it's lost for good.

We must balance economic development with protecting the land for preservation and outdoor recreation. Rather than being forced to sell to developers, conservation easement tax incentives allow farmers and landowners the choice to maintain working lands for agriculture or to protect more land for wildlife protection and outdoor recreation. In the Hudson Valley conservation easements have a tremendously positive impact, boosting regional economies while protecting some of America's most important natural sites for future generations.

While we have been successful in protecting thousands of acres over the last ten years all across the Hudson Valley, our work is not done. Passing the Conservation Easement Incentive Act is about more than just environmental preservation it is about regional economies, businesses and jobs. Without the conservation easement tax incentives, landowners may be forced to divide or sell their property to developers; losing the land, its heritage and economic benefits for good.

HONORING ST. PERPETUA CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, we honor St. Perpetua Catholic Church as they celebrate their 50th anniversary. St. Perpetua has been a staple of the community in Waterford since its founding in 1964 by Archbishop John F Dearden. Under the current leadership of the Pastor, Father Jack Baker, the parish continues to grow and invite more families into the parish. Congratulations on 50 years in the community!

CELEBRATING THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADA

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 24th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

For 24 years now, the ADA has secured for people with disabilities their most fundamental rights, and allowed them to integrate more fully in their communities. More than two decades ago, my hero, TOM HARKIN spearheaded this legislation that would change the attitudes of so many in order to protect the civil rights of the 54 million Americans with disabilities. Like so many others, I thank him for his tireless advocacy in the United States Senate and his continued dedication to this important issue.

I would also like to thank all of the organizations involved in this year's Johnson County ADA Celebration for bringing together a community of all walks of life, and recognizing that all people have unique skills, talents and abilities.

Expanding access and opportunities for people with disabilities is something we must work to improve every day. There are obstacles that, thanks to the Americans with Disabilities Act, have been all but eliminated and I look forward to seeing even more progress.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. GAIL SHAW

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, Gail Shaw, a visionary, a scientist, a community leader, and a 64 year-long resident of Chehalis, Washington, died peacefully in his sleep on June 6, 2014.

His six decade stay in his adopted hometown was not part of his original career plan, but before long he decided to make Chehalis home.

When he first moved to the thick forests surrounding Lewis County in 1950, the accomplished chemist still had his sights set on an urban life up North in Seattle. That changed when a fire burned one of the largest local employers—the Chehalis Perma Products plant—to the ground.

Instead of fleeing from the fire's widespread destruction, Shaw stayed in Chehalis and helped rebuild the factory and the city from the plant's ashes.

With a focus on what Shaw termed ''social capital'' or what he described in one newspaper interview as a ''matter of people getting together and learning how to include your neighbor instead of excluding,'' Shaw collaborated with fellow Chehalis residents to strengthen the collaborative and economic framework of the city.

Shaw joined efforts with—and later became chairman of—what became known as the Industrial Commission, and together the group brought development, industry, jobs, and new energy to the small logging town.

Even though Gail Shaw disliked public recognition for his accomplishments; he will always be remembered for the lasting legacy he left in his community. His unyielding commitment to making Lewis County a better place to live will continue to be an inspiration for generations after him. I considered Gail a friend and am incredibly proud to say I knew him.

Gail is survived by his wife, Carolyn; son, Lawrence; daughters, Cynthia, Rebecca and Catherine; nine grandchildren; and one great-grandson.

HONORING NEIL ARMSTRONG

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday we marked the 45th anniversary of Ohio's native son Neil Armstrong taking what he famously called ''one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind.''

Neil Armstrong was born in 1930 on a farm near Wapakoneta. He earned his student's pilot license at age 16, reached the rank of Eagle Scout, and graduated from Blume High School before enrolling at Purdue University on a Navy scholarship.

He was called to active duty by the Navy in 1949, serving as a naval aviator until 1952. He later served 17 years as an engineer, test pilot, astronaut, and administrator for NASA and its predecessor agency.

Despite his lifetime of service, he is best remembered for one day: July 20, 1969, when he capped a 240,000-mile journey through space, stepped off the ''Eagle,'' and became the first human to walk on the surface of the moon.

Neil Armstrong died in 2012 at the age of 82, but the impact of his journey is still felt today—in rural Auglaize County, Ohio, and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Neil Armstrong for his service and sacrifice—this day and always.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today President Nixon signed the law creating the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) as a private, nonprofit corporation to support civil legal aid organizations all across the country. Since that time LSC has become a critical and integral vehicle through which federal funds are distributed to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district.

LSC is tasked by Congress to ensure equal access to justice for those Americans who otherwise would be unable to afford to enforce their rights through our legal system. It serves people with the most critical legal needs—food, shelter, medical care, income maintenance, and physical safety. It makes a real difference for low-income and elderly Oregonians and Americans.

I was proud to work at legal aid early in my career and I'll never forget the people I was able to help. They desperately needed an attorney when they could little afford one. I want to emphasize that they were not low income by choice—most had unexpected medical bills, had lost a job, or lost a spouse.

Unfortunately, Congress is not living up to its obligation. LSC-funded attorneys still turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients because of a lack of resources. It is unacceptable to leave people out on their own to navigate a complicated and already strained legal system, or else suffer continued injustice. We must do better.

I congratulate LSC on its 40th anniversary, and commend all the hard working legal aid attorneys and staff who get so little recognition for such important work.

H. CON. RES. 105 AND H.R. 4935

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I regret my absence from today's proceedings due to a death in my family.

First, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 105, directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces from Iraq, and had I been present I would have voted in favor of the resolution offered by my colleague from Massachusetts. The rapid advance of ISIS remains an issue of great concern to our national security interests, as well as the stability of the entire Middle East. However, after nearly a decade of war, and the loss of more than 4,000 American lives in Iraq, we must be extremely cautious of the dangers posed by further U.S. military involvement.

For example, it was recently reported that a classified military assessment of Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) revealed dangers to U.S. military

personnel currently advising forces in the country. These dangers include infiltration by informants for Sunni extremists, as well as ISF reliance on Shiite militias trained by Iranian paramilitary forces. These risks must be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated, and we must ensure that ISF are reliable before considering any further U.S. commitment.

Thus far, the President has shown great restraint in addressing this ongoing crisis, informed by his understanding of recent history and internal Iraqi politics. Nevertheless, I strongly support the passage of this resolution because Congress must continue to play an integral role in making decisions that impact national security, as mandated by the law and the Constitution of the United States.

Second, I strongly oppose H.R. 4935, the so-called Child Tax Credit Improvement Act, which is also being considered today. Had I been present, I would have voted against H.R. 4935 because it would allow the Child Tax Credit (CTC) to disappear for many low-income working families after 2017 while expanding the CTC for higher income households without an offset.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 451, 452, 453, and 454 on July 25, 2014. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

I would have opposed final passage of H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014. As with the tax bills that have preceded it this year, I have strong concerns that this bill violates the pay-as-you-go law, enacted with my support in 2010, by failing to offset the cost of permanent tax policy changes with an equivalent amount of deficit reduction. Furthermore, I am concerned that the bill would permanently expand eligibility for the child tax credit to families at the upper income limit while simultaneously failing to continue eligibility for families at the lower end. Finally, I am concerned that provisions added to the bill would prevent legal permanent residents who pay taxes from being eligible for the credits.

I would have voted in favor of H. Con. Res. 105, which—pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution—would prevent the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use. The United States must ensure that it has the security personnel necessary to protect U.S. embassy and consulate personnel and I support the administration's decision to send additional forces for this purpose. The President also took an important step toward de-escalating the violence in Iraq when he sent 300 additional personnel to advise and train Iraqi forces in their battle with the Islamic State. However, I am concerned about the potential for escalation in this conflict and believe that any further deployment of U.S. personnel to be employed in a sustained combat role should require specific authorization from Congress.

I would have voted in favor of the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3230. I was proud to speak on behalf of this motion on the House floor, noting the important steps included in the Senate-passed amendment supporting victims of sexual assault.

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 5081, Representative KAREN BASS's important bill that will help combat human trafficking.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 25, marks the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In 1974, Congress, with bipartisan support, established LSC to be a major source of funding for civil legal aid in this country. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, as well as by state, local, and private contributions, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under the law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes nearly 94 percent of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, with nearly 800 offices serving every congressional district and U.S. territories.

LSC-funded legal aid programs make a crucial difference to millions of Americans by assisting with the most basic civil legal needs, such as addressing matters involving safety, subsistence, and family stability. These low-income Americans are women seeking protection from abuse, mothers trying to obtain child support, families facing unlawful evictions or foreclosures that could leave them homeless, veterans seeking their duly-earned benefits, seniors defending against consumer scams, and individuals who have lost their jobs and need help in applying for unemployment compensation and other benefits.

In my district, LSC provides funding to California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), an organization that served 27,000 individuals, and recovered over $2.5 million dollars for their low-income clients, in 2012. CRLA serves a wide array of clients, such as farmworkers, individuals with disabilities, immigrant populations, school children, lesbian/gay/bisexual and transgender populations, seniors, and individuals with limited English proficiency. Nearly 60 percent of CRLA clients are women. It is crucial that we continue to provide adequate funding to LSC so organizations like CRLA can provide these essential services.

In my role as a senior member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, I have fought to increase LSC funding, and have sought to remove federal restrictions on how LSC can use state, local, and private funds to more efficiently use the resources it has available to serve low-income clients. I will continue to work to provide LSC with the resources and flexibility it needs to ensure equal access to justice.

On this 40th anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation, and LSC-funded attorneys, for the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who need qualified counsel.

SENATE—*Monday, July 28, 2014*

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HARRY REID, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, You set before us each day a bountiful table of blessings. We accept Your gracious gifts with joy, desiring to use them in Your service.

Empower our Senators to engage in work worthy of their high calling. Lord, make them open even to the words of people with whom they expect to disagree, as they remember that no one has a monopoly on the truth. May they work together to discover Your providential purposes for our Nation and our world. Keep them close to You and open to one another so that this will be a week of substantive progress.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Pamela Harris to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit, postcloture. The time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees. At 5:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote on confirmation of the nomination. Immediately upon disposition of the Harris nomination, there will be four voice votes on the following nominations: Elliot F. Kaye to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; Elliot F. Kaye to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; Joseph P. Mohorovic to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and Brian P. McKeon to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the McKeon nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of S. 2569, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2666

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2666 is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2666) to prohibit future consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals or work authorization for aliens who are not in lawful status, to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border, and to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse States for National Guard deployments in response to large-scale border crossings of unaccompanied alien children from noncontiguous countries.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to this matter at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our great country has many friends in the world. We are proud of all the alliances we have, but certainly our deepest attachment is that which we have with Israel. The United States and Israel have stood by each other in good times, in bad times, in times of peace, and in times of war.

Right now our friends in the State of Israel are under attack. Hamas continues to indiscriminately fire thousands of rockets into Israel with the sole objective of inflicting casualties on somebody—anybody.

I was watching ''NewsHour.'' Every Friday they have a commentary, usually by Shields and Brooks. Shields is supposedly the Democrat and Brooks the Republican. David Brooks said so descriptively that he had never seen a conflict or read about a conflict in the past where one of the participants said: Kill some more of my people.

That is what Hamas is saying. When Hamas fires these rockets, Hamas has no idea whether they will land at a military installation—they hope; a daycare center; they don't care or an empty parking lot; they don't care. They are firing these rockets indiscriminately.

Israel doesn't have the luxury of not worrying about where these rockets land. It must respond swiftly in shooting down all rockets or else risk serious harm to its people. In thwarting these rocket attacks, Israel depends on what is termed and named the ''Iron Dome.'' It is a missile defense system. But as the number of rockets being launched from Gaza continues to surge, Israel's Iron Dome resources are necessarily being depleted.

Last week U.S. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel requested that Congress allocate $225 million of emergency funding to help Israel reinforce its defense system. After 3 weeks of fighting Israel needs these funds to replace the weaponry it has used to destroy Hamas's incoming rockets. But there is no guarantee that Israel won't need our help again if this conflict continues for weeks or months. What this funding does do for the time being is it provides Israel with the resources to continue defending its people against these terrorist attacks.

Last Thursday the Republican leader urged the Senate to act quickly in approving the Defense Secretary's request. I agree with my friend the Republican leader. We must pass legislation providing Israel with this critical aid, but in my opinion the $225 million being requested is only temporary. If Hamas continues to escalate this conflict, Israel's resources—including the funding requested by the Secretary of Defense—will quickly be depleted.

With its current number of batteries, Israel has to prioritize populated areas and strategically important locations. The Iron Dome is a mobile system.

They have to move it around. That means, unfortunately, there are some Israelis still susceptible to Hamas's rocket attacks.

We should not give the Israeli people the minimum amount of aid and then cross our fingers and hope it all works out in the future. Each missile battery costs Israel about $50 million. Each missile Israel shoots to knock down one of those rockets from the Gaza Strip costs about $62,000. Hamas has already fired 2,500 of those rockets in just 3 weeks. As we speak, they are going out and continuing to fire them. As we know, they are located in schools, in neighborhoods. They are hidden all over—in mosques.

Taking into account what Israel actually needs to adequately protect its people, the United States and other allies should consider providing more aid to do more for the Iron Dome. Our Israeli friends shouldn't be in the position of picking and choosing which parts of the country to defend.

The United States of America should live up to its commitments, particularly with our friend Israel, which happens to be the only true democracy in the Middle East. We can do better and we need to go further in protecting Israel.

That being said, it is critical that we approve the money requested by Secretary Hagel now. Coming to the defense of Israel is not a partisan issue; it is an American principle. Both Democrats and Republicans should agree on this measure.

Another issue we can all agree on is the emergency funding requested by the White House for what is going on in the western part of the United States. We should pass this immediately.

Over the past month or 6 weeks the State of Oregon has been on fire. Hundreds of thousands of acres have burned. In one of the sparsely populated parts of the State of Washington, more than 500 homes have been destroyed. Wildfires are all over. They are in Nevada. They are in California. The base of the Sierras has a big fire going in California, and about 1,500 acres have burned already. There is a fire now going on in Idaho. Oregon is on fire. There are numerous fires in Oregon. Every day there are reports of more and more wildfires—lightning, negligence of somebody who threw out a cigarette. These fires are very oppressive. In the State of Nevada wide areas have been burned. The sad part is that once these fires are over, we will have many native species that will have been wiped out, and what will come back are invasive species, which is really not what nature intended.

We should work in the Senate on quickly putting together this funding. We have the request. It is certainly a good request, and we should get this emergency funding to the States so they can be protected. When I say ''to the States,'' right now we have more than 4,000 firefighters out there. There is an army out there fighting fires. It is very dangerous, as we know. Every year people are killed. We know what happened in Arizona just 1½ years ago where 21 people who were fighting fires were burned in a devastating fire. They were dead in a matter of a few minutes.

Americans living in these areas are in dire need of the Federal Government's help. There is no reason to delay getting aid to our own people.

So as we begin this week, I am hopeful the Senate will also move quickly to pass legislation to aid Israel, emergency funding for wildfires, and the border supplemental.

The truth is, if the House of Representatives would vote on the Senate-passed comprehensive immigration reform bill, it would give Border Patrol the resources it needs to address this humanitarian crisis that is now on the border. That is true. But my Republican friends are slow-walking this, to say the least. The senior Senator from Texas proposed a solution to this crisis. Once again, the legislation is a short-term fix and does nothing to address the crisis at the border, while putting vulnerable children in harm's way.

We should approve funding for these three very important measures, and we should do it immediately. We should do them—separately, together, we have to get this done. Leaving here with Israel being naked, as they are, with these wildfires raging, and the crisis at the border—it would be a shame if we did nothing.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NOMINATION OF PAMELA HARRIS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am here to talk about some complex litigation on Chinese drywall. But before I do, this week seems to be the week if we are going to get anything done to assist the administration with regard to all of these children showing up at the border. It has diminished over the last few weeks. Nevertheless, there has still been an influx that we have all read about. Senator MIKULSKI, the chairman of Appropriations, has roughly a $2.7 million supplemental appropriations bill. It would be this Senator's intention—and I think I can speak for several other Senators who feel very strongly—that we have not addressed the very root cause of the problem, which is that the drugs in huge shipments on boats coming from South America into those three Central American countries with boatloads of cocaine, carrying 1 to 3 tons of cocaine apiece, have not been interdicted. It was riveting testimony that our four-star Marine commander General Kelly of the U.S. Southern Command pointed out that he, his staff, and the Joint Interagency Task Force that is headquartered in Key West have to watch 75 percent of those boats coming in from the Caribbean in the east into Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador and the Pacific on the west—they have to watch 75 percent of them get through. They cannot do anything about it because they don't have the Navy ships or the Coast Guard cutters with the helicopters that can interdict them. If we did that we would diminish a lot of the flow of those drugs. And you wonder why are all the children showing up. A number of us have made several speeches about this and I will not go back into all of that. Suffice it to say that the drug lords basically control the countries because they are in cahoots with the criminal networks that have taken over and violence has erupted.

Remember, Honduras is the No. 1 murder capital of the world. What is a parent going to do? Their child has to join the drug gang or they are going to go to their child's funeral because they will kill him if he doesn't.

No. 3, they are seduced by these coyotes who have this network to get immigrants to the north into Texas, and they are telling them they can get in—just send your child. You pay me $1,500, $5,000 a child; we will get them in. Now that is going back to the root cause of the problem. If we stop all the drugs going in, maybe governments such as that of President Hernandez of Honduras will have a chance of stopping some of the corruption that is so rife in that government and the local governments and the local police forces.

We have gone over and over this before, and I just want to say that this Senator and others—particularly Senator KAINE who knows this issue well. He was a missionary when he was in law school. He took a year off from law school. Senator KAINE of Virginia lived in Honduras. He speaks fluent Spanish. He knows this problem as well. If we could have a greater percentage of those drugs interdicted, then we would seriously start to diminish all of this migration to the north through the rest of Central America and through Mexico to the Texas border.

In closing, why are the children not coming from the other three countries right there—Belize, Nicaragua, Panama; Costa Rica, a fourth country—in Central America? The children are not coming from those areas. They are coming from the three where all the drugs are and where the drug lords have taken over. I hope the Senate will react with some rationality, and as difficult as it is going to be to pass a supplemental appropriations bill down at the other end of this hall in the House of Representatives, putting money in there to activate Coast Guard cutters—there are a number of them out in San Diego that are inactive—activate them and give the U.S. Navy the ability to reposition ships—it might actually help us pass this supplemental appropriations bill down there at the other end of the hallway in the House of Representatives. We have just a few days to pass this. I am hoping we are going to be able to do so.

CHINESE DRYWALL

I came to the floor to tell you about Chinese drywall. You cannot see it. This is a normal piece of drywall. It is cut off here. It is very faint on this picture I have in the chamber where you can see the marking that this is from China. This photograph doesn't tell us much, but let me tell you what Chinese drywall has done to the people of this country, making them unable to live in their houses because there is some kind of sulfuric content in this Chinese drywall that emits a gas and the occupants of a house such as this get sick. I can tell you what it smells like. It smells like rotten eggs. I have such sensitive air passages that when I walked in, all of a sudden my eyes were watering, my nose was stopping up, and I was starting to cough. That was just a few minutes in a house with Chinese drywall.

If you can imagine, what if somebody cannot sell the house because the mortgage company will not cooperate. They are stuck. They cannot sell their house because who is going to buy a house with defective Chinese drywall. They cannot get a loan for their house. What would have happened if back at the severe time in the 2004–2005 timeframe—and then they got hit with a big recession coming in 2007, 2008—what would have happened if they didn't have a job and were stuck with the house and everybody was getting sick in the house?

The Chinese Government has had continued and repeated failure to participate in the legal process of this country to help the homeowners who were severely impacted by this problem with Chinese drywall.

Here is how it started. We had a few hurricanes in 2004 and 2005. The big one everybody remembers is Katrina in 2005, but there was one year before Katrina when four hurricanes hit the Florida Peninsula all within the span of a month and a half. Therefore, there was a lot of cleanup and a lot of rebuilding because of the damage the hurricanes had done. Normal drywall manufacturers and distributors and suppliers ran out, so they asked for extra drywall coming from China. It was coming from a Chinese company, but it was basically owned by the Chinese Government. So we had a housing boom to recover from the hurricanes, and as a result we had in the gulf coast area these rebuilding efforts to recover.

A number of builders and contractors imported this defective and sickly drywall. It started causing problems the minute people walked into the repaired home. They reported that it smelled like sulfur, rotten eggs. They would have metal corrosion. Let me show you a picture of an air-conditioner. This photograph doesn't do it justice, but these are all the coils on the air-conditioner, and on close inspection we can see that every one of these coils—these metal parts—are corroded.

I went into a home that had their silverware—the silverware—totally corroded. Any metal parts in the house were totally corroded. People started reporting the health effects, and following all these reports several Federal agencies, including the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, started looking into the problem.

I must say there were a number of Senators who had to start kicking down the door to get them to pay attention. This Senator from a State that was severely affected was one of them, and the Senator from Louisiana who sits right here. After she had all the problems of Hurricane Katrina, the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, started raising Cain, and they found that this sulfur emission from this defective drywall was causing the corrosion and the property damage as well as the health effects. But these agencies, once they did that—and I must say we had to urge and urge and urge the agencies, but they weren't able to offer any kind of financial assistance.

As I laid out in my opening comments, what was a homeowner to do. They couldn't get the bank to go along. They couldn't get the insurance company to go along. By the way, the insurance company said: We are not covering this as a defect in the house. So the homeowners didn't have any other recourse than to join a lawsuit against the responsible Chinese parties. Much of this litigation was consolidated in Federal district court in New Orleans in a multidistrict litigation. After an extensive period of discovery, the judge ordered it was determined that two Chinese manufacturers and their affiliates were responsible for most of the problem drywall: Knauf Plasterboard Tainjin and its associated affiliates, Knauf Industries. Knauf was a German company that imported and distributed this drywall. The other one was Taishan Gypsum Company and its affiliates.

The Knauf entities agreed to appear in court on this litigation. Knauf reached a global settlement that allowed many of the homeowners with Knauf drywall to remediate their homes, get the plasterboard torn out. They often had to redo anything that was metal, such as pipes, air-conditioners, and so forth, and be able to get on with their lives.

Taishan has refused to participate in the multidistrict litigation, despite the fact that several of the plaintiffs in this litigation served Taishan officials in China. This Senator went to China and talked to their equivalent of our Consumer Product Safety Commission. Early on I talked to them, and in essence they blew me off. They were served legal process in the lawsuit under an international agreement called the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters. It is the Hague Convention, of which the United States and China are both signatories. Taishan thumbed its nose at everybody and failed to appear in court in cases where they had been properly served under the Hague Convention. The judge in this litigation then entered default judgments against Taishan for damages resulting from the defective drywall.

Listen to this. Rather than pay these claims under court order, Taishan then retained counsel. They refused to do anything up to that point. When they were docked by the judge, they retained counsel in the United States for the sole purpose of contesting the district court's jurisdiction and they appealed the case to the court of appeals.

In January of this year a three-judge panel of the Fifth Circuit unanimously upheld that the U.S. courts had proper jurisdiction over Taishan and could enforce the default judgment. In addition, Taishan let the time limit to file an appeal with the Supreme Court expire. You would have thought this would have spurred this Chinese company and its affiliates to do the right thing and

finally reach a settlement, but, unfortunately, they thumbed their noses again.

Instead, Taishan told the district court's Federal judge that it was walking away and would no longer make any appearances in the court.

Well, there is a judge down in New Orleans named Judge Fallon, and needless to say that didn't go over too well with him. In July—earlier this month—Judge Fallon issued an order holding Taishan in both civil and criminal contempt. He enjoined Taishan and any of its affiliates from conducting business in the United States until it participates in the judicial process. He also took the unusual step—because he wanted everybody in the U.S. Government to understand the gravity of his order—to send the contempt order to the U.S. Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and Members of Congress to express his frustration on how Taishan—and therefore the Chinese Government—was flouting international and U.S. law. I am very grateful to Judge Fallon. He has taken this action to ensure that this rogue company and its rogue government are prohibited from conducting any business in the United States until they participate in this judicial process and take responsibility for their actions.

We can't issue that against the Chinese Government. It is against this company and its affiliates. But make no mistake. This company is owned by the Chinese Government.

What does this say about our policy of letting Chinese manufacturers import pretty much any kind of consumer product they want into this country without mandating any legal recourse if something goes wrong? We thought that was covered under the Hague Convention. What does this say about Chinese companies that routinely ignore service of process under ratified international conventions?

The reason for this speech is to call on Taishan and the Chinese Government to do the right thing: Stop hiding and finally help the homeowners who have had their lives turned upside down at great financial and personal health loss by your defective product. If they don't, then I think it is time for the Senate to take action to make sure the Chinese and other foreign manufacturers are held financially accountable for defective products.

As I close I wish to reiterate why this case is so important. My constituents are certainly aggrieved, as are Senator LANDRIEU's constituents and a number of constituents in the Commonwealth of Virginia, by this defective drywall.

Why is this case so important? Its implications are far broader than the issues presented in this litigation. It poses a defining moment for the Chinese Government and its companies, which raises grave questions as to the risk of doing business with the Chinese.

Will the Chinese Government and its companies honor their moral and legal obligations under this or any other commercial contract? Will the Chinese Government and its companies which have profited from the sale of defective products to consumers here in the United States continue to flee court jurisdiction when sued or will they honor moral and legal obligations to appear in court, defend themselves, and satisfy an adverse judgment?

If the Chinese Government and its companies will flee jurisdiction in this case, when they fear or are faced with an adverse judgment, can any company or any individual or any party afford the risk of doing business with the Chinese Government or its companies?

If China will run from the law here in the United States, will it not run from the law everywhere else?

I rest my case, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are entering a momentous week. Congress must face the reality that President Obama is moving towards a decision whereby he would issue Executive orders in direct contravention of long-established American law that would grant administrative amnesty and work permits to 5 to 6 million persons who are unlawfully in this country. This is after Congress has explicitly refused demands to change the law to suit his desire.

The current law is plain. Those who enter this great Nation by unlawful means, or who overstay their visa, are subject to removal and are ineligible to work. Indeed, I will read one portion of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 274, which makes employment of unauthorized aliens unlawful. ''In general, it is unlawful for any person or other entity to hire or to recruit or refer for a fee for employment in the United States an alien knowing the alien is an unauthorized alien.'' That is the law of the United States.

It is plain. Those who enter by unlawful entry are subject to removal and ineligible to work. That is just one of the provisions, and it is our law. Our law is right and just, and it comports with the laws of civilized nations the world over, and if followed, will serve the honorable and legitimate interests of this Nation and her people.

The National Journal, Time magazine, The Hill, and others, are reporting that by the end of summer President Obama—sore at Congress, and by implication at the American people—plans, by the stroke of a pen, to do what the law expressly forbids: to provide amnesty and work permits for millions. This would be in the contravention of his duty and his oath to see that the laws of the United States are faithfully enforced, and it would be a direct challenge to the clear powers of Congress to make laws.

Congress makes law and the executive branch executes those laws. It is that simple. The President's actions are astonishing and are taking our Nation into exceedingly dangerous waters. Such calculated action strains the constitutional structure of our Republic. Such unlawful and unconstitutional action, if taken, cannot stand. No Congress—with Republicans or Democrats in the majority—can allow such action to occur or to be maintained. The people will not stand for it. They must not stand for it.

Mr. President: My petition is that you pull back. It is utterly unacceptable for you to meet with special interest groups, such as the National Council of La Raza and others, and then promise an action to them that is contrary to law. Such actions would be wrong. It would be an affront to the people of this country which they will never forget. It would be a permanent stain on your Presidency. I urge you to make clear you will not do this.

I am not suggesting negotiations or any parley or any compromise. There is no middle ground on nullifying immigration law by the President. Some of your people—maybe bright, young staffers—think the President can intimidate Congress, that the Chief Executive can make such a threat and the lawmakers will just cower under their desks. That is wrong, sir. You cannot intimidate Congress—or the American people who sent them here, for that matter. Simply put, that which you desire is beyond your lawful reach. This is the time for administration officials to urge restraint within the White House. It is critical that the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the White House legal counsel do their duty and give the only advice they can give: ''Do not do this, Mr. President.'' ''You cannot do this, Mr. President.'' That is what they need to say. They know that is the right answer, and they should stand up and say no.

Some of the best work advisers can do is to head off a disaster before it happens. CEOs, business types, politicians, Governors, and mayors get headstrong sometimes. In those instances, to avoid disaster, their advisers need to stand up and be counted.

Just as the unlawful DACA amnesty for young people created an unprecedented and unlawful flow of more young people, that initiative has now, it seems, encouraged the President to take even more unlawful action for millions of adults this time, the papers say, by a 10-fold increase. If millions are given amnesty by Executive order, we can be sure that the result will be that even more adults—by the millions—will be coming here unlawfully in the future.

It will collapse any remaining moral authority of our immigration law and undermine the sovereignty of our Nation. If you don't have a legitimate,

lawful system of immigration that you can enforce and abide by, then you have undermined the very sovereignty of your Nation. It amounts, in effect, to an open borders policy that has never been the policy of any developed Nation that I am aware of and has been rejected by Congress and the American people repeatedly.

In effect, the President is preparing to assume for himself the absolute power to set immigration law in America: Well, I'll just enforce what I wish to enforce, with the absolute power to determine who may enter and who may work, no matter what the law says—by the millions.

Our response now is of great import. It will define the scope of executive and congressional powers for years to come. If President Obama is not stopped in this action and exceeds his powers by attempting to execute such a massive amnesty contrary to law, the moral authority for any immigration enforcement henceforth will be eviscerated. Anyone the world over will get the message: Get into America by any method you can and you will never have to leave.

We are almost there, but it is not too late. I have studied this issue. It is absolutely not too late for us to restore a lawful system that treats applicants who come to America fairly and serves the national interest. This can be done; we just need a Chief Executive who leads.

Let me state a warning.

For the more purely political in Washington, the results of the recent primary elections show that the American people are being roused to action and, once activated, their power will be felt. They will not be mocked. They have begged and pleaded for our Nation's immigration laws to be enforced for 30 or 40 years. The politicians have refused—refused, refused, refused. They have defeated amnesty after amnesty after amnesty, and they will not sit back and allow the President to implement through unlawful fiat what they have defeated through the democratic process. They must not yield to this.

There is one thing that powers in Washington fear, and that is being voted out of office. Before a Member of Congress acquiesces to any action of this kind, they should consider their responsibility to their constituents.

No Member in either party—Republican or Democrat—should support any border legislation that moves through this Senate that does not expressly prohibit these planned executive actions by the President, and that prohibits any expenditure of funds to implement them. There can be no retreat on this point. We simply need to say the Chief Executive of these United States cannot expend any money to execute a plan of amnesty. Surely that would end it.

All of this is grim talk, but the situation is stark. Congressional action this week to bar unilateral, imperial action by the President is surely the best course to head off what could be a constitutional crisis. It will be good for the President because it will stop him from taking a step that will permanently mar his Presidency and the office of the President. It will avoid a major governmental disruption at a time when the Nation faces many threats. It will protect the rule of law and the constitutional order whereby Congress makes laws and the President executes them, whether he likes them or not.

We have heard it said the President must act because Congress refused to act. Well, that is not so. Congress considered his proposal, they looked at existing law today, and Congress made a decision. They did not pass what the President proposed. They decided to stay with current law. So I would say that is a decision and a clear action by Congress. And his statement that Congress doesn't act; therefore, I can use my pen to act—it is not correct. It is absolutely false and contrary to our constitutional traditions.

Pulling back at this time will avoid a major governmental disruption at a time when we are facing threats all over the world. There is much instability. As someone said, the wheels seem to be coming off in every area of the globe and at home. The last thing we need is a major, intense, internal battle with the President over illegal actions he would like to take.

It will also help reestablish the constitutional power of Congress to make laws and perhaps mark the end of this Congress's acquiescence to executive overreach.

Professor Jonathan Turley has expressed amazement that Congress has been silent in the face of some of the most imperial Presidential actions ever, and he explicitly considers President Obama's actions on immigration to be one of those. But there are a host of others.

It will stop millions of work authorizations for those who would then be able to take any job in America at a time of high unemployment and falling wages. In this way, standing up to the President's action would protect American workers. We have the largest percentage of working-age Americans who are unemployed since the 1970s, and people need to know that a lot of the recent job numbers that are cited with such positive spin include unprecedented numbers of individuals on part-time work. These are not full-time jobs, many of them. An unprecedentedly high number of those jobs are part-time jobs. We are not doing well. This country does not have a shortage of labor. It just does not. It has a shortage of jobs. And recent immigrants—Hispanics and others who are coming to America—are having a hard time getting jobs too. Would it help them to have millions more competing for the limited number of jobs out there? Would it help poor working people all over America? Would it help African Americans? The experts tell us absolutely not. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that if this kind of mass amnesty were to be adopted, wages in America would fall for a decade.

So let this clearly be known: The Congress of the United States and the President of the United States are given only limited powers by our Constitution. They are not unlimited. Neither the President nor Congress can do anything it wants to do. It was set up that way from the very beginning.

Mr. President: You work for the American people. They don't work for you, and they will not accept nullification of their law passed by their elected representatives. The American people are not going to accept it. They are going to fight this. I am confident they will. They will resist.

Every Member of this Congress—Republican or Democrat—will face a time of choosing this week. Directly or indirectly, every Member will be asked to support and cosponsor legislation that would stop these actions by the President. It is not hard to do. It will be a simple choice that people will remember: Do you support and approve the President's proposed actions? For those who cosponsor legislation to stop this illegality, their answer will be clear. For those who refuse to take simple action to stop it, they will have voted to enable what the National Journal has rightly called ''explosive action'' by the President. ''Explosive action.'' And, indeed it is. This immigration debate is important. People have invested time and energy and heart and soul into it, on both sides. Good people have debated it. Congress has made a decision. The President is not now entitled unilaterally to assert his position. Indeed, he told some of these activist groups not long ago that he did not have the power to do what they were asking him to do. Now he suggests he does before the end of the summer.

So I am calling on all Members of Congress today to stand up to these lawless actions and sponsor legislation that will block them. I am calling on all Members of Congress today to oppose any border supplemental that does not include such language. I am calling on every person in this body, and in the House of Representatives, to stand and be counted at this perilous hour.

I am calling on the American people to ask their representatives: Where do you stand on this, Senator? Where do you stand on this, Congressman? All of us were elected by American citizens to serve them and to serve and honor their Constitution that is our birthright. Will we answer that call? Where will history record that each of us stood at this important time? I believe

the answer should be clear: We stand for law. We stand for the Constitution. We stand for an honorable, lawful immigration system that treats everyone fairly and serves the national interests of the people of the United States.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here because in the next week we are going to, it looks, vote on a House-passed bill to prevent an impending highway funding gap. We must pass this bill to avoid funding disruptions and to avoid all the job losses that would follow from funding disruptions, all of which could begin literally in weeks if we did not pass the bill.

But I have to say the House highway bill is woefully inadequate. It is, frankly, a pathetic measure. It fails at virtually every measure, most particularly failing to provide the leadership and the certainty all of our States need so badly as they seek to implement their highway programs.

The only positive thing that can be said about this bill is it is better than no bill at all and a collapse of the highway fund. But that is not much of a commendation. The American Society of Civil Engineers gives America's roads a letter grade of D, our bridges only a C-plus.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have been around a long time. We were one of the founding Colonies. We have a lot of old roads, a lot of old infrastructure. We have a lot of stuff that dates a long way back. Our infrastructure, for that reason, is among the worst in the Nation, with 41 percent of our roads in poor condition, 57 percent of our bridges rated deficient or obsolete.

Last Friday I visited one of our bridges, the Great Island Bridge in Narragansett, RI. This bridge is the sole access to an island community of 350 homes. It has been rated functionally obsolete and it must be replaced. If that bridge fails, the island's residents have no way to get to or from their homes.

I will vote for this House bill to avoid that kind of catastrophe. But we are wasting an opportunity to do more, to do a responsible highway bill. We actually have a pretty good model. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, on which I serve, actually passed a bipartisan, multiyear infrastructure investment plan. That is what we need. A 6-year bill is what EPW passed. That is the kind of certainty our highway departments need so they can sign contracts for long-term projects.

Sadly, the Republicans in the House could not manage that. The House-passed bill will extend the authorization for a mere 8 months. The EPW bill, the 6-year bill written by Chairman BOXER and Ranking Member VITTER, in bipartisan fashion would reauthorize our Nation's highway programs for 6 years, through 2020.

Our committee has done its part to move a 6-year bill in the regular order, in a bipartisan fashion. The House, once again, has failed. States need budget certainty to plan multiyear construction projects. That should be obvious enough even for the House to understand. To the millions of Americans who depend on Federal highway funding, either directly or indirectly, for their paychecks, for their livelihoods, the paltry 8-month extension says to them and their families: You have work until next May. That is not what these workers need and that is not what our 50 States need. They need long-term certainty, and this bill fails them.

I plan to support the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment which would force that debate this year so we do not go home at the end of this Congress without having passed a serious highway bill. There is no reason the American people should have to wait until 2015 for the certainty and security of a long-term highway bill, plus no guarantee we will do it even in 2015. If the House cannot do a long-term bill now, what makes them think they can do a long-term bill later? Let's roll up our sleeves and pass a long-term highway bill this year.

The House bill also fails to provide any real solution to highway funding, to the widening revenue gap in the highway trust fund. The Federal gas tax of 18.4 cents a gallon is not indexed to inflation and Congress has not touched it in 20 years. So it should be no surprise that it is no longer providing the revenue support it used to.

Plus, thankfully, cars are more fuel efficient, which is great for drivers—it lowers their fuel expenses—but it lowers highway revenues further. The House bill completely ignores that larger problem of how we pay for our highways in favor of a short-term funding patch with gimmicky one-time budget offsets that have nothing to do with highway use.

We had the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in the Environment and Public Works Committee say: Sure, raise the highway tax a little bit. Let's get built the infrastructure this country needs. But instead of crafting a responsible long-term highway plan, the House Republicans are running scared from tea party groups, tea party groups that do not think the Federal Government should invest in infrastructure at all.

The Club for Growth, so called, went so far last week as to say the highway trust fund—and I am quoting them here—''should not even exist.'' Funny how Republican Presidents—Eisenhower, Nixon, Reagan, Ford, Bush, and Bush—all managed to accept the idea of a Federal highway system, not thinking that there was anything unusual or improper about that.

Well, today's far-right extremists have gone way beyond them. They have gone way beyond the American people. The American people overwhelmingly support Federal infrastructure investments. According to a recent poll commissioned by the American Automobile Association, more than two-thirds of Americans believe the Federal Government should invest more in roads, bridges, and mass transit systems.

We may as Americans have differing views on many issues, but when it comes to investing in the roads and bridges we all use, there is, unsurprisingly, broad agreement except, of course, at the far-right fringe where people hate the government so much they want the rest of us to drive on bad roads and obsolete bridges. But that kind of extreme ideology hits Americans in the pocketbook.

Rhode Islanders, for example, pay an estimated $467 extra each year for car repairs due to bad roads and potholes. So if you are looking out for the ordinary American, if you are looking out for the ordinary American consumer, if you are looking out for the ordinary American consumer's pocketbook, you will invest in infrastructure so our cars are not being banged up and beaten up on bad roads, obsolete bridges, and unfilled potholes.

I am going to hold my nose and vote for this House-passed bill, because at this point the only alternative is a shutdown of the highway program. But let's be clear: This bill is a joke that does nothing on long-term investments in our infrastructure, nothing in a sustainable way to pay for them. We should not procrastinate until next May. We should start right now by building off of the bipartisan 6-year bill the Environment and Public Works Committee passed to give our constituents the infrastructure investments they are counting on us for.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANUFACTURING JOBS

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about jobs, about manufacturing jobs in particular.

As we in the Senate get ready to leave Washington and return home to

our States for August, it has become popular in the media to say our legislative work is done; that it is mostly about campaigning from here on out, for the weeks, the months remaining until the election in November. After all, we hear reported this is a body so divided, so riven by gridlock and partisanship that we haven't gotten a lot done, and the prospect for getting more done is even less.

Although I have certainly been frustrated by the pace of progress at times, this story not only gets a lot of things wrong, it is counterproductive and at times even self-fulfilling.

Let me start with the fact that we can, and we have, gotten important things done for manufacturing and for our economy and for our States as a whole.

Last year 26 of my Democratic colleagues, including the Presiding Officer, joined an initiative called Manufacturing Jobs for America, or MJA. The goal of Manufacturing Jobs for America has been simple: put together a collection of our best ideas—our best ideas—to spur manufacturing, job creation, to work with Republicans to find common ground, and to get these bills passed. We are focusing on manufacturing as a group of Senators because it is the foundation of our economy. It is the foundation of the pathway toward a middle class. Manufacturing jobs pay more in benefits and contribute more to the local economy than any other sector, fueling growth in other sectors.

Manufacturing is also incredibly innovative. Manufacturers invest the most in research and development of any industrial sector.

We have focused on four different broad areas in the MJA initiative: training a 20th century workforce; expanding access to capital for businesses looking to expand and invest in growth; leveling the global trade playing field and opening markets abroad; and focusing our government behind a national manufacturing strategy.

These are the four main areas of focus for Manufacturing Jobs for America, and together we have introduced over 30 bills, nearly half of which are bipartisan bills, with Republicans joining us in advancing these ideas. Together, we have made real progress in moving the ball forward. Already, five of these bills have passed out of committee. Three of them would take further steps to give startups and small businesses access to the research and development tax credit which came out of the Finance Committee. Two others passed as part of a single package to create a national manufacturing strategy and improve STEM education in our high schools and colleges that came out of the commerce committee. There is no reason that, working together, we can't get these bipartisan bills passed through the full Senate before the end of this Congress.

This isn't just wishful thinking. We have already seen seven provisions from Manufacturing Jobs for America bills enacted into law as well. In last year's Defense Authorization Act we included an MJA amendment that streamlines regulations and makes it easier for small businesses to do work with the Federal Government. Recently, as a result of our work to ensure innovative small businesses and startups can access the research and development tax credit, the administration took executive action to implement another MJA provision, and just last week the House and Senate came together to pass the broad bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to reform and streamline our Nation's job training programs—a bill that ultimately included five separate MJA provisions within it, and a bill that has now been signed into law by our President.

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act was years in the making, and its success is in no small part due to the relentless efforts of my colleagues Senators MURRAY and ISAKSON—Democrat and Republican—as well as Senators HARKIN and ALEXANDER, who have worked for years to get this over the finish line. Their success in crafting this bill and in building bipartisan support for it is a lesson for all of us, and it is a large example of what we have tried to do, bit by bit, for other manufacturing bills.

To me, it is really about determination. We have shown it is possible to get things done if we relentlessly seek common ground, if we engage outside groups, if we strengthen the quality of the ideas, and if we build bipartisan paths toward success.

One of our country's biggest challenges is the rapid pace of change in our globally interconnected economy. The middle-class jobs of today and tomorrow require higher skill levels than ever before as the economy continues to evolve. America needs a system that emphasizes lifelong learning, learning on the job, and constant adjustment. This is a challenge that Members of both parties are well aware of and are dedicated to stepping up and meeting. That is what the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is all about.

To put it in some context, by 2022 we are projected to have 11 million fewer workers with postsecondary education than our economy will need. But by consolidating 15 outdated or redundant Federal job training programs, by creating new board accountability standards, and by giving cities and States the flexibility to meet their economy's unique local needs, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act will help us make up that shortfall.

I was at the bill signing last week at the White House, along with the Senators whom I cited who led the charge on this, and it was uplifting to see the positive impact that came out of uniting in such a broadly bipartisan way on such an important issue as job skills for the modern manufacturing workforce for America.

On a week when Congress came together to improve our investment in America's workers, Vice President BIDEN also released a critical report that had great contributions from the Secretaries of Commerce, Education, and Labor—a critical report that details a number of other steps the administration is taking as a complement to that new law, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, to equip our workers for the 21st century economy.

As we get ready this week to return to our home States and to hear from our constituents in August, there is no reason to stop legislating this week and when we return in September. That is why I am introducing another bill as part of Manufacturing Jobs for America, a bill called Manufacturing Universities Act of 2014.

This bill will take on a simple but important challenge. Because today's manufacturing jobs require higher skill levels than ever—higher skill levels than yesterday's assembly line jobs, our schools and in particular universities need to be equipping students with those skills. Since innovation and research and development keep leading to new materials and new technologies that are critical to keeping American manufacturing at the cutting edge of the global economy, we also need to connect our universities with our manufacturers.

The manufacturing universities bill would create a competitive grant program that would ultimately designate 25 American universities as manufacturing universities. The competition would incentivize schools to build engineering programs that are targeted, that are focused on 21st century manufacturing and the skills our workers need to thrive. This would allow the cycle of innovation that can begin in the laboratory, that can mature in a factory, and that can produce more competitive products of the market to be fully harnessed around the challenge of meeting the 21st century manufacturing environment. That would build on important work that is already being done to link universities all the way to the shop floor but where we are not doing as much as we can and should with Federal grant funds that go to universities for research, to make them relevant and to make them current and to make them competitive.

For example, in my home State of Delaware, this bill, if enacted into law, could help the University of Delaware bolster its work with the private sector, focus its work with the Delaware Manufacturing Extension Partnership, focus the partnership between Delaware Technical and Community College, Delaware State University, and

our manufacturing community in Delaware, to ensure that manufacturing becomes a larger part of the University of Delaware's engineering curriculum and the training and research and outreach conducted by Del State and Del Tech.

The competitive challenges of the 21st century are big, but we have every reason to be united around meeting them. Manufacturing Jobs for America, like the Manufacturing Universities Act, take simple steps to invest in America's workers so they can drive our innovation and growth today and tomorrow, and take simple steps to make sure we are being as competitive as possible, that we are growing the best jobs possible for our home States and for our whole country.

Let's come together in a bipartisan way. Let's build on the success we have already seen across the different skills initiatives I have discussed. Just because elections are coming up this fall doesn't mean we can't continue to get behind great ideas—whether Democrat or Republican, whether from the House or the Senate—to move our Nation forward, and to create great jobs for all our States and all our communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, last week I explained why I oppose the nomination of Pamela Harris to the Fourth Circuit. I wish to raise several other aspects of her record that I find troubling, but before I address the specifics of this nominee, I need to place this nomination in context.

Last November, when the distinguished majority leader decided to toss aside an institution almost as old as the Senate itself, he claimed that breaking the rules was necessary because of an imminent crisis in the DC Circuit—not a judicial emergency; the numbers made it plain there was no judicial emergency, but a crisis that required radical action. That was after we had already confirmed the President's first nominee to the DC Circuit by a unanimous vote of 97 to 0. As I said in November, there was no crisis.

According to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, as of September 2013, the DC Circuit had 149 pending appeals for each active judge, by far the lightest caseload of any of the Nation's 13 circuit courts of appeals. The number of cases filed in that circuit decreased by almost 5 percent during the year 2013. So the only crisis the distinguished majority leader was responding to was one he and the Obama White House had manufactured. Instead, in an exercise of raw political power he decided to stack the DC Circuit by ramming through three of the President's nominees simultaneously. It turns out that the crisis was just an excuse for a political power grab, plain and simple, and everyone knew it. Despite the denials from the other side, all the signs were there for anyone and anybody who cared to see those signs.

In May of last year the distinguished majority leader said the DC Circuit was ''wreaking havoc with the country'' and that he was going ''to do something about it.'' I am not going to recount how many of my Democratic colleagues repeatedly blocked President Bush's nominees to that court when they were in the minority. Those were and remain nominees of the highest quality who deserved a vote but never got such a vote. Suffice it to say then that during the Bush administration, when the parliamentary shoe was on the other foot, the distinguished Democratic leader claimed the filibuster was a sacred institution. Times surely have changed.

So now after the other side has succeeded in stacking the DC Circuit, Democratic appointees outnumber Republican appointees by a 7-to-4 majority among active judges. The distinguished majority leader wasn't going to leave anything to fortune and he rammed those three nominees through.

I am recounting how the majority leader took the Senate nuclear because it all came to another head last week. You see, on Tuesday the three-judge panel of the DC Circuit decided the Halbig v. Burwell case, the most significant ObamaCare ruling since the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the law in 2012. Halbig is a straightforward case of statutory interpretation under the Administrative Procedures Act and the DC Circuit panel got it right. As the panel held, the text of the Affordable Care Act states on its face that tax credits are available only to individuals—individuals—who purchase their insurance plans through an exchange established by a State. So the IRS cannot make the tax credits available as the law clearly says to those who bought plans through the Federal exchange. You don't have to take my word for it. Putting aside the ample evidence mustered by the DC Circuit's opinion, as early as 2009, the former Democratic chair of our Finance Committee suggested that tax credits were aimed to cover only State exchanges. Additionally, economist Jonathan Gruber, one of the key architects of ObamaCare, has been very clear on this question.

According to the New York Times, Mr. Gruber's role in designing ObamaCare was so crucial that ''the White House lent him to Capitol Hill to help Congressional staff members draft the specifics of the legislation.''

What did the administration's own expert economist have to say about the availability of tax credits under ObamaCare? Here is his quote from 2012 explaining how credits were intended as a political pressure tactic on our 50 States:

I think what's important to remember politically about this, is if you are a state and you don't set up an Exchange, that means your citizens don't get their tax credits. But your citizens still pay the taxes that support this bill. So you're essentially saying to your citizens, you're going to pay all the taxes to help all the other states in the country. I hope that's a blatant enough political reality that states will get their act together and realize that there are billions of dollars at stake here in setting up these Exchanges, and that they'll do it. But you know, once again, the politics can get ugly around this.

Mr. Gruber is right. The politics have gotten very ugly around this.

After the panel ruled against the HHS Secretary in Halbig last week, it only took the administration about an hour to announce that it would seek en banc review by the full DC Circuit. That is where the majority's power grab is paying off. Breaking the Senate's longstanding rules and stacking the DC Circuit was a premeditated political calculation from the very beginning. So last week when asked whether his decision to stack the courts was vindicated by the Halbig decision, the distinguished majority leader told the press: ''I think if you look at simple math, it does. Simple math, you bet.''

Simple math was the other side's calculation. The simple math is stacking the DC Circuit with leftwing judges who will do in a court what the President and the other side have been unable to do through the legislative process. It is what they have been unable to do through the proper channels of government designated by the Constitution to resolve these issues through the Congress. But the President has been complaining for years that he cannot accomplish his legislative agenda that way, so he went looking for alternatives to that constitutional process, where the Constitution says the legislative branch shall legislate, and the Constitution says that the executive branch should only execute. Faithfully executing the laws is not something this President concerns himself with. By now everybody has heard the President's boast about his pen and his phone. As of July 18 of this year, the President wielding that pen and dialing that phone has unconstitutionally amended ObamaCare by executive or administrative fiat a grand total of 24 times, and that could be a very conservative estimate of everything he has done. The President's unilateral Executive actions were not minor. They unconstitutionally altered basic aspects of the law's design and operation. Things as fundamental as delaying the individual mandate, ordering the IRS to make subsidies available through Federal exchanges in direct contravention of the law, extending noncompliant plans, delaying the employer mandate—not once but twice—and exempting unions from reinsurance fees which will create costs that will be passed on to consumers who aren't fortunate enough to be employed by the President's political allies—all of these and

more in violation of law. By his own admission the President has used these aggressive and lawless tactics because he cannot prevail in the legislative process. But time has shown that Executive action has been insufficient to realize a failed legislative agenda. So the President turned to the courts to do what he couldn't otherwise do legislatively, what he couldn't do within constitutional constraints, because it is all about just ''simple math.''

That is not the way the Constitution works. High school students know otherwise. The President isn't entitled to a rubberstamp from a Congress on unpopular legislation, and he is not entitled to stack the courts with radically liberal judges when his political initiatives fail legislatively.

So I want the other side to remember how politics works when they inevitably find themselves in the minority once again. I want them to remember the new realities of the so-called simple math that they resorted to in order to accomplish legislative projects through judicial proxies instead of through the democratic process.

The DC Circuit wasn't the only appeals court to rule on the ObamaCare subsidies issue last week, and that brings me back to Professor Harris's nomination that we will be voting on today. The Fourth Circuit has ruled, but in contrast to the DC Circuit, it upheld the administration's subsidies regime in a case called the King case, and that is where this nominee comes in. As I explained to my colleagues last week, the timing of the vote on this nomination is not coincidence. Professor Harris is being fast-tracked to the Fourth Circuit just in time for another en banc appeal, should one materialize.

The professor, one of the President's most stridently liberal nominees to date, is jumping ahead of other circuit nominees on the Executive Calendar. Why? For one simple reason: The administration is betting on more simple math to defend ObamaCare in the Fourth Circuit, just like they are betting on simple math to save them in the DC Circuit.

My colleagues need to face the facts. Professor Harris is a rock-solid vote for saving ObamaCare's unlawful subsidy regime which many commentators have described as the economic linchpin of the entire law. All we need to do is look at the nominee's record, which shows time and again how this nominee confuses politics with the law.

For years prior to her confirmation hearing she advocated a legal philosophy in which leftwing politics actively guides and actively shapes judicial decisionmaking. She has explained in detail that she believes the Constitution is made and remade over and over again by political movements at the so-called constitutionally critical junctures. So do we even need to ask whether Professor Harris thinks that passage of ObamaCare was one such critical juncture and that the law is worth preserving at all costs? The question answers itself.

Just look at Professor Harris's record. Before my colleagues vote I want them to have a clear picture of what this nominee stands for, so I am going to mention a few truly remarkable positions she has taken in addition to the many I discussed with my colleagues last week. Professor Harris is on record that extralegal considerations should influence how a judge rules. She also expressed her belief that the personal characteristics of the judge should matter as well.

I think it is fair to say that she is acutely concerned with the personal characteristics of the judge. In 2010 she even told the Los Angeles Times that the President should consider a judicial nominee's religious beliefs when filling Supreme Court vacancies, even though our Constitution says there can be no religious test for any office. She said:

> It is hard for me to see religion as especially different than all other things that presidents take into account.

I don't even know where to start with that, and perhaps the less said about it the better. But I would be interested to know which religions the nominee thinks are suitable or unsuitable for representation on the Federal bench.

I will leave you with another example of how out of mainstream this nominee is. Professor Harris is an outspoken advocate for abortion rights. Over the years she has made a number of controversial statements about abortion and the Supreme Court's abortion precedent. Shockingly, on one occasion last year she described partial-birth abortion as merely a ''late-ish'' kind of abortion. The nominee also suggested that States ''gin up medical controversies'' intentionally and in bad faith in order to justify restrictions on late-term abortions.

She denigrated restrictions on partial-birth abortion because, in her view, ''you could find one guy to say 'I don't know it's safe to create medical uncertainty that will allow state regulation.' ''

Those are definitely not the views of mainstream nominees.

My colleagues need to understand this nominee's views fully before they cast their votes. This is a nominee who describes herself as a ''profoundly liberal person'' and who thinks the Constitution is a ''profoundly progressive document.'' This is a nominee who actually thinks the Constitution embodies her personal leftwing philosophy and has said it is ''pretty close to where I am.'' This is a nominee who suggested that a judicial nominee's religious faith is a valid consideration for service on the Federal bench. This is a nominee who thinks partial-birth abortion is just a ''late-ish'' kind of abortion and criticizes State partial-birth abortion laws ginned up by fake controversies and bogus data.

I explained earlier, a vote for this nominee is a vote in favor of ObamaCare, and that is why she is being hurried onto the Fourth Circuit ahead of nominees to other courts of appeal. It is the distinguished majority leader's simple math.

This is perhaps the most liberal judicial nominee we have seen from this President so far, which is why I am going to vote no on this nominee and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

STATE OF THE SENATE

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise to speak about a subject that troubles me greatly: the state of affairs in this body, the U.S. Senate.

I spoke on the floor last week about how the Senate has historically lived up to its unique and essential role in our constitutional order. Today, I am compelled to offer an account of this institution as it operates today. I believe this message is important both for the American people, whom we all serve, and for my colleagues in this body.

When I spoke on the floor last week, I noted the widespread perception that the Senate has fallen into dysfunction. The pervasiveness of this view is striking among the public, in the media, and even among current and former Senators of all political and ideological stripes. And it is true. The Senate is in worse shape now than ever before in my 38 years of service here.

We must properly locate the source of the problem if we are to have any hope of correcting it. Political discourse about the state of the Senate is so often dominated by those who call for the Senate to be more productive, more efficient. To these critics, the Senate's rules are anachronisms, historical accidents, relics of a bygone era that must be swept away for the Senate to race through more legislation and nominations, not the least of which we just heard Senator GRASSLEY speak about.

As I laid out on the floor last week, the purpose of the Senate is not to duplicate the work of the majoritarian House of Representatives. Our work is of a different sort. The Senate was designed to refine the unbridled passions of popular will, to apply considered judgment to produce thoughtful legislation aimed at the common good.

Structuring a body of such a unique character occupied much of the Framers' time during that hot summer in Philadelphia in 1787. Beyond the Senate's constitutional architecture, the body's rules, traditions, and precedents have developed over more than two centuries, not as flukes but as means of reinforcing and facilitating its purpose.

During the past 227 years, the right to debate and the right to amend have become the twin pillars that upheld the Senate's lofty purpose as a body of considered judgment. As Senator Robert C. Byrd wisely observed, ''As long as the Senate retains the power to amend and the power of unlimited debate, the liberties of the people will remain secure.''

Many of the greatest legislative achievements of this body during my 38 years as a Senator were only possible because of our open methods of deliberation and amendment. I think of my many partnerships with the late Ted Kennedy, and others—Senator HARKIN, Senator Dodd, HENRY WAXMAN. I can name quite a few. Senator Kennedy and I fought like brothers but became the best of friends. This unique environment of the Senate allowed us to find areas of mutual interest and ultimate agreement for the public good. Last week I named just a few of these landmark accomplishments: the 1981 budget, the blueprint of how we turned the economy around in the Reagan years; the 1997 budget deal in which we cut taxes, balanced the budget for the first time in decades, and created the State Children's Health Insurance Program; the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, a vital criminal law that curtailed the abuse of our courts; and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, a landmark piece of legislation sadly attacked by many of my Democratic colleagues to gin up a phantom war on women to save their lagging electoral fortunes, but in reality a bipartisan agreement that Teddy Kennedy and I championed and that passed almost unanimously. These are just a handful of our legislative achievements throughout the past four decades.

Like so many others, the roots of these successes lay in the Senate's characteristic deliberation, including unlimited debate and an open amendment process. Guaranteeing each individual Senator the full right of participation enhanced the quality of the final product and crowdsourcing good ideas rather than limiting input to a small gathering in backroom Capitol offices.

Giving each Senator the opportunity to have his ideas discussed and debated gave us all confidence that the final product represented the best, most considered judgment of the whole body, encouraging Senators to support sometimes imperfect but decisively beneficial legislation. Allowing modifications to the initial iteration of a bill—while often frustrating for partisans and purists—often created a broad base of support for lasting reforms. Emphasizing an open and inclusive process encouraged partnerships even among ideological opposites, such as Ted Kennedy and myself, to find areas of mutual agreement and reach broad consensus. And respecting the limits of the majority party's power established confidence that when the positions of the parties switched, the rights of the minority would remain protected.

The atmosphere facilitated by our longstanding rules and traditions represents the Senate at its best. The Senate, functioning as it should, and so often has over much of my time here, demonstrates that these procedures and traditions are not flukes of history meant to be swept away as soon as they are politically inconvenient or frustrate a majority party. Rather, they are vital to the Senate's ability to serve the American people.

This is why the first Adlai Stevenson in his farewell address to the Senate as Vice President warned:

> It must not be forgotten that the rules governing this body are founded deep in human experience; that they are the result of centuries of tireless effort in legislative halls, to conserve, to render stable and secure, the rights and liberties which have been achieved by conflict. By its rules the Senate wisely fixes the limits to its own power. Of those who clamor against the Senate, and its methods of procedure, it may be truly said: They know not what they do.

Sadly, these critical and defining practices are under attack. Some who once defended the right to amend when in the minority have acted consistently to deny that right now that they are in the majority.

On February 28, 2006, the senior Senator from Nevada, then serving as minority leader, condemned a procedural maneuver that denied the minority the opportunity to offer amendments. He stated unequivocally: This is a very bad practice. It runs against the basic nature of the Senate.

That maneuver, referred to as filling the amendment tree, allows the majority leader to use his right to be recognized before any other Members as a means to block any and all other amendments by filling all amendment slots with his own amendments and thus prohibiting anybody else from having any rights of amendment.

Less than a year after condemning the maneuver of filling the amendment tree as a very bad practice, inconsistent with the very nature of the Senate, the senior Senator from Nevada became the majority leader. Rather than take his own wise counsel from months before, he instead began a consistent pattern of procedural abuse by using that very same destructive practice. The majority leader employed that tactic 21 times during the 110th Congress and 23 times during the 111th Congress. As the 112th Congress opened, the majority leader pledged to use this tactic only ''infrequently,'' but went on to employ it a record 26 times in the following 2 years.

The Congressional Research Service confirms that the current majority leader has used his position to deny amendments to the minority more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined. He has used his position to deny amendments to the minority more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined.

Six Senators led this body as majority leader between the 99th and 109th Congresses, three Republicans and three Democrats. I served here under all of them. Together they denied amendments to the minority 40 times in those 22 years. No individual leader used this tactic more than 15 times. As of this month, in less than 8 years, the current majority leader has denied amendments to the minority a staggering 87 times.

The right to amend is indeed a part of the basic nature of the Senate, a defining feature of this body that allows us to conduct legislative business differently than in the majoritarian House. The right to amend allows different voices to be heard, different issues to be raised, and different decisions to be made. Denying that right changes the basic nature of the Senate and prefers power over liberty.

Hardly a day goes by without the current majority confirming my point. Earlier this month the majority leader discussed the possibility of allowing amendments to a bill. The minority, he said, want amendments ''because they want to kill the bill.'' But he pledged to consider amendments that, in his view, would ''lead to passage of the bill.''

In other words, the minority has only those opportunities to participate in the legislative process that the majority leader says they do. He was right back in 2006: This is a very bad practice, and he is only making it worse.

Consider another way of looking at this problem. Recently, almost a year went by during which the majority leader allowed votes on only 11 Republican amendments. Think about that—only 11 amendments in nearly a year. All 45 Republican Senators together got fewer votes on amendments than, for example, one House Democrat, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE. Indeed, the Republican House majority allowed votes on 174 Democratic amendments during the same period that the majority leader here allowed votes on only 11 Republican amendments. There are Senators who have been here 6 years and have never had an amendment of theirs voted upon—that is pathetic—on both sides.

The other defining feature of the Senate, the right to debate, is also fast becoming a thing of the past. This practice has been a central characteristic of the Senate for more than 200 years and, like the right to amend, allows voices to be part of the legislative process who would otherwise be shut out.

When I was first elected, this body included only 38 of us Republicans, even fewer than the threshold in our

Senate rules to prevent cutting off debate. I know from long experience that the right to debate can often annoy the majority by empowering the minority. But fulsome debate and thorough deliberation far more than expediency or efficiency is essential to the nature of the Senate. Both sides have been annoyed from time to time, but nothing like this.

Senate practice and rules have, for more than two centuries, required a supermajority of Senators to end debate before the Senate can vote on a pending legislative matter or a nomination. The current majority leader has compromised the minority's ability to debate in both areas.

Under the rule adopted in 1917, ending debate begins with a motion to invoke cloture to end debate. The current majority leader often files a cloture motion on a bill at the very same time he brings it up for consideration. He has used this tactic far more often than previous majority leaders, and its effect is not to end debate on legislation but to prevent it altogether. Whenever those of us in the minority have resisted his demand that we end debate as soon as we begin consideration, the majority leader wrongly labels it a filibuster.

Last November the majority leader claimed there had been 168 filibusters on executive and judicial nominations. The majority leader used this supposedly unprecedented level of confirmation obstruction to take the drastic step of abolishing extended debate altogether using the so-called nuclear option. But the majority leader was counting cloture motions, not filibusters. A cloture motion is simply a request to end debate. A filibuster occurs when the debate cannot be ended because the cloture vote fails. In fact, most of those were not filibusters; they were falsely called that. There have been only 14 filibusters of President Obama's nominees, and that practice was on a decline. The Senate, in fact, confirmed 98 percent of President Obama's nominees. There was never a problem there.

The majority leader's current opposition to filibustering Democratic nominees is simply impossible to reconcile with the 26 times he voted to filibuster Republican nominees.

But even as destructive as the nuclear option has been, some of the less visible changes to the management of this Chamber have proven just as damaging to the functioning of the Senate. Take the committee process—the primary forum for both deliberation and amendment. The majority leader has set a record for completely bypassing the committee process, bringing most of the bills we have considered lately up in essentially final form, shielding them from deliberation and amendment on both the floor and in committee. In each Congress since he became majority leader, the senior Senator from Nevada has set a record for bypassing the committee process. In fact, with 6 months remaining in this Congress, he has already used this tactic more in one Congress than any other majority leader.

What are these matters the majority leader brings to the floor? An unschooled observer might imagine that after the negotiation of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement—an imperfect bargain but a breakthrough for cooperation nonetheless—we would join the House in pursuing the appropriations process through the regular order; that we would use the opportunity to exert our influence as legislators on how our constituents' hard-earned dollars are spent. Instead, the majority leader brings up bills that have no chance of becoming law in order to score political points to reinforce disingenuous narratives about a supposed war on women or so-called economic patriotism.

The current majority leader's abuse of the Senate amounts to a national travesty. He has broken down so much of what makes this institution serve the Nation's interests in order to advance his own party's temporary political gain. Such a betrayal of trust is nothing short of tragic.

To my 56 colleagues who have never served in the Senate when this body lived up to its potential greatness, we can indeed restore the Senate's rightful place in our constitutional order. This body can again be a source of great legislative achievement borne out of thoughtful deliberation and inclusive consideration. But this majority leader's slash-and-burn tactics are not the path to achieve these worthy ends. They are a dead end, leading only to the destruction of this institution that has served our Nation so well for so long. Instead, restoring the Senate will require us all—Republicans and Democrats alike—to stand for the institution's rules, traditions, precedents, and for our individual prerogatives as Senators.

The majority leader is my friend, but I have to say these criticisms are valid, they are honorable, and it is about time that people on both sides of the floor start to realize we can't keep going this way and still call this the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is pathetic. I think people on both sides know it is pathetic, and it is time for it to stop.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it is hard to imagine a more pressing need for our people, for our economy, and for our quality of life than reauthorizing the highway trust fund.

The Senate has previously entered into a unanimous consent agreement to have votes on four transportation funding amendments. The reality, however, is that time is running out to hold those votes before they would become what amounts to a meaningless exercise.

We all know that this week the Senate still has to vote on veterans health care, emergency funding to deal with wildfires raging in the West, and the challenge of those child immigrants coming across the border from Mexico. That is all the more reason why the critical issue, the urgent issue of transportation funding should not be left to the last minute. Left to the last minute, in effect, this body would simply be surrendering its ability to have a genuine impact on an urgent national issue—an issue critical for our people, for our economy, and for our country in the days ahead.

Now, if the Senate were to vote tomorrow on transportation funding—and the majority leader, Senator REID, has assured me that would be acceptable to him—there would still be time to work out any differences between the Senate and the other body before the Congress recesses at the end of this week.

However, if the votes are delayed until later in the week, my judgment, as chairman of the Finance Committee, where Senator HATCH and I have put together a bipartisan bill is that if the votes are delayed, for example, on the bipartisan Wyden-Hatch amendment, it would become almost impossible for the Senate to have any input into the final transportation bill that goes to the President.

Just from my own standpoint, I think it would be legislative malpractice for the Senate not to have a role to play in this premier economic issue now before the Congress. The highway trust fund, colleagues, is going to be reauthorized this week. That is nonnegotiable. The reason it is going to be reauthorized this week and we will not accept anything else is that the stakes are just too great. If our country was to have the transportation equivalent of a government shutdown, more than 700,000 jobs could be affected, coming on the heels of a slowdown in home construction which we have just seen in the last few days. It would be a devastating blow for the construction industry and our whole economy.

Beyond the short-term impact and the threat to the already shaky recovery, my view is that every Senator, every Democrat and every Republican, understands transportation funding

and improving our infrastructure is critical to our country's future. The reality is that it is just not possible to have a big league quality of life with little league infrastructure.

Now as I wrap up, I would like to talk about a couple of other points that are relevant to how the Senate conducts its business. I am especially grateful to Senator HATCH, who has consistently met me halfway. As we know, our distinguished colleague, the former chairman, Senator Baucus, is now Ambassador to China. I took up that position in February. From the very day I became chairman of the committee, Senator HATCH has been willing to work with me, meet me halfway and, in particular, has talked about the importance of the Senate functioning in its regular order.

I would point out that a number of colleagues have been saying just that, and that the Senate has not had a chance to vote on amendments to legislation this year. That is not how this great body is supposed to operate. We know, with respect to this transportation bill, if we can get it brought to the floor tomorrow so we can have a real debate, we could have two bipartisan amendments and two from the minority that will shape not only transportation policy but also policies in vital other areas, including taxes, pensions, and trade.

If the votes on these amendments, bipartisan amendments, are fairly structured so that both sides would have a chance to weigh in and if the votes on these amendments are going to be given full and fair consideration and not become some kind of exercise in futility, they have to be held tomorrow. So I hope we will be able to work this out. I had thought about coming here and advancing a procedural motion. My hope is we can work this out so we can really debate these critical issues.

I do think the other body goes too far on the issue of pensions smoothing. Given that position, the country is likely to have two big challenges in the future. First, how do we fund transportation? And second, what are we going to do about the hopes and aspirations of all of those workers relying on pensions and the future of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation?

So I do think the bipartisan Senate proposal that Senator HATCH and I have authored—and there are other bipartisan proposals—gives us a chance to, in effect, have the Senate weigh in in a meaningful fashion on this critical issue.

I know we are going to have a vote in a little bit, and there will be a discussion between the leaders and colleagues. I may come back later tonight to discuss this further. I simply come this afternoon—more than anything else, what I have sought to do is to try to advance exactly what Senator HATCH has been talking about: Regular order and the chance for both sides to be heard on critical issues and to try to get beyond some of the polarizing, divisive kind of rhetoric that certainly you hear outside the Capitol.

I was home this weekend marching in parades, getting out across the State. That is what I heard continually, people coming up and saying: RON, can't the Senate and the Congress find a way to come together? Senator HATCH and I did that on a bipartisan proposal. There are other bipartisan proposals, proposals that ensure the minority has a chance to be heard. I just hope we can work it out this evening so both sides will have a chance to have a fair debate on this issue at a time when it is still meaningful.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time in quorum calls be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in a few moments we are going to have the opportunity to vote on the confirmation of Pamela Harris for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. I am very proud to have joined Senator MIKULSKI in recommending to President Obama the appointment of Pamela Harris to the Fourth Circuit.

I have interviewed many candidates for judicial appointments. I can tell you Pamela Harris is at the top, as far as her qualifications for this appellate court position. She is an extraordinarily talented person who has devoted the prime part of her life to public service and seeks this appointment for the right reasons—to continue her public service.

I mentioned that Senator MIKULSKI and I both recommended her appointment. Senator MIKULSKI has set up, as the senior Senator in our State, a process by which we solicit the strongest possible candidates of interest to fill judicial vacancies. We understand these are lifetime appointments. We understand the importance of these appointments. We have a screening process and an interview process in addition to the White House and Justice Department vetting process, which we think will give us the highest quality person to fill these lifetime appointments. In Pamela Harris's case, I am extremely proud. I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her commitment to a process that gives us the very best people for these positions.

Pamela Harris is the granddaughter of Polish-Jewish immigrants who came to this country to seek a better life for their children. Pamela's mother worked her way through law school. Pamela herself went to Yale College and then Yale Law School. She was helped in the process with Pell grants. She is a product of the Montgomery County public schools. We are very proud of the fact that she has really lived the American dream and has been able to accomplish so much in her career through hard work and believing in this country.

When we take a look at her professional accomplishments, I don't know what else we could ask. She has the highest rating from the American Bar Association, which gives us that information on the candidates who are nominated for judgeships.

She clerked for Judge Harry T. Edwards in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and she clerked for Justice John Paul Stevens in the Supreme Court of the United States. She has been an associate professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, codirector of Harvard Law School's Supreme Court and appellate litigation clinic, a visiting professor at Georgetown University Law Center, and she was in the Justice Department's Office of Legal Policy. At Georgetown University Law Center, her clinic prepares lawyers for their arguments before the Supreme Court of the United States. In other words, she is basically the person who teaches and gives practical experience for those who have to appear before the highest Court in this land.

It is interesting that she has dedicated about half of her time to civil cases and about half to criminal cases, so she is well versed on the responsibilities of our appellate court. I don't think we could have found a more qualified person to fill this extremely important position on the Fourth Circuit.

I also want my colleagues to know that she understands the responsibilities of a lawyer and a judge to provide access to all. She will take an oath if she is confirmed—and I am hopeful she will be in a few moments, literally—to serve justice regardless of a person's wealth or poverty. As a private attorney, she helped develop a relationship with the public defender of Maryland to provide help to indigent individuals who needed additional services. She is committed to pro bono service and she is committed to equal access to justice in addition to everything else she has done in her career. She really understands. She has the talent, she has the commitment to all in our communities, and she understands what the appropriate role is for a member of the bench, for a judge.

I know Senator GRASSLEY has mentioned his concerns, but Senator GRASSLEY asked a lot of questions for the record, which is the right of any Senator to do. These are lifetime appointments, and I fully support that.

But I wish to state Pamela Harris's own words in response as to understanding the difference between an advocate and a judge, between a lawyer representing a client and a judge. I know when I practiced law, I gave everything I could to help the clients I represented. I didn't always 100 percent agree with their position, but it was my responsibility to advocate for their position. That is how our system of justice operates. That is our rule of law.

Pamela Harris said:

I fully recognize that the role of a judge is entirely different from the role of an advocate. If confirmed as a judge, my role would be to apply governing law and precedent impartially to the facts of a particular case.

She gets it. She understands what the role of a judge is.

Quite frankly, I want people who are active in the legal system to apply and become our judges because they understand the importance of the work a judge does.

She continues:

It is inappropriate for any judge or Justice to base his or her decision on their own personal view or on public opinion. . . . If confirmed as a circuit judge, I would faithfully follow the methodological precedence of the Supreme Court and the Fourth Circuit, applying the interpretive approaches and only the interpretive approaches used by those courts.

Perhaps that is exactly what we want from our judges. We want them to be worldly. We want them to understand the law. We want them to have been involved in the law. In Pam Harris's case, she has been a professor, she has taught the law, and, yes, she has been actively engaged. But once they become a judge, they need to apply the precedence from that circuit, from the Supreme Court, and that is exactly what Pam Harris said she would do. Her reputation for being straightforward and telling it exactly the way she believes has been well documented in the record before the Judiciary Committee.

I thank Senator LEAHY for the incredible manner in which he operates the Judiciary Committee in the best traditions of the Senate. They had a full hearing on Pamela Harris's nomination. They had a full record. One of the letters that is part of that record that is also part of the record of the Senate was a letter—the Judiciary Committee received numerous letters of support for Pamela Harris. I will quote from one letter that was signed by more than 80 of her professional peers, which included individuals appointed by Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents to key positions, including Gregory Garre, the former Solicitor General for George W. Bush. In that letter where these 80 signatories to that letter strongly endorsed Pamela Harris's confirmation for judge on the Fourth Circuit, it says:

We are lawyers from diverse backgrounds and varying affiliations, but we are united in our admiration for Pam's skills as a lawyer and our respect for her integrity, her intellect, her judgment, and her fair-mindedness.

Continuing:

Many of us have had the opportunity to work with Pam on appellate matters. She has been co-counsel to some of us, opposing counsel to others, and a valuable colleague to all. In her appellate work, Pam has demonstrated extraordinary skill. She is a quick study, careful listener, and acute judge of legal arguments. She knows the value of clarity, candor, vigor, and responsiveness. Of equal importance, she has always conducted herself with consummate professionalism, grace, and congeniality, and has a humble and down-to-earth approach to her work.

The letter concludes:

Her well-rounded experience makes her well prepared for the docket of a federal appellate court. Pam's substantive knowledge, intellect, and low-key temperament will be great assets for the position for which she has been nominated.

I pointed out before and I will again that there are many questions that were posed to Pamela Harris during the confirmation process. I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at those. I did. I read her answers to those questions. They were very well documented and very professional. Her reputation is one of being a straight shooter and saying exactly what is on her mind. Read her responses. She understands the role of a judge. She is well qualified to serve on this circuit.

She has the strong endorsement of the two Senators from her home State, and I urge my colleagues to vote for her confirmation. We are very proud of her record on the Fourth Circuit.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Harris nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—43

Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Pryor
Chambliss	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Roberts
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	Manchin	
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Murkowski	Vitter
Begich	Rubio	
Landrieu	Schatz	

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ELLIOT F. KAYE TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF ELLIOT F. KAYE TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH P. MOHOROVIC TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF BRIAN P. McKEON TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2013; Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; Joseph P. Mohorovic, of Illinois, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2012; and Brian P. McKeon, of New York, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

VOTE ON KAYE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Kaye nomination.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back whatever time is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2013?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON KAYE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MOHOROVIC NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph P. Mohorovic, of Illinois, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2012?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MCKEON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Brian P. McKeon, of New York, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, did we vote on the Kaye nomination twice?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We did vote on the Kaye nomination twice.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3693

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3693.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3694 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3693

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3694 to amendment No. 3693.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3695

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit S. 2569, with instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith with the following amendment numbered 3695.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3696

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3696 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3697 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3696

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3697 to amendment No. 3696.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''5''.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion which has been filed and ask that the Chair have it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Harry Reid, John E. Walsh, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Kay R. Hagan, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bill Nelson, John D. Rockefeller IV, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jeff Merkley, Mazie K. Hirono, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 488.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bill Nelson, John D. Rockefeller IV, Mazie K. Hirono, Tom Harkin, Bernard Sanders, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 524

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of a simple and straightforward resolution cosponsored by 20 of our colleagues that would simply express the sense of the Senate that climate change is occurring and that it will continue to pose ongoing risks and challenges to our citizens and to our country. That is all it says. We know we have a problem. We don't pretend to give every solution in this resolution; it simply gives us the point of saying we have a problem.

I am pleased to be joined by two leaders on this issue, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE as well as Chairman BARBARA BOXER, the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

We have an obligation to our constituents and to this country to address global climate change. We must tackle the challenge head-on. This is an issue facing all Americans—from farmers struggling with extreme weather from drought, to floods in seaside communities threatened by rising waters, to habitat changes that are impacting our hunting, fishing, and outdoor economy, to businesses trying to mitigate the financial risks posed by the effects of climate change.

It is clear climate change poses a grave threat to food security, the environment, and our national security, as well as to our businesses. Yet achieving a commitment to at least admit this problem is going on in the Senate has fallen short. That is the point of our direct resolution that simply states the facts—the science—about climate change and the impact it is having on our country.

The resolution draws from the 2014 National Climate Assessment which was drafted by 300 climate experts and extensively reviewed by a 60-member advisory committee and the National Academy of Sciences. The National Climate Assessment states the science very simply. The most recent decade was the Nation's warmest on record and U.S. temperatures are expected to continue to rise. The Department of Defense of this country, of the United States of America, our own Department of Defense 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review reiterates climate change has a destabilizing effect, stating: ''The pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.'' And the Defense Science Board report concluded: ''Climate change will only grow in concern for the United States and its security interests.''

All the resolution says is that it is the sense of the Senate that global climate change is occurring and will continue to cause ongoing risks and challenges to the people and the Government of the United States.

We know the costs. The 2012 drought was the worst drought since 1956 and caused over $30 billion in damage nationwide. The current drought in the Western and Southwestern States is estimated to cost billions and it remains ongoing. Last week there was a newspaper map showing that about 34 percent of the contiguous United States was in at least a moderate drought as of July 22. Those are the numbers. Those are the facts.

We have seen heavy downpours increasing nationally. We have seen hurricanes increasing in intensity. If we continue on our current path, by the year 2050, between $66 billion and $106 billion worth of existing coastal properties will likely be below sea level nationwide, and $238 billion to $507 billion worth of property will be below sea level by the year 2100.

So what are we hearing from the business community? We have conservative businesspeople such as former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under George Bush, Hank Paulson, speaking out. He, along with former New York mayor Michael Bloomberg and eight other prominent business and policy leaders, recently released the first comprehensive assessment of the economic risks our Nation faces from the changing climate, including increased coastal storm damage, reduced productivity in some areas of the United States because they have become too hot for outdoor work, strained energy networks, and expanding public health impacts. This report represents an important first step toward a true accounting of the risks of climate change so the American business community can begin to work toward effective climate risk management.

Just this past Thursday, former Clinton Treasury Secretary and cochair of the Foreign Relations Council Bob Rubin wrote an article in the Washington Post advocating that although it is clear that the U.S. economy faces enormous risks from unmitigated climate change, policy and business leaders are not taking into account the cost of inaction, which means decisions are being made based on the broad picture posed by climate change on our economy.

So now we have scientists, business leaders, church groups, and outdoor groups all out in front of this issue. In fact, a recent poll found that 63 percent of Americans believe this is occurring. Sixty-three percent of Americans believe it is occurring. Yet where is the Senate? Where are we?

We have an opportunity today, to pass this simple resolution saying it is the sense of the Senate that global climate change is occurring and will continue to pose ongoing challenges to the people and the Government of the United States.

It should not be that hard for this Congress to simply say that. Think of what the Senate has done in the past. When we saw what was going on in South Africa, it was the Senate that overcame a Presidential veto to approve the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act. It was the Senate that took the lead on civil rights legislation. It was the Senate that was willing to put partisan issues aside and take on the Watergate hearings. It was the Senate that took on consumer issues. It was the Senate that passed the Clean Air Act approved by 43 Democrats and 30 Republicans.

We just have to take one step today; that is, to simply tell the world we know there is a problem. We are not here trying to give all the solutions. We know colleagues disagree with this in terms of what we should do, depending on where they are from or what States they represent. But to even start having those discussions, we have to admit there is a problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple, straightforward resolution. I urge them to support it because it is so important to our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 524, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding global climate change which was submitted earlier today; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have to say this. The resolution by Senator KLOBUCHAR clearly demonstrates the vast political influence of the President's global warming advocates and what they have been doing over time.

This is not new. This started in this Chamber—let's see, 15 years ago—at the time the Clinton-Gore effort took place in South America and they signed on to the treaty down there. Of course, it never came up to be ratified.

This resolution cites 13 different government agencies that are colluding together to merge their policies to promote global warming, which underscores how effective the environmental activists such as Tom Steyer have been at getting their agenda into the Obama administration.

While some Democrats may be convinced global warming is continuing to occur, the scientific record does not agree. In fact, for the past 15 years temperatures across the globe have not increased. Let's think about that. Is anyone listening here? Temperatures have not increased over the last 15 years. This isn't just—a major magazine had an article on it, ''The Economist'' did, and even the scientists at the IPCC.

Let's keep in mind that the whole thing was started by the United Nations. They started this group called the IPCC—the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—and they have been promoting it ever since. Even the IPCC says we have had no warming for the last 15 years. Senator WICKER from Mississippi, at a hearing last week, pointed out that some 31,000 American scientists, 9,000 of whom have Ph.D.s, have signed a petition noting there is a lack of scientific evidence that greenhouse gases are causing global warming.

Looking at the political side of things, the Senate has been debating this issue for nearly 15 years. I can remember standing right here at this podium, the first bill that came down was the McCain-Lieberman bill. It was to legislatively do a cap-and-trade bill. It would have set up an economywide cap-and-trade program. It failed by a vote of 43 to 55. This is in the Senate. A short while after that they had another bill, which was in 2005, and it failed by a larger margin. In 2008, the Warner-Lieberman bill came up. It failed also. Each time it fails, it fails by a larger plurality, which leads me to question how people can possibly say the majority in this Senate has an interest in this legislation because they fail every time. The last time the bill was considered in Congress was in 2009. That was the Waxman-Markey bill. It passed the House but never got a vote in the Senate because they knew it was going to fail.

One might ask, Why is that? What changed from the time the polling showed Americans were interested in this issue? I will tell my colleagues when it was. I happened to be at that time chairman of the air subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee. They had at that time a study that came out. It was by the scientists from the Wharton School of Economics talking about what the cost would be if we were to pass cap and trade. That figure was between $300 billion and $400 billion a year. Let's keep in mind that would constitute the largest tax increase in the history of America.

It is not as if it is just one group. MIT, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, came out and agreed with those figures. They said $300 billion to $400 billion. Then Charles Rivers came out and said the same thing, about $300 billion to $400 billion a year.

Since that time there has been a wake-up call for the American people. I don't know what my good friend from Minnesota—maybe she will elaborate a little bit on these polls. But I can remember back when the Gallup polls used to say, some 15 years ago, that global warming was either the first or the second major concern people had. A Gallup poll that came out just 2 weeks ago said it was No. 14 out of 15. In other words, they said: Name the 15 greatest concerns we have, and No. 14 out of 15 was global warming.

The Pew Research Center came out just the other day saying that 53 percent of Americans who believe in global warming—these are the ones who truly believe the globe is warming and we are all going to die—when they asked about the cause of global warming, either they said they don't believe there is enough evidence to blame manmade gases—that is anthropogenic gases—or they believe it is caused by natural variation.

This probably explains why it has been difficult for Tom Steyer to reengender a lot of interest in this issue. He has committed to raising $100 million. He promised to help Democrats win elections this fall. He put $50 million of his own money—this is Tom Steyer talking; he admits he is doing this—and he is going to raise the other $50 million. We found out from an article in Politico 2 weeks ago that the most he has been able to raise of the second $50 million is $1.2 million from outside donors so far. Maybe over the weekend he had a good weekend; I don't know. That is a possibility.

What we should be doing is learning from the international community. Just last week Australia repealed its much hated carbon tax—the same thing that is being promoted right now. Either cap and trade or a tax on carbon is what they passed in Australia, and they did it overwhelmingly. Then they realized the real cost. Tony Abbott, the Prime Minister, should be heralded as a hero for his courageous leadership to help the poor and those on fixed incomes who suffer when energy prices needlessly rise.

Upon passage of the bill to repeal the tax, he told the Australian people—this is his quote; listen very carefully: ''Today the tax that you voted to get rid of is finally gone. A useless destructive tax which damaged jobs, which hurt families' cost of living and which didn't actually help the environment is finally gone.'' He is talking about the tax they passed in the country of Australia and just recently rescinded that.

By the way, there is a guy, Senator Cory Bernardi, who came out—I happened to see him 3 or 4 days ago in Washington. He was here. He was one of the senators who actually had promoted this to start with and then changed his mind and realized this is something that is worth repealing. And they did it.

So the Australian people are thanking their Prime Minister. I believe we will be able to protect the American people from the senseless global warming policies here in the United States. It is something they have tried for 15 years here. Every time they stand up and say, oh, the science is settled, the science is settled, then we come up with more groups. I can remember the first time they said the science is settled. That was 12 years ago. Look at my Web site. I named a handful of scientists who had been intimidated by the IPCC—that is the United Nations—into saying: Yes, we want you to participate. But to do this, you have to believe this stuff on global warming. Of course, it did not happen.

So we started listing, and we got several hundred, then several thousand scientists who we still have on the Web site. You can access it. So it is not just recently that scientists have changed their mind on this, because they started a long time ago. By the way, I know this is a fine person, Tom Steyer, and we are reading from Politico. Later on he made the statement:

> It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in the mid-term elections. We are looking at a bunch of races. My guess is that we will end up involved in eight or more races.

This is a guy talking about what he is going to do with $100 million. So it is something that is not going to happen.

It sounds real good, standing up and talking about the world coming to an end, but that was not sellable back in 2003 when they had the first bill. It is not sellable today.

It always bothers me when we have a President who tries his best to get things done legislatively, and then cannot do it that way so he is trying to do it through regulations. So having said all of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much having had the opportunity to hear those words from what I can only describe as an alternate reality from the one I inhabit, any way. First, let me say the very first paragraph of the resolution is this: Whereas, the 2014 National Climate Assessment stated the most recent decade was the Nation's warmest on record—U.S. Temperatures are expected to continue to rise.

There is some evidence that certain temperatures have been flat for a few years—atmospheric temperatures. What that little rhetorical device omits to consider is two things: One, 93 percent of the heat that comes onto the Earth from global warming goes into the oceans. Maybe 3 or 4 percent actually goes into the atmosphere—93 to 3. So if there is any change in the ocean, which regulates the temperature of the Earth, then it is going to have a pronounced effect on atmospheric temperature. And the ocean continues to warm.

People will say: No, the Earth stopped warming. It has not warmed for 12 or 15 years—whatever they say. No, if you actually look at it, the oceans are continuing to warm. There has been this step in atmospheric temperature at a certain level. The other thing that gets left out when our friends say that is this is not the first step. If you look at the history of how this got to be the hottest decade on record, over and over you can look at the graphs and you see these steps. To pretend that each step is the last one runs completely against the science. So to say we have no warming is just not factual. To say that the government—he used the word colluding—is colluding together, that is a fairly tough word to use. Let me tell you some of the government agencies that are so-called colluding together and believe climate change is real and carbon pollution is causing it.

How about NASA? We trust them to send our astronauts into space. We trust them to deliver a rover the size of an SUV to the surface of Mars safely and drive it around, sending data and pictures back from Mars to us. You think these people know what they are talking about?

We trust NOAA with our weather predicting. That is what they tell us. Nobody is saying they are incompetent at weather predicting. Do not listen when people are warning you about storms. But somehow when they talk about climate change, that is colluding.

How about the U.S. Navy? The Commander in Chief of our Pacific Command, Admiral Locklear, has said the No. 1 threat we face in the Pacific theatre comes from climate change. Is he colluding when he says that? This is a career Navy man whom the people of America have trusted with the security of our Pacific theater. It is exactly consistent with what the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review said both last time—4 years ago—and most recently.

If you want to ignore the Federal Government, if you live in a world in which you think the Federal Government colludes with itself to make up things that are not true—OK, but look at the property casualty insurance and reinsurance industry. They are the people with the biggest bet on this. They have billions of dollars riding on getting it right. They say climate change is real. Carbon pollution is causing it. We have to do something about it.

So does the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, because they care about the poor and the effect this will have on the people who have the least. So does every major U.S. scientific society—every single one. So you can take a poll or a petition and say it has 30,000 names on it. I am told that among the names on that petition are the Spice Girls and people from MASH such as Dr. Frank Burns. It is almost a comedic effort.

When you say there are 9,000 who have degrees, that is—what—.00003 percent of our population of 300 million? Maybe I got a zero wrong there. The idea that you cannot find 9,000 people who think the Earth is flat is a bit of a stretch. The idea that we should base our policies on a petition that imaginary people are on rather than on what NASA, NOAA, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, every major scientific society, and the entire property casualty insurance and reinsurance industry are telling us is just extraordinary.

If you want to go into the private sector, you have to look no further than Coke and Pepsi. Look no further than Walmart. Look no further than Mars. You can go over there to the candy drawer and you can get wonderful Mars products. It is a huge company. They are going carbon neutral. They are desperately concerned about climate change. Look at Nike, look at Google, look at Apple—American company after American company.

The only place, other than, of course, the 9,000 people who joined the Spice Girls and MAJ Frank Burns on this petition, where denial is anything credible any longer is here in Congress where the money from the fossil fuel industry still has such a pernicious effect. But even among the Republicans—I will close by saying this and yield to my distinguished chairman. Even among the Republicans, they are losing their young voters on this issue. People know better. You poll Republicans who are under the age of 35 and a majority of them will say that somebody who believes in climate denial is ignorant, out of touch or crazy. That is what the young Republicans think about that position. So time is on our side. The day will come when the Senate can face the fact that climate change is real. I want to thank Senator KLOBUCHAR and salute her effort to bring such a noncontroversial proposition to the floor in the form of a resolution—such a noncontroversial and factual proposition. It is a measure of our times and a measure of this body and a measure of the influence on it that it was not adopted by unanimous consent but was objected to by the Republicans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR from the bottom of my heart for writing such a sensible resolution. People who do not know AMY KLOBUCHAR, as I know her, may not know that she is terrific at bringing both sides together. She does it every day of the week. I could list all of the issues, but I will not take the time to do that. The record speaks for itself.

But on this one, on this simple statement of fact, our Republican friends will not even let that go. This is amazing. This is not a document that says this is how we should fix climate change or this is how we should address it. She does not get into that. She stays away from that because there are legitimate differences.

Some people say: Let's keep on making more electric cars. Some people say: Let's focus on energy efficiency in our homes. Some people say: Shut down the old coal powerplants. It is dangerous to breathe that air. They are adding to the problem.

She does not get into that. All she does in this beautifully elegant and simple resolution is state the facts. First, the resolution acknowledges that the National Climate Assessment report, which is congressionally required—the Congress set it up—states that serious impacts are happening all around us. That report was drafted by more than 300 experts. Guess what it shows? This is what she points out. There are more frequent heat waves, wildfires, and droughts. Coming from California, I can tell you, we are in a terrible fire season. We go to bed at night not knowing what we are going to hear in the morning when we wake up about the raging wildfires in our great State.

We see them in all of our neighboring States as well, whether it is Washington, or Oregon or Arizona. The least we can do is acknowledge we have more frequent fires, that we have a terrible drought in the West, and that this is a fact in evidence. It is not a fact not in evidence.

Second, the resolution acknowledges that our top military leaders at the Pentagon have concluded the impacts of climate change are a growing concern. Sometimes when the military makes a statement it is hard to understand it. This one is really clear. Do you know what they say? They say that climate change is moving from a threat multiplier to a catalyst for conflict. Let me say that again. They used to think it was a threat multiplier. So if there was a problem, say, in Syria, where there is a horrific drought—and some people think that whole conflict has a lot of roots in that drought—where it used to be a multiplier, now they are saying it could actually be the reason why there are conflicts.

Now, I cannot believe my Republican friends would cast away the words of our military leaders and stand up here and object to this resolution. All it says is: Climate change is happening. These are the people who say it is happening. It is a risk to the American people if we do not address it.

Now, I will close with this. In our committee Senator WHITEHOUSE had an incredible hearing he organized. It was amazing. I sat through the entire hearing. He invited four former Republican EPA Administrators who served under the last four Republican Presidents: Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, and George W. Bush. Now, listen to this. Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, and George W. Bush—all of these former administrators said: Climate change requires action now, and it should not be a partisan issue. I ask rhetorically: When did the environment become a partisan issue? When I first got into politics—it was a while ago—but it was completely bipartisan.

We addressed this issue together because the health of the American people, the ability to go to work and breathe clean air and not have an asthma attack or a heart attack, the desire to make sure our kids are swimming in safe, clean water and drinking clean water. This wasn't partisan.

The latest thing we know—and this is critical to put in the RECORD at this time—is that when we clean up dirty, filthy carbon pollution, we also make sure the air is cleaner to breathe. This is critical. That is why the administration's plan is going to lead to healthier communities. We can't afford to sit around here debating whether climate change is real. We can't afford that.

All we wanted to say in this resolution and all Senator KLOBUCHAR says is that climate change is happening. The experts are telling us. The peer review scientists are telling us. The military is telling us. Everybody is telling us.

Yes, as Senator WHITEHOUSE said, there is a small group of people—there always has been and there always will be—but we didn't wait before we protected our people from tobacco smoke because 10 percent of the scientists said: No, no, no, it doesn't cause cancer.

I would love to be able to bring back the lives of those lost when the tobacco companies put their dirty money all around the Capitol and stopped us from acting.

I am proud to stand with my friends.

When history is written—trust me on this one—they are going to look at us and say: What did they do? What did they do to step to the plate?

President Obama did, and we are protecting his rules here. But we have a job to do. It all starts with acknowledging that there is a problem. If you don't acknowledge that there is a problem, you will never fix it.

I thank my friend Senator KLOBUCHAR for her leadership, and I hope she will not be deterred because I want to be back on this floor with her, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and others as many times as she is willing to put this forward because it is that important.

I yield the floor.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I thank Senator BOXER.

We now have 21 cosponsors. We are adding daily. We have cosponsors, of course, from coastal States. States such as Hawaii and Maine see the effect of the water all around them. Independent Senator ANGUS KING is a cosponsor of this resolution. We have Colorado, with Senator UDALL and Senator BENNET, who are cosponsors, who understand the risk of wildfire and what they see in their State with climate change. We have States in the Midwest, such as Iowa, with Senator HARKIN; Michigan, with Senator STABENOW, the chair of the Agriculture Committee. They understand what drought means to farmers.

This is not just a coastal problem; this is a problem across the United States as we are seeing the disruptions of climate change.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a link to a June 14 report called ''Risky Business, The Economic Risks of Climate Change in the United States.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

http://riskybusiness.org/uploads/files/Risk Business _Report_WEB_7_22_14.pdf

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I wanted to follow up on the good words not only of Senator BOXER but my good friend Senator WHITEHOUSE, as he took on some of the words we were hearing from our colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE, as he talked about collusion of the people in this area—collusion. I guess he meant with the President of the United States.

I looked at some of the names on this report—Hank Paulson, former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under George Bush. I am trying to imagine him colluding with President Obama, and I just can't picture it right now.

Gregory Page is someone I know, the former head of Cargill, the CEO of Cargill, a multinational company—the biggest company in the United States—based in Minnesota. The executive chairman of Cargill is a part of this report warning the business community, looking at what the risks are to the business community. I can tell you he is not colluding with the President of the United States.

Olympia Snowe—talk about an independent—the former Senator from the State of Maine, is part of this group issuing this report. She is not colluding with the President of the United States.

As Senator WHITEHOUSE pointed out, all of these military branches and people from the branches of our military who look at this as a security risk are looking at this and literally following the oath. They are doing what they are supposed to do—their duty, their duty to protect our country—and they see this as a threat to national security, to the United States, a threat to our standing in the world and to the scarce resources we are seeing with water not only in the United States but all across the world—a threat.

This is not collusion. This is science. These are facts. In my State we embrace science. We brought the world everything from the pacemaker to the Post-it note. We are the home of the Mayo Clinic. We believe in science.

What this resolution does is it simply states the science, drafted by over 300 authors, the 2014 National Climate Assessment, extensively reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences, with support, with the facts.

From the Department of Defense, the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review of the Department of Defense states that ''the pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.''

All this says is let's get the facts straight. It is a sense of the Senate that global climate change is occurring and will continue to pose ongoing risks and challenges to the people and the government of the United States. That is all it says.

We are going to have major debate on how to solve this problem. That debate is going on right now. But unless we can at least get a vote and some support in the Senate for this problem that is happening, when 63 percent of Americans know it is happening, we look silly. The people are in front of us

again. The businesses are in front of us. The church groups are in front of us. The scientists are in front of us. The hunting groups in my State are in front of us. It is time that we acknowledge we have a problem and then move on to fix it.

As Senator BOXER posed at the end of her remarks, yes, we will be back. I am someone who likes to get things done, and I believe the first thing we need to do is to get an agreement here on the fact that we have a problem. Once we have done that, we can move on and work on those solutions.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has been a leader in the Senate, has been to those coastal communities not only in Rhode Island but up and down the coast looking at that damage, seeing what is happening in Virginia, and seeing what is happening in Florida.

I yield for the Senator from Rhode Island for closing remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR. It has been a pleasure working with the Senator.

This was an important step today. It was the most benign, factual, noncontroversial statement of virtually undisputed facts that one could imagine. Yet, here of all places it was unable to achieve consent.

Let me close by mentioning that this is not something that happens off in some other place; it is happening right in our homes.

In Rhode Island, the tide gauge at Naval Station Newport is up 10 inches since the 1930s. We have had big storms before. We have had big hurricanes before. They do a lot of damage to our State, adding 10 inches of more ocean to our shores. That is serious for my State. That is deadly serious for my State. You can't argue with a tide gauge. It is not complicated; it is a measurement.

We can look at the experience of Rhode Island fishermen who are hauling up fish such as tarpon and grouper. Fishermen have told me they started fishing on their granddad's boat and they finished on their dad's boat and in their lives they never saw these fish. But because of the warming seas I talked about earlier, these tropical fish are coming up into Rhode Island waters. When the seas warm, they get bigger. It is called the law of thermal expansion. It is not a law we passed; it is a law of God's Earth. To deny that is to deny the fundamental premises of this planet.

If you think the Rhode Island gauge is weird, go down to Fort Pulaski, GA, where I went on my tour of the southern coast. Tides are up there as well, same thing. The ocean is warming, the seas are rising, and it creates much more risk for our coastal communities.

You can go as far away from Rhode Island as you like. You can go to Utah; how about that. The Park City Foundation, which represents the skiing community—a lot of people go to Utah to ski—says climate change is serious, carbon pollution is causing it, and we are going to lose a lot of business because we are not going to have as much snow. It is going to shorten our season and make life much more difficult.

It is the same in New Hampshire, back on our coast. I went up to New Hampshire a little while ago and met with the ski industry. They are seeing much more need to make snow because they are not getting the snow they used to. If you want to go cross-country skiing or if you want to go on a ski mobile tour, they can't make snow on those trails, so they are getting clobbered.

What is really getting clobbered from the lack of snow is that iconic New Hampshire animal—the moose. Evidently, the way ticks breed, snow kills them off, and when the moose are walking around on snow they are protected from ticks, but when the snow is not there the ticks come at them.

I was told in New Hampshire about young moose calves that had not 1 tick on them, not 100 ticks on them, not 1,000 ticks on them—10,000 ticks on them. Adult moose have been found with 100,000 ticks on them. They are sucking so much blood out of these animals that they can't come up, they sicken, and they die. That is from the New Hampshire scientists, including people at the University of New Hampshire, State universities.

Utah Senators can deny this is real and refuse to talk about it, but Utah State universities both have climate change programs, and they both have people studying climate change. How can their State universities have programs and people studying climate change in their home States and then they come to Washington and pretend it is not real? It doesn't make any sense.

How can a New Hampshire Senator not come here and admit it is real when the University of New Hampshire is so active in all of this?

Florida—I will stop with Florida because Florida is probably the worst of all. Florida is getting hugely hurt by sea level rise. One of our great cities floods at high tide in Florida.

I went down on my visit, and I stopped at the Army Corps of Engineers. People may think that the Army Corps of Engineers is some liberal organization colluding with somebody to do improper stuff and that they can't be trusted, but that is not the way people behave around here on any other subject. When the Army Corps wants to build lakes or dam rivers or build levees or anything else, we have 100 percent confidence in them. We have confidence in the Army Corps of Engineers. So you have to take with a grain of salt some of this skepticism about the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Army Corps of Engineers expert in Florida says that as the sea level rises it shoves saltwater by pressure into the limestone southern Florida is made of. You can actually measure the infiltration of saltwater into what used to be freshwater wells, and the line moves back from the coast as the sea level rises and creates hydraulic pressure. As they try to create counter-hydraulic pressure, which they do with freshwater to push back in this hard limestone sponge, they raise the water level for freshwater. They said Florida is in a box. There is no way out. It is either going to flood with sea level or flood with freshwater. There is no way out. This is the Army Corps of Engineers expert in Jacksonville, FL. Why won't our colleague from Florida listen to the Army Corps of Engineers expert from his own State?

We have to get through this, and we will, but it is going take pressure, it is going to take leadership, and it is going to take the kind of leadership Senator KLOBUCHAR showed this evening on the floor. I am immensely grateful to her.

I yield the floor.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING JULIA ALVAREZ

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, at a ceremony at the White House, President Obama awarded the National Medal of Arts to a distinguished author who calls the Green Mountains of Vermont home: Julia Alvarez.

Born in the United States but raised in the Dominican Republic, Julia Alvarez grew up under the brutal dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo. Fearing for their lives after her father became involved in the revolution to overthrow Trujillo, Ms. Alvarez and her family fled to the United States. Just months later, three of the leaders of that underground movement—Patria Mirabal Reyes, Minerva Mirabel Reyes, and Maria Mirabal Reyes—were brutally murdered. It was this series of events that compelled Ms. Alvarez to author, ''In the Time of the Butterflies.'' The

fiction novel based on real-life events is a story incorporated into the curriculum of schools around the world, including many Vermont schools. Ms. Alvarez's novel explains the complexities of family and cultural divide, while celebrating strength in the face of oppression.

Julia Alvarez has been a trailblazer in Latino literature. When Julia started writing, Latino literature was only considered an ''ethnic interest.'' Today, her work is well known in America and around the world, thanks to her passion and creativity.

Ms. Alvarez first came to Vermont as a student at Middlebury College. She graduated with a bachelor of arts, summa cum laude. Years later, she has returned to Middlebury College as the author-in-residence. She continues to mentor students and gives back to the institution that nurtured her soul as a writer.

Julia has now spent more time in Vermont than anywhere else in the world, and she calls our great State ''the mother of [her] soul.'' I can think of no more fitting recipient of the National Medal of Arts than Julia Alvarez. Vermonters are proud of the courage that her works display, and the passion with which she weaves her own personal history into compelling novels.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last year, I cosponsored the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013. The sponsor of the bill is reintroducing the bill with some modifications. While I am again cosponsoring this new bill, I wanted to remind my colleagues of my concerns related to the visa waiver section of the bill. The Visa Waiver Program is a benefit to other countries, and they are allowed to participate after meeting certain conditions, which are laid out in statute. A section in the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act provides authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive the requirements and allow Israel to participate in the program. Specifically, under the legislation, Israel would not have to abide by the low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate standard. As I stated previously, I am concerned about this section of the bill because it sets a precedent for other countries not to have to abide by all the terms of the program. Neither Congress or the executive branch should be making exceptions to the rules. I support the bill because it reaffirms the United States' partnership with Israel, however, we need to be cautious in relaxing the rules regarding the Visa Waiver Program.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bring Jobs Home Act.

I am a blue-collar Senator. I grew up in a blue-collar neighborhood in Baltimore during World War II where my father had a small neighborhood grocery store.

We were the neighborhood of mom-and-pop businesses and factories. We made liberty ships. We put out turbo steel to make the tanks. Glenn L. Martin made the seaplanes that helped win the battle of the Pacific. We were in the manufacturing business. But the blue-collar Baltimore of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam just isn't what it used to be.

In the last decade, 2.4 million American jobs were shipped overseas. Where did those jobs go? Those jobs are on a slow boat to China and a fast track to Mexico. And why did they go?

In some cases, they went because of tax breaks that rewarded corporations for moving manufacturing overseas. It is wrong to give companies incentives to send jobs to other countries, especially when millions of Americans are looking for work.

The current Tax Code is putting companies that keep their business here, hire their workers at home, pay their share of taxes, and provide health care to their employees, at a disadvantage.

We should be rewarding these companies with ''good guy'' tax breaks for hiring and building their businesses right here in the United States.

I have been on a jobs tour of Maryland. I visited bakeries, microbreweries, and factories of small machine tool companies. I visited Main Street, small streets, and rural communities.

I talked with business owners and their employees. These are ''good guy'' businesses. They work hard and play by the rules. They have jobs right here in the United States. They want to expand. They want to hire. They need a government on their side and at their side.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill ends the loophole that gives companies a tax break for sending jobs overseas.

The Bring Jobs Home Act tells companies: If you want to export jobs out of America, you can't file a deduction for doing it. And it ensures the Tax Code can't be used to boost corporate rewards at the expense of American workers.

Economic patriotism means bringing our jobs back home, bringing our money back home, and standing up for America. So let's pass the Bring Jobs Home Act and take an important step toward economic patriotism.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this past Friday, July 25, marked the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, LSC. In 1974, Congress enacted legislation with the signature of President Nixon that established LSC with bipartisan support. LSC is a private, nonprofit corporation, funded by Congress, with the mission to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans by providing civil legal assistance to those who otherwise would be unable to afford it. LSC distributes almost all of its annual Federal appropriations to 134 local legal aid programs, serving communities in every State.

In Maryland, according to the Maryland Legal Services Corporation, MLSC, services to clients in fiscal year 2013 increased 5 percent from the prior year, with MLSC grantees opening nearly 168,000 new cases, a record high, and benefiting almost 252,000 individuals and families. Family cases, about one-third of all cases, involved domestic violence, child custody, child support, and other matters and benefited nearly 80,000 people. Foreclosures, evictions, and other housing cases, also almost one-third of cases, benefited approximately 94,000 individuals and families. Debt collection, bankruptcy, and other consumer cases, which are one-fifth of all cases, directly benefited 23,000 individuals and families. The private bar handled almost 8,000 cases through MLSC-funded organizations. Pro bono attorneys gave nearly 69,000 hours, representing almost $19 million in donated legal services.

And finally, helping to leverage pro bono, the judicare project referred about 1,000 judicare cases to nearly 500 reduced-fee attorneys that provided 22,000 hours of services, including at least 2,000 pro bono hours, which benefited 2,700 individuals and families.

Let me just give a few examples of the excellent work done by MLSC grantees over the last year as a result of the grants given by LSC. ''Shirley'' was thrilled to move into her new house in Baltimore County after nearly 3 years in a nursing facility with help from the Maryland Disability Law Center, MDLC. Shirley had a special voucher for non elderly persons with disabilities who are transitioning from nursing homes to the community, but ran into obstacles finding the right place and location to meet her needs. MDLC's Sun shine Folk, a group of advocates with disabilities who were formerly institutionalized, and MDLC's housing lawyers helped Shirley get an extension of her voucher and a professional housing transition team, ensuring that her rights to reasonable accommodations were protected.

Several years ago, Kenneth Brown's mother learned that her landlord was in foreclosure and that Fannie Mae wanted to evict her from her long-time Baltimore home. But through the Brown family's persistence, Public Justice Center's, PJC legal advocacy, and

the support of community organizing partners, Kenneth and his brother Berveyn were able to buy the home this year. Together, PJC and the Browns challenged multiple eviction attempts in court and demanded needed repairs. PJC community organizing partners also secured a meeting with Fannie Mae executives. The Browns avoided eviction and ultimately bought the house from Fannie Mae.

After visiting Baltimore Catholic Charities Immigration Legal Services years ago for getting help obtaining her legal permanent residence green card, ''Jeannette'' returned to apply for naturalization with the help of a volunteer attorney during one of ILS's regular naturalization clinics, and was sworn in as a U.S. citizen.

I remain concerned about the access to justice gap that still exists today. We must do better than turn away more than 50 percent of eligible clients who seek assistance because of the lack of LSC program resources. I support full funding of LSC's budget request for fiscal year 2015. I strongly support lifting unnecessary, burdensome, and counterproductive congressional restrictions, such as restrictions on filing class action lawsuits and recovering attorneys' fees. Congress should also remove restrictions on the use of non-LSC funds by LSC grantees.

I commend the LSC, MLSC, and the many LSC-funded attorneys and private sector lawyers who have donated pro bono hours and who strive to live up to the commitment of our legal system to provide equal justice under law. Last week I attended a Federal judicial investiture ceremony in Maryland, and the judge swore to ''administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich.'' Congress needs to live up to the same commitment that we require our Federal judges to make before sitting on the bench and deciding cases. Let us make sure that millions of Americans who need access to legal assistance are provided that critical help in cases that will have a profound impact on their lives, their family, and their community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT GENERAL MARC REYNOLDS, RETIRED

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am saddened to report to my Senate colleagues the passing of a true American hero and defender of our great Nation, Lt. Gen. Marc C. Reynolds, Retired, who passed away with his family by his side on Monday, July 21, 2014.

Marc was born in Chamberlain, a small town in south central South Dakota, to the late Morris and Ione Reynolds, in 1928, and graduated from Chamberlain High School in 1946. After high school, he moved on to Colorado where he worked at Estes Park, Montgomery Wards, and attended the University of Denver before entering the Air Force as an aviation cadet in January 1951. He was commissioned upon graduation from pilot training in February 1952.

Marc flew F–94B, F–94C, and F–101B air defense assignments between 1952 and 1961 that included rotations to Air Force bases in California, Washington, Okinawa, and Massachusetts. He transitioned to reconnaissance missions in 1961 with an assignment to the Royal Air Force Station in Bruntingthorpe, England, flying RB–66s. After completing Air Command and Staff College in 1966, Marc moved to the 460th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, Republic of Vietnam, and flew 230 combat missions in RF–4C's over North Vietnam and the Republic of Vietnam.

Following his Southeast Asia tour of duty, Marc continued with air reconnaissance assignments in Japan and South Carolina. He graduated from the Naval War College in August 1973 and transitioned out of flying assignments and into logistics, where he was assigned to the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT, initially as the director of distribution and later as director of maintenance.

In July 1976, he transferred to McClellan Air Force Base, CA, as the director of materiel management, Sacramento Air Logistics Center. In March 1978, he became the center's vice commander. Marc moved to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, in May 1980 as vice commander of the Air Force Acquisition Logistics Division and took command of the division in October 1981. In July 1983, he was appointed commander of the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT.

In Marc's last assignment, he served as the vice commander, Air Force Logistics Command, with headquarters at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. In this assignment, he provided worldwide technical logistics support to all Air Force active and reserve force activities, military assistance program countries and designated U.S. government agencies.

Marc was a command pilot with more than 5,200 flying hours, including 475 combat hours. His military decorations and awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, the Air Medal with 15 oak leaf clusters and the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters.

Marc's passion for aviation continued after his Air Force retirement when he accepted a position on the Utah Aerospace Heritage Foundation board, which helped fund projects for the Hill Aerospace Museum located near Hill Air Force Base. He eventually became its chairman and served a total of 26 years on the board. Marc worked tirelessly in the community to raise funds and searched around the world to obtain aircraft displays to enhance Utah's great Air Force museum. Through Marc's efforts, the museum added two additional hangars and it continued as one of Utah's top visitor attractions. Marc was also a regular fixture at the local Ogden Airport where he kept his airplanes and loved swapping flying stories with his fellow ''airport bums.'' He enjoyed flying friends and family around the local area and never missed the annual flight back to Oshkosh, WI for the aviation celebration at Oshkosh.

Marc was the consummate gentleman and servant/leader who was loved by everyone who knew and worked with him. His gift was his extraordinary generosity and natural ability to make people feel important.

Marc is survived by his loving wife of 30 years, Ellie, six children: Pam Chatelain, Barbara Reynolds, Scott Reynolds, Lisa Oelke, Kristan Ingebretsen, and Karine Kucej, 15 grandchildren, and 12 great grandchildren. The family wishes to pass on a hearty thanks to the caregivers at Gentiva Hospice Health Care, McKay-Dee Hospital, and the George E. Wahlen Ogden Veterans Home, who took very good care of Marc in his time of need.

I wanted to personally highlight this great man's achievements, his service to our country and our freedoms, and his devotion to his family and his community.

It was my honor to have known Marc and to make tribute to yet another remarkable patriot that we are so proud of.●

TRIBUTE TO MERL PAAVERUD

● Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I wish to honor Merl Paaverud, who is retiring later this year after serving the State of North Dakota for the past 31 years. Merl has dedicated his life and career to documenting and preserving our State's history, and it is only fitting that his retirement culminates as North Dakota celebrates its 125th anniversary.

In 1983, Merl began his career with the State of North Dakota as supervisor for the Fort Totten State Historic Site where he had the challenge of managing the upkeep of the 1867 military post. After his service at Fort Totten, Merl was the grants administrator in the Office of Intergovernmental Assistance. From 1993 to 2001, he served as director of the North Dakota Archaeology and Historic Preservation Division.

Merl understands the importance of documenting and preserving the lives and stories of our State and its people for future generations. For the past 13

years, Merl has served as the director of the North Dakota State Historical Society. In this position, he led a significant expansion and renovation of the North Dakota Heritage Center and State Museum. Under his leadership, the center has become the ''Smithsonian of the Plains.'' In addition, he has played a pivotal role in the purchase of the boyhood home of Lawrence Welk, which will highlight the region's strong German-Russian heritage along with the important role of agriculture in our State.

Merl's passion and commitment to public service has been demonstrated through his service to our country during his time in the U.S. Air Force and in every position he has held throughout his years with the State of North Dakota. This dedication has not gone unnoticed by his peers or the public. His ever present smile and steady leadership will be missed. I want to thank Merl for his years of public service to the people of North Dakota, current and past, and wish him a happy and full retirement.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 517. An act to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

S. 653. An act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1104. An act to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3393. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4984. An act to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5081. An act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5111. An act to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific, subsequent statutory authorization.

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 3:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 517. An act to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3212. An act to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4984. An act to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5081. An act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5111. An act to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution prohibiting the President from deploying or maintaining United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific, subsequent statutory authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and referred as indicated:

S. 2352. A bill to re-impose sanctions on Russian arms exporter Rosoboronexport; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2666. A bill to prohibit future consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals or work authorization for aliens who are not in lawful status, to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border, and to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse States for National Guard deployments in response to large-scale border crossings of unaccompanied alien children from noncontiguous countries.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 3393. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2673. A bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 28, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 517. An act to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6618. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Money Market Fund Reform; Amendments to Form PF'' (RIN3235–AK61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6619. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6620. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the temporary relocation of certain U.S. forces and embassy personnel in Libya, received during adjournment of the Senate on July 27, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 1818, a bill to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–220).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE—TREATY

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 112–7: Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Ex. Rept. 113–12)

The text of the committee-recommended resolution of advice and consent to ratification is as follows:

As reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to Reservations, Understandings, and Declarations.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 13, 2006, and signed by the United States of America on June 30, 2009 (''the Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 112–7), subject to the reservations of section 2, the understandings of section 3, and the declarations of section 4.

Sec. 2. Reservations.

The advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the Convention is subject to the following reservations, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification:

(1) The Convention shall be implemented by the Federal Government of the United States of America to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the State and local governments. To the extent that State and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the obligations of the United States of America under the Convention are limited to the Federal Government's taking measures appropriate to the Federal system, which may include enforcement action against State and local actions that are inconsistent with the Constitution, the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), or other Federal laws, with the ultimate objective of fully implementing the Convention.

(2) The Constitution and laws of the United States of America establish extensive protections against discrimination, reaching all forms of governmental activity as well as significant areas of non-governmental activity. Individual privacy and freedom from governmental interference in certain private conduct are also recognized as among the fundamental values of our free and democratic society. The United States of America understands that by its terms the Convention can be read to require broad regulation of private conduct. To the extent it does, the United States of America does not accept any obligation under the Convention to enact legislation or take other measures with respect to private conduct except as mandated by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

(3) Article 15 of the Convention memorializes existing prohibitions on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment contained in Articles 2 and 16 of the United Nations Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly December 10, 1984, and entered into force June 26, 1987 (the ''CAT'') and in Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly December 16, 1966, and entered into force March 23, 1976 (the ''ICCPR''), and further provides that such protections shall be extended on an equal basis with respect to persons with disabilities. To ensure consistency of application, the obligations of the United States of America under Article 15 of the Convention shall be subject to the same reservations and understandings that apply for the United States of America with respect to Articles 1 and 16 of the CAT and Article 7 of the ICCPR.

Sec. 3. Understandings.

The advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the Convention is subject to the following understandings, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification:

(1) The United States of America understands that this Convention, including Article 8 thereof, does not authorize or require legislation or other action that would restrict the right of free speech, expression, and association protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

(2) Given that under Article 1 of the Convention ''[tithe purpose of the present Convention is to promote, protect, and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities,'' with respect to the application of the Convention to matters related to economic, social, and cultural rights, including in Articles 4(2), 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30, the United States of America understands that its obligations in this respect are to prevent discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of any such rights insofar as they are recognized and implemented under United States law.

(3) Current United States law provides strong protections for persons with disabilities against unequal pay, including the right to equal pay for equal work. The United States of America understands the Convention to require the protection of rights of individuals with disabilities on an equal basis with others, including individuals in other protected groups, and does not require adoption of a comparable worth framework for persons with disabilities.

(4) Article 27 of the Convention provides that States Parties shall take appropriate steps to afford to individuals with disabilities the right to equal access to equal work, including nondiscrimination in hiring and promotion of employment of persons with disabilities in the public sector. Current interpretation of Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791) exempts United States military departments charged with defense of the national security from liability with regard to members of the uniformed services. The United States of America understands the obligations of Article 27 to take appropriate steps as not affecting hiring, promotion, or other terms or conditions of employment of uniformed employees in the United States military departments, and that Article 27 does not recognize rights in this regard that exceed those rights available under United States law.

(5) The United States of America understands that the terms ''disability'', ''persons with disabilities'', and ''undue burden'' (terms that are not defined in the Convention), ''discrimination on the basis of disability'', and ''reasonable accommodation'' are defined for the United States of America coextensively with the definitions of such terms pursuant to relevant United States law.

(6) The United States understands that the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, established under Article 34 of the Convention, has an important, but limited and advisory role. The United States understands that the Committee has no authority to compel actions by the United States, and the United States does not consider conclusions, recommendations, or general comments issued by the Committee as constituting customary international law or to be legally binding on the United States in any manner. The United States further understands that the Committee's interpretations of the Convention are not legally binding on the United States.

(7) The United States of America understands that the Convention is a nondiscrimination instrument. Therefore, nothing in the Convention, including Article 25, addresses the provision of any particular health program or procedure. Rather, the Convention requires that health programs and procedures are provided to individuals with disabilities on a nondiscriminatory basis.

(8) The United States of America understands that, for the United States of America, the term or principle of the ''best interests of the child'' as used in Article 7(2), will be applied and interpreted to be coextensive with its application and interpretation under United States law. Consistent with this understanding, nothing in Article 7 requires a change to existing United States Federal, State, or local law.

(9) Nothing in the Convention limits the rights of parents to homeschool their children.

Sec. 4. Declarations.

The advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the Convention is subject to the following declarations:

(1) The United States of America declares that the provisions of the Convention are not self-executing.

(2) The Senate declares that, in view of the reservations to be included in the instrument of ratification, current United States law fulfills or exceeds the obligations of the Convention for the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 2670. A bill to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2671. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2672. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2673. A bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel; read the first time.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2674. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency a Columbia River Basin Restoration Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 524. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding global climate change; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Res. 525. A resolution designating July 30, 2014, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the perfiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 2132

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2132, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2250, a bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes.

S. 2348

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 2388

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2388, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the depreciation recovery period for energy-efficient cool roof systems, and for other purposes.

S. 2458

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2458, a bill to provide student loan forgiveness for American Indian educators teaching in local educational agencies with a high percentage of American Indian students.

S. 2464

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2464, a bill to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 2631

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2631, a bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

S. 2642

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2642, a bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation, and to ensure that employers consider these requests; and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain growing low-wage occupations, and for other purposes.

S. 2649

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2649, a bill to provide certain legal relief from politically motivated charges by the Government of Egypt.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, a bill to prohibit the exercise of any waiver of the imposition of certain sanctions with respect to Iran unless the President certifies to Congress that the waiver will not result in the provision of funds to the Government of Iran for activities in support of international terrorism, to develop nuclear weapons, or to violate the human rights of the people of Iran.

S.J. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 37, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights.

S. RES. 499

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 499, a resolution congratulating the American Motorcyclist Association on its 90th Anniversary.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 506, a resolution recognizing the patriotism and contributions of auxiliaries of veterans service organizations.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 513, a resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

S. RES. 520

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 520, a resolution condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims.

AMENDMENT NO. 3584

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3584 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5021, a bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3612

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3612 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3625

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3625 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3627

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3627 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3686

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3686 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 524—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 524

Whereas the 2014 National Climate Assessment stated ''The most recent decade was the nation's warmest on record. U.S. temperatures are expected to continue to rise.'';

Whereas the 2014 National Climate Assessment was drafted by over 300 authors and extensively reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences and a Federal Advisory Committee of 60 members;

Whereas the United States Global Change Research Program found that ''[i]n the United States, climate change has already resulted in more frequent heat waves, extreme precipitation, wildfires, and water scarcity'';

Whereas the United States Global Change Research Program coordinates and integrates global change research across 13 Government agencies including the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, and the United States Agency for International Development;

Whereas the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review of the Department of Defense of the United States stated ''The pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.''; and

Whereas a Defense Science Board report concluded that ''[c]limate change will only grow in concern for the United States and its security interests'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that global climate change is occurring and will continue to pose ongoing risks and challenges to the people and the Government of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 525—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY''

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 525

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including by releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation against the whistleblowers;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: ''*Resolved,* That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge'' (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Worthington C. Ford et al. (Washington, D.C., 1904-37), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, when providing proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save taxpayers in the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection of classified information), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2014, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day''; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal rights of citizens of the United States to ''blow the whistle'' by honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, or other crimes to the appropriate authorities; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3691. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3692. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3693. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SA 3694. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3693 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, supra.

SA 3695. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2569, supra.

SA 3696. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, supra.

SA 3697. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3696 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, supra.

SA 3698. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3699. Mr. REID (for Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3691. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. ___. PROGRAM TO SUPPORT ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS FOR DEFENSE MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program (referred to in this section as the ''Program'') for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.—The purposes of the Program are as follows:

(A) To improve measurably the competitiveness of United States manufacturing relating to national security and defense and to increase domestic production.

(B) To help the United States meet national security and emergency preparedness needs by minimizing the risk of dependence on foreign sources for critical components.

(C) To stimulate United States leadership in advanced defense manufacturing research, innovation, and technology that has a strong potential to generate substantial benefits to the United States that extend significantly beyond the direct return to participants in the Program.

(D) To facilitate the transition of innovative and transformative technologies into scalable, cost-effective, and high-performing manufacturing capabilities.

(E) To facilitate access by manufacturing enterprises to capital-intensive infrastructure, including high-performance computing, in order to improve the speed with which such enterprises commercialize new processes and technologies.

(F) To accelerate measurably the development of an advanced manufacturing workforce.

(G) To leverage non-Federal sources of support to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding.

(3) SUPPORT.—The Secretary shall carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) by supporting the establishment of centers for defense manufacturing innovation.

(b) CENTERS FOR DEFENSE MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the Program, a center for defense manufacturing innovation is a center that—

(A) has been established by a person or group of persons to address challenges in advanced defense manufacturing and to assist manufacturers in retaining or expanding industrial production and jobs in the United States;

(B) has a predominant focus on a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or another relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing, as determined by the Secretary, with the potential—

(i) to ensure domestic sources for critical defense material;

(ii) to maintain a qualitative technical military advantage;

(iii) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing;

(iv) to accelerate non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing production capacity in the United States;

(v) to increase measurably the non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing research; and

(vi) to enable the commercial application of new technologies or industry-wide manufacturing processes; and

(C) includes active participation among representatives from multiple industrial entities, research universities, community colleges, and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, which may include industry-led consortia, career and technical education schools, Federal laboratories, State, local, and tribal governments, businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations.

(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a center for defense manufacturing innovation may include the following:

(A) Research, development, and demonstration projects, including proof-of-concept development and prototyping, to reduce the cost, time, and risk of commercializing new technologies and improvements in existing technologies, processes, products, and research and development of materials to solve pre-competitive industrial problems with economic or national security implications.

(B) Development and implementation of education and training courses, materials, and programs.

(C) Development of workforce recruitment programs and initiatives.

(D) Development of innovative methodologies and practices for supply chain integration and introduction of new technologies into supply chains.

(E) Development or updating of industry-led, shared-vision technology roadmaps for the development of technologies underpinning next-generation or transformational innovations.

(F) Outreach and engagement with small- and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, in addition to large manufacturing enterprises.

(G) Coordinate with the Defense Production Act Committee to determine which technologies produced by the centers for defense manufacturing innovation warrant support for commercialization.

(H) Such other activities as the Secretary, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced defense manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

(3) ADDITIONAL CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—For purposes of the Program, the National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute and manufacturing centers formally recognized or under pending interagency review on the date of enactment of the this Act shall be considered centers for defense manufacturing innovation, but such centers shall not receive any preference for financial assistance under subsection (c) solely on the basis of being considered centers for defense manufacturing innovation under this paragraph.

(c) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH AND SUPPORT CENTERS FOR DEFENSE MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall award financial assistance to a person to assist the person in planning, establishing, or supporting a center for defense manufacturing innovation.

(2) APPLICATION.—A person seeking financial assistance under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall, at a minimum, describe the specific sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support for the center on the date financial assistance is sought, as well as the anticipated sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support during the period for which the center could be eligible for continued Federal financial assistance under this section.

(3) OPEN PROCESS.—In soliciting applications for financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure an open process that will allow for the consideration of all applications relevant to advanced defense manufacturing regardless of technology area.

(4) SELECTION.—

(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise.

(B) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(i) make publicly available at the time of the award a description of the bases for the award, including an explanation of the relative merits of the winning applicant as compared to other applications received, if applicable; and

(ii) develop and implement metrics-based performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the activities funded.

(C) COLLABORATION.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall collaborate with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced defense manufacturing.

(D) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting a person who submitted an application under paragraph (2) for an award of financial assistance under paragraph (1) to plan, establish, or support a center for defense manufacturing innovation, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

(i) The potential of the center for defense manufacturing innovation to advance domestic manufacturing and the likelihood of economic impact in the predominant focus areas of the center for defense manufacturing innovation.

(ii) The commitment of continued financial support, advice, participation, and other contributions from non-Federal sources, to provide leverage and resources to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding.

(iii) Whether the financial support provided to the center from non-Federal sources significantly outweighs the requested Federal financial assistance.

(iv) How the center will support core Department of Defense missions and address key technology priorities.

(v) How the center for defense manufacturing innovation will increase the non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing research in the United States.

(vi) How the center for defense manufacturing innovation will engage with small- and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, to improve the capacity of such enterprises to commercialize new processes and technologies.

(vii) How the center for defense manufacturing innovation will carry out educational and workforce activities to support the defense supply chian workforce in the United States.

(viii) Whether the predominant focus of the center for defense manufacturing innovation is a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or other relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing that has not already been commercialized, marketed, distributed, or sold by another entity.

(5) MATCHING FUNDS AND WEIGHTED PREFERENCES.—The total Federal financial assistance awarded to a person, including the financial assistance under paragraph (1), in a given year shall not exceed 50 percent of the total funding of the center in that year. The Secretary may give a weighted preference to applicants seeking less than the maximum amount of funding allowed under this paragraph.

(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may appoint such personnel and enter into such contracts, financial assistance agreements, and other agreements as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program, including support for research and development activities involving a center for defense manufacturing innovation.

(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may transfer to other Federal agencies such sums as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program. No funds so transferred may be used to reimburse or otherwise pay for the costs of financial assistance incurred or commitments of financial assistance made prior to the date of enactment of the this Act.

(3) AUTHORITY OF OTHER AGENCIES.—In the event that the Secretary exercises the authority to transfer funds to another agency under paragraph (2), such agency may award and administer, under the same conditions and constraints applicable to the Secretary, all aspects of financial assistance awards under this section.

(4) USE OF RESOURCES.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Program, the Secretary may use, with the consent of a covered entity and with or without reimbursement, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of such covered entity.

(5) ACCEPTANCE OF RESOURCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated to carry out the Program, the Secretary may accept funds, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities from any covered entity to carry out the Program, subject to the same conditions and constraints otherwise applicable to the Secretary under this section.

(6) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, a covered entity is any Federal department, Federal agency, instrumentality of the United States, State, local government, tribal government, Territory or possession of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, or international organization, or any public or private entity or individual.

(e) PATENTS.—Chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply to any funding agreement (as defined in section 201 of that title) awarded to new or existing centers for defense manufacturing innovation.

(f) SUNSET.—The authority to provide financial assistance to plan for, establish, or support a center for defense manufacturing innovation under subsection (c) terminates effective December 31, 2015.

SA 3692. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XXVI, add the following:

SEC. 2614. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

The table in section 2604 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1002) is amended in the item relating to Martin State Airport, Maryland, for construction of a CYBER/ISR Facility by striking ''$8,000,000'' in the amount column and inserting ''$12,900,000''.

SA 3693. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 3694. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3693 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 3695. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 3696. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

SA 3697. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3696 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''5''.

SA 3698. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—MARKETPLACE AND INTERNET TAX FAIRNESS ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Marketplace and Internet Tax Fairness Act''.

Subtitle A—Marketplace Fairness

SEC. 211. AUTHORIZATION TO REQUIRE COLLECTION OF SALES AND USE TAXES.

(a) STREAMLINED SALES AND USE TAX AGREEMENT.—Each Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement is authorized to require all sellers not qualifying for the small seller exception described in subsection (c) to collect and remit sales and use taxes with respect to remote sales sourced to that Member State pursuant to the provisions of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement, but only if any changes to the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement made after the date of the enactment of this Act are not in conflict with the minimum simplification requirements in subsection (b)(2). Subject to section 212(h), a State may exercise authority under this subtitle beginning 180 days after the State publishes notice of the State's intent to exercise the authority under this subtitle.

(b) ALTERNATIVE.—A State that is not a Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement is authorized notwithstanding any other provision of law to require all sellers not qualifying for the small seller exception described in subsection (c) to collect and remit sales and use taxes with respect to remote sales sourced to that State, but only if the State adopts and implements the minimum simplification requirements in paragraph (2). Subject to section 212(h), such authority shall commence beginning no earlier than the first day of the calendar quarter that is at least 6 months after the date that the State—

(1) enacts legislation to exercise the authority granted by this subtitle—

(A) specifying the tax or taxes to which such authority and the minimum simplification requirements in paragraph (2) shall apply; and

(B) specifying the products and services otherwise subject to the tax or taxes identified by the State under subparagraph (A) to which the authority of this subtitle shall not apply; and

(2) implements each of the following minimum simplification requirements:

(A) Provide, with respect to all remote sales sourced to the State—

(i) a single entity within the State responsible for all State and local sales and use tax administration, return processing, and audits;

(ii) a single audit of a remote seller for all State and local taxing jurisdictions within that State; and

(iii) a single sales and use tax return to be used by remote sellers to be filed with the single entity responsible for tax administration.

A State may not require a remote seller to file sales and use tax returns any more frequently than returns are required for nonremote sellers or impose requirements on remote sellers that the State does not impose on nonremote sellers with respect to the collection of sales and use taxes under this subtitle. No local jurisdiction may require a remote seller to submit a sales and use tax return or to collect sales and use taxes other than as provided by this paragraph.

(B) Provide a uniform sales and use tax base among the State and the local taxing jurisdictions within the State with respect to products and services to which paragraph (1)(B) does not apply.

(C) Source all remote sales in compliance with the sourcing definition set forth in section 213(7).

(D)(i) Make publicly available information indicating the taxability of products and services along with any product and service exemptions from sales and use tax in the State and a rates and boundary database.

(ii) Provide software free of charge for remote sellers that calculates sales and use taxes due on each transaction at the time

the transaction is completed, that files sales and use tax returns, and that is updated to reflect any rate changes and any changes to the products and services specified under paragraph (1)(B), as described in subparagraph (H); and

(iii) Establish certification procedures for persons to be approved as certified software providers, with any software provided by such providers to be capable of calculating and filing sales and use taxes in all States qualified under this subtitle.

(E) Relieve remote sellers from liability to the State or locality for the incorrect collection, remittance, or noncollection of sales and use taxes, including any penalties or interest, if the liability is the result of an error or omission made by a certified software provider.

(F) Relieve certified software providers from liability to the State or locality for the incorrect collection, remittance, or noncollection of sales and use taxes, including any penalties or interest, if the liability is the result of misleading or inaccurate information provided by a remote seller.

(G) Relieve remote sellers and certified software providers from liability to the State or locality for incorrect collection, remittance, or noncollection of sales and use taxes, including any penalties or interest, if the liability is the result of incorrect information or software provided by the State.

(H) Provide remote sellers and certified software providers with 90 days notice of any rate change or any change to the products and services specified under paragraph (1)(B) by the State or any locality in the State and update the information described in subparagraph (D)(i) accordingly and relieve any remote seller or certified software provider from liability for collecting sales and use taxes at the immediately preceding effective rate during the 90-day notice period if the required notice is not provided.

(c) SMALL SELLER EXCEPTION.—A State is authorized to require a remote seller to collect sales and use taxes under this subtitle only if the remote seller has gross annual receipts in total remote sales in the United States in the preceding calendar year exceeding $1,000,000. For purposes of determining whether the threshold in this section is met, the gross annual receipts from remote sales of 2 or more persons shall be aggregated if—

(1) such persons are related to the remote seller within the meaning of subsections (b) and (c) of section 267 or section 707(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(2) such persons have 1 or more ownership relationships and such relationships were designed with a principal purpose of avoiding the application of these rules.

SEC. 212. LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as—

(1) subjecting a seller or any other person to franchise, income, occupation, or any other type of taxes, other than sales and use taxes;

(2) affecting the application of such taxes; or

(3) enlarging or reducing State authority to impose such taxes.

(b) NO EFFECT ON NEXUS.—This subtitle shall not be construed to create any nexus or alter the standards for determining nexus between a person and a State or locality.

(c) NO EFFECT ON SELLER CHOICE.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to deny the ability of a remote seller to deploy and utilize a certified software provider of the seller's choice.

(d) LICENSING AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as permitting or prohibiting a State from—

(1) licensing or regulating any person;

(2) requiring any person to qualify to transact intrastate business;

(3) subjecting any person to State or local taxes not related to the sale of products or services; or

(4) exercising authority over matters of interstate commerce.

(e) NO NEW TAXES.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as encouraging a State to impose sales and use taxes on any products or services not subject to taxation prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) NO EFFECT ON INTRASTATE SALES.—The provisions of this subtitle shall apply only to remote sales and shall not apply to intrastate sales or intrastate sourcing rules. States granted authority under section 211(a) shall comply with all intrastate provisions of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement.

(g) NO EFFECT ON MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SOURCING ACT.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as altering in any manner or preempting the Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act (4 U.S.C. 116–126).

(h) LIMITATION ON INITIAL COLLECTION OF SALES AND USE TAXES FROM REMOTE SALES.—A State may not begin to exercise the authority under this subtitle—

(1) before the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) during the period beginning October 1 and ending on December 31 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 213. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.

In this subtitle:

(1) CERTIFIED SOFTWARE PROVIDER.—The term ''certified software provider'' means a person that—

(A) provides software to remote sellers to facilitate State and local sales and use tax compliance pursuant to section 211(b)(2)(D)(ii); and

(B) is certified by a State to so provide such software.

(2) LOCALITY; LOCAL.—The terms ''locality'' and ''local'' refer to any political subdivision of a State.

(3) MEMBER STATE.—The term ''Member State''—

(A) means a Member State as that term is used under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) does not include any associate member under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement.

(4) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means an individual, trust, estate, fiduciary, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other legal entity, and a State or local government.

(5) REMOTE SALE.—The term ''remote sale'' means a sale into a State, as determined under the sourcing rules under paragraph (7), in which the seller would not legally be required to pay, collect, or remit State or local sales and use taxes unless provided by this subtitle.

(6) REMOTE SELLER.—The term ''remote seller'' means a person that makes remote sales in the State.

(7) SOURCED.—For purposes of a State granted authority under section 211(b), the location to which a remote sale is sourced refers to the location where the product or service sold is received by the purchaser, based on the location indicated by instructions for delivery that the purchaser furnishes to the seller. When no delivery location is specified, the remote sale is sourced to the customer's address that is either known to the seller or, if not known, obtained by the seller during the consummation of the transaction, including the address of the customer's payment instrument if no other address is available. If an address is unknown and a billing address cannot be obtained, the remote sale is sourced to the address of the seller from which the remote sale was made. A State granted authority under section 211(a) shall comply with the sourcing provisions of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement.

(8) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States, and any tribal organization (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

(9) STREAMLINED SALES AND USE TAX AGREEMENT.—The term ''Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement'' means the multi-State agreement with that title adopted on November 12, 2002, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and as further amended from time to time.

SEC. 214. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this subtitle or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this subtitle and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 215. PREEMPTION.

Except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, this subtitle shall not be construed to preempt or limit any power exercised or to be exercised by a State or local jurisdiction under the law of such State or local jurisdiction or under any other Federal law.

Subtitle B—Internet Tax Freedom Act

SEC. 221. EXTENSION OF INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note) is amended by striking ''November 1, 2014'' and inserting ''November 1, 2024''.

(b) GRANDFATHERING OF STATES THAT TAX INTERNET ACCESS.—Section 1104(a)(2)(A) of such Act is amended by striking ''November 1, 2014'' and inserting ''November 1, 2024''.

SA 3699. Mr. REID (for Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 725. PILOT PROGRAM ON PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE IN MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR CIVILIAN INDIVIDUALS WITH CERTAIN DISEASES NOT OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE FOR CARE IN SUCH FACILITIES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing specialized health care or treatment at military treatment facilities for civilian individuals described in subsection (b) who are not otherwise eligible for care in such facilities under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, for the disease or condition of such individuals as specified in that subsection.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—Civilian individuals described in this subsection are civilian individuals who—

(1) have a disease or condition that, under commonly accepted medical guidelines, requires specialized care or treatment in or through a civilian care center capable of providing care or treatment specifically tailored to such disease or condition; and

(2) reside more than 100 miles from the nearest civilian care center capable of providing care or treatment specifically tailored to such disease or condition.

(c) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program may be carried out at not more than three military treatment facilities selected by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program.

(2) LOCATION OF FACILITIES.—The military treatment facilities selected by the Secretary shall be in remote areas or areas that are underserved in access to the specialized care or treatment to be provided under the pilot program.

(d) DURATION.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out the pilot program shall cease three years after the commencement of the pilot program.

(e) CARE AND TREATMENT AVAILABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A military treatment facility providing specialized care and treatment for an individual under the pilot program may provide the following:

(A) Specialized care and treatment for the disease or condition of the individual as specified in subsection (b).

(B) Such other care and treatment as may be medically necessary (as determined pursuant to the regulations under this section) in connection with the provision of care and treatment under subparagraph (A).

(2) CARE AND TREATMENT ONLY ON SPACE-AVAILABLE BASIS.—A military treatment facility may not provide specialized care and treatment under the pilot program if the provision of such care and treatment would prevent or limit the availability of health care services at the facility for members of the Armed Forces on active duty or any other covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program who are eligible for care and services in or through the facility.

(f) PAYMENT FOR CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual may not be provided any care or treatment under the pilot program unless the individual reimburses the Department of Defense for the full cost of providing such care or treatment.

(2) PAYMENT IN ADVANCE.—A military treatment facility may require payment under this subsection before providing any care or treatment under the pilot program.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the following:

(1) A list of the military treatment facilities at which care and treatment were provided under the pilot program.

(2) A description of the specialized care and treatment provided under the pilot program.

(3) A description of the number of individuals provided care and treatment under the pilot program, by aggregate and by military treatment facility at which provided.

(4) A description of the total amount paid or reimbursed to the Department of Defense under subsection (f).

(5) Such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program for the provision of specialized care and treatment through military treatment facilities to individuals not otherwise eligible for such care and treatment through such facilities.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''TRICARE program'' and ''covered beneficiary'' have the meaning given such terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 30, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting to consider the following bills: S. 1948, a bill to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program; S. 2299, a bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; S. 2442, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important land into trust for the benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and for other purposes; S. 2465, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; S. 2479, a bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada; S. 2480, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes and H.R. 4002, an act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes. Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the President pro tempore of the Senate has asked that Joshua Goldberg, an intern in his office, be granted floor privileges for tomorrow, July 29, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Tuesday, July 29, 2014, the Senate execute the order with respect to Executive Calendar No. 952, McDonald, with the only debate time occurring from 12 noon to 12:30 p.m., and from 2:15 p.m. until 2:45 p.m., equally divided in the usual form, and that at 2:45 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following Senate consideration of Executive Calendar No. 952, McDonald, on Tuesday, July 29, the Senate remain in executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 530 Andre, 543, Hoza, and 899, Polaschik; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we would hope we can do those by voice vote.

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration S. Res. 525, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 525) designating July 30, 2014, as ''National Whistleblower Appreciation Day''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the

preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 525) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2673 AND H.R. 3393

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2673) to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

A bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for the second reading of both of these matters and object my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objections are noted and heard. The bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 2352

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2352, and the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 29, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, July 29, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that at 12 noon the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 952, as provided under the previous order; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; and finally, upon disposition of Calendar No. 899 and resuming legislative session, the Senate execute the order with respect to H.R. 5021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 2:45 p.m. tomorrow we will have a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the McDonald nomination to be the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, followed by several voice votes to confirm the nominations of Andre, Hoza, and Polaschik. We will then turn to consideration of the Highway Transportation Funding Act.

Senators should expect five rollcall votes tomorrow evening in relation to the Wyden, Carper-Corker-Boxer, Lee, and Toomey amendments and on passage of H.R. 5021, as amended, if amended. Senators will be notified when those votes are scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 29, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

THERESE W. MCMILLAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATOR, VICE PETER M. ROGOFF.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WILLIE E. MAY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY, VICE PATRICK GALLAGHER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS FRIEDEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION, VICE NILS MAARTEN PARIN DAULAIRE, RESIGNED.

PERRY L. HOLLOWAY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CO–OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA.

PAMELA LEORA SPRATLEN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

BRIAN P. MCKEON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

JOSEPH P. MOHOROVIC, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2012.

ELLIOT F. KAYE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2013.

ELLIOT F. KAYE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

THE JUDICIARY

PAMELA HARRIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 28, 2014*

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 28, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

ENDING THE FEDERAL BAN ON MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, The New York Times produced a carefully balanced rationale for ending the Federal ban on marijuana. In more than 40 years, this failed attempt at prohibition has been hopelessly out of step.

The Times editorial points out the fallacy the as States marching toward decriminalization, medical marijuana, and adult use, the Federal Government maintains its schizophrenic posture, pretending that marijuana is as dangerous—as heroin or LSD, worse than cocaine or methamphetamine.

While the current administration has been somewhat tolerant of the actions that have taken place in three-quarters of our States that are acting to decriminalize, authorize medical marijuana, and, more recently, in Colorado and Washington State, to legalize adult use, there is no guarantee that future administrations will have a lighter touch.

That is wrong. As the Times and others have pointed out, there are significant financial costs and huge human costs of this failed experiment in prohibition which, falls disproportionately on young men of color, especially African Americans.

The Times readily acknowledged that this issue has troubling aspects. We have all struggled, as a society, to deal with drugs, legal and illegal. Addiction to cigarettes and alcohol, prescription drugs and narcotics extracts a heavy toll.

We are all deeply concerned about the impact that marijuana and other dangerous substances have on young people. This is particularly a problem dealing with the development of the young brain affected by marijuana use.

While this clearly can have serious consequences, so, too, there are horrific costs associated with alcohol and tobacco, to say nothing of other illegal drugs. We, as a society, have struggled with these challenges, but we have actually had some measure of success with controlling use of cigarettes and alcohol.

The use by adults of tobacco has declined two-thirds in a generation. There is no reason to think we can't do the same for marijuana if we act rationally.

As a practical matter, the current system doesn't accomplish keeping it out of the hands of children, while it does inflict that real damage on casual users and those young men of color.

Currently, there is a vast illegal network that supplies the public and children with marijuana. No one checks ID. There is no business license to use.

For those of us working to reform our flawed marijuana laws, the Times editorial marks a significant milestone, joining other publications and organizations arguing for a new approach. It comes while we in Oregon, which was the first State to decriminalize marijuana, will vote this fall to become the third State to legalize adult use.

The Times editorial and the promise of more discussion in the paper joins with other editorial pages across the country. The Portland Oregonian had a particularly thoughtful and very positive editorial just the day before, on Saturday, the 26th of July, talking about the opportunities in our State for legalization.

The Nation's editorial pages are playing a constructive role in promoting a broad, nuanced, careful discussion of the marijuana policy, its failure, and the alternatives. Here in Congress we have started the discussion and have seen growing awareness among significant floor action that slightly reduces the outmoded and illogical restrictions.

It is time for the administration and Congress to elevate this discussion to keep pace with what is going on with opinion leaders like the Nation's editorial writers and the march towards rational policy that is taking place in States across America.

It is not too late for this Congress to make constructive contributions. We have several opportunities: the cultivation of industrial hemp; changing banking regulations so we don't force legal marijuana businesses to be all cash; tax equity; and protecting medical marijuana from heavy-handed Federal interference.

The recent positive votes in Congress suggest that more progress is possible before we adjourn.

CHRISTIANITY IS BEING ERADICATED IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, another Sunday has come and gone without mass being said in Mosul.

There is no doubt about it; religious cleansing is continuing to occur in Iraq. The churches have been seized and some turned into mosques. Every trace of Christianity is being eradicated in Iraq. The Christians' property has been seized, looted, and given to others.

Canon Andrew White, the vicar of the only Anglican church in Baghdad, Iraq, recently stated, ''Things are so desperate, our people are disappearing. We have had our people massacred, their heads chopped off. Are we seeing the end of Christianity? We are committed,'' he said, ''come what may, we will keep going to the end, but it looks as though the end could be near.''

Vicar White, continuing, said, ''The Christians are in grave danger. They are literally living in the desert and on the street. They have nowhere to go.''

The question remains: What should the world be doing to help the Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq?

The administration has taken a small step, although it needs to do much more. The President of the United States needs to speak out on this issue.

This morning, after a 9-month vacancy, the White House announced the nomination of Rabbi David Saperstein to be the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom. Rabbi Saperstein is well-respected on these matters and has been engaged on this issue for a long time. I welcome this nomination. It is a good nomination, and I ask the Senate to confirm Rabbi Saperstein quickly.

On Friday, the House passed legislation that creates the position of Special Envoy for Religious Minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia. This was bipartisan legislation that was introduced by Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO and myself. Our office worked closely with our former colleague, Senator ROY BLUNT.

I call on the President to sign this bill quickly and to fill this position as quickly as possible. Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to wait any longer. Christianity, as we now know it, is being wiped out before our very eyes in Iraq.

23 IN 1—KERMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to continue the journey through the 23rd District of Texas and talk about Kermit, Texas, which many people know as being one of the communities in the center of all of the action with respect to the energy economy in Texas, but I know it as the home of the Yellow Jackets, the Yellow Jackets who, for years, have been a formidable foe for my own Alpine Bucks.

Kermit started life, the town started as a local trading and supply company, or trading and supply depot, for the ranches that dotted the west Texas landscape. Kermit gets its name not from a notable green frog known for being the first frog to communicate with humans, but, instead, it gets its name from Kermit Roosevelt, the only place in the United States that is named for the son of a former U.S. President, Teddy Roosevelt.

Kermit, Texas, became the county seat of Winkler County in 1910 and was a city, like many of the other rural communities in Texas, that had a challenge staying alive.

Small towns have always had a particular challenge, and in Kermit's case, they were devastated by a drought that struck the area in 1916 that forced many homesteaders and ranchers to leave. Kermit ran dry by 1924, and the Ern Baird family was the sole family in town, with three houses, a single-student school, and a lone courthouse.

The whole town nearly evaporated into the air until that sea of oil was discovered below the surface and, in 1926, Kermit, Texas, became a boomtown. That boomtown continued into the sixties, and through the boom, the town has seen tremendous growth.

During the rapid expansion of the city, flooding actually became a problem. As with small towns that are scattered throughout rural Texas, they worked through that problem to a solution. They constructed crown streets, and the city kept growing and building additional infrastructure to support the oil boom and the growing needs of their county.

Kermit, Texas, although small in size, has displayed that same attitude reflected in many of the successes of our great Nation. They work through tough situations with creativity and resolve, and, as a result, we as a nation greatly benefit from their willingness to stick through it.

Kermit, Texas, and those who worked and lived and raised families there, they have all contributed to our energy security. They have all contributed to the energy security of our entire country. Without them, it would have been difficult to meet the energy demands of World War II and, after the war, the economic boom that the U.S. would experience.

Even today, Kermit is a mainstay of the west Texas economy, an active chamber, an active community, a wonderful place to live and to raise kids, and, of course, the ever-proud Yellow Jackets.

If you find yourself near Kermit, Texas, I invite you to visit this small and historic town that has contributed so much so greatly to our Texas values, our Texas history, and our Texas success, Kermit, Texas.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. JIM FULGHUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOLF). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize North Carolina Representative Dr. Jim Fulghum, who recently passed away after a brief but courageous battle with cancer.

A lifelong resident of Raleigh, Jim attended Broughton High School and married his high school sweetheart, Mary Susan. They both received their medical degrees at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Mary Susan continues to serve the Raleigh community as a doctor, as Jim did for so many years.

I want to commemorate Jim for all he contributed to the field of medicine, the city of Raleigh, North Carolina, and our country. Jim was a world-renowned neurosurgeon, served his country in the gulf war, and later went on to serve in the North Carolina State Legislature.

Jim was truly a great American, a good friend of mine, and a mentor to me and so many others that he came in contact with. As a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives, Jim was an exemplary statesman on behalf of his constituents. He was a compassionate man and touched the lives of many.

Throughout Jim's life, he tirelessly offered his services to the community. He was involved in numerous organizations in the State, including Edenton Street United Methodist Church, where he was active throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, Jim served his community with great honor and distinction, and North Carolina mourns his passing. My thoughts and prayers are with Jim's wife of 47 years, Mary Susan, and the rest of his family: Emily, Molly, Patrick, Jens; his sisters Peggy, Mary Anne, and Ruth; and his two grandchildren, Margaret and Kirk.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we begin the final week before the August recess, we give You thanks as well for the recent progress made over the weekend and ask Your blessing on the Members of the people's House in completing their work on the important legislation that demands their attention.

May goodwill and a common love for our Nation and its people abound in this assembly. Bless the work of the Members, their staff, and all who labor to complete the unfinished work at hand.

As always, may all that is done today and for the rest of this week be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COHEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

EBOLA OUTBREAK

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the picture on the front page of this morning's New York Times is about the latest deadly outbreak of Ebola in Africa. This horrible disease knows no borders and has already claimed the lives of 660 people in four countries since it was first detected in March.

The White House needs to pull together the CDC, NIH, State Department, USAID, the World Health Organization, and other Western governments to stave off this outbreak before it spreads further. I am concerned that there is not a sufficient plan in place, either in Africa or in the event that it spreads to the U.S.

We live in a global world. We need a clear plan and strong leadership now. We cannot wait until a case shows up in the United States.

THE WAR ON MARIJUANA

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's New York Times editorial page—the entire page, a very unusual circumstance—was dedicated to ending our crazy and unsuccessful and expensive war on marijuana, emphasizing that the war on marijuana costs us much money in prosecuting and also ruins people's lives. It costs us more than it protects, and it has a disparate impact on African Americans and minorities, as they are much more likely to be arrested, have a scarlet M on their chest for the rest of their lives, denying them public housing, scholarships, and often jobs.

It is time we left the situation to the States, like we did with alcohol, the last prohibition we had in this country, and let the States make these decisions, as Colorado and Washington have, the laboratories of democracy. Let's make sense of our drug policies and drug laws and not have marijuana and heroin in the same class.

A CRISIS ON THE TEXAS BORDER

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows now, there is a crisis on the Texas border. And what is the proximate cause of that crisis? It was the President's decision to defer adjudication for childhood arrivals a little over 2 years ago. When the President issued his memorandum, stating that deferred adjudication was now possible, the floodgates opened.

To make that call was irresponsible. But once again, we heard evidence this weekend that the President is, again, thinking of overstepping his authority.

Mr. Speaker, this would only throw gasoline on a fire. We need legislation that will allow for more sensible solutions to be put in place. The executive overreach effectively called for no-holds-barred at the border and has caused great strain on our system.

No one but the President has the power to remedy this legislation. By issuing the order 2 years ago, the President opened the floodgates. It is up to him to quench the bleeding.

FIREFIGHTING BUDGET

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the end of this week begins the August recess, or district work period. Some of us will go home working—and I am going home to a State that is on fire. We have four major fires, and many dozens of other fires are burning in Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Utah.

The Forest Service and the BLM have about exhausted their budget for fighting fires. They can't stop fighting fires. So they are going to have to gut their other budgets, including budgets that would mitigate future fire risk, fuel reduction, and other programs. They will also cut recreation and other things that people really care about. Congress has not seen fit to give them adequate money.

There is a bipartisan, bicameral proposal, supported by the President—that is about the rarest thing in Washington, D.C., these days—to give the Forest Service and the BLM the tools they need, an adequate budget, and for these extreme fires—the 1 percent that cost 30 percent of the budget—treat those like emergencies, like we do floods, hurricanes, and tornadoes.

What have the Republicans done with this? Nothing. Nada. Zip. Not one hearing. Not one mention, except in the Ryan budget, where he said he didn't support that approach; they should just gut their budgets, or we should kill some other program to pay for fighting fires.

HOLD THE PRESIDENT RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS BORDER CRISIS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is not too late to do the right thing, and that is hold the President responsible for his immigration policies.

His ignoring immigration laws and weakening immigration laws through executive orders has caused the border crisis. It has encouraged tens of thousands of illegal immigrants to undertake a dangerous journey north.

The burden rests on the President to enforce current immigration laws. Otherwise, he will continue to reap the whirlwind of displaced families and an unsecure border.

To those who say, ''We have to do something,'' the answer is, ''Yes, tell the President to uphold the Constitution and faithfully execute the laws.''

The President doesn't need more power. He doesn't need more money. He just needs to keep his oath of office.

THE MANY ISSUES FACING THE CONGRESS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me welcome the young African leaders that are here from all over Africa. They came because they view America as a working government, a government of democracy and collaboration and coalition. So I welcome them. But I also ask my colleagues to show them that government and pass the emergency supplemental now.

The issues at the border, the unaccompanied children, are not the fault of President Obama or any of us who believe in immigration reform. They are the fault of people fleeing violence, prepared to flee from losing their lives.

Just like the unfortunate circumstances in Nigeria, where Boko Haram is terrorizing people, people are fleeing for their lives. Boko Haram needs to be addressed because they have just kidnapped the Vice Prime Minister's wife in Cameroon. And, as well, we need to bring about some solution to the devastation of Ebola in Liberia, brought to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, there are many issues. We should not go home. We should address them and not point the blame. We need to get to work and do what is right by the people of the world and the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

TRANSPARENT AIRFARES ACT OF 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4156) to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Transparent Airfares Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. ADVERTISEMENTS AND SOLICITATIONS FOR PASSENGER AIR TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FULL FARE ADVERTISING.—Section 41712 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FULL FARE ADVERTISING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be an unfair or deceptive practice under subsection (a) for a covered entity to state in an advertisement or solicitation for passenger air transportation the base airfare for the air transportation if the covered entity clearly and separately discloses—

''(A) the government-imposed taxes and fees associated with the air transportation; and

''(B) the total cost of the air transportation.

''(2) FORM OF DISCLOSURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the information described in paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) shall be disclosed in the advertisement or solicitation in a manner that clearly presents the information to the consumer.

''(B) INTERNET ADVERTISEMENTS AND SOLICITATIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), with respect to an advertisement or solicitation for passenger air transportation that appears on an Internet Web site, the information described in paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) may be disclosed through a link or pop-up, as such terms may be defined by the Secretary, that displays the information in a manner that is easily accessible and viewable by the consumer.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

''(A) BASE AIRFARE.—The term 'base airfare' means the cost of passenger air transportation, excluding government-imposed taxes and fees.

''(B) COVERED ENTITY.—The term 'covered entity' means an air carrier, including an indirect air carrier, foreign carrier, ticket agent, or other person offering to sell tickets for passenger air transportation or a tour or tour component that must be purchased with air transportation.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by subsection (a) may be construed to affect any obligation of a person that sells air transportation to disclose the total cost of the air transportation, including government-imposed taxes and fees, prior to purchase of the air transportation.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue final regulations to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the effective date of regulations issued under subsection (c); and

(2) the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 4156.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4156. Let me begin by thanking my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle for their helpful support on this bill: Congressmen DEFAZIO, RAHALL, and RICK LARSEN of Washington. And on the Republican side, I would like to thank Congressmen FRANK LOBIONDO and TOM GRAVES of Georgia for their help and bipartisanship in crafting this bill.

A special thanks to Congressman TOM GRAVES who, in the 112th Congress, introduced similar legislation. He reached out to us early in the process and has been a true leader, helping us craft and move this legislation forward to provide absolute transparency to the flying public through H.R. 4156.

Before I explain the bill, I will enter into the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 4156, which represent a broad spectrum of support from business and labor.

A4A, AFA, IAMAW, APA,
CAPA, SWAPA,
April 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to urge your support for the Transparent Airfares Act of 2014 (H.R. 4156). This bipartisan legislation will enhance airfare transparency for airline customers by ensuring that they know exactly how much of their ticket price is attributable to federal taxes and fees while still knowing the full price of air travel before they purchase a ticket.

In January 2012, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) fundamentally changed U.S. airline industry advertising practices by implementing a Full Fare Advertising (FFA) rule, which reduced airfare transparency by requiring airlines to include government-imposed taxes and fees in the base price of an advertised fare. DOT's previous advertising rules had been in effect for 25 years—through Democratic and Republican administrations. Under the previous rules, airlines and travel agents were allowed listed government-imposed taxes and fees separately from the base price of a ticket in advertisements—as all other U.S. consumer products, with the exception of gasoline, are sold.

Our industry is critical to the U.S. economy. The U.S. commercial aviation sector drives more than $1 trillion in annual economic activity—approximately 5 percent of U.S. Gross Domestic Product—and 10 million U.S. jobs. The industry's long-term viability and global competitiveness is threatened by a rising federal aviation tax burden that has increased 30-fold over the last three decades. On a typical $300 one-stop domestic roundtrip ticket, airline customers pay $62 in federal taxes and fees, or 21 percent of the ticket price. The federal tax bite will increase to $63 in July when the Transportation Security Administration passenger security fee will more than double from $2.50 per flight segment to $5.60 per one-way trip. Consequently, air travel is currently taxed at a higher federal rate than alcohol and tobacco, which are subject to so-called ''sin taxes'' intended to discourage their use.

Requiring airlines to include rising taxes and fees in advertisements and offers from airline and travel agent websites can dampen demand for travel and ultimately cost even more jobs in an industry that has lost nearly one-third of its work force since 2001, typically resulting in reduced service to small and rural communities. Since air travel is often an optional choice for individual consumers and businesses, even the smallest increase—or perceived increase—in airline tickets costs has a negative impact on travel decisions. In fact, in 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that a one percent increase in the cost of an airline ticket, including taxes and fees, would result in a one percent reduction in the quantity of tickets sold.

Your support of H.R. 4156 will help enhance airfare transparency for consumers, protect U.S. airline jobs and preserve air service to small and rural communities. We appreciate your consideration of this important legislation and hope that Congress will pass the bill on a strong, bipartisan basis as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

AIRLINES FOR AMERICA,
ASSOCIATION OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS—CWA,
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS,
ALLIED PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
COALITION OF AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
SOUTHWEST AIRLINES PILOTS' ASSOCIATION.

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the nearly 50,000 professional airline pilots represented by the Air Line Pilots Association, International (ALPA), I write in support of H.R. 4156, the Transparent Airfares Act of 2014.

The Transparent Airfares Act of 2014 seeks to restore the transparency of airline ticket advertisement. In January 2012, the Department of Transportation (DOT) introduced a regulation that prohibits airfare advertisements from highlighting the base cost of an

airline ticket. The regulation instead mandated that the total cost of airfare, including government-imposed taxes and fees, be presented as a single price shown to the consumer. This misguided policy effectively hides the magnitude of government imposed taxes and fees from consumers, which typically constitute 21 percent of the total ticket cost.

The Transparent Airfares Act will restore transparency to air travel advertising by allowing airlines to separately declare the base airfare and additional government-imposed taxes and fees. In addition to providing consumers with greater information, the bill will remove the often misplaced blame airlines receive with regard to airfare increases. The legislation has been introduced by Transportation and Infrastructure Committee leaders Chairman Bill Shuster (R–PA), Ranking Member Nick J. Rahall, (D–WV), Aviation Subcommittee Chairman Frank LoBiondo (R–NJ), Aviation Subcommittee Ranking Member Rick Larsen (D–WA), and Senior Committee Members Peter DeFazio (D–OR) and Tom Graves (R–GA).

The Air Line Pilots Association, International strongly supports this move towards greater transparency in airline ticket advertisement. We urge you to add your name as a cosponsor of H.R. 4156.

Sincerely,

LEE MOAK,
President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I am writing to state our support for H.R. 4156, the Transparent Airfares Act of 2014.

H.R. 4156 reverses the Department of Transportation's Full Fare Advertising Rule, which requires airlines to include taxes and fees in the price quotes they give to customers when they shop online for flights. This requirement negatively impacts consumers in two ways. First, it effectively shields consumers from knowing what portion of their ticket price is the base fare and which portion is imposed taxes, which makes it nearly impossible to compare base fares. Second, the consumer is misled into thinking that airline ticket prices are higher than they actually are. This has a chilling effect on the demand for air travel by making the advertised price of an airline ticket artificially higher.

Consumers have a right to see the full breakdown of their ticket price, especially when taxes and fees imposed on air travel are on the rise. While the Department of Transportation had good intentions, in practice this regulation has actually reduced transparency. H.R. 4156 is practical legislation that will bring air travel in line with virtually all other consumer products which are sold at base price, with taxes added on at the point of purchase.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters is pleased to offer our support for H.R. 4156. We thank you for taking the lead on this important issue and look forward to working with you to ensure the bill's swift enactment.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4156, the Transparent Airfares Act of 2014, is a commonsense, fair, bipartisan bill that provides airfare transparency to the flying public.

In January of 2012, a Department of Transportation rule went into effect that requires the airlines and travel agents to bury government-imposed taxes and fees in the advertised price of a ticket. This rule effectively masks and, I would argue, hides the current government-imposed taxes and fees on consumers.

H.R. 4156 clarifies that it is not an unfair or deceptive practice to display, in an advertisement or solicitation, the base fare for the air transportation as long as the taxes, fees, and total costs are clearly and separately disclosed—again, let me repeat that: clearly and separately disclosed—in the advertisement or solicitation.

This bill will allow the airlines and travel agents to display the actual cost of air travel in a clear and transparent way, enabling travelers to see the base airfare and government-imposed taxes and fees. For instance, right now, the DOT requires airlines and travel agents to advertise a $237 plane ticket as costing $300, hiding the $63 of government taxes and fees from consumers. It is only fair that consumers know what they are paying for. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, with 50 cosponsors.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The so-called Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which I opposed for many reasons, but buried deep within it—you know, they were sitting down, crunching numbers. They had the Ryan-Murray budget deal, and they had to meet certain targets. They were short. You can't raise taxes around here. Well, yes, maybe you kind of can, things that are taxes that don't look like taxes.

So the deal that was cut was a 125 percent increase in the TSA passenger security fee. Now, many Americans probably wouldn't object too much to a passenger security fee increase if they thought it was going to enhance passenger security, especially with better throughput for the long lines at the airports. But no, that is not where the money is going. It is just going somewhere in the Federal Treasury. Maybe it will help reduce the deficit. Maybe it will be spent on something else. No one knows. But airline passengers will pay it.

□ 1415

A one-stop flight from Eugene to San Francisco used to be $2.50. The tax will now be $5.60. That is a pretty steep increase, and that is what really drove me to support this legislation.

I am happy to talk about increased taxes and have an upfront debate about it, where it is needed and where it needs to be reformed, but these invisible things like this, where some backroom deal between a senior House Republican and a Democrat in the Senate, where they just stick it on to airline passengers, that shouldn't happen.

It can happen, in part, because nobody knows. They weren't watching the debate, it was buried in the bill, and they don't see it in the required full-fare advertising. There is just one big number.

Well, where does all that money go? Well, guess what, a lot of it goes to the government, and as of this week, on a one-way flight to San Francisco, another $3.10 will go to the government. So I think if we had good disclosure of the tax part, then it wouldn't be as easy for some of my colleagues to sneak that stuff through.

Now, secondly, we are kind of looking at the nanny state here. Do you know what the current rule is? Well, the airlines can advertise the taxes after the full fare, the aggregate fare, but it has to be in smaller print. It has to be in smaller print. Talk about the nanny state. Give me a break.

What do you think, Americans are idiots? Besides that, I have trouble with small print, and a lot of other people do too. So they are probably going to be really squinting, trying to read the small print part, where the big numbers stand out.

Third, why airlines? Why did they go after the aviation industry? Whoa—were there a lot of complaints? No, there weren't. In May 2011, there were four complaints about fare advertising out of 1,062 complaints. If they really wanted the FAA to focus on things, they would look at customer service, baggage, 143, 120, boarding problems, 116, refunds, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So the FAA somehow went out in search of a problem that didn't exist; but guess what? Did they fix the problem that didn't exist? Did we go from four complaints to zero? Oops—no. Actually, May 2014, with the new full-fare advertising rule with the tiny print for government and big print for the total cost, they had 12 complaints. Complaints are up 300 percent.

Now, I wonder what that is about, so I would say that this was a nanny state rule in search of a problem that didn't exist that may have created a problem that does exist. There is a whole host of issues that go to price sensitivity, many studies about that, and other things.

So it is detrimental to the industry; it is, I think, confusing; and I think it is deceptive. In March, I was going to hike the Grand Canyon. I was going to rent a car that was going to sit for 7 days. I didn't want to pay a lot for a rental car to sit for 7 days. So I went on Priceline, and I bid. I got a car for $19 a day—pretty good, but I know that

the next page is going to tell me what I am really going to pay.

Now, any informed consumer knows that. It is prominent because you have to get finally to click and agree to the end, so you are going to see the whole thing. It is the same thing with airline tickets under this bill. You will see first what the airline is charging you. Next, you will see what the government is charging you, and then, finally, you will see what you will pay.

That is just like I paid for this rental car, just like a hotel room, just like for cruises and everything else.

Now, I don't want to give anybody down at DOT any ideas—or whatever other agencies have jurisdiction in those areas—because I don't want them to start thinking, well, wait a minute, maybe we need a nanny state rule too because we don't have one for rental cars and we don't have one for cruises. No, that is not my point.

My point is consumers are pretty smart. We are not concealing anything here. Give us full and meaningful information, and help me prevent people sticking fees on to airline passengers that have nothing to do with aviation in secret budget deals in the future.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for enlightening us to some of those facts that I was not aware of. Complaints going up 300 percent in the new law is quite shocking, but I do agree with the gentleman completely on his argument that there needs to be transparency.

It is not fair and it is not right that the government can hide those fees when there are other industries and other modes of transportation that have to put them out there in full, plain view of the traveling public.

The gentleman is correct that the traveling public and the consumers understand. They can look, they can read, and they can add and subtract. So, again, I think this is a fair and prudent piece of legislation that is going to make sure it is transparent for the traveling public.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for being a big supporter on this, as well as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Mr. LARSEN; as well as the full committee ranking member, Mr. RAHALL; and, of course, Mr. LOBIONDO, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Again, a special thanks to TOM GRAVES, who has been so effective in working this issue and working with us to put forth this bill that is bipartisan today.

Does the gentleman have any other speakers?

Mr. DEFAZIO. No, I have no requests for time. Apparently, we have done something unusual around here, created something that doesn't seem to be controversial, except among a few talking heads out there somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, having no requests for time, I am happy to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for working with me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit the following letters into the RECORD with regard to the debate on H.R. 4156.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
July 18, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Consumer Federation of America, a nonprofit association of consumer organizations around the country that represent the interests of millions of your constituents, urges you to reject HR. 4156, the Transparent Airline Act of 2014. This bill may be taken up on the suspension calendar, but at whatever point it is presented, we ask you to oppose it.

There is nothing transparent, or pro-consumer, about this bill. It would allow airlines to advertise fares that do not include the mandatory taxes, hiding the true cost until consumers reach the end of the purchase process. This would make the cost of airline tickets appear artificially low and prevent budget-conscious consumers from determining upfront whether they can afford to fly and how the cost of doing so compares to other options, such as traveling to their destinations by train or car.

The argument that consumers are entitled to know how much of the ticket price is comprised of taxes is totally disingenuous—that breakdown does show before consumers complete their purchases. Unlike charges for things such as checked baggage and extra legroom, however, taxes are not optional. Therefore, consumers do not base their air travel decisions on the amount of the taxes, which are standardized. Just as with buying gasoline, they shop for airline tickets based on the total cost including taxes. They are entitled to know that cost at the onset.

Please stand with the traveling public in supporting real truth in airfares by rejecting H.R. 4156.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN GRANT,
Director of Consumer Protection.

JULY 15—CONSUMER GROUPS' LETTER TO U.S. HOUSE MEMBERS

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We the undersigned consumer groups have learned that highly controversial H.R. 4156, the Transparent Airfares Act of 2014, is on the short list in the House for possible inclusion on the Suspension Calendar prior to the August recess. H.R. 4156 is contentious legislation that would harm millions of consumers by reversing a U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) rule implemented in 2012 as a cure to misleading airline advertising. We urge you to strongly object to the inclusion of H.R. 4156 on the Suspension Calendar.

Consumer groups were not alerted to the prospect of this legislation, nor were we provided any opportunity for input before Committee markup. H.R. 4156 was rushed by voice vote through the House Transportation Committee on April 9, 2014 after just 9 minutes of discussion. There were no hearings, no outreach for public opinion. This rushed process has denied other stakeholders an opportunity to inform Congress of their views and the flaws in this bill.

Now, after steamrollering the bill through Committee, airlines hope to rush the bill through the House under Suspension of the Rules. But this is not the type of unobjectionable proposal that the Suspension Calendar is designed for; rather, it is harmful and controversial special-interest legislation. There is not one consumer group or business travel organization that supports this legislation; most have publicly criticized both the bill and the rushed process.

This anti-consumer legislation serves no purpose, in our view, other than to mislead consumers about the real price of airfare—to the benefit of airlines, but at the expense of consumers.

Indeed, The New York Times Editorial Board on April 22 criticized the bill in an editorial saying: ''This push to mislead consumers is particularly galling since recent mergers, like that of American Airlines and US Airways, have made the industry less competitive.'' Likewise, The Washington Post reported on April 24: ''Consumers have reacted to this bill in the same way their advocates have: They're dead-set against it.''

We urge you to stand up against this anti-consumer move by the airlines and to ask House leadership not to schedule this highly controversial bill for the Suspension Calendar, and instead insist on a fair opportunity for travel industry and consumer groups' input and proper deliberation.

Sincerely,

AirlinePassengers.org, Association for Airline Passenger Rights, Business Travel Coalition, Consumers Union, Ed Perkins, Consumer Advocate, FlyersRights.org, National Consumers League, Travelers United, U.S. PIRG.

TRAVELERS UNITED, INC.,
Arlington, VA, July 30, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to outline the harm the Airfare Transparency Act (HR 4156) will cause for passengers, travel agencies and corporate travel managers. And, to highlight the strong opposition to this legislation from consumers, the aviation distribution industry and corporate travel managers.

HR 4156 is completely unnecessary for its proposed impact.

Under this bill aviation will become the only industry in American permitted to add federal excise taxes and fees at the end of the ticket buying process, just like local taxes and fees.

HR 4156 will enshrine drip pricing into law, a form of deceptive and misleading pricing that has long been battled by the FTC and DOT.

This legislation makes understanding airfares less transparent, more confusing and misleading.

Airlines and their unions claim that this bill is necessary to ensure passengers know ''exactly how much of their ticket price is attributable to federal taxes and fees while at the same time knowing the full price of air travel before they purchase a ticket.''

The current DOT rules allow for airlines to do exactly that. Specific language in the regulation codifies how that can be done. Plus, airlines have many other opportunities to clearly outline taxes and fees paid when purchasing tickets. Airlines can explain taxes and fees on ticket itineraries. Airlines can print taxes and fees on boarding passes along with Sudoko games and the weather. However, airlines choose not to do this.

When airlines claim that they are the unjustly subjected to revealing federal excise taxes prior to purchase, they are wrong. Every other industry in the U.S. that is subjected to federal excise taxes and federal fees includes those costs in the product price.

These include gasoline, liquor, beer, tires, trucks and others. The taxes and fees that other transportation and travel entities add to the final prices are state and local taxes and fees—airlines are exempt from those taxes.

The only part of this bill that would change what can be done under the current DOT full-fare regulations is the misleading and deceptive ability to advertise incomplete low prices for which no consumer can purchase air travel.

HR 4156 makes airfares more difficult to understand and purchase. It was passed out of committee and under suspension of rules with no consumer input and no consultation with the airline distribution network of travel agents and corporate travel managers that deal with the public on a day-by-day basis.

This bill has been opposed by far more than a few ''talking heads.''

Almost every major newspaper has opposed HR 4156 in editorials or articles over the past few months. The papers and magazines include The New York Times, Washington Post, USA Today, Chicago Tribune, Time Magazine, and many others. A change.org petition garnered more than 127,000 signatures specifically opposing this bill.

Major consumer organization, in addition to Travelers United (formerly Consumer Travel Alliance), have aligned to oppose this legislation. These organization include AAA, Association for Airline Passenger Rights, Business Travel Coalition, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Ed Perkins (Consumer Advocate), FlyersRights.org, National Consumers League and U.S. PIRG.

This legislation undoes years of hard work by advocates to ensure that consumers are not duped when purchasing airfare. Transparency cannot be achieved through confusion.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE LEOCHA,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4156.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. GRAY III 30TH STREET STATION

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4838) to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', shall be known and designated as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the railroad station referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4838.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4838, and I am honored to rise in support of H.R. 4838, which renames Amtrak's 30th Street Station for William H. Gray III.

I am proud to be a Pennsylvanian and proud to have known Mr. Gray. Mr. Gray led a life of service in his church and to the Second District of Pennsylvania, to the education community, and to America.

Representative Gray served the Second District for six terms and was the first African American House Budget Committee chairman and first African American House majority whip.

He also helped provide Federal resources for the renovation of Amtrak's 30th Street Station, so it is only appropriate today that we have a bill on the floor that would rename the 30th Street Station for him. As I understand it, this will have no cost to the taxpayers, but, again, I probably have used the 30th Street Station more than any other station, whether traveling from Union Station to Philadelphia or traveling from the Harrisburg terminal to Philadelphia.

Again, it is a beautiful building, and, again, with the renaming of it, I think it is very appropriate that we name it for William Gray.

With that, I urge the support of H.R. 4838, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4838, which designates Amtrak's 30th Street Station in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the William H. Gray III 30th Street Station.

For those who did not know him, Bill Gray was a tireless advocate for both the people of the Second District of Philadelphia and Amtrak. He was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1978 and served with distinction until 1991, when he went on to serve as president of the United Negro College Fund, before founding Gray Global Advisors.

During his tenure in the House, Bill Gray served as the first African American to chair the Budget Committee and the first to serve as the majority whip from 1989 to 1991. His role on the Budget Committee and, later, the Appropriations Committee enabled him to help boost Federal spending on public housing and revitalize Amtrak's 30th Street Station, one of the busiest intercity passenger rail service in the United States.

I want to thank Congressman CHAKA FATTAH for introducing this important legislation recognizing the chairman's great accomplishments.

In 2011, Amtrak renamed its Wilmington station stop the JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Railroad Station. Amtrak was able to accomplish this without any disruption to operations, including its ticketing and reservation systems, training, schedule, and other references to the station, and we expect Amtrak will carry this renaming in the same manner.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to congratulate and thank Congressman FATTAH for honoring the great legend of Bill Gray's strong leadership and steadfast support of Amtrak. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, our side has no more speakers, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman CHAKA FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. Well, I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. As an appropriator, we were going to proceed in an appropriations bill with this naming, but after consulting with the chairman, he felt that it was important that we proceed under regular order and that this was important enough that we have an actual piece of legislation, and he guided me through this process.

I want to thank the chairman for his advice on the matter, and also, we were able to round up every single member of the Federal delegation from our State who were enthusiastic in their support for this, and our cosponsors—and our two United States Senators have introduced a companion bill in the Senate, Senator TOOMEY, and our senior Senator, Senator CASEY. We thank Senators TOOMEY and CASEY for their support.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Gray served for 12 years as Budget Committee chair and

as majority whip. He was an accomplished lawmaker and leader in a bipartisan way. He helped to lead the budget negotiations with President Reagan's administration, which at first sought to eliminate Amtrak, but in the conclusion, it was Secretary Stockman who said that it was Bill Gray's leadership that allowed for necessary cuts to be made in other areas of the budget, but for Amtrak to continue to receive the necessary support, so that it could be a vital part of our transportation infrastructure.

He also, as the chairman has indicated, directly impacted the station in Philadelphia by arranging for some urban development action grants to be the focus of revitalization of the station at 30th Street.

Now, I live in a city in which we have the Betsy Ross Bridge, the Walt Whitman Bridge, and the Ben Franklin Parkway, but to add to this now the Bill Gray Station at 30th Street I think appropriately recognizes the historical contribution of a young man who was elected at 38, who served in this Congress, and provided extraordinary service.

When he left here, he went on to lead the Nation's most aggressive effort ever in terms of scholarships for students to pursue colleges who were coming from underrepresented categories.

He served as a special envoy for President Clinton, in terms of interacting around challenges in Haiti, and on a day where we had the Young African Leaders summit here in Washington, some 500 young leaders, Gray is most remembered in Africa because he championed and passed successfully the divestiture of South Africa, the legislation that would effect the divestiture of stock to end apartheid, and as a freshman, he passed a bill that created the African Development Bank. Freshmen at that point, and even today, find it difficult to pass major legislation in our House.

So I think it is great that we have come to this moment, and even though I passed other very important pieces of legislation, I am extraordinarily and personally honored to be able to carry this bill. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, the ranking member, and the chairman for all of the courtesies that have been extended.

□ 1430

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have one quick question.

Mr. FATTAH, were you aware that the gentleman was raised on the campus of Florida A&M University where his father was the president?

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I am aware that he was raised by educators and that his father was the president of a great college in Florida. I think it is appropriate that you would come in from Florida to help us move this bill forward. But Bill Gray loved you, and he loved the State of Florida. He made that his home once he retired from the Congress representing Pennsylvania.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Were you also aware that he was one of the most outstanding preachers that this country has ever known?

Mr. FATTAH. I am convinced, in terms of someone mounting a pulpit, there are very few people who could claim the mantle that he claimed as pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church. He was just an extraordinary figure. There are so many stories on a bipartisan basis that could be told. I think it is great that years—decades—after his service and before a year has passed since his passing that the House is taking this step today to honor his service. It honors us that he served here.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank you, and I thank his wife, his children, and his family.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentlelady yielding back the balance of her time so I get the final word. Sometimes I don't always get the final word with the gentlelady from Florida. I didn't know if you knew he was a graduate of Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. So he was educated at a great school in central Pennsylvania, so we would like to take some credit.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FATTAH. I was aware of that, and he constantly reminded those of us from Philadelphia that it wasn't Penn or some of these other institutions in which he got fortified for his national service role.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. I am a graduate of Dickinson College, which used to be in the MAC, Middle Atlantic Conference, which F&M was in, so I share that heritage of the MAC conference with Mr. Gray.

The other thing I wanted to point out, his family moved to Philadelphia in 1949. His father took over the church of his grandfather, and then Bill Gray led that church, and so he was a third-generation pastor at the Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia. After pointing that out, some folks around here know my heritage.

I spoke to my father this weekend and asked him what he remembered about Bill Gray. My father said he was smart, he was hardworking and tough, and he was a true gentleman. So he sent his best down here for this debate also.

Finally, I just want to thank Amtrak for working with us to be able to move this forward. The president of Amtrak, JBoardman, and his staff worked very hard to ensure this became a reality. Being able to name the station for a Pennsylvanian, someone with a tremendous background and experience, it has been an honor for me to take part in this.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, Bill Gray was a friend and mentor.

With his unwavering dedication to public service, Bill made an indelible mark on the history of Philadelphia and the U.S. House of Representatives.

Bill was a trailblazer and was truly one of the most remarkable public figures in Philadelphia.

He was a proud leader and representative of the people of Philadelphia and a staunch advocate for the working families and those less fortunate in Pennsylvania and across the nation.

In the House, Bill was the first African American to serve as Chairman of the Budget Committee and the first to rise to the rank of Majority Whip.

I am proud to support this measure to name Philadelphia's 30th Street Station in his honor.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise is strong support of H.R. 4838, which designates the railway station located at 2955 Market St. in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as the ''30th Street Station,'' as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station.''

This is a fitting tribute to the late Congressman William H. ''Bill'' Gray III, who was a legislator, a politician, a pastor, a teacher, a public servant, and a larger-than-life patriot.

Congressman Bill Gray was born on August 20, 1943 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, but he spent most of his childhood in Florida, where his father was president of Florida Normal and Industrial College, which later became Florida A & M University.

Congressman Gray, like his father, was a strong supporter of education and leading advocate for strengthening America's educational systems.

He earned several degrees: a bachelor's degree in 1963 from Franklin and Marshall College, a Master's of Divinity in 1966 from Drew Theological Seminary, and another Master's in Church History from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1970.

Additionally, he was awarded more than 65 honorary degrees from America's leading colleges and universities.

At an early age, he accepted his calling to become a preacher, and from that day, he proclaimed the Gospel of Jesus in the church, in the community, and even in the halls of Congress. His faith was unshakable. It was evident that he lived his life based upon what he preached.

Congressman Gray was the pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia for more than 25 years, a church pastored by his father and grandfather.

Elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1978, Congressman Gray was a persistent voice for equal rights, educational access, and opportunity for all persons, in the United States and abroad.

In 1985, Congressman Gray became the first African American in history to chair the

House Budget Committee, where he introduced H.R. 1460, the ''Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985,'' which prohibited loans and new investment in South Africa and imposed sanctions on imports and exports with South Africa.

In 1989, Congressman Gray was elected by his colleagues Chairman of the Democratic Caucus and later that year was elected Majority Whip.

As the first African American to hold these two senior leadership positions, Bill Gray's success inspired a generation of African American elected officials.

In 1991, Congressman Gray resigned from Congress to become the president and chief executive officer of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF).

Approximately one-half of the more than $1.6 billion raised in UNCF's history was collected during Congressman Gray's tenure.

During the Clinton Administration, Congressman Gray served as President Clinton's special adviser on Haiti.

As a result of his commitment to Haiti, Congressman Gray and President Clinton received the Medal of Honor from Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one word to convey the sweep and scope of Congressman Gray's life of service: giant. He was a giant of Philadelphia, of the Congress, and in the history of our country.

By designating ''30th Street Station'' to ''William H. Gray 30th Street Station,'' the American people, not just the residents of Philadelphia, will be reminded of Congressman Gray's illustrious legacy of public service to his city, his state, his country, and the world.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 2430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4838.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.''.

SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

''(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

''(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

''(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

''(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

''(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

''(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

''(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

''(ii) Treatment works effluent.

''(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013. I introduced H.R. 935 to clarify the congressional intent regarding how the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters should be regulated.

It is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, also known as FIFRA, and not the Clean Water Act, which has long been the Federal regulatory statute that governs the safety and use of pesticides in the United States. In fact, FIFRA has regulated pesticides long before the enactment of the Clean Water Act. However, more recently, as the result of a number of lawsuits, the Clean Water Act has been added as a new and redundant layer of Federal regulation over the use of pesticides.

H.R. 935 is aimed at reversing a decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in National Cotton Council v. EPA, which imposed Clean Water Act permitting on pesticide use. That case vacated a 2006 Environmental Protection Agency rule that codified EPA's longstanding interpretation that the application of a pesticide for its intended purpose and in compliance with the requirements of FIFRA is not a discharge of a pollutant under the Clean Water Act, and, therefore, an NPDES permit is not required.

In vacating the rule, the Sixth Circuit substituted judge-made policy choices for reasonable Agency interpretations of the law. In the process, the court undermined the traditional understanding of how the Clean Water Act interacts with other environmental statutes and judicially expanded the scope of Clean Water Act regulation further into areas and activities not originally envisioned or intended by Congress. As a result of that court decision, EPA has been required to develop and impose a new and expanded NPDES permitting process under the Clean Water Act to cover pesticide use.

EPA has estimated that approximately 365,000 pesticide users, including State agencies, cities, counties, mosquito control districts, water districts, pesticide applicators, farmers, ranchers, forest managers, scientists, and even everyday citizens that perform some 5.6 million pesticide applications annually would be affected by the court's ruling. This substantially increases the number of entities subject to NPDES permitting.

With this ill-advised court decision, Federal and State agencies are expending vital funds to initiate and maintain Clean Water Act permitting programs governing pesticide applications, and a wide range of public and private pesticide users are now facing increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting process.

Despite what the fearmongers suggest, all of this expense comes with no additional environmental protection. NPDES compliance costs and fears of potentially ruinous litigation associated with complying with the new NPDES requirements for the use of pesticides are forcing mosquito control other pest control programs to reduce operations and redirect resources to comply with the regulatory requirements.

In many States, routine preventive programs have been reduced due to the NPDES requirements. This most likely impacted and increased the record-breaking outbreaks of West Nile virus around the Nation in 2012. In response to West Nile outbreaks, many States and communities had to declare public health emergencies, resulting in pesticide use to control mosquitoes with the delay caused by the NPDES permitting process. It remains to be seen how the control of mosquitoes will be affected this year, although recent press reports are noting an increase this summer in West Nile virus and the spread of a newly introduced tropical disease spread by mosquitoes.

H.R. 935 will enable communities to resume conducting routine preventive mosquito control programs in the future. H.R. 935 exempts from the NPDES permitting process a discharge to waters involving the application of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, where the pesticide is used for its intended purpose and the use is in compliance with pesticide label requirements.

Exempting pesticides from the NPDES permitting is appropriate because EPA already protects human health and the environment under FIFRA. When it reviews the safety of pesticides, it determines whether to approve or not approve a pesticide for use and sets the rules for each pesticide's uses under the product label.

H.R. 935 was drafted very narrowly to address the Sixth Circuit Court's holding in National Cotton Council and return the state of pesticide regulation to the status quo before the court got involved.

EPA provided technical assistance in drafting this bill so that it would achieve these objectives. Well over 150 organizations representing a wide variety of public and private entities and thousands of stakeholders support a legislative resolution of this issue. Just to name a few, these organizations include the American Mosquito Control Association, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, the National Water Resources Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, Family Farm Alliance, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, CropLife America, and Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership at the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as well as Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON of the Agriculture Committee for their leadership. I urge all Members to support H.R. 935.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, it is Groundhog Day again here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Much of the speech we just heard actually was read 3 years ago on the floor. Three years ago, we were in a different place. There was a new pending rule. There was tremendous uncertainty whether this would be an undue burden on individuals—no, in the end, it isn't at all—on individual farmers—no, except for the largest farms over 6,000 acres—or on forestry. And no, it has not been a problem, and I have a heavily forested State. So there was tremendous uncertainty, and the House Republicans moved this legislation. Of course, it went nowhere in the Senate.

Here we are 3 years later. We have been living under the permit and general permit process, and I am going to look forward to hearing some very specific problems, denials, or litigation from the other side—not maybe, there should have, could have, would have, might be stuff, because I am not aware of any. And we have asked.

Now, sure, my Farm Bureau supports this. Hey, whatever. That is great. Others say sure, but it is not anything that we really have on our priority list.

But, you know, here we are.

Fires are burning in the West. We don't have time for a hearing or a bill to get money to the Forest Service and the Interior Department, but we do have time to do pretend legislation that isn't going anywhere in the Senate again to deal with a problem that doesn't exist.

Why doesn't it exist? Well, first of all, all individuals and applications by farmers are exempt under a permit. You follow the label, you are fine. No one can sue you.

Then you have, if you are a bigger applicator, if you are like someone who is paid to apply pesticides and herbicides, you have to give notice under a general permit. That is all you have to do. You file it online. Not too burdensome. Most applicators, I think, have access to a computer.

Is there an approval process? No. Is there a waiting period? No. You just file it, and then you are exempt from litigation if you follow the label.

So why would we have this? Well, there have been a few instances of problems, and we want to be able to track where those problems originated. So if you have a general permit out there for an industrial application or a commercial application of a certain herbicide and it starts showing up downstream with dead fish, you know probably where it came from and you can trace it back and you will probably find out that they violated the label.

Now, why did this come about? Well, for a real reason: 92,000 steelhead were killed in southern Oregon because an irrigation district chose to use a powerful herbicide in its irrigation canals and they didn't follow the label in terms of the waiting period for it to degrade. They ran the water through and killed 92,000 fish. That is where this all started.

So we are not saying they can't use it, they can't apply it—you know, they can—but we want to know where it is coming from. In that case, it was pretty easy to track back. The trail of dead fish led right back to the irrigation canal.

In other cases of impaired waters—and I have a long list in my State, and I am sure there are other States—we are not quite sure how they got impaired or where they are being impaired, and we would have a better indication if we merely have this notice requirement.

Now, there will be a lot of fearmongering here today: ''You won't be able to use stuff on your lawn.'' ''You will be liable.'' ''It won't be available.''

No, not true.

''Farmers won't be able to apply their own herbicides and pesticides.''

No, not true.

''Very large farms, commercial applicators will not be able to use it.''

No, not true, but they will need to put a notice online they are using it, and they are supposed to follow the label.

I really find it unfortunate that we are spending time on this instead of getting some additional allocation of funds to fight fires in the West. My State is burning up. Washington State is burning up. California is burning up. Other intermountain States are burning up. The Forest Service and BLM are going to run out of money this week or next.

□ 1445

They have got all their other budgets to pay for fighting fires because they can't stop fighting the fires. They can't stop.

But Congress has a bipartisan, bicameral bill agreed to by the President. There is nothing else like that in Washington, D.C., with the partisan activity around here, the conflict always between the House and the Senate.

Here is a bill agreed to by Democrats and Republicans—52 Rs, 52 Ds on the bill. Here is a bill that is pending in the House and the Senate, bicameral—it is also bipartisan on that side—and it is supported by the President.

But we can't find time to take action on that and get the Forest Service and BLM money this week because we are doing stuff like this about pretend problems that don't exist and scaring people who use these products legitimately. It is a very sad waste of our time.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

This piece of legislation before us today is very familiar to many of us. As many of you will remember, we stood here 3 years ago voting on this same bill text. That bill, H.R. 872, was passed by this body with an overwhelming demonstration of bipartisan support. The legislation was the product of collaborative work done between two House committees, along with the technical assistance of the Obama administration's Environmental Protection Agency. This is the way legislation should be handled, and I was proud of our efforts in the House.

To refresh your memory, this problem stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. This decision invalidated a 2006 EPA regulation exempting pesticide applications that are in compliance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act from having to also comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

The effect to have these same products doubly regulated through the Clean Water Act permitting process is unnecessary, costly, and ultimately undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of regulatory compliance costs for a variety of public agencies and doubles their legal jeopardy.

Additionally, more than 40 States have endured increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting requirement process during a time when many States are already being forced to make difficult budget decisions. Should vector control agencies cease operations due to these costs, it will expose a vast new unprotected population cohort to mosquitoes potentially carrying a number of dangerous exotic diseases such as West Nile.

Some will argue the costs associated with this permit requirement have been small. As it stands, some people may believe millions of dollars to be a small amount, but I think most of our constituents would disagree. What nobody can document—and let's think about this again—what no one can document is a single benefit this burden has offered. In a time when our economy is struggling, regulatory burdens that add cost while providing no quantitative benefit need to be eliminated. This is an unnecessary, costly, duplicative permitting requirement. It is a poster child for regulatory reform.

Now, my friends, if you can only look at one thought, simply bear this in mind: by this misguided court ruling requiring the double permitting process, you are causing States to waste money. They don't have the money to waste.

I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 935.

When the House considered this bill in the 112th Congress, before I was elected to serve here, proponents like my good friend, Mr. GIBBS, argued that unless Congress acted, the process for getting a pesticide general permit under the Clean Water Act would cause agriculture, forestry, and public health-related activities to grind to a halt.

However, after almost 3 years of implementation, I am confused about the need for this bill. The sky has not fallen, farmers and forestry operators have had several successful growing seasons, and public health officials have successfully addressed multiple threats of mosquito-borne illness while at the same time complying with the sensible requirements of both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, known as FIFRA.

I say sensible because, as we should clearly understand, the intended focus of the Clean Water Act and FIFRA are very different.

FIFRA is intended to address the safety and effectiveness of pesticides on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse effects on human health and the environment through uniform labels indicating approved uses and restrictions.

However, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of the Nation's waters, with a primary focus on the protection of local water quality.

It is simply incorrect to say that applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide in accordance with its labeling requirement is a surrogate for protecting local water quality. As any farmer knows, complying with FIFRA is as simple as applying a pesticide in accordance with its label. Farmers do not need to look at the localized impact of that pesticide on local water quality.

If, as my colleagues suggest, FIFRA is an adequate substitute for the Clean Water Act permitting requirements, then why is it that pesticides keep showing up in water quality samples from both ground and surface waters?

If applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide according to its label is protective of human health and the environment, then why is it that so many States continue to report significant numbers of pesticide-impaired waters?

I urge my colleagues to note that, according to a 2006 study by the U.S. Geological Survey, at least one pesticide was detected in waters from all streams tested throughout the Nation. Let me repeat that. Pesticides were detected in every single stream tested by the USGS.

State water pollution control agencies have similarly identified a number of surface waters that are currently contaminated by pesticides. States have identified over 16,800 miles of rivers and streams, 1,700 square miles of bays and estuaries, and 372,000 acres of lakes that are currently impaired or threatened by pesticides, meaning that that particular water body cannot or should not be used as a source of drinking water and be appropriate for fish or shellfish propagation or recreation.

It is also telling that States continue to identify waters that remain impaired by pesticides, pesticides which have been banned by this country for decades.

Some have questioned the environmental and public health benefits of the Clean Water Act for the application of pesticides. However, many of the benefits are so obvious that perhaps we have simply overlooked them.

First, let us look, the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, requires pesticide applicators to minimize pesticide discharge through the use of pesticide management measures.

Second, it is the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to monitor for and report any adverse incidents that result from spraying. I would think that monitoring for large fish kills or wildlife kills, as my colleague from Oregon has noted, would be a mutually-agreed upon benefit.

Also, it is the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to keep records on where and how many pesticides are being applied throughout the Nation.

Again, if data is showing that a local water body is contaminated by pesticides, I would think that the public, our constituents, would want to quickly identify the likely source of the pesticide that is causing the impairment.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I am unaware of any specific example where the current Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing his or her services.

Despite claims to the contrary, the Clean Water Act is not being used to ban the use of pesticides.

So, again, let's summarize a few points.

First, the Clean Water Act provides a valuable service by ensuring that an appropriate amount of pesticides are being applied at appropriate times, and that pesticides are not having an adverse impact on human health or the environment.

Second, to the best of my knowledge, the pesticide general permit has not impeded pesticide applicators from servicing both agricultural and public health communities. In fact, most pesticide applications are automatically covered under the pesticide general permit, either by no action or by the filing of the simple electronic notice of intent.

Third, Federal and State data make it very clear that the application of

pesticides in compliance with FIFRA alone, as was the case for many years, was insufficient to protect bodies of water throughout the United States from being contaminated by pesticides.

If we care about water quality, we need to do more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to question what this legislation is really trying to accomplish. Is it really about the so-called regulatory burden of applying for a Clean Water Act permit? As we noted earlier, in the majority of cases, a small-scale user of pesticides is automatically covered by the Clean Water Act under the general permit, provided they apply pesticides in a commonsense manner.

Again, is it about the so-called threat of lawsuits? Again, if the pesticide applicator is applying the pesticide in compliance with the permit, they are statutorily immune from lawsuits under the Clean Water Act.

Is it about compliance costs? Yet, again, there is no evidence at the hearing, in the record, to demonstrate that the Clean Water Act is significantly increasing the costs of compliance to the average pesticide applicator.

The reality is there is no substantive reason why this legislation is necessary, except to limit the scope of the Clean Water Act protections from pesticide pollution that is impairing water quality across the Nation.

I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 935.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond a little bit to some of the questions that were raised by my good friend from Connecticut.

Back in 2012, the American Mosquito Control Association polled their members, and the feeling from the poll was that a lot of the public entities in the control districts for mosquitoes were kind of holding off on the preventive mosquito control programs. Of course, we had a record number of West Nile outbreaks in 2012. I think the season we probably didn't have quite the mosquito pressure was in 2013. We will see what happens in 2014.

My point is that because of the additional permitting and the costs and the time, a lot of districts did not do their preventive control, and they caused an outbreak of mosquitoes more severe than what it would have been—and that was from the American Mosquito Control Association.

With regard to pesticide application in the agriculture sector, if not in all States, in most States, these applications have to be done by certified applicators that have a lot of training. They know they have to abide by the label, because if they don't they could risk losing their applicator's license.

I would also raise the question that if you are a certified applicator, you might not follow the permit requirements under the Clean Water Act either. It all comes down to additional costs and delays, and we all know that you don't get a NPDES permit just overnight, so the cost factor is a major issue.

Another issue I think that needs to be talked a little bit about is, why do we find in some water bodies pesticide residue? The main reason we do is because we have something we call ''legacy'' from pesticides used long ago, years ago, that in a lot of cases aren't even on the market anymore, or if they are they are not being used by the industry because the industry, the agriculture industry and the industry, has done such a wonderful job of research and development in developing new pesticides that are actually more biodegradable and safer and less quantities used. We have come a long way in that technology.

As a farmer, I know that because I experienced that every growing season, the new technologies, the new applications and pesticides that we have available to us. So we really need to address that legacy issue and separate that out, what is really happening in these water bodies.

Then lots of times, too, in some of the data, the data is old from the United States Geological Service and things have changed. Also, some of the testing that has been done, some of the levels are well below what the human health benchmark standards are. So I think there is a scare tactic out there.

But we have got to make sure that we are applying these pesticides under label, which I think the industry is working well at. Because as a farmer, we drink the water first. It comes through our aquifers, our wells, and then also the streams through our property where we live around it, so we want to make sure that that water is clean.

□ 1500

So we need to assess this data—and use sophisticated methods to do that—but not have more government red tape and bureaucracy. All this does is just add time and costs and more headaches for our mosquito control districts, farmers, and others.

I just want to make the point clear that we have got to have these pesticides, and we can do it in a safe way. The technology is improving pesticide use. So that is why I think this bill is necessary to overturn a very ill-advised court decision.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I think we have heard arguments on both sides. I am convinced more by the arguments I have heard on our side. I don't believe it is an undue burden on States. I live in a mosquito control district, and 3 years ago, they had tremendous concerns.

Last year, they went ahead with their regular program, and this year, they are going ahead with their regular permit, under a general permit which they filed online. They said it wasn't a big deal.

So I don't know where the millions of dollars comes in, unless we have States or applicators or other who don't own computers or whatever. I can't figure out where that number comes from.

So I don't believe we have created an egregious problem. Given some of the past problems and the number of impaired waterways in my State, we just want to know where the stuff is being applied. We certainly want to be certain it is applied according to the label, but if it is not, then we have some capability of tracing it back and finding the responsible party and preventing future problems and potentially penalizing those people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that raises a question. If it has been going so good for the last 3 years and there is no need to pass this bill, why in the world would organizations like the American Mosquito Control Association think this bill is needed?

The American Farm Bureau, the National Water Resources Association, Farmers Union, and especially CropLife America are all experts out there that want to make sure that the pesticide use is under label and we are protecting the environment and not endangering it.

So I guess I would take issue with the comment that this legislation isn't needed because it has gone so great in the last 3 years. Well, we are finding out maybe it isn't going so great. I think that is the rhetoric from the other side.

We know that, in 2012, by a poll from the American Mosquito Control Association, a lot of our mosquito control districts did not initiate their preventative programs in the early spring. I know some of them had to declare an emergency.

The irony of this is when you declare an emergency, you do aerial spraying and everything else and not have to get a permit at all, so the environment is even more at risk. If they had done the preventative treatment, they might not have had to do aerial spraying.

I know at least one instance of a major metropolitan area in the Southern part of the country that had to do that. These organizations think this is important. Things aren't going so well. We are having a duplication with more permitting, more red tape, more headaches, and adding to cost.

So I strongly support this bill. Last Congress, I think this bill had 294 ''yea'' votes. It went over to the Senate. Unfortunately, the majority leader would not take it up. It was put in the farm bill, and there was pressure from one or two Senators to take it out. I think it would have passed strongly in the Senate, if we would have been able to have a vote on this very bipartisan initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 935, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 935.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONFERRING HONORARY CITIZENSHIP ON BERNARDO DE GÁLVEZ Y MADRID

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 105

Whereas the United States has conferred honorary citizenship on 7 other occasions during its history, and honorary citizenship is and should remain an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred nor frequently granted;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez, was a hero of the Revolutionary War who risked his life for the freedom of the United States people and provided supplies, intelligence, and strong military support to the war effort;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez recruited an army of 7,500 men made up of Spanish, French, African-American, Mexican, Cuban, and Anglo-American forces and led the effort of Spain to aid the United States' colonists against Great Britain;

Whereas during the Revolutionary War, Bernardo de Gálvez and his troops seized the Port of New Orleans and successfully defeated the British at battles in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Natchez, Mississippi, and Mobile, Alabama;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez led the successful 2-month Siege of Pensacola, Florida, where his troops captured the capital of British West Florida and left the British with no naval bases in the Gulf of Mexico;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez was wounded during the Siege of Pensacola, demonstrating bravery that forever endeared him to the United States soldiers;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez's victories against the British were recognized by George Washington as a deciding factor in the outcome of the Revolutionary War;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez helped draft the terms of treaty that ended the Revolutionary War;

Whereas the United States Continental Congress declared, on October 31, 1778, their gratitude and favorable sentiments to Bernardo de Gálvez for his conduct towards the United States;

Whereas after the war, Bernardo de Gálvez served as viceroy of New Spain and led the effort to chart the Gulf of Mexico, including Galveston Bay, the largest bay on the Texas coast;

Whereas several geographic locations, including Galveston Bay, Galveston, Texas, Galveston County, Texas, Galvez, Louisiana, and St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, are named after Bernardo de Gálvez;

Whereas the State of Florida has honored Bernardo de Gálvez with the designation of Great Floridian; and

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez played an integral role in the Revolutionary War and helped secure the independence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez, is proclaimed posthumously to be an honorary citizen of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 105, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. FRANKS, for yielding.

H.J. Res. 105 would bestow honorary American citizenship on General Bernardo de Gálvez. Though not born in the United States, General Gálvez was a true friend to our country who played an integral role in securing the independence of this Nation.

As governor of Spanish Louisiana, General Gálvez provided American forces with funds, arms, and ammunition, and he provided military intelligence to the American commanders.

After Spain's entry into the war, General Gálvez recruited an army of American, Spanish, and French troops and set about a multiyear campaign that decimated British forces all along the gulf coast.

General Gálvez led successful campaigns in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama before embarking on his seminal victory at the Siege of Pensacola, where he captured the capital of British West Florida after a bloody 2-month long battle, during which he in fact was wounded by gunfire.

General Gálvez's victory left the British with no naval forces or bases along the gulf coast and prevented British troops and supplies from reaching the battles along the eastern seaboard.

His efforts to assist the formation of our country were recognized by President George Washington, President John Adams, and by the United States Continental Congress. In fact, President Washington cited General Gálvez's efforts as a deciding factor in the outcome of the war.

Honorary citizenship is a rare and extraordinary recognition granted to foreigners who have rendered great service to the United States of America. Only seven individuals have been granted honorary citizenship, including two Revolutionary War heroes, the Marquis de Lafayette, and General Casimir Pulaski.

When our Founding Fathers declared our independence, they knew that they were going up against probably the world's most preeminent power. They chose to take up that battle because of their unwavering commitment to liberty and freedom, but they also knew that in order to be successful, they needed the support of allies and great men like the Marquis de Lafayette, Casimir Pulaski, and General Bernardo de Gálvez.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman GOWDY, Chairman FRANKS, and the staff of the Judiciary Committee for their assistance in moving this bill through committee. I also want to thank our majority leader for bringing this bill to the floor.

I would encourage all my colleagues to support this measure to recognize General Gálvez's immense contribution to the history of our country by granting him honorary American citizenship.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 105, which proclaims Bernardo de Gálvez to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously and recognizes his contribution in aiding the American colonists in the fight for independence against the British.

Although he was born in Spain, General Gálvez led masterful military campaigns against the British and played a crucial role in securing land and seaports on behalf of the American colonists. He additionally helped negotiate the terms of the treaty that

ended the American Revolution and secured America's independence from British rule.

This is only the eighth time that Congress has bestowed posthumous citizenship, most recently in 2009, when we honored Casimir Pulaski, a Polish military officer who, like General Gálvez, fought alongside American colonists during the Revolutionary War.

This honor is reserved for only the most highly-deserving individuals, but it should be noted that it is purely symbolic and does not have any substantive effect on the immigration status of surviving family members.

In closing, General Gálvez played an important role in the American Revolution, and he was recognized for his efforts by George Washington. The time has come for Congress to now recognize him by granting him posthumous citizenship.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 105 confers honorary United States citizenship upon Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid in recognition of his many contributions to and sacrifices for the cause of American independence. I want to commend again our colleague, JEFF MILLER, for introducing this legislation, and I certainly urge my colleagues to support it.

American citizenship, Mr. Speaker, is the highest honor that our country can confer upon a person who is a citizen of another land. The granting of honorary citizenship is a symbolic gesture that welcomes the recipient into our national family.

Honorary citizenship is and should always be an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred. Congress has granted honorary citizens on only six occasions in the past to seven individuals. The seven recipients have been Casimir Pulaski, the Marquis de Lafayette, Mother Teresa, William and Hannah Penn, Raoul Wallenberg, and Winston Churchill. The last two recipients, Casimir Pulaski and the Marquis de Lafayette, both played crucial roles in the United States' victory in the Revolutionary War.

General Gálvez's contributions to the war effort compare very favorably with those of Casimir Pulaski and the Marquis de Lafayette. H.J. Res. 105 states that Gálvez ''provided supplies, intelligence, and strong military support to the war effort.''

Indeed, the historical record indicates that, due to the British blockade of seaports on the eastern seaboard, Gálvez's secretly-coordinated smuggling operation and efforts to clear the Mississippi River of British influence helped to ensure that George Washington's Continental Army received necessary weapons and other provisions.

H.J. Res. 105 states that:

Gálvez recruited an army of 7,500 men . . . and led the effort of Spain to aid the United States' colonists . . . he and his troops seized the Port of New Orleans and successfully defeated the British at battles in Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Natchez, Mississippi; and Mobile, Alabama.

Commentators and historians have uniformly lauded General Gálvez's bravery, tenacity, and tactical military skill in rapidly assembling and leading a diverse, multiethnic regiment. Gálvez's forces were victorious in every battle into which he led them.

H.J. Res. 105 states that Gálvez ''led the successful 2-month siege of Pensacola, Florida, where his troops captured the capital of British West Florida and left the British with no naval bases in the Gulf of Mexico.''

The historical narrative surrounding Gálvez's actions leading up to and throughout the 2-month-long Battle of Pensacola underscores his heroism and leadership in pursuit of the objective of pinning down the British forces and driving them from the Gulf of Mexico.

There is no question that keeping the British occupied on a second front during the war was crucial and critical to the success of General Washington's campaign.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, some historians have noted that the length and timing of the Battle of Pensacola, in particular, impacted the number of forces and ships the British could commit to the Battle of Yorktown, which was the final campaign of the Revolutionary War.

Finally, H.J. Res. 105 states that Gálvez' victories against the British were recognized by George Washington as a deciding factor in the outcome of the Revolutionary War.

I believe that Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid deeply deserves honorary citizenship, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 105.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1799) to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1799

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. IMPROVING INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CHILD ABUSE CASES.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 214B of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13004) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''fiscal years 2004 and 2005'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''fiscal years 2004 and 2005'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018''.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 214C. ACCOUNTABILITY.

''All grants awarded by the Administrator under this subtitle shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued and any appeal has been completed.

''(B) AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this subtitle to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this subtitle that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this subtitle during the following 2 fiscal years.

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subtitle, the Administrator shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a grant under this subtitle.

''(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this subtitle during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Administrator shall—

''(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

''(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

''(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Administrator may not award a grant under any grant program described in this subtitle to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the

tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this subtitle and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Administrator, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Administrator shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

''(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this subtitle may be used by the Administrator, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, including the Administrator, provides prior written authorization through an award process or subsequent application that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.''.

SEC. 3. CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

Section 1402(d)(3) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''Of the sums''; and

(2) by striking ''available for the United States Attorneys Offices'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''available only for—

''(i) the United States Attorneys Offices and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide and improve services for the benefit of crime victims in the Federal criminal justice system (as described in 3771 of title 18, United States Code, and section 503 of the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607)) through victim coordinators, victims' specialists, and advocates, including for the administrative support of victim coordinators and advocates providing such services; and

''(ii) a Victim Notification System.

''(B) Amounts made available under subparagraph (A) may not be used for any purpose that is not specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on S. 1799, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak in favor of S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2013.

This bill, introduced by Senators COONS and BLUNT, reauthorizes the funding streams for child advocacy centers, which are often the first line of service providers for the young victims of child abuse, sexual assault, and other crimes.

There are over 750 child advocacy centers located in all 50 States and in the District of Columbia and four regional centers that provide training and technical assistance to the local centers. The child advocacy centers are designed to limit additional trauma to victimized children by bringing all of the necessary law enforcement agencies and service providers to a single safe place. Depending on the case, they can include forensic interview teams, child protection and social services, medical care, and mental health services. In addition to limiting the trauma for the children, this is an efficient and effective approach to investigating child abuse cases.

In 2013 alone, Mr. Speaker, over 294,000 children were served at child advocacy centers, and over 200,000 of those children were victims of sexual abuse. More than one-third of the victims seen by the centers are under the age of 6 years old, and two-thirds are under the age of 13. Despite being unauthorized since 2005, the child advocacy center programs have received appropriations every year. S. 1799 reauthorizes the funding at its current authorization level and provides additional accountability measures to ensure that Federal funds are spent appropriately. A House companion to this legislation, H.R. 3706, was introduced by Representative TED POE and was included in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which passed the Judiciary Committee and the House floor unanimously earlier this year.

In addition to reauthorizing the child advocacy centers, S. 1799 clarifies that funds available to the FBI for victims' services under the Justice Department's Crime Victims Fund may only be used to directly benefit victims and not for administrative purposes. This provision was contained in a House bill, the Justice for Crime Victims Act of 2014, which I introduced in March of this year.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of section 3 of this bipartisan legislation is simple: to reassert Congress' control over the use of the Crime Victims Fund, which is so critical for crime victims. Victim specialists, also referred to as victim advocates, along with their supervisors, victim witness coordinators, should be improving services for the benefit of crime victims and not be diverted to other purposes.

To quote Joan Ganz Cooney: ''Cherishing children is the mark of a civilized society.''

S. 1799 will reauthorize an important tool in our ongoing fight against child abuse.

I commend all of my colleagues who dedicated their efforts to this legislation. I urge its passage and quick signature into law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, on July 28, I made remarks on S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act. I want to clarify that the bill makes funds available to the Department of Justice, including the FBI and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices for victims' services under the Crime Victims Fund. S. 1799 clarifies that funds available may only be used to benefit victims, through the work of Victim Witness Coordinators, Advocates, and Specialists, and for the administrative support of these employees to help them in their service to crime victims. For example, these Coordinators, Advocates, and Specialists may not be used to do witness travel services but instead should be exclusively providing services for the benefit of crime victims as the statute says. This provision was contained in a House bill, the Justice for Crime Victims Act of 2014, which I introduced in March of this year.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the passage of S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2013.

This bill passed the Senate last month and provides important services and funding to protect and heal the most vulnerable of all crime victims: our children.

During their participation in the Federal criminal justice system, it will provide and improve the resources available to assist children who are victims of crime. Child victims will be supported through this often lengthy and difficult process by designated victims' coordinators, specialists, and advocates. Surplus funds in the Crime Victims Fund will be used for a Victim Notification System, which preserves and protects the rights of those victims to be involved at important steps during the criminal justice process. In addition to these services and programs, the bill also authorizes appropriations for the children's advocacy program, the development and implementation of multidisciplinary child abuse investigation and prosecution programs, and grants to provide training and technical assistance to attorneys and others who are instrumental during the

criminal prosecution of child abuse cases in State and Federal courts.

In these fiscally lean times, it is important to note that the bill authorizes the inspector general of the Department of Justice to audit grant recipients to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. This will also ensure that all of the funds are used to protect our most vulnerable people in the process: crime victims.

In closing, as we have repeatedly recognized, children are the most vulnerable in our society and warrant unique treatment. As a country and as a people, we have a constitutional, statutory, and moral obligation to provide them with the protection, resources, and support they need even under the best circumstances. Our responsibilities and moral imperative to act are at the apex when these children are victimized and are at our mercy. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2013.

This bill, as has been noted by the previous speakers, is the Senate companion to H.R. 3706, which I sponsored, along with Congressman TED POE of Texas and Congressman FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Congressman TED POE and I cochair the Victims' Rights Caucus that we organized some 9 years ago. He wanted to be here today to express his deep support for this legislation.

As has been noted, the children in our society are the most dear and precious to all of us, and they are also the most vulnerable. As a society, therefore, we must do all we can to ensure the protection of these children. Tragically, the physical or sexual abuse of a child is a horrific crime that touches, sadly, every community in America. In response to these unconscionable acts, Congress passed the Victims of Child Abuse Act in 1990 to provide funding for a network of Children's Advocacy Centers across the country, which do great work—over 700 of them.

These centers are essential tools to allow communities to care for our children when they are harmed and to deliver justice for the child abusers. Children's Advocacy Centers are a unique model and focus on teamwork. They bring together law enforcement officials, prosecutors, and child service professionals under one roof to do what is best for the child. The Community Action Partnership of Madera County, in my district, is an accredited child advocacy center in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley. I have visited with them. I have met with those who work there together to help our children. I know of the good work they do.

The Madera Community Action Partnership—or ''Madera CAP'' as they like to refer to themselves—depends on funding from the Victims of Child Abuse Act to care for victims and bring justice to the perpetrators of these heinous crimes. However, this important law expired in 2005, and the President has eliminated or reduced the funding for these centers in the last three budgets. Yet Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has chosen to continue to provide funding. That is why Senator COONS of Delaware, Senator BLUNT of Missouri, Congressman POE, Congressman FITZPATRICK, and I have introduced the legislation to reauthorize the Victims of Child Abuse Act and to, therefore, protect these Children's Advocacy Centers across the country. The bill includes strong accountability language to improve the oversight of the program, and it ensures that the money from the Crime Victims Fund is spent only for victim assistance purposes.

The bill before us today, once again, is a product of a bipartisan and bicameral negotiation, and I thank my colleagues again—Senators COONS and BLUNT and Congressmen POE and FITZPATRICK—for their hard work and for that of their staffs on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to urge all of our colleagues to strongly support S. 1799. Let's do the right thing by our Nation's children and swiftly send this bill to the President's desk.

I thank Congressman SCOTT, and I thank Congressman FRANKS for their time and their effort today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would just join with the gentleman in urging its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees and as founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I rise in strong support of S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Reauthorization Act 2014.

This bill authorizes the Children's Advocacy Program for FY 2014–18 and modifies the program to improve the fiscal accountability of those receiving grants under the program—including required audits, requirements for nonprofit organizations and limitations on conference expenditures. It also permits surplus amounts in the Crime Victims Fund to be used only for specific purposes: a victim notification system and the improvement of services for crime victims in the federal criminal justice system.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and as founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have advocated on behalf of victims of abuse, especially children, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims. There is no greater crime that an individual can commit than the crime of child molestation and child abuse. The perpetrators of this crime rob children of their innocence.

Moreover, victims of child molestation are profoundly affected for the rest of their lives. As parents, elected officials and concerned citizens, we have an obligation to condemn this violence, work for stronger enforcement of the law and provide adequate funding for programs to assist children who may have experienced such abuse.

Although child sexual abuse is reported almost 90,000 times a year, the numbers of unreported abuse is far greater because the children are afraid to tell anyone what has happened, and the legal procedure for validating an episode is difficult. It is estimated that 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 6 boys will have experienced an episode of sexual abuse while younger than 18 years.

Protection from child sexual abuse in the United States is principally the responsibility of state and local governments. Each of the 50 states has enacted laws defining child sexual abuse and mistreatment, determining when outside intervention is required, and establishing administrative and judicial structures to deal with mistreatment when it is identified.

In my home city of Houston, child safety continues to be a top priority. Houston has the largest child population in Texas with more than 1 million children which presents unique challenges. In 2012, 52,000 children in Houston, Texas were victims of abuse and neglect.

This bill will provide the funding necessary for Child Advocacy Centers to continue serving child victims of violent crimes to the highest possible standard. An increase in funding will enable Child Advocacy centers to be better equipped in helping law enforcement hold perpetrators of these child abuse crimes accountable.

Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs) are community based public-private partnerships dedicated to a team of professionals pursuing the truth in child abuse investigations.

A recently conducted cost-benefit analysis found that the use of a Children's Advocacy Center in a child abuse case saved, on average, more than $1,000 per case compared with non CAC communities due to the efficiencies gained through this tested evidence-supported model.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make a difference and deserves the overwhelming support of this body.

The primary mission of a Children's Advocacy Center is to prevent further victimization by ensuring that investigations are comprehensive and meet the age appropriate needs of the child. Communities with Children's Advocacy Centers demonstrate increased successful prosecution of perpetrators, reduction in re-abuse rates for child victims, as well as better access to medical and mental health care for the victims.

The sheer volume of child abuse victims being served by these Centers warrants continued funding at a level which will maintain these programs and allow for future development in underserved areas.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in protecting our children and those suffering from abuse by supporting S. 1799.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1799.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1771) to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Government of North Korea has repeatedly violated its commitments to the complete, verifiable, irreversible dismantlement of its nuclear weapons programs, and has willfully violated multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions calling for it to cease its development, testing, and production of weapons of mass destruction.

(2) North Korea poses a grave risk for the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

(3) The Government of North Korea has been implicated repeatedly in money laundering and illicit activities, including prohibited arms sales, narcotics trafficking, the counterfeiting of United States currency, and the counterfeiting of intellectual property of United States persons.

(4) The Government of North Korea has, both historically and recently, repeatedly sponsored acts of international terrorism, including attempts to assassinate defectors and human rights activists, repeated threats of violence against foreign persons, leaders, newspapers, and cities, and the shipment of weapons to terrorists.

(5) North Korea has unilaterally withdrawn from the 1953 Armistice Agreement that ended the Korean War, and committed provocations against South Korea in 2010 by sinking the warship Cheonan and killing 46 of her crew, and by shelling Yeonpyeong Island, killing four South Koreans.

(6) North Korea maintains a system of brutal political prison camps that contain as many as 120,000 men, women, and children, who live in atrocious living conditions with insufficient food, clothing, and medical care, and under constant fear of torture or arbitrary execution.

(7) The Congress reaffirms the purposes of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 contained in section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7802).

(8) North Korea has prioritized weapons programs and the procurement of luxury goods, in defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions, and in gross disregard of the needs of its people.

(9) Persons, including financial institutions, who engage in transactions with, or provide financial services to, the Government of North Korea and its financial institutions without establishing sufficient financial safeguards against North Korea's use of these transactions to promote proliferation, weapons trafficking, human rights violations, illicit activity, and the purchase of luxury goods, aid and abet North Korea's misuse of the international financial system, and also violate the intent of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(10) The Government of North Korea's conduct poses an imminent threat to the security of the United States and its allies, to the global economy, to the safety of members of the United States armed forces, to the integrity of the global financial system, to the integrity of global nonproliferation programs, and to the people of North Korea.

(11) The Congress seeks, through this legislation, to use nonmilitary means to address this crisis, to provide diplomatic leverage to negotiate necessary changes in North Korea's conduct, and to ease the suffering of the people of North Korea.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPLICABLE EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ''applicable Executive order'' means—

(A) Executive Order 13382 (2005), 13466 (2008), 13551 (2010), or 13570 (2011), to the extent that such Executive order authorizes the imposition of sanctions on persons for conduct, or prohibits transactions or activities, involving the Government of North Korea; or

(B) any Executive order adopted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to the extent that such Executive order authorizes the imposition of sanctions on persons for conduct, or prohibits transactions or activities, involving the Government of North Korea.

(2) APPLICABLE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION.—The term ''applicable United Nations Security Council resolution'' means—

(A) United Nations Security Council Resolution 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), or 2094 (2013); or

(B) any United Nations Security Council resolution adopted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to the extent that such resolution authorizes the imposition of sanctions on persons for conduct, or prohibits transactions or activities, involving the Government of North Korea.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(4) DESIGNATED PERSON.—The term ''designated person'' means a person designated under subsection (a) or (b) of section 104 for purposes of applying one or more of the sanctions described in title I or II of this Act with respect to the person.

(5) GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA.—The term ''Government of North Korea'' means—

(A) the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof; and

(B) any person owned or controlled by, or acting for or on behalf of, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

(6) INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term ''international terrorism'' has the meaning given such term in section 140(d) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 2656f(d)).

(7) LUXURY GOODS.—The term ''luxury goods'' has the meaning given such term in subpart 746.4 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, and includes the items listed in Supplement No. 1 to such regulation, and any similar items.

(8) MONETARY INSTRUMENT.—The term ''monetary instrument'' has the meaning given such term under section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(9) NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''North Korean financial institution'' means—

(A) a financial institution organized under the laws of North Korea or any jurisdiction within North Korea (including a foreign branch of such institution);

(B) any financial institution located in North Korea, except as may be excluded from such definition by the President in accordance with section 207(d);

(C) any financial institution, wherever located, owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea; and

(D) any financial institution, wherever located, owned or controlled by a financial institution described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

(10) OTHER STORES OF VALUE.—The term ''other stores of value'' means—

(A) prepaid access devices, tangible or intangible prepaid access devices, or other instruments or devices for the storage or transmission of value, as defined in part 1010 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) any covered goods, as defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, and any instrument or tangible or intangible access device used for the storage and transmission of a representation of covered goods, or other device, as defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(11) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means—

(A) a natural person;

(B) a corporation, business association, partnership, society, trust, financial institution, insurer, underwriter, guarantor, and any other business organization, any other nongovernmental entity, organization, or group, and any governmental entity operating as a business enterprise; and

(C) any successor to any entity described in subparagraph (B).

TITLE I—INVESTIGATIONS, PROHIBITED CONDUCT, AND PENALTIES

SEC. 101. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

In order to achieve the peaceful disarmament of North Korea, Congress finds that it is necessary—

(1) to encourage all states to fully and promptly implement United Nations Security Council Resolution 2094 (2013);

(2) to sanction the persons, including financial institutions, that facilitate proliferation, illicit activities, arms trafficking, imports of luxury goods, serious human rights abuses, cash smuggling, and censorship by the Government of North Korea;

(3) to authorize the President to sanction persons who fail to exercise due diligence to ensure that such financial institutions and jurisdictions do not facilitate proliferation, arms trafficking, kleptocracy, and imports of luxury goods by the Government of North Korea;

(4) to deny the Government of North Korea access to the funds it uses to obtain nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and luxury goods instead of providing for the needs of its people; and

(5) to enforce sanctions in a manner that avoids any adverse humanitarian impact on the people of North Korea.

SEC. 102. INVESTIGATIONS.

The President shall initiate an investigation into the possible designation of a person under section 104(a) upon receipt by the President of credible information indicating that such person has engaged in conduct described in section 104(a).

SEC. 103. BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the President shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on efforts to implement this Act, to include the following, to the extent the information is available:

(1) The principal foreign assets and sources of foreign income of the Government of North Korea.

(2) A list of the persons designated under subsections (a) and (b) of section 104.

(3) A list of the persons with respect to which sanctions were waived or removed under section 207.

(4) A summary of any diplomatic efforts made in accordance with section 202(b) and of the progress realized from such efforts, including efforts to encourage the European Union and other states and jurisdictions to sanction and block the assets of the Foreign Trade Bank of North Korea and Daedong Credit Bank.

SEC. 104. PROHIBITED CONDUCT AND MANDATORY AND DISCRETIONARY DESIGNATION AND SANCTIONS AUTHORITIES.

(a) PROHIBITED CONDUCT AND MANDATORY DESIGNATION AND SANCTIONS AUTHORITY.—

(1) CONDUCT DESCRIBED.—Except as provided in section 207, the President shall designate under this subsection any person the President determines to—

(A) have knowingly engaged in significant activities or transactions with the Government of North Korea that have materially contributed to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or their means of delivery (including missiles capable of delivering such weapons), including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such items;

(B) have knowingly imported, exported, or reexported to, into, or from North Korea any arms or related materiel, whether directly or indirectly;

(C) have knowingly provided significant training, advice, or other services or assistance, or engaged in transactions, related to the manufacture, maintenance, or use of any arms or related materiel to be imported, exported, or reexported to, into, or from North Korea, or following their importation, exportation, or reexportation to, into, or from North Korea, whether directly or indirectly;

(D) have knowingly, directly or indirectly, imported, exported, or reexported significant luxury goods to or into North Korea;

(E) have knowingly engaged in or been responsible for censorship by the Government of North Korea, including prohibiting, limiting, or penalizing the exercise of freedom of expression or assembly, limiting access to print or broadcast media, or the facilitation or support of intentional frequency manipulation that would jam or restrict an international signal;

(F) have knowingly engaged in or been responsible for serious human rights abuses by the Government of North Korea, including torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, prolonged detention without charges and trial, causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons, and other denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of a person;

(G) have knowingly, directly or indirectly, engaged in significant acts of money laundering, the counterfeiting of goods or currency, bulk cash smuggling, narcotics trafficking, or other illicit activity that involves or supports the Government of North Korea or any senior official thereof, whether directly or indirectly; or

(H) have knowingly attempted to engage in any of the conduct described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of this paragraph.

(2) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—With respect to any person designated under this subsection, the President—

(A) shall exercise the authorities of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705 et seq.) without regard to section 202 of such Act to block all property and interests in property of any person designated under this subsection that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of any United States person, including any overseas branch; and

(B) may apply any of the sanctions described in section 204, 205(c), and 206.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person who violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any prohibition of this subsection, or of an order or regulation prescribed under this Act, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act (50 U.S.C. 1705(a)).

(b) DISCRETIONARY DESIGNATION AND SANCTIONS AUTHORITY.—

(1) CONDUCT DESCRIBED.—Except as provided in section 207, the President may designate under this subsection any person the President determines to—

(A) have knowingly engaged in, contributed to, assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material or technological support for, or goods and services in support of, any violation of, or evasion of, an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution;

(B) have knowingly facilitated the transfer of any funds, financial assets, or economic resources of, or property or interests in property of a person designated under an applicable Executive order, or by the United Nations Security Council pursuant to an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution;

(C) have knowingly facilitated the transfer of any funds, financial assets, or economic resources, or any property or interests in property derived from, involved in, or that has materially contributed to conduct prohibited by subsection (a) or an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution;

(D) have knowingly facilitated any transaction that contributes materially to a violation of an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution;

(E) have knowingly facilitated any transactions in cash or monetary instruments or other stores of value, including through cash couriers transiting to or from North Korea, used to facilitate any conduct prohibited by an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution;

(F) have knowingly contributed to the bribery of an official of the Government of North Korea, the misappropriation, theft, or embezzlement of public funds by, or for the benefit of, an official of the Government of North Korea, or the use of any proceeds of any such conduct; or

(G) have knowingly and materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, the conduct described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of this paragraph or the conduct described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (a)(1).

(2) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—With respect to any person designated under this subsection, the President—

(A) may apply the sanctions described in section 204;

(B) may apply any of the special measures described in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code;

(C) may prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which such person has any interest;

(D) may prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the

United States and involve any interest of the person; and

(E) may exercise the authorities of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705 et seq.) without regard to section 202 of such Act to block any property and interests in property of the person that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of any United States person, including any overseas branch.

(c) BLOCKING OF ALL PROPERTY AND INTERESTS IN PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH KOREA.—The President shall exercise the authorities of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705 et seq.) without regard to section 202 of such Act to block all property and interests in property of the Government of North Korea that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of any United States person, including any overseas branch.

(d) APPLICATION.—The designation of a person and the blocking of property and interests in property under subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall also apply with respect to a person who is determined to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.

(e) TRANSACTION LICENSING.—The President shall deny or revoke any license for any transaction that, in the determination of the President, lacks sufficient financial controls to ensure that such transaction will not facilitate any of the conduct described in subsection (a) or subsection (b).

SEC. 105. FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY.

(a) AMENDMENT TO PROPERTY SUBJECT TO FORFEITURE.—Section 981(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) Any property, real or personal, that is involved in a violation or attempted violation, or which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to a violation, of section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014.''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF CIVIL FORFEITURE STATUTE.—Section 983(i)(2)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act'' and inserting '', the International Emergency Economic Powers Act''; and

(2) by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: '', or the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014''.

(c) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF SPECIFIED UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY.—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or section 92 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954'' and inserting ''section 92 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: '', or section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014''.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREAN PROLIFERATION, HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES, AND ILLICIT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 201. DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA AS A JURISDICTION OF PRIMARY MONEY LAUNDERING CONCERN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, who is responsible for safeguarding the financial system against illicit use, money laundering, terrorist financing, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, has repeatedly expressed concern about North Korea's misuse of the international financial system as follows:

(A) In 2006, the Undersecretary stated that, given North Korea's ''counterfeiting of U.S. currency, narcotics trafficking and use of accounts worldwide to conduct proliferation-related transactions, the line between illicit and licit North Korean money is nearly invisible'' and urged financial institutions worldwide to ''think carefully about the risks of doing any North Korea-related business.''.

(B) In 2011, the Undersecretary stated that ''North Korea remains intent on engaging in proliferation, selling arms as well as bringing in material,'' and was ''aggressively pursuing the effort to establish front companies.''.

(C) In 2013, the Undersecretary stated, in reference to North Korea's distribution of high-quality counterfeit United States currency, that ''North Korea is continuing to try to pass a supernote into the international financial system,'' and that the Department of the Treasury would soon introduce new currency with improved security features to protect against counterfeiting by the Government of North Korea.

(2) The Financial Action Task Force, an intergovernmental body whose purpose is to develop and promote national and international policies to combat money laundering and terrorist financing, has repeatedly—

(A) expressed concern at deficiencies in North Korea's regimes to combat money laundering and terrorist financing;

(B) urged North Korea to adopt a plan of action to address significant deficiencies in these regimes and the serious threat they pose to the integrity of the international financial system;

(C) urged all jurisdictions to apply countermeasures to protect the international financial system from ongoing and substantial money laundering and terrorist financing risks emanating from North Korea;

(D) urged all jurisdictions to advise their financial institutions to give special attention to business relationships and transactions with North Korea, including North Korean companies and financial institutions; and

(E) called on all jurisdictions to protect against correspondent relationships being used to bypass or evade countermeasures and risk mitigation practices, and take into account money laundering and terrorist financing risks when considering requests by North Korean financial institutions to open branches and subsidiaries in their jurisdiction.

(3) On March 7, 2013, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2094, which—

(A) welcomed the Financial Action Task Force's recommendation on financial sanctions related to proliferation, and its guidance on the implementation of sanctions;

(B) decided that Member States should apply enhanced monitoring and other legal measures to prevent the provision of financial services or the transfer of property that could contribute to activities prohibited by applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions; and

(C) called on Member States to prohibit North Korean banks from establishing or maintaining correspondent relationships with banks in their jurisdictions, to prevent the provision of financial services, if they have information that provides reasonable grounds to believe that these activities could contribute to activities prohibited by an applicable United Nations Security Council resolution, or to the evasion of such prohibitions.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE DESIGNATION OF NORTH KOREA AS A JURISDICTION OF PRIMARY MONEY LAUNDERING CONCERN.—Congress—

(1) acknowledges the efforts of the United Nations Security Council to impose limitations on, and require enhanced monitoring of, transactions involving North Korean financial institutions that could contribute to sanctioned activities;

(2) urges the President, in the strongest terms, to consider immediately designating North Korea as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern, and to adopt stringent special measures to safeguard the financial system against the risks posed by North Korea's willful evasion of sanctions and its illicit activities; and

(3) urges the President to seek the prompt implementation by other states of enhanced monitoring and due diligence to prevent North Korea's misuse of the international financial system, including by sharing information about activities, transactions, and property that could contribute to activities sanctioned by applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions, or to the evasion of sanctions.

(c) DETERMINATIONS REGARDING NORTH KOREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, determine, in consultation with the Secretary of State and Attorney General, and in accordance with section 5318A of title 31, United States Code, whether reasonable grounds exist for concluding that North Korea is a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern.

(2) ENHANCED DUE DILIGENCE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in section 207, if the Secretary of the Treasury determines under this subsection that reasonable grounds exist for finding that North Korea is a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Federal functional regulators, shall impose one or more of the special measures described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 5318A(b) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of North Korea.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that North Korea is a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary makes such determination, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determination made under paragraph (1) together with the reasons for that determination.

(B) FORM.—A report or copy of any report submitted under this paragraph shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 202. ENSURING THE CONSISTENT ENFORCEMENT OF UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS AND FINANCIAL RESTRICTIONS ON NORTH KOREA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all states and jurisdictions are obligated to implement and enforce applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions fully and promptly, including by—

(A) blocking the property of, and ensuring that any property is prevented from being made available to, persons designated by the Security Council under applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions;

(B) blocking any property associated with an activity prohibited by applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions; and

(C) preventing any transfer of property and any provision of financial services that could contribute to an activity prohibited by applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions, or to the evasion of sanctions under such resolutions;

(2) all states and jurisdictions share a common interest in protecting the international financial system from the risks of money laundering and illicit transactions emanating from North Korea;

(3) the United States Dollar and the Euro are the world's principal reserve currencies, and the United States and the European Union are primarily responsible for the protection of the international financial system from these risks;

(4) the cooperation of the People's Republic of China, as North Korea's principal trading partner, is essential to the enforcement of applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions and to the protection of the international financial system;

(5) the report of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1874, dated June 11, 2013, expressed concern about the ability of banks in states with less effective regulators and those unable to afford effective compliance to detect and prevent illicit transfers involving North Korea;

(6) North Korea has historically exploited inconsistencies between jurisdictions in the interpretation and enforcement of financial regulations and applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions to circumvent sanctions and launder the proceeds of illicit activities;

(7) Amroggang Development Bank, Bank of East Land, and Tanchon Commercial Bank have been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the United Nations Security Council, and the European Union;

(8) Korea Daesong Bank and Korea Kwangson Banking Corporation have been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury and the European Union;

(9) the Foreign Trade Bank of North Korea has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for facilitating transactions on behalf of persons linked to its proliferation network, and for serving as ''a key financial node''; and

(10) Daedong Credit Bank has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for activities prohibited by applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions, including the use of deceptive financial practices to facilitate transactions on behalf of persons linked to North Korea's proliferation network.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should intensify diplomatic efforts, both in appropriate international fora such as the United Nations and bilaterally, to develop and implement a coordinated, consistent, multilateral strategy for protecting the global financial system against risks emanating from North Korea, including—

(1) the cessation of any financial services whose continuation is inconsistent with applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions;

(2) the cessation of any financial services to persons, including financial institutions, that present unacceptable risks of facilitating money laundering and illicit activity by the Government of North Korea;

(3) the blocking by all states and jurisdictions, in accordance with the legal process of the state or jurisdiction in which the property is held, of any property required to be blocked under applicable United Nations Security Council resolutions; and

(4) the blocking of any property derived from illicit activity, or from the misappropriation, theft, or embezzlement of public funds by, or for the benefit of, officials of the Government of North Korea.

SEC. 203. PROLIFERATION PREVENTION SANCTIONS.

(a) EXPORT OF CERTAIN GOODS OR TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 207(a)(2)(C) of this Act, a license shall be required for the export to North Korea of any goods or technology subject to the Export Administration Regulations (part 730 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations) without regard to whether the Secretary of State has designated North Korea as a country the government of which has provided support for acts of international terrorism, as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2045), as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

(2) PRESUMPTION OF DENIAL.—A license for the export to North Korea of any goods or technology as described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to a presumption of denial.

(b) TRANSACTIONS WITH COUNTRIES SUPPORTING ACTS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The prohibitions and restrictions described in section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), and other provisions in that Act, shall also apply to exporting or otherwise providing (by sale, lease or loan, grant, or other means), directly or indirectly, any munitions item to the Government of North Korea without regard to whether or not North Korea is a country with respect to which subsection (d) of such section (relating to designation of state sponsors of terrorism) applies.

(c) TRANSACTIONS IN LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall withhold assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to any country that provides lethal military equipment to, or receives lethal military equipment from, the Government of North Korea.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibition under this subsection with respect to a country shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date on which such country ceases to provide lethal military equipment to the Government of North Korea.

(3) WAIVER.—The President may waive the prohibition under this subsection with respect to a country if the President determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

SEC. 204. PROCUREMENT SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, the United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from any designated person.

(b) FAR.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation issued pursuant to section 1303 of title 41, United States Code, shall be revised to require a certification from each person that is a prospective contractor that such person does not engage in any of the conduct described in section 104(a). Such revision shall apply with respect to contracts in an amount greater than the simplified acquisition threshold (as defined in section 134 of title 41, United States Code) for which solicitations are issued on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS AND INITIATION OF SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT PROCEEDING.—

(1) TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the head of an executive agency shall terminate a contract with a person who has provided a false certification under subsection (b).

(2) WAIVER.—The head of an executive agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to a person based upon a written finding of urgent and compelling circumstances significantly affecting the interests of the United States. If the head of an executive agency waives the requirement under paragraph (1) for a person, the head of the agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 30 days after the waiver is made, a report containing the rationale for the waiver and relevant information supporting the waiver decision.

(3) INITIATION OF SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT PROCEEDING.—The head of an executive agency shall initiate a suspension and debarment proceeding against a person who has provided a false certification under subsection (b). Upon determination of suspension, debarment, or proposed debarment, the agency shall ensure that such person is entered into the Government-wide database containing the list of all excluded parties ineligible for Federal programs pursuant to Executive Order 12549 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note; relating to debarment and suspension) and Executive Order 12689 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note; relating to debarment and suspension).

(d) CLARIFICATION REGARDING CERTAIN PRODUCTS.—The remedies specified in subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply with respect to the procurement of eligible products, as defined in section 308(4) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2518(4)), of any foreign country or instrumentality designated under section 301(b) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2511(b)).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to limit the use of other remedies available to the head of an executive agency or any other official of the Federal Government on the basis of a determination of a false certification under subsection (b).

(f) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 205. ENHANCED INSPECTIONS AUTHORITIES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, acting through the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a report identifying foreign sea ports and airports whose inspections of ships, aircraft, and conveyances originating in North Korea, carrying North Korean property, or operated by the Government of North Korea are deficient to effectively prevent the facilitation of any of the activities described in section 104(a).

(b) ENHANCED SECURITY TARGETING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after

the identification of any sea port or airport pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, utilizing the Automated Targeting System operated by the National Targeting Center in U.S. Customs and Border Protection, require enhanced screening procedures to determine if physical inspections are warranted of any cargo bound for or landed in the United States that has been transported through such sea port or airport if there are reasonable grounds to believe that such cargo contains goods prohibited under this Act.

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.—A vessel, aircraft, or conveyance used to facilitate any of the activities described in section 104(a) that comes within the jurisdiction of the United States may be seized and forfeited under chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, or under the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 206. TRAVEL SANCTIONS.

(a) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(1) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien (or an alien who is a corporate officer of a person (as defined in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 3(11)) who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe, is described in subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1) of section 104 is—

(A) inadmissible to the United States;

(B) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(C) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(2) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who is described in subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1) of section 104 regardless of when issued.

(B) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subparagraph (A)—

(i) shall take effect immediately; and

(ii) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(b) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under subsection (a)(1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

SEC. 207. EXEMPTIONS, WAIVERS, AND REMOVALS OF DESIGNATION.

(a) EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) MANDATORY EXEMPTIONS.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under section 104:

(A) Activities subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(B) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed June 26, 1947, and entered into force on November 21, 1947, or under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, signed April 24, 1963, and entered into force on March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(2) DISCRETIONARY EXEMPTIONS.—The following activities may be exempt from sanctions under section 104 as determined by the President:

(A) Any financial transaction the exclusive purpose for which is to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of North Korea.

(B) Any financial transaction the exclusive purpose for which is to import food products into North Korea, if such food items are not defined as luxury goods.

(C) Any transaction the exclusive purpose for which is to import agricultural products, medicine, or medical devices into North Korea, provided that such supplies or equipment are classified as designated ''EAR 99'' under the Export Administration Regulations (part 730 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations) and not controlled under—

(i) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.), as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(iii) part B of title VIII of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); or

(iv) the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the imposition of sanctions for a period of not more than one year, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than one year, any sanction or other measure under section 104, 204, 205, 206, or 303 if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a written determination that the waiver meets one or more of the following requirements:

(1) The waiver is important to the economic or national security interests of the United States.

(2) The waiver will further the enforcement of this Act or is for an important law enforcement purpose.

(3) The waiver is for an important humanitarian purpose, including any of the purposes described in section 4 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7802).

(c) REMOVALS OF SANCTIONS.—The President may prescribe rules and regulations for the removal of sanctions on a person that is designated under subsection (a) or (b) of section 104 and the removal of designations of a person with respect to such sanctions if the President determines that the designated person has verifiably ceased its participation in any of the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 104, as the case may be, and has given assurances that it will abide by the requirements of this Act.

(d) FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—The President may promulgate regulations, rules, and policies as may be necessary to facilitate the provision of financial services by a foreign financial institution that is not controlled by the Government of North Korea in support of the activities subject to exemption under this section.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENFORCEMENT OF SANCTIONS ON NORTH KOREA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 6, 2014, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1874, a Panel of Experts issued a report assessing the enforcement of existing sanctions on North Korea. The Panel reported that North Korea continues to ''trade in arms and related materiel in violation of the resolutions'' and that ''there is no question that it is one of the country's most profitable revenue sources''.

(2) The Panel of Experts found that North Korea ''presents a stiff challenge to Member States'' through ''multiple and tiered circumvention techniques'' and ''is experienced in actions it takes to evade sanctions''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to increase the capacity of responsible nations to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695, 1718, 1874, 2087, and 2094, including to strengthen the capacity of responsible nations to monitor and interdict shipments to and from North Korea that contribute to prohibited activities under such Resolutions.

TITLE III—PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

SEC. 301. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

Section 104 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7814) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified report setting forth a detailed plan for making unrestricted, unmonitored, and inexpensive electronic mass communications available to the people of North Korea.''.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON NORTH KOREAN PRISON CAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing, with respect to each political prison camp in North Korea to the extent information is available—

(1) the camp's estimated prisoner population;

(2) the camp's geographical coordinates;

(3) the reasons for confinement of the prisoners;

(4) the camp's primary industries and products, and the end users of any goods produced in such camp;

(5) the natural persons and agencies responsible for conditions in the camp;

(6) the conditions under which prisoners are confined, with respect to the adequacy of food, shelter, medical care, working conditions, and reports of ill-treatment of prisoners; and

(7) imagery, to include satellite imagery of each such camp, in a format that, if published, would not compromise the sources and methods used by the intelligence agencies of the United States to capture geospatial imagery.

(b) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) may be included in the first report required to be submitted to Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act under sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) (relating to the annual human rights report).

SEC. 303. REPORT ON PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES OR CENSORSHIP IN NORTH KOREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains an identification of each person the Secretary determines to be responsible for serious human rights abuses or censorship in North Korea and a description of such abuses or censorship engaged in by such person.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In preparing the report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall give due consideration to the findings of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in North Korea, and shall make specific findings with respect to the responsibility of Kim Jong Un, and of each natural person who is a member of the National Defense Commission of North Korea, or the Organization and Guidance Department of the Workers' Party of Korea, for serious human rights abuses and censorship.

(c) DESIGNATION OF PERSONS.—The President shall designate under section 104(a) any person listed in the report required under subsection (a) as responsible for serious human rights abuses or censorship in North Korea.

(d) SUBMISSION AND FORM.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years, shall be included in each report required under sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) (relating to the annual human rights report).

(2) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex. The Secretary of State shall also publish the unclassified part of the report on the Department of State's website.

TITLE IV—GENERAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 401. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS AND OTHER MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any sanction or other measure required by title I, II, or III of this Act (or any amendment made by title I, II, or III of this Act) may be suspended for up to 365 days upon certification by the President to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea has—

(1) verifiably ceased its counterfeiting of United States currency, including the surrender or destruction of specialized materials and equipment used for or particularly suitable for counterfeiting;

(2) taken significant steps toward financial transparency to comply with generally accepted protocols to cease and prevent the laundering of monetary instruments;

(3) taken significant steps toward verification of its compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695, 1718, 1874, 2087, and 2094;

(4) taken significant steps toward accounting for and repatriating the citizens of other countries abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea or detained in violation of the 1953 Armistice Agreement;

(5) accepted and begun to abide by internationally recognized standards for the distribution and monitoring of humanitarian aid;

(6) provided credible assurances that it will not support further acts of international terrorism;

(7) taken significant and verified steps to improve living conditions in its political prison camps; and

(8) made significant progress in planning for unrestricted family reunification meetings, including for those individuals among the two million strong Korean-American community who maintain family ties with relatives in North Korea.

(b) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—The suspension described in subsection (a) may be renewed for additional consecutive periods of 180 days upon certification by the President to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea has continued to comply with the conditions described in subsection (a) during the previous year.

SEC. 402. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AND OTHER MEASURES.

Any sanction or other measure required by title I, II, or III of this Act (or any amendment made by title I, II, or III of this Act) shall terminate on the date on which the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of North Korea has met the requirements of section 401, and has also—

(1) completely, verifiably, and irreversibly dismantled all of its nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons programs, including all programs for the development of systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons;

(2) released all political prisoners, including the citizens of North Korea detained in North Korea's political prison camps;

(3) ceased its censorship of peaceful political activity;

(4) taken significant steps toward the establishment of an open, transparent, and representative society;

(5) fully accounted for and repatriated all citizens of all nations abducted or unlawfully held captive by the Government of North Korea or detained in violation of the 1953 Armistice Agreement; and

(6) agreed with the Financial Action Task Force on a plan of action to address deficiencies in its anti-money laundering regime and begun to implement this plan of action.

SEC. 403. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act (which may include regulatory exceptions), including under section 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1704).

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to an applicable Executive order or otherwise pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 404. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. OFFSET.

Section 102(a) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–73; 22 U.S.C. 8412(a)) is amended by striking ''$1,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,490,000,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, North Korea, which is one of the nuclear proliferators on this planet in having proliferated missiles to Iran and in having proliferated to Syria the construction some years ago of a site in order to create nuclear weapons, this particular regime remains today one of the most significant national security threats that we face. It is an enduring threat to us and our allies in northeast Asia. It is an enduring threat not just because of that proliferation but also because of the attitude of the regime there. Frankly, America's policy over the last 25 years, whether we are talking about a Republican administration or a Democrat administration, has been a bipartisan failure for that whole period of time.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the Clinton administration's agreed framework, the first in a long line of failed agreements in which North Korea holds out the promise of cooperation, only to game the negotiations for more time and more incentives and uses that opportunity to continue to expand its nuclear program.

□ 1530

Today, we are no closer to the goal of disarming those nukes than we were in 1994. The only difference is there is a whole lot more of them.

Meanwhile, North Korea continues to make progress on its nuclear weapons program, conducting three tests in recent years. It has actively worked on intercontinental ballistic missile technology to deliver a three-stage ICBM.

To underscore the threats that we face, let us not forget that, in 2007, a North Korean-built nuclear reactor was destroyed in Syria along the banks of the Euphrates River.

Mr. Speaker, we need a new approach, frankly, to North Korea, and it is time for Congress to lead. Recent events around the world underscore the foolishness of inaction. We need a clear framework for sanctions to deprive Kim Jong Un of his ability to build nuclear weapons and to repress and abuse the North Korean people. The way a regime treats its own people will tell you a lot in life about how they may end up treating their neighbors.

The North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act seeks to apply the same type of pressure that the Treasury Department used back in 2005 when it caught the regime counterfeiting hundred-dollar bills. Treasury, at that time, targeted the bank in Macao that was complicit in counterfeiting with North Korea. This action sent a ripple throughout the international financial system, and it seriously hindered North Korea's finances. This was one of the most effective steps in 20 years that we took against North Korea.

I can tell you some of the results because we have talked with defectors afterwards about what they had seen in terms of the fact that productions had

closed. The regime could not pay their own generals, and that is not a good position for dictators to be in. Unfortunately, though, the sanctions were lifted by the State Department in the naive hope that the North Koreans would negotiate away their nuclear program.

It is time to open our eyes. This legislation enables our government to go after Kim Jong Un's illicit activities, just like we went after organized crime in our own country, by interdicting shipments and disrupting the flow of money, stopping the hard currency, the very hard currency he utilizes for his weapons program.

These sanctions target North Korea's money laundering, their counterfeiting, their narcotics trafficking operation. The only way we can stop North Korea is cutting off its access to this hard currency, to stop Kim Jong Un from being able to pay his generals or conduct research on nuclear weapons.

Critically, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act also includes the basis imposing sanctions based on North Korea's deplorable human rights abuses. By directly targeting individuals in positions of power, we will finally hold North Korea responsible for the torture, the gulags, the extrajudicial killings that were recently exposed by that high-level UN inquiry, one of the first of its kind.

For far too long, the world has turned a blind eye to human rights abuses in North Korea. By supporting this bill, we will take a critical step toward stopping this type of abuse.

This bipartisan piece of legislation, by the way, has over 140 cosponsors. It has garnered the support of humanitarian groups around the world. And I note that humanitarian aid is in no way affected by this legislation.

Again, humanitarian societies worldwide support this, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H.R. 1771, the ''North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act,'' which the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported favorably on May 29, 2014. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1771 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1771 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1771, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 1771.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of your committee that were worked out in consultation with your staff.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1771 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1771, the ''North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014,'' which was favorably reported out of your Committee on May 29, 2014.

Given that certain provisions in the bill are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I appreciate that you have addressed these provisions in response to the Committee's concerns. As a result, in order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 1771. Further, the Committee will not oppose the bill's consideration on the suspension calendar, based on our understanding that you will work with us as the legislative process moves forward to ensure that our concerns continue to be addressed. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1771, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the rule X jurisdiction of your committee that were worked out in consultation with your staff.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1771 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of your committee that were worked out in consultation with your staff.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1771 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your

cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: On May 29, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2013, to be reported favorably to the House with an amendment. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1771, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I appreciate your July 25 letter anticipating this letter memorializing this understanding with respect to H.R. 1771, as amended. I would further appreciate your inclusion of a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2014.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of your committee that were worked out in consultation with your staff.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1771 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1771, the ''North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2013.''

H.R. 1771 contains provisions within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
FORD HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1771 into our Committee Report and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1771, the ''North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act,'' which your Committee ordered reported on May 29, 2014.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Homeland Security on provisions in our jurisdiction and in an effort to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 1771, the Committee on Homeland Security will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional upon our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation.

I request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the strongest support of H.R. 1771, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2014.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also want to thank the distinguished chairman. He and I had a conversation several months ago where I encouraged that we put this on the schedule, the agenda, for a markup on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and he did so with alacrity, and I really appreciate his consideration and leadership.

This legislation, which I am pleased to have cosponsored, provides us with the opportunity to communicate that the House of Representatives is resolved to hold the Orwellian North Korean regime accountable for unspeakable brutality against its own people and the erratic and dangerous manner in which it conducts itself on the world stage.

The bill imposes the first comprehensive sanctions on the North Korea regime, and those in other countries, who abet its arms smuggling, weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile development, human rights abuses, and terrorism support.

It imposes asset freezes and seizures and visa denials on persons who materially contribute to North Korea's WMD missile development and proliferation, as well as its human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

H.R. 1771 requires the Treasury Department to determine if North Korea is engaged in money laundering, and, if so, it blocks any entity from access to the entire United States financial system if it conducts direct or indirect transactions with North Korea's banks.

It also requires a public report identifying North Korean human rights violators and political prison camps. It calls for a feasibility study of providing North Korean nationals with Internet communication devices that can overcome the incredible censorship in that country.

Mr. Speaker, these sanctions are warranted. North Korea is a reckless international actor that has amassed a litany of violations and abuses of international law that one would think belong in a fictional novel. It continues to develop nuclear weapons programs in defiance of the Security Council and worldwide condemnation.

North Korea supports the development of Iranian missile technology and nuclear capabilities. Hamas and Hezbollah, both designated foreign terrorist organizations by the United States Government, receive missile technology and training from the North Korea regime that they have used to attack Israel, an ally of the United States.

The Security Council at the United Nations' resolutions deterring missile tests and launches are routinely flouted. It is clear that a pattern of behavior has developed in North Korea that should be concerning to all in the international community, not just this body.

The U.S. will not and cannot allow an authoritarian regime to operate with impunity and threaten our national security and that of our allies.

Of course, the United States and the international community should not only address the aggression North Korea has projected outward. The atrocities committed within the borders of North Korea are, of course, of equal concern and deserve similar condemnation.

The status of human rights seems to have regressed under Kim Jong Un, if that is at all possible. A recent United Nations report recounts in horrifying detail the ''offenses'' which land individuals in labor camps, including the misspelling of Kim Jong Il. Deplorable conditions persist in the nation's system of gulags that reports say contain as many as 200,000 prisoners.

People seeking refuge from the oppressive regime must disregard public executions used to intimidate the populace and brave a ''shoot to kill'' set of orders levied against citizens who are simply attempting to make a living somewhere else. Family reunifications between South Korean families and their loved ones on the other side of the DMZ remain limited to fleeting reunions.

I really want to thank Chairman ROYCE and our committee staff on both sides for working with us on an amendment that makes the suspension of sanctions in this legislation conditional on North Korea making significant progress in planning for unrestricted family reunification meetings, including for those individuals among the 2 million strong Korean American community who still have relatives in North Korea.

Pyongyang must pay, and the lives of North Koreans must be improved.

I applaud this legislation for levying extensive sanctions against bad actors in the North Korean saga while recognizing the urgency of humanitarian, medical, and food assistance for North Korea's citizens. Rest assured that no such reprieve is offered by the regime in Pyongyang.

Again, I commend my colleagues, the chairman, and the ranking member of our committee for finding, once again, common ground on the North Korea sanctions issue and for taking decisive action against this despotic regime.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers on this side.

I urge passage of this legislation. I think it can send a very important message to our allies and to our foes and to, especially, the North Korea regime itself. I think the timing is right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, for far too long the world has ignored the significant human rights abuses that occur almost every single day in North Korea. Increasingly, as people escape, we begin to get some sense of what life is like for the hundreds of thousands that live in these concentration camps.

By turning a blind eye to what is going on in North Korea, we, and the rest of the world, risk missing an opportunity to hold the Kim regime responsible for its terrible crimes against humanity. This legislation is a chance to hold them responsible for those crimes against their own people. We have an opportunity here to cut off the hard currency that goes right to the leadership in this regime. They depend on that hard currency.

Earlier this year, the U.N. Commission of Inquiry laid out the most damning case against North Korea. Internationally, communities were shocked by the revelations in this Commission of Inquiry.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have met with a number of North Korean defectors and refugees over the years. I have heard their stories. We have had some of them testify here in the House of Representatives. I have seen North Korea with my own eyes. I have seen the malnutrition engineered by the regime, while the money goes into their nuclear arms program and their military buildup.

Listen. The message from the defectors and the survivors are remarkably similar. What they tell us is: please help us. By supporting H.R. 1771, we send an unmistakable message that the United States will no longer tolerate a regime that tortures and kills its own people. We will not tolerate, either, nuclear weapons and unchecked proliferation being developed with the hard currency that this regime gets its hands on by violating international law and being involved in the type of smuggling and illegal activities that they are involved in.

North Korea is, undoubtedly, one of the most significant security threats that we here face and our allies face, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1771, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4490) to enhance the missions, objectives, and effectiveness of United States international communications, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4490

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''United States International Communications Reform Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) United States international broadcasting exists to advance the United States interests and values by presenting accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information, which is the foundation for democratic governance, to societies that lack a free media.

(2) Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that ''[e]veryone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression'', and that ''this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers''.

(3) Secretary of State Hillary Clinton testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on January 23, 2013, that the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) ''is practically a defunct agency in terms of its capacity to be able to tell a message around the world. So we're abdicating the ideological arena and need to get back into it.''.

(4) The BBG, which was created by Congress to oversee the United States international broadcasting in the wake of the Cold War, has, because of structural and managerial issues, had limited success to date in both coordinating the various components of the international broadcasting framework and managing the day-to-day operations of the Federal components of the international broadcasting framework.

(5) The lack of regular attendance by board members and a periodic inability to form a quorum have plagued the BBG and, as a result, it has been functionally incapable of running the agency.

(6) The board of governors has only achieved the full slate of all nine governors for seven of its 17 years of existence, which highlights the difficulties of confirming and retaining governors under the current structure.

(7) Both the Department of State's Office of Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office have issued reports which outline a severely dysfunctional organizational structure of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(8) The Inspector General of the Department of State concluded in its January 2013 report that dysfunction of the BBG stems from ''a flawed legislative structure and acute internal dissension''.

(9) The Inspector General of the Department of State also found that the BBG's structure of nine part-time members ''cannot effectively supervise all United States Government-supported, civilian international broadcasting'', and its involvement in day-to-day operations has impeded normal management functions.

(10) The Government Accountability Office report determined that there was significant overlap among the BBG's languages services, and that the BBG did not systematically consider the financial cost of overlap.

(11) According to the Office of the Inspector General, the BBG's Office of Contracts is not in compliance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, lacks appropriate contract oversight, and violates the Anti-Deficiency Act. The Office of the Inspector General also determined that the Broadcasting Board of Governors has not adequately performed full and open competitions or price determinations, has entered into hundreds of personal service contracts without statutory authority, and contractors regularly work without valid contracts in place.

(12) The size and make-up of the BBG workforce should be closely examined, given the agency's broader broadcasting and technical mission, as well as changing media technologies.

(13) The BBG should be structured to ensure that more taxpayer dollars are dedicated to the substantive, broadcasting, and information-related elements of the agency's mission.

(14) The lack of a coherent and well defined mission of the Voice of America has led to programming that duplicates the efforts of the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, Radio Free Asia, RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated that results in inefficient use of tax-payer funding.

(15) The annual survey conducted by the ''Partnership for Public Service'' consistently ranks the Broadcasting Board of Governors at or near the bottom of all Federal agencies in terms of ''overall best places to work'' and ''the extent to which employees feel their skills and talents are used effectively''. The consistency of these low scores point to structural, cultural, and functional problems at the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(16) The Federal and non-Federal organizations that comprise the United States international broadcasting framework have different, yet complementary, missions that necessitate coordination at all levels of management.

(17) The Broadcasting Board of Governors has an overabundance of senior civil service positions, defined here as full-time employees encumbering GS-14 and GS-15 positions on the General Schedule pay scale.

(18) United States international broadcasting should seek to leverage public-private partnerships, including the licensing of content and the use of technology owned or operated by non-governmental sources, where possible to expand outreach capacity.

(19) Shortwave broadcasting has been an important method of communication that should be utilized in regions as a component of United States international broadcasting where a critical need for the platform exists.

(20) Congressional action is necessary at this time to improve international broadcasting operations, strengthen the United States public diplomacy efforts, enhance the grantee surrogate broadcasting effort, restore focus to news, programming, and content, and maximize the value of Federal and non-Federal resources that are dedicated to public diplomacy and international broadcasting.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To provide objective, accurate, credible, and comprehensive news and information to societies that lack freedom of expression and information.

(2) To improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and flexibility of United States international broadcasting to allow it to adapt to constantly changing political and media environments through clarification of missions, improved coordination, and organizational restructuring.

(3) To coordinate the complementary efforts of the Department of State and United States international broadcasting.

(4) To create a United States international broadcasting framework that more effectively leverages the broadcasting tools available and creates specialization of expertise in mission oriented programming, while minimizing waste and inefficiency.

(5) To improve United States international broadcasting workforce effectiveness, security, and satisfaction.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) GRANTEE.—The term ''grantee'' means the non-Federal organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code as of day before the date of the enactment of this Act that receives Federal funding from the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and includes Radio Free Asia, RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated.

(3) FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—The term ''Freedom News Network'' refers to the non-Federal organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code that would receive Federal funding and be responsible for promoting democratic freedoms and free media operations for foreign audiences in societies that lack freedom of expression and information, and consisting of the consolidation of the grantee in accordance with section 211.

(4) PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.—The term ''public diplomacy'' means the effort to achieve broad United States foreign policy goals and objectives, advance national interests, and enhance national security by informing and influencing foreign publics and by expanding and strengthening the relationship between the people and Government of the United States and citizens of other countries.

SEC. 5. BROADCASTING STANDARDS.

United States international broadcasting shall incorporate the following standards into all of its broadcasting efforts:

(1) Be consistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States.

(2) Be consistent with the international telecommunications policies and treaty obligations of the United States.

(3) Not duplicate the activities of private United States broadcasters.

(4) Be conducted in accordance with the highest professional standards of broadcast journalism while remaining consistent with and supportive of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States.

(5) Be based on reliable, research-based information, both quantitative and qualitative, about its potential audience.

(6) Be designed so as to effectively reach a significant audience.

(7) Promote freedom of expression, religion, and respect for human rights and human equality.

SEC. 6. ELIGIBLE BROADCAST AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board of the United States International Communications Agency and the Board of the Freedom News Network, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that United States international broadcasting is conducted only to countries and regions that—

(1) lack democratic rule, or the indicia of democratic rule, such as demonstrable proof of free and fair elections;

(2) lack the legal and political environment that allows media organizations and journalists to operate free from government-led or permitted harassment, intimidation, retribution, and from economic impediments to the development, production, and dissemination of news and related programming and content;

(3) lack established, domestic, and widely accessible media that provide accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and related programming and content; and

(4) by virtue of the criteria described in this subsection, would benefit the national security and related interests of the United States, and the safety and security of United States citizens at home and abroad.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network may broadcast to countries that fall outside of the criteria described in subsection (a) if the Chief Executive Officer of the Agency and the Freedom News Network, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determine it is in the national security interest of the United States, or in the interests of preserving the safety and security of United States citizens at home and abroad, to do so.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT, ORGANIZATION, AND MANAGEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

Subtitle A—Establishment of the United States International Communications Agency

SEC. 101. EXISTENCE WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

There is hereby established a single Federal organization consisting of the Voice of America and the offices that constitute the International Broadcasting Bureau and referred to hereafter as the ''United States International Communications Agency'', which shall exist within the executive branch of Government as an independent establishment described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 102. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board (in this section referred to as the ''Board'') of the United States International Communications Agency shall consist of nine members, as follows:

(A) Eight voting members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) The Secretary of State, who shall also be a voting member.

(2) CHAIR.—The President shall appoint one member (other than the Secretary of State) as Chair of the Board, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(3) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Exclusive of the Secretary of State, not more than four members of the Board shall be of the same political party.

(4) RETENTION OF EXISTING BBG MEMBERS.—The presidentially-appointed and Senate-confirmed members of the Broadcasting Board of Governors serving as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall constitute the Board of the United States International Communications Agency and hold office the remainder of their original terms of office without reappointment to the Board.

(b) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of each member of the Board shall be three years, except that the Secretary of State shall remain a member of the Board during the Secretary's term of service. Of the other eight voting members, the initial terms of office of two members shall be one year, and the initial terms of office of three other members shall be two years, as determined by the President. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Board members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the members so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term. Members may not serve beyond their terms. When there is no Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Board until a Secretary is appointed.

(c) SELECTION OF BOARD.—Members of the Board shall be citizens of the United States who are not regular full-time employees of the United States Government. Such members shall be selected by the President from among citizens distinguished in the fields of public diplomacy, mass communications, print, broadcast media, or foreign affairs.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this section (including travel time) shall be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular places of business, members of the Board may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with section 5703 of such title for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The Secretary of State shall not be entitled to any compensation under this chapter.

(e) DECISIONS.—Decisions of the Board shall be made by majority vote, a quorum being present. A quorum shall consist of a majority of members then serving at the time a decision of the Board is made.

(f) TRANSPARENCY.—The Board of the United States International Communications Agency shall adhere to the provisions specified in the Government in the Sunshine Act (Public Law 94–409).

SEC. 103. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

The Board of the United States International Communications Agency shall have the following authorities:

(1) To review and evaluate the mission and operation of, and to assess the quality, effectiveness, and professional integrity of, all programming produced by the United States International Communications Agency to ensure alignment with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States.

(2) To ensure that broadcasting of the United States International Communications Agency is conducted in accordance with the standards specified in section 5.

(3) To review, evaluate, and recommend to the Chief Executive of the United States International Communications Agency, at least annually, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the necessity of adding or deleting of language services of the Agency.

(4) To submit to the President and Congress an annual report which summarizes and evaluates activities of the United States International Communications Agency described in this title.

SEC. 104. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency, appointed by the Board of the Agency for a five-year term, renewable at the Board's discretion,

and subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments, classification, and compensation.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be selected from among United States citizens with two or more of the following qualifications:

(1) A distinguished career in managing a large organization or Federal agency.

(2) Experience in the field of mass communications, print, or broadcast media.

(3) Experience in foreign affairs or international relations.

(4) Experience in directing United States public diplomacy programs.

(c) TERMINATION AND TRANSFER.—Immediately upon appointment of the Chief Executive Officer under subsection (a), the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau shall be terminated, and all of the responsibilities and authorities of the Director shall be transferred to and assumed by the Chief Executive Officer.

(d) REMOVAL OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The Chief Executive Officer under subsection (a) may be removed upon a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Board of the United States International Communications Agency then serving.

(e) COMPENSATION OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—Any Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency hired after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be eligible to receive compensation up to an annual rate of pay equivalent to level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 105. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

(a) DUTIES.—The Chief Executive Officer under section 104 shall direct operations of the United States International Communications Agency and shall have the following non-delegable authorities, subject to the supervision of the Board of the United States International Communications Agency:

(1) To supervise all Federal broadcasting activities conducted pursuant to title V of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) and the Voice of America as described in subtitle B of title I of this Act.

(2) To make and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement in accordance with section 110.

(3) To review engineering activities to ensure that all broadcasting elements receive the highest quality and cost-effective delivery services.

(4) To undertake such studies as may be necessary to identify areas in which broadcasting activities under the authority of the United States International Communications Agency could be made more efficient and economical.

(5) To the extent considered necessary to carry out the functions of the Board, procure supplies, services, and other personal property, as well as procurement pursuant to section 1535 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Economy Act''), of such goods and services from other Federal agencies for the Board as the Board determines are appropriate.

(6) To appoint such staff personnel for the Board as the Board may determine to be necessary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(7) To obligate and expend, for official reception and representation expenses, such amounts as may be made available through appropriations Acts.

(8) To make available in the annual reports required under section 103 information on funds expended on administrative and managerial services by the Board of the United States Communications Agency, and the steps the Board has taken to reduce unnecessary overhead costs for each of the broadcasting services.

(9) To provide for the use of United States Government broadcasting capacity to the Freedom News Network.

(10)(A) To procure temporary and intermittent personal services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate provided for positions classified above grade GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5108 of such title.

(B) To allow those individuals providing such services, while away from their homes or their regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed.

(11) To utilize the provisions of titles III, IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, and X of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), and section 6 of Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1977, as in effect on the day before the effective date of title XIII of the Foreign Affairs Agencies Consolidation Act of 1998, to the extent the Board considers necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

(12) To utilize the authorities of any other statute, reorganization plan, executive order, regulation, agreement, determination, or other official document or proceeding that had been available to the Director of the United States Information Agency, the International Broadcasting Bureau, or the Board of the Broadcasting Board of Governors before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(13)(A) To provide for the payment of primary and secondary school expenses for dependents of personnel stationed in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) at a cost not to exceed expenses authorized by the Department of Defense for such schooling for dependents of members of the Armed Forces stationed in the Commonwealth, if the Board determines that schools available in the Commonwealth are unable to provide adequately for the education of the dependents of such personnel.

(B) To provide transportation for dependents of such personnel between their places of residence and those schools for which expenses are provided under subparagraph (A), if the Board determines that such schools are not accessible by public means of transportation.

(b) CONSULTATIONS.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall regularly consult with the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network and the Secretary of State as described in sections 108 and 109.

SEC. 106. ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To assist the Board of the United States International Communications Agency in carrying out its functions, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Board information in accordance with section 109(b), as well as guidance on United States foreign policy and public diplomacy priorities, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 107. ROLE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of State shall exercise the same authorities with respect to the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network as the Inspector General exercises with respect to the Department.

(b) JOURNALIST INTEGRITY.—The Inspector General of the Department of State shall respect the journalistic integrity of all the broadcasters covered by this Act and may not evaluate the philosophical or political perspectives reflected in the content of the broadcasts of such broadcasters.

SEC. 108. ENHANCED COORDINATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY AND THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK; PROGRAM CONTENT SHARING; GRANTEE INDEPENDENCE.

(a) MEETINGS.—The chair of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall meet at least on a quarterly basis with the chair and Chief Executive Officer, as identified in section 221, of the Freedom News Network to discuss mutual issues of concern, including the following:

(1) The strategic direction of their respective organizations, including target audiences.

(2) Languages of information transmission.

(3) Prioritization of funding allocations.

(4) Areas for greater collaboration.

(5) Elimination of programming overlap.

(6) Efficiencies that can be realized through best practices and lessons learned.

(7) Sharing of program content.

(b) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Broadcasting Agency and the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network shall share all strategic planning documents, including the following:

(1) Results monitoring and evaluation.

(2) Annual planning documents.

(3) Audience surveys conducted.

(4) Budget formulation documents.

(c) PROGRAM CONTENT SHARING.—The United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network shall make all original content available to each other through a shared platform in accordance with section 112(a)(3).

(d) INDEPENDENCE OF FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—The United States International Communications Agency, while conducting management of the grant described in section 110, shall avoid even the appearance of involvement in daily operations, decisions, and management of the Freedom News Network, and ensure that the distinctions between the United States International Communications Agency and Freedom News Network remain in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 109. ENHANCED COORDINATION AMONG THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY, THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK INDEPENDENCE.

(a) COORDINATION MEETINGS.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency and the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network shall meet, at least on a quarterly basis, with the Secretary of State to—

(1) review and evaluate broadcast activities;

(2) eliminate overlap of programming; and

(3) determine long-term strategies for international broadcasting to ensure such strategies are in accordance with the broad foreign policy interests of the United States.

(b) STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENTS.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency, the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network, and the Secretary of State shall share all relevant unclassified strategic planning documents produced by the Agency, the Freedom News Network, and the Department of State.

(c) FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK INDEPENDENCE.—The Department of State, while coordinating with the Freedom News Network in accordance with subsection (a), shall avoid even the appearance of involvement in the daily operations, decisions, and management of the Freedom News Network.

SEC. 110. GRANTS TO THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall make grants to RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, or the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated only after the Chief Executive Officer of the Agency and the Chief Executive Officer of Freedom News Network certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the headquarters of the Freedom News Network and its senior administrative and managerial staff are in a location which ensures economy, operational effectiveness, and accountability, and the following conditions have been satisfied:

(1) RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated have submitted to the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency a plan for consolidation and reconstitution as described in section 211 under the new corporate name ''Freedom News Network'' with a single organizational structure and management framework, as described in section 221.

(2) The necessary steps towards the consolidation described in paragraph (1) have been completed, including the selection of a Board, Chair, and Chief Executive Officer for the Freedom News Network, the establishment of bylaws to govern the Freedom News Network, and the filing of articles of incorporation.

(3) A plan for content sharing has been developed in accordance with section 112(a)(3).

(4) A strategic plan for programming implementation has been developed in accordance with section 222(c).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of the United States International Communications Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the status of any grants made to the Freedom News Network.

(c) ALTERNATIVE GRANTEE.—If the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency, after consultation with the Board of the Agency and the appropriate congressional committees, determines at any time that the Freedom News Network is not carrying out the mission described in section 212 and adhering to the standards and principles described in section 213 in an effective and economical manner for which a grant has been awarded, the Chief Executive Officer of the Agency, upon approval of the Board, may award to another entity the grant at issue to carry out such functions after soliciting and considering applications from eligible entities in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Board may require.

(d) NOT A FEDERAL ENTITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to make the Freedom News Network a Federal agency or instrumentality.

(e) AUTHORITY.—Grants authorized under this section for the United States International Communications Agency shall be available to make annual grants to the Freedom News Network for the purpose of carrying out the mission described in section 212 and adhering to the standards and principles described in section 213.

(f) GRANT AGREEMENT.—Grants authorized under this section to the Freedom News Network by the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall only be made in accordance with a grant agreement. Such grant agreement shall include the following provisions:

(1) A grant shall be used only for activities in accordance with carrying out the mission described in section 212 and adhering to the standards and principles described in section 213.

(2) The Freedom News Network shall comply with the requirements of this section.

(3) Failure to comply with the requirements of this section may result in suspension or termination of a grant without further obligation by the United States International Communications Agency or the United States.

(4) Use of broadcasting technology owned and operated by the United States International Communications Agency shall be made available through an International Cooperative Administrative Support Service (ICASS) agreement or memorandum of understanding.

(5) The Freedom News Network shall, upon request, provide to the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency documentation which details the expenditure of any grant funds.

(6) A grant may not be used to require the Freedom News Network to comply with any requirements other than the requirements specified in this Act.

(7) A grant may not be used to allocate resources within the Freedom News Network in a manner that is inconsistent with the Freedom News Network strategic plan described in section 222(c).

(g) PROHIBITIONS ON THE USE OF GRANTS.—Grants authorized under this section may not be used for the following purposes:

(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (C), to pay any salary or other compensation, or enter into any contract providing for the payment of salary or compensation, in excess of the rates established for comparable positions under title 5, United States Code, or the foreign relations laws of the United States, except that no employee may be paid a salary or other compensation in excess of the rate of pay payable for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title.

(B) Salary and other compensation limitations under subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any employee covered by a union agreement requiring a salary or other compensation in excess of such limitations before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) Notwithstanding the limitations specified in subparagraph (A), grants authorized under this section may be used by the Freedom News Network to pay up to six employees employed in the Washington, D.C. area, salary or other compensation not to exceed the rate of pay payable for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, except that such shall not apply to the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network in accordance with section 221(d).

(2) For any activity intended to influence the passage or defeat of legislation being considered by Congress.

(3) To enter into a contract or obligation to pay severance payments for voluntary separation for employees hired after December 1, 1990, except as may be required by United States law or the laws of the country where such an employee is stationed.

(4) For first class travel for any employee of the Freedom News Network, or the relative of any such employee.

SEC. 111. OTHER PERSONNEL AND COMPENSATION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the organizational and personnel restrictions described in subsection (c), the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall have the discretion to determine the distribution of all personnel within the Agency, subject to the approval of the Board of the Agency.

(b) LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No employee of the United States International Communications Agency, other than the Chief Executive Officer or Director of the Voice of America, shall be eligible to receive compensation at a rate in excess of step 10 of GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation described in paragraph (1) does not apply in the case of members of the Board in accordance with section 102(d) or affect the rights of employees covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

(c) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN NEW EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date that is five years after such date, the United States International Communications Agency may not fill any currently unfilled full-time or part-time position compensated at an annual rate of basic pay for grade GS-14 or GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including any currently filled position in which the incumbent resigns, retires, or otherwise leaves such position during the such five year period.

(2) WAIVER.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency may waive the prohibition specified in paragraph (1) if the position is determined essential to the functioning of the Agency and documented as such in the report required under section 112(a), or necessary for the acquisition of skills or knowledge not sufficiently represented in the current workforce of the Agency. The Chief Executive Officer of the Agency shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees before issuing a waiver under this paragraph.

(d) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL STATUS.—Nothing in this Act may be interpreted to change the Federal status or rights of employees of the Voice of America or the International Broadcasting Bureau by the consolidation and establishment of the United States International Communications Agency.

SEC. 112. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY.

(a) REORGANIZATION REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A plan to assess and provide recommendations on the appropriate size and necessity of all current offices and positions (also referred to as a ''staffing pattern'') within the Agency, including full-time employee positions rated at the Senior Executive Service (SES) level or at GS-14 or GS-15 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. Such plan shall include a detailed organizational structure that delineates lines of authority and reporting between junior staff, management, and leadership.

(2) A plan to consolidate the Voice of America and the International Broadcasting Bureau into a single Federal entity identified as the ''United States International Communications Agency'', and how the structure and alignment of resources support the fulfillment of the Agency's mission and standards and principles as described in sections 5 and 122.

(3) A plan for developing a platform to share all programming content between the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network, including making available for distribution all programming content licensed or produced by the Agency and the Freedom News Network, and expanding the functionality of the platforms already in existence, such as the web content management system ''Pangea''.

(4) A joint plan written with the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network to coordinate the transition of language services between the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network in accordance with sections 6, 123, 124, 212, and 214.

(b) CONTRACTING REPORT.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the Agency's compliance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (the ''FAR'') and the Anti-Deficiency Act, including a review of contracts awarded on a non-competitive basis, compliance with the FAR requirement for publicizing contract actions, the use of any personal service contracts without explicit statutory authority, and processes for contract oversight in compliance with the FAR.

(c) LISTENERSHIP REPORT.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency shall annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that details the transmission capacities, market penetration, and audience listenership of all mediums of international communication deployed by the United States International Communications Agency, including a plan for how target audiences can be reached if the first medium of delivery is unavailable.

(d) GAO REPORT.—Every five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that reviews the effectiveness of content sharing between the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network and makes recommendations on how content sharing can be improved.

(e) LANGUAGE REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency and the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a joint report detailing—

(1) information outlining the criteria and analysis used to determine broadcast recipient countries and regions; and

(2) an initial list of broadcast countries and regions.

Subtitle B—The Voice of America

SEC. 121. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Voice of America has been an indispensable element of United States foreign policy and public diplomacy efforts since 1942, and should remain the flagship brand of the United States International Communications Agency;

(2) the Voice of America has been a reliable source of accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and related programming and content for the millions of people around the world who cannot obtain such news and related programming and content from indigenous media outlets;

(3) the Voice of America's success over more than seven decades has created valuable brand identity and international recognition that justifies the maintenance of the Voice of America;

(4) the Voice of America's public diplomacy mission remains essential to broader United States Government efforts to communicate with foreign populations; and

(5) despite its tremendous historical success, the Voice of America would benefit substantially from a recalibration of Federal international broadcasting agencies and resources, which would provide the Voice of America with greater mission focus and flexibility in the deployment of news, programming, and content.

SEC. 122. PRINCIPLES OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA.

The Voice of America shall adhere to the following principles in the course of fulfilling its duties and responsibilities:

(1) Serving as a consistently reliable and authoritative source of news on the United States, its policies, its people, and the international developments that affect the United States.

(2) Providing accurate, objective, and comprehensive information, with the understanding that these three values provide credibility among global news audiences.

(3) Presenting the official policies of the United States, and related discussions and opinions about those policies, clearly and effectively.

(4) Representing the whole of the United States, and shall accordingly work to produce programming and content that presents a balanced and comprehensive projection of the diversity of thought and institutions of the United States.

SEC. 123. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA.

The Voice of America shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

(1) Producing accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and related programming that is consistent with and promotes the broad foreign policies of the United States.

(2) Producing news and related programming and content that accurately represents the diversity of thoughts and institutions of the United States as a whole.

(3) Presenting the law and policies of the United States clearly and effectively.

(4) Promoting the civil and responsible exchange of information and differences of opinion regarding policies, issues, and current events.

(5) Making all of its produced news and related programming and content available to the Freedom News Network for use and distribution.

(6) Producing or otherwise allowing editorials, commentary, and programming, in consultation with the Department of State, that present the official views of the United States Government and its officials.

(7) Maximizing foreign national information access through both the use of existing broadcasting tools and resources and the development and dissemination of circumvention technology.

(8) Providing training and technical support for independent indigenous media and journalist enterprises in order to facilitate or enhance independent media environments and outlets abroad.

(9) Reaching identified foreign audiences in local languages and dialects when possible, particularly when such audiences form a distinct ethnic, cultural, or religious group within a country critical to United States national security interests.

(10) Being capable of providing a broadcasting surge capacity under circumstances where overseas disasters, crises, or other events require increased or heightened international public diplomacy engagement.

SEC. 124. LIMITATION ON VOICE OF AMERICA NEWS, PROGRAMMING, AND CONTENT; EXCEPTION FOR BROADCASTING TO CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Voice of America shall be limited to providing reporting in accordance with the principles specified in section 122. Nothing in this section may preclude the Voice of America from broadcasting programming content produced by the Freedom News Network.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR BROADCASTING TO CUBA.—Radio Marti and Television Marti, which constitute the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, shall continue programming and content production consistent with the mission and activities as described in the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act (Public Law 98–111) and the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (Public Law 101–246), and continue existing within the Voice of America of the United States International Communications Agency, established in section 101.

SEC. 125. DIRECTOR OF VOICE OF AMERICA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be a Director of the Voice of America, who shall be responsible for executing the duties and responsibilities of the Voice of America described in subsection (b).

(b) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director of the Voice of America shall, subject to the final approval of the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency carry out the following duties and responsibilities:

(1) Determine the organizational structure of, and personnel allocation or relocation within, the Voice of America, subject to section 105.

(2) Make recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency regarding the production, development, and termination of Voice of America news programming and content.

(3) Make recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency about the establishment, termination, prioritization, and adjustments of language services utilized by the Voice of America to reach its international audience.

(4) Allocate funding and material resources under the jurisdiction of the Voice of America for the furtherance of the other duties and responsibilities established under this subsection.

(5) Oversee the daily operations of the Voice of America, including programming content.

(c) APPOINTMENT AND QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The position of Director of the Voice of America shall be filled by a person who shall serve at the pleasure of the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to be appointed Director of the Voice of America, a person shall have at least two of the following qualifications:

(A) Prior, extensive experience managing or operating a private-sector media or journalist enterprise.

(B) Prior, extensive experience managing or operating a large organization.

(C) Prior, extensive experience engaged in mass media or journalist program development, including the development of circumvention technologies.

(D) Prior, extensive experience engaged in international journalism or other related activities, including the training of international journalists and the promotion of democratic institutional reforms abroad.

(3) COMPENSATION.—Any Director who is hired after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate equal to the annual rate of basic pay for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

Subtitle C—General Provisions

SEC. 131. FEDERAL AGENCY COORDINATION IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board of the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network shall conduct periodic, unclassified consultations with the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, for the purpose of assessing the following:

(1) Progress toward democratization, the development of free and independent media outlets, and the free flow of information in countries that receive programming and content from the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network.

(2) Foreign languages that have increased or decreased in strategic importance, and the factors supporting such assessments.

(3) Any other international developments, including developments with regional or country-specific significance, that might be of value in assisting the United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network in the development of their programming and content.

(b) GUIDANCE.—The Board of the United States International Communications Agency shall use the unclassified consultations required under subsection (a) as guidance for its distribution and calibration of Federal resources in support of United States public diplomacy.

SEC. 132. FEDERAL AGENCY ASSISTANCE AND COORDINATION WITH THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY AND THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK DURING INTERNATIONAL BROADCAST SURGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to a formal request from the Chair of the Board of the United States International Communications Agency, Federal agency heads shall assist and coordinate with the Agency to facilitate a temporary broadcasting surge or enhance transmission capacity for such a temporary broadcasting surge for the Agency, the Freedom News Network, or both.

(b) ACTIONS.—In accordance with subsection (a), Federal agency heads shall assist or coordinate with the United States International Communications Agency by—

(1) supplying or facilitating access to, or use of—

(A) United States Government-owned transmission capacity, including the use of transmission facilities, equipment, resources, and personnel; and

(B) other non-transmission-related United States Government-owned facilities, equipment, resources, and personnel;

(2) communicating and coordinating with foreign host governments on behalf of, or in conjunction with, the Agency or the Freedom News Network;

(3) providing, or assisting in the obtaining of, in-country security services for the safety and protection of Agency or Freedom News Network personnel; and

(4) providing or facilitating access to any other United States Government-owned resources.

(c) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, neither Federal agency heads nor their agencies shall receive any reimbursement or compensatory appropriations for complying with implementing this section.

SEC. 133. FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL IN INSTANCES OF FEDERAL DISPOSAL OF RADIO OR TELEVISION BROADCAST TRANSMISSION FACILITIES OR EQUIPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be the policy of the United States International Communications Agency to, in the event it intends to dispose of any radio or television broadcast transmission facilities or equipment, provide the Freedom News Network with the right of first refusal with respect to the acquisition of such facilities and equipment.

(b) TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL.—Pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) in the event the Freedom News Network is willing to accept the facilities and equipment referred to in such subsection, the United States International Communications Agency shall transfer to the Freedom News Network such facilities and equipment at no cost to the Freedom News Network; or

(2) in the event the Freedom News Network opts to not accept such facilities and equipment, the United States International Communications Agency may sell such facilities and equipment at market price, and retain any revenue from such sales.

(c) RULES REGARDING CERTAIN FUNDS.—Pursuant to subsections (b) and (c), any revenues that the United States International Communications Agency shall derive from such sales shall be used entirely for the purposes or research, development, and deployment of innovative broadcasting or circumvention technology.

SEC. 134. REPEAL OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1994.

The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.; title III of Public Law 103–236) is repealed (and the items relating to title III in the table of contents of such Public Law are struck).

SEC. 135. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK

SEC. 201. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated share a common mission with distinct geographic foci, and should therefore be merged into a single organization, with distinct marketing brands to provide the news and related programming and content in countries where free media are not established.

Subtitle A—Consolidation of Existing Grantee Organizations

SEC. 211. FORMATION OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK FROM EXISTING GRANTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—When the conditions specified in section 110 are satisfied, the Freedom News Network, comprised of the consolidation of RFE/RL Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated, shall exist to carry out all international broadcasting activities supported by the United States Government, in accordance with sections 212 and 213.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF THE EXISTING INDIVIDUAL GRANTEE BRANDS.—RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated shall remain brand names under which news and related programming and content may be disseminated by the Freedom News Network. Additional brands may be created as necessary.

SEC. 212. MISSION OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.

The Freedom News Network established under section 211 shall—

(1) provide uncensored local and regional news and analysis to people in societies where a robust, indigenous, independent, and free media does not exist;

(2) strengthen civil societies by promoting democratic values and promoting equality and the rights of the individual, including for marginalized groups, such as women and minorities;

(3) help countries improve their indigenous capacity to enhance media professionalism and independence, and develop partnerships with local media outlets, as appropriate; and

(4) promote access to uncensored sources of information, especially via the internet, and use all effective and efficient mediums of communication to reach target audiences.

SEC. 213. STANDARDS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.

The broadcasting of the Freedom News Network shall—

(1) be consistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(2) be consistent with the international telecommunications policies and treaty obligations of the United States;

(3) be conducted in accordance with the highest professional standards of broadcast journalism;

(4) be based on reliable information about its potential audience;

(5) be designed so as to effectively reach a significant audience; and

(6) prioritize programming to populations in countries without independent indigenous media outlets.

Subtitle B—Organization of the Freedom News Network

SEC. 221. GOVERNANCE OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.

(a) BOARD OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—A board shall oversee the Freedom News Network and consist of nine individuals with a demonstrated background in

media or the promotion of democracy and experience in measuring media impact.

(b) COMPOSITION OF FIRST BOARD OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Presidents of RFE/RL Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks shall—

(1) identify, in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, candidates for the first board of the Freedom News Network;

(2) direct the appointment of board members; and

(3) select the first chair of the board of the Freedom News Network.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATION REGARDING THE FIRST BOARD OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—The individuals appointed pursuant to subsection (b) shall serve as members of the first board of the Freedom News Network unless a joint resolution of disapproval is enacted.

(d) OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST BOARD OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The board of the Freedom News Network shall have nine members charged with the sole responsibility to operate the Freedom News Network within the legal jurisdiction of its state of incorporation. The board of the Freedom New Network shall exercise due diligence, and execute its fiduciary duties to the corporation without conflict of interests and consistent with section 212. At no time may the United States International Communications Agency add requirements to a grant agreement with the Freedom News Network that could be construed as inappropriate supervision, oversight, or management under chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code. Nothing in this title may be construed to make the Freedom News Network an agency, establishment, or instrumentality of the United States Government, or to make the members of the board of Freedom News Network, or the officers or employees of Freedom News Network, officers of employees of the United States Government.

(2) BYLAWS.—The first board of the Freedom News Network shall write the bylaws of the organization.

(3) OVERSIGHT.—The Freedom News Network shall be subject to the appropriate oversight procedures of Congress.

(4) TERM LIMITS.—The board members of the first board of the Freedom News Network may not serve more than a three-year term, and shall be replaced in accordance with the bylaws referred to in paragraph (2) and the succession process described in paragraph (5).

(5) SUCCESSION OF BOARD MEMBERS.—The board members of the first board of the Freedom News Network and all subsequent boards shall fill vacancies on the board due to death, resignation, removal, or term expiration through an election process described in the bylaws referred to in paragraph (2) and in accordance with the principle of a ''self-replenishing'' body.

(6) SELECTION OF BOARD MEMBERS.—The board members of the Freedom News Network may not be current employees or officers of RFE/RL Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, or the United States International Communications Agency.

(e) COMPENSATION OF BOARD AND OFFICERS OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—Members of the board of the Freedom News Network may not receive any fee, salary, or remuneration of any kind for their service as members, except that such members may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses, such as board-related travel, incurred with approval of the board upon presentation of vouchers. No officers of the Freedom News Network, other than the Chief Executive Officer, shall be eligible to receive compensation at a rate in excess of the annual rate of basic pay for level II on the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) ABOLISHMENT OF EXISTING BOARDS.—The boards of directors of RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be abolished on the date of the first official meeting of the first board of the Freedom News Network.

(g) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network shall serve at the pleasure of the board of the Freedom News Network, and be responsible for the day-to-day management and operations of the Freedom News Network, including the selection of individuals for management positions, ensuring compliance with all applicable rules, regulations, laws, and circulars, providing strategic vision for the execution of its mission as specified in section 212, and carrying out such other responsibilities as set forth in the laws of the State of its incorporation.

(h) PLAN FOR CONSOLIDATION OF EXISTING INDIVIDUAL GRANTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the first official meeting of the first board of the Freedom News Network, the chair of the board of the Freedom News Network shall submit a report to, and consult with, the appropriate congressional committees on the plan to consolidate RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated into a single non-Federal grantee organization.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The consolidation plan referred to in paragraph (1) shall include the following components:

(A) The location and distribution of employees, including administrative, managerial, and technical staff, of the Freedom News Network that will be located within and outside the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

(B) An organizational chart identifying the managerial and supervisory lines of authority among all employees of the Freedom News Network, including the members of the board and chair.

(3) TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the chair of the board of the Freedom News Network shall fully implement the consolidation plan referred to in paragraph (1) after consultation with the appropriate congressional committees.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than five years after the date on which initial funding is provided for the purpose of operating the Freedom News Network, the chair of the board of the Freedom News Network shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that details the following:

(A) Whether the Freedom News Network is technically sound and cost-effective.

(B) Whether the Freedom News Network consistently meets the standards for quality and impact established by this title.

(C) Whether the Freedom News Network is receiving a sufficient audience to warrant its continued operation.

(D) The extent to which the Freedom News Network's programming and content is already being received by the target audience from other credible indigenous or external sources.

(E) The extent to which the broad foreign policy and national security interests of the United States are being served by maintaining operations of the Freedom News Network.

SEC. 222. BUDGET OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The annual budget of the Freedom News Network shall consist of the following:

(1) A grant described in section 110, consisting of the total grants to RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Any grants or transfers from other Federal agencies.

(3) Other funds described in subsection (b).

(b) OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING.—The Freedom News Network may, to the extent authorized by its board and in accordance with applicable laws and the mission of the Freedom News Network under section 212 and eligible broadcast areas under section 6, collect and utilize non-Federal funds, except that the Freedom News Network may not accept funds from the following:

(1) Any foreign governments or foreign government officials.

(2) Any agents, representatives, or surrogates of any foreign government or foreign government official.

(3) Any foreign-owned corporations or any subsidiaries of any foreign-owned corporation, regardless of whether such subsidiary is United States-owned.

(4) Any foreign national or individual who is not either a citizen or a legal permanent resident of the United States.

(c) ANNUAL STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE FREEDOM NEWS NETWORK.—The Freedom News Network shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the United States International Communications Agency an annual strategic plan to satisfy the requirements specified in section 110. Each such strategic plan shall outline the following:

(1) The strategic goals and objectives of the Freedom News Network for the upcoming fiscal year.

(2) The alignment of the Freedom News Network's resources with the strategic goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Clear benchmarks that establish the progress made towards achieving the strategic goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) A plan to monitor and evaluate the success of the Freedom News Network's broadcasting efforts.

(5) A reflective analysis on the activities on the past fiscal year.

(6) Any changes to facility leases, contracts, or ownership that would result in the relocation of staff or personnel.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that administrative and managerial costs for operation of the Freedom News Network should be kept to a minimum and, to the maximum extent feasible, should not exceed the costs that would have been incurred if RFE/RL, Incorporated, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Incorporated had been operated as independent grantees or as a Federal entity within the Voice of America.

SEC. 223. ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

(a) SURPLUS PROPERTIES.—In order to assist the Freedom News Network in carrying out the provisions of this title, any agency or instrumentality of the United States may sell, loan, lease, or grant property (including interests therein) to the Freedom News Network as necessary.

(b) FACILITIES AND BROADCASTING INFRASTRUCTURE.—The United States International Communications Agency and the Freedom News Network shall negotiate an International Cooperative Administrative Support Service (ICASS) agreement or memorandum of understanding permitting the continued use of technological infrastructure for broadcasting and information dissemination, except that the Freedom News Network may choose to procure such services through negotiated contracts with private-sector providers.

SEC. 224. REPORTS BY THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AUDITS BY GAO.

(a) IG REPORTS.—The Inspector General of the Department of State shall, as appropriate, submit to the appropriate congressional committees reports on management practices of the Freedom News Network, including financial reports on unobligated balances.

(b) GAO AUDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Financial transactions of the Freedom News Network, as such relate to functions carried out under this Act, may be audited by the Government Accountability Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Freedom News Network are normally kept.

(2) ACCESS.—Representatives of the Government Accountability Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property belonging to or in use by the Freedom News Network pertaining to the financial transactions referred to in paragraph (1) and necessary to facilitate an audit in accordance with such paragraph. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of the Freedom News Network shall remain in the possession and custody of the Freedom News Network.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, one percent of the funds made available by the United States International Communications Agency shall be transferred to the Inspector General of the Department of State to cover the expenses of carrying out the activities of the Inspector General under this section.

SEC. 225. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948.

The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is amended—

(1) in title V (22 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.), by striking ''Broadcasting Board of Governors'' and inserting ''United States International Communications Agency'' each place it appears;

(2) by amending paragraph (1) of section 501(b) (22 U.S.C. 1461(b)) to read as follows:

''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary and the United States International Communications Agency may, upon request and reimbursement of the reasonable costs incurred in fulfilling such a request, make available, in the United States, motion pictures, films, video, audio, and other materials disseminated abroad pursuant to this Act. Any reimbursement pursuant to this paragraph shall be credited to the applicable appropriation account of the Department of State or the United States International Communications Agency, as appropriate. The Secretary and the United States International Communications Agency shall issue necessary regulations.'';

(3) by repealing sections 504 and 505 (22 U.S.C. 1464 and 1464a);

(4) by redesignating section 506 (22 U.S.C. 1464b) as section 504;

(5) in section 504, as so redesignated, in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Board'' each place it appears and inserting ''Agency'';

(6) in clause (iii) of section 604(d)(1)(A) (22 U.S.C. 1469(d)(1)(A)), by striking ''Broadcasting Board of Governors'' and inserting ''United States International Communications Agency'';

(7) in paragraph (3) of section 801 (22 U.S.C. 1471), by striking ''Director of the United States Information Agency'' and inserting ''Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency'';

(8) in subsection (b) of section 802 (22 U.S.C. 1472)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''Director of the United States Information Agency'' and inserting ''Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''Broadcasting Board of Governors'' and inserting ''United States International Communications Agency''; and

(9) in paragraph (1) of section 804 (22 U.S.C. 1474), by striking ''Director of the United States Information Agency'' and inserting ''Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency'';

(10) in section 810(b) (22 U.S.C. 1475e(b))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''United States Information Agency'' and inserting ''United States International Communications Agency''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''International Broadcasting Bureau'' and inserting ''United States International Communications Agency''; and

(11) in subsection (a) of section 1011 (22 U.S.C. 1442), by striking ''Director of the United States Information Agency'' and inserting ''Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency''.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. PRESERVATION OF UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES.

The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Communications Agency and the Chief Executive Officer of the Freedom News Network shall each establish procedures to vet and monitor employees of each such agency for affiliations to terrorist organizations, foreign governments, or agents of foreign governments to protect against espionage, sabotage, foreign propaganda messaging, and other subversive activities that undermine United States national security objectives.

SEC. 302. REQUIREMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the fiscal year 2015 and for each subsequent fiscal year, any funds appropriated for the purposes of broadcasting subject to supervision of the Board of the United States International Communications Agency shall not be available for obligation or expenditure—

(1) unless such funds are appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations; or

(2) in excess of the authorized level of appropriations.

(b) SUBSEQUENT AUTHORIZATION.—The limitation under subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the extent that an authorization of appropriations is enacted after such funds are appropriated.

(c) APPLICATION.—The provisions of this section—

(1) may not be superseded, except by a provision of law which specifically repeals, modifies, or supersedes the provisions of this section; and

(2) shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts which are authorized by law and administered under or pursuant to this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the world has been watching eastern Ukraine following the downing of a civilian passenger plane by Russian-backed separatists. We have watched as families have grieved. We have watched as thugs have blocked access to the crash site.

I say ''thugs'' because a lot of these individuals are recruited in the Russian-speaking world on these social Web sites and, frankly, every malcontent, every skinhead that they could enlist in this cause has been given a weapon, and their behavior, as we have watched on television, is really unconscionable.

What isn't so well known is the information battle that is being waged and that we are losing. We are losing on this front in the information war.

□ 1545

Listen to what The Economist magazine says: ''Russia has again become a place in which truth and falsehood are no longer distinct, and facts are put into the service of the government. Mr. Putin sets himself up as a patriot, but he is a threat—to international norms, to his neighbors, and to the Russians, themselves, who are intoxicated by his hysterical brand of anti-Western propaganda.''

That analysis followed Russia's latest lie, that Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 was shot down by the Ukrainian military.

Look, I was in eastern Ukraine. I had an opportunity to talk to many Russian-speaking Ukrainians. I will tell you what they shared with me—and this was whether they were civil rights groups, the local governor Dnepropetrovsk, minority groups, women's groups, the Jewish community there, which is a very vibrant community; they all share the same concern.

They felt that this crisis was being engineered by President Vladimir Putin and that he was sending in and recruiting malcontents and trying to create a crisis. And they felt that the reason he was doing it was to try to break off eastern Ukraine to become part of Russia. And they resisted this. They felt it was very important that elections go forward.

Now you have a new government in Ukraine that is trying to push a peace plan and, instead, you have got the propaganda every night. And the question is, who is going to offset that propaganda? Our best weapon in this information battle, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the BBG, is totally defunct.

This is not just my observation. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and others have observed that that is the world we live in now. We have known this for years, based on report after report from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of the Inspector General.

This has real consequences. One newspaper rightly noted: ''The BBG has greatly diminished America's capacity to fight the Putin propaganda machine.'' If we don't put the truth out there, if we don't put our reality out there, if there isn't a surrogate free radio and television for people to listen to, all they are going to hear is the conspiratorial note of propaganda.

Former BBG governors, Voice of America directors, staff, and those that follow international broadcasting have repeatedly called on Congress to step up and reform the BBG. We must act with urgency.

Yes, Russia's propaganda machine is saturating the airwaves with false information designed to incite violence, designed to stoke sectarian fears and create a pretext for Russian military engagement in Ukraine.

But I will share with you that, in the Middle East, Hezbollah's television station, Al-Manar, continues to broadcast lies and propaganda and incitement designed to destabilize the region and build support for a terror war on Israel and on democracy there.

China's CCTV now broadcasts to over 100 countries and recently established its new Africa bureau in Nairobi, Kenya.

You know, there was a time when the U.S. dominated the international airwaves. Now we are a voice among many, but that voice is really on the defensive and, in many places, is no longer heard.

Our competitors highlight our failings. They minimize our successes. They are working 24/7 to discredit America in a well-orchestrated game of chess, and we have a part-time broadcasting board.

This legislation, the United States International Communications Reform Act of 2014, is a bipartisan effort to reform the BBG and make it more effective and efficient in efforts to confront this propaganda. The legislation cuts the bureaucracy so that more funding is spent fighting foreign propaganda instead of paying inflated salaries in Washington. The bill brings accountability to our international broadcasters, installing a full-time CEO empowered to make decisions. The current dysfunctional board of nine part-time Presidential appointees is reduced to an appropriate advisory capacity.

The Voice of America is, once again, an integral part of foreign policy, with a mission that makes clear that all three parts of the charter must be emphasized. Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Network—the so-called ''surrogates''—have a different mission; that is, to provide uncensored local news and information to people in closed societies and to be ''a megaphone for internal advocates of freedom.'' Whether it is in Iran, North Korea, or elsewhere, our surrogate broadcasters will be at the tip of the spear in this information battle and are given a global mandate to go after the most despotic regimes, exposing their abuses, their violence, their hypocrisy, and telling the story of what is really going on in the country.

And these critical reforms come with the benefit of a cost savings to the American taxpayers here. H.R. 4490 will result in a cost savings of $160 million over 5 years.

The legislation mandates that no future funding will be provided unless cost-saving reforms are implemented, including administrative consolidation, right-sizing, and leveraged public-private partnerships. Ripping away the bureaucracy will reduce administrative overlap and allow both organizations to strive.

To be clear, this legislation isn't about creating a U.S. Government propaganda effort. VOA is not being turned into a version of Russia's RT or China's CCTV.

This bill is about communicating America's message of pluralism, tolerance, and transparency to foreign audiences. There was a time when we did that really well, but we have lost it. This bill gets us back on track. We can't afford anything but high performance with the world's crises seemingly multiplying.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4490, the United States International Communications Reform Act.

I want to congratulate, again, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL on the bipartisan legislation before us today to reform the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

I am pleased to join them in cosponsoring these commonsense reforms that will result in a more clearly defined mission for the Broadcasting Board of Governors and its components, and a more efficient operation on behalf of the taxpayers.

Like many of my colleagues, I was troubled to hear former Secretary of State Clinton tell the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the Broadcasting Board of Governors had become ''practically a defunct agency in terms of its capacity to be able to tell a message around the world.'' And as the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee just said, we need that ability right now, given the events that are going on in Russia and the Ukraine.

As my colleagues know, this bill responds to critical reports issued early last year by the Government Accountability Office and the State Department Office of Inspector General, which were the subject of a hearing before our committee last June. Those reports highlighted structural deficiencies and overlapping functions within the Broadcasting Board of Governors' federally operated programs Voice of America and the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, and the private but federally funded broadcasters Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, and Radio Free Asia.

This legislation also clarifies the mission statements of the Federal and non-Federal broadcasters. Voice of America, for example, will now confine itself to its public diplomacy mission to foster positive relationships between the United States and the rest of the world.

There were concerns about mission creep within the Voice of America, blurring the lines between it and the mission of the international broadcasters to provide uncensored and objective news and analysis on a local and regional level in those places lacking a free press.

The bill also includes necessary structural reforms, including a new International Communications Agency with a CEO to manage the day-to-day operations of VOA and other federally run operations.

As we learned during last year's hearing, there was growing concern of micromanagement by the Broadcasting Board of Governors and the challenge of achieving a quorum at the board meetings needed to make operational decisions. This will put the Board of Governors in a more advisory role.

Further, the bill will consolidate the non-Federal broadcasters under the

same umbrella, known as the Freedom News Network, achieving economies of scale, saving money, as the chairman has indicated, and allowing for closer collaboration on other more global efforts.

Importantly, this legislation maintains the requirement that U.S. Federal programs serve as an objective source of news and information and not as a mouthpiece for U.S. foreign policy.

This bill has been a collaborative effort that included outreach and input from key stakeholders, including the board itself, the broadcasters, and agency staff. This is the kind of bipartisan oversight on which we should be focusing. I wish more committees in this body would follow this example.

Once again, I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their bipartisan leadership and for bringing our committee, once again, together on this very important piece of legislation.

Having no further speakers on this side, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I just will close with this because we had testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee last summer by the former BBG Governor, Enders Wimbush. And I wanted to quote what he said:

Today's problem is not enough information but the opposite. Most places, even some enduring the repression of nasty regimes, get plenty, much of it junk. This is the new competitive landscape for U.S. international broadcasting. Our competitors, too, have multiplied, while our allies have retreated. One would think that American strategists would sharpen their spears to compete in this world. Yet the opposite seems to be happening, again, due in large part to the incoherence of the BBG. It is incapable of articulating a set of media strategies, and it has no way to attach whatever measures it does adapt to larger U.S. national objectives.

So as you can tell, the current bureaucratic umbrella overseeing U.S. international broadcasters is deeply flawed. That is why this bill is so important. We need our international broadcasters to succeed in their missions. We want the Voice of America to—I am going to quote President Kennedy here—''tell America's story to the world.'' We want our surrogate broadcasters to tell the stories to people in closed societies that their own governments won't tell them. And we want the American taxpayers to see a return on the generous investment they have been making in international broadcasting. This legislation does that, and I urge all of the Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4490, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESSENTIAL TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL ASSESSMENT ACT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3202) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3202

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act''.

SEC. 2. COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY ASSESSMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program under section 70105 of title 46, United States Code, at enhancing security and reducing security risks for facilities and vessels regulated pursuant to section 102 of Public Law 107–295. Such assessment shall be conducted by a national laboratory that, to the extent practicable, is within the Department of Homeland Security laboratory network with expertise in maritime security or by a maritime security university-based center within the Department of Homeland Security centers of excellence network.

(b) CONTENTS.—The comprehensive assessment shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the extent to which the program, as implemented, addresses known or likely security risks in the maritime environment;

(2) an evaluation of the extent to which deficiencies identified by the Comptroller General have been addressed; and

(3) a cost-benefit analysis of the program, as implemented.

(c) CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN; PROGRAM REFORMS.—Not later than 60 days after the Secretary submits the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a corrective action plan to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that responds to the assessment under subsection (b). The corrective action plan shall include an implementation plan with benchmarks, may include programmatic reforms, revisions to regulations, or proposals for legislation, and shall be considered in any rule making by the Department relating to the transportation security card program.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 120 days after the Secretary issues the corrective action plan under subsection (c), the Comptroller General shall—

(1) review the extent to which such plan implements—

(A) recommendations issued by the national laboratory or maritime security university-based center, as applicable, in the assessment submitted under subsection (a); and

(B) recommendations issued by the Comptroller General before the enactment of this Act; and

(2) inform the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate as to the responsiveness of such plan to such recommendations.

(e) TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARD READER RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not issue a final rule requiring the use of transportation security card readers until—

(A) the Comptroller General informs the Committees on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate that the submission under subsection (a) is responsive to the recommendations of the Comptroller General; and

(B) the Secretary issues an updated list of transportation security card readers that are compatible with active transportation security cards.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any final rule issued pursuant to the notice of proposed rulemaking on Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC)-Reader Requirements published by the Coast Guard on March 22, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 17781)

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL OVERSIGHT.—Not less than 18 months after the date of the issuance of the corrective action plan under subsection (c), and every six months thereafter during the 3-year period following the date of the issuance of the first report under this subsection, the Comptroller General shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate regarding implementation of the corrective action plan.

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3202, which is called the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act, commonly referred to as TWIC, which I will now call TWIC. That is a mouthful.

First, I would certainly like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for introducing this very thoughtful legislation. She has really worked very diligently on this in a very bipartisan way. We have worked together to move this legislation through our subcommittee and through the full Committee on Homeland Security.

□ 1600

This bill will really help Congress determine the value of the TWIC program and simultaneously allow the department to proceed apace with finalizing the long-awaited card reader rule.

I mentioned I am a cosponsor of this bill because it really responds to key recommendations of the GAO that the TWIC program should have a baseline security assessment before the program moves forward.

As many of my colleagues with ports in their districts know, TWIC is a port security program that has been wrought with constant delays and questions about its overall security value.

Last year, the Border and Maritime Subcommittee that I am honored to chair held a hearing with the Coast Guard, with the TSA, and with the GAO on the TWIC program and the ongoing concerns that we have with it, and this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is really a result of that oversight.

Now, it may be hard to believe, but more than a decade after the legislation that required TWIC was first enacted, there has been no security or effectiveness assessment of the program to assess the underlying assumptions of the security and access control concerns that the card was intended to mitigate.

This bill seeks to answer the simple question: How, if at all, does TWIC improve maritime security? It should have been one of the very first things that the department did when it began to implement this program, and this bill ensures that it finally gets done.

The TWIC card was initially designed to prevent terrorists from gaining access to sensitive parts of our Nation's ports through the use of biometric-enabled credentials. However, with no biometric reader regulations in place, the TWIC card currently is used really as a flash pass, since most facilities and vessels are neither currently required to nor voluntarily utilize biometric readers. The lack of biometric readers, therefore, limits the effectiveness of this program.

For several years, members of the Homeland Security Committee have been calling on the department to release the card reader rule to provide some certainty to workers and to industry. We finally received the notice of proposed rulemaking over a year ago, which would require TWIC readers to be used at the riskiest 5 percent of all the TWIC-regulated vessels and facilities, and this comes, Mr. Speaker, nearly 6 years after workers were first required to pay for and to obtain a TWIC card.

The delays are so significant that workers have already had to renew their biometric credentials in the time that it has taken to issue regulations on credential readers to actually utilize this biometric-enabled technology.

While we certainly all agree that there is huge room for improvement with the TWIC program, putting it on hold for several more years, we think, would do more harm than good. The business community has been preparing for this TWIC rule for several years.

This bill will give them certainty about the requirements of the program. It also allows the Coast Guard and the TSA to continue their efforts to deliver the port security program that Congress enacted several years ago.

Finally, H.R. 3202 requires the GAO to perform consistent reviews of the TWIC program and to follow the changes the department makes as a result of the required assessment. This added level of review will provide Congress, especially the members of our committee, with progress updates for future legislative action.

The proposed rule and open GAO recommendations lead to some very basic questions about mitigating threats, risk, and vulnerability at our Nation's ports and how the TWIC program should be used effectively to prevent a potential terrorist attack. We certainly have an obligation to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3202, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act, as ordered reported, with amendment, by the Committee on Homeland Security on June 11, 2014. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 3202, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 3202 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3202, the ''Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act.''

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a jurisdictional interest in the United States Coast Guard, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 3202. Additionally, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation, should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the report accompanying H.R. 3202 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the Floor. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act and, again, want to offer my appreciation to Chairwoman MILLER of the committee, that I am the ranking member of, for her collaboration, cooperation, and commitment to America's security and working together in a bipartisan manner not only at the subcommittee level, but at the full committee level.

Again, thanking Mr. MCCAUL, the chairman of the full committee, and Mr. THOMPSON, the ranking member of the full committee, I would offer to say that Homeland Security has put national security first beyond any of our partisan desires, so I am grateful for

that as we move this legislation forward.

I would like to think that both Chairwoman MILLER and myself believe that there is a value to the TWIC card. Even this weekend, as I was in my district canvassing an area about crime issues, a gentleman came out and said: I have a house here, I am training individuals how to apply for the TWIC card.

I couldn't believe it. In a neighborhood, there was someone who was trying to get resources to train people to get a TWIC card because they knew how valuable it was if you want to work in the Nation's ports.

It is valuable, but I want to acknowledge the card reader pilot results are unreliable, and security benefits need to be reassessed. This was done by the GAO in May 2013. I would just like to read these words from what the GAO recommended:

Congress should halt DHS' efforts to promulgate a final regulation until the successful completion of a security assessment of the effectiveness of using TWIC.

Here is an issue where Congress rose to the occasion, and this is this legislation, to be able to respond to make something better. When Congress enacted the SAFE Port Act in 2006, we directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a biometric credential program to ensure that individuals with unescorted access to sensitive areas of ports and vessels were vetted and known.

I think there is enough evidence for us to know that terror can come in many forms, and we know that by some of the terrible incidents that have occurred—the incident in Yemen where one of our ships was attacked—so we know how difficult securing these large areas and vessels are.

However, we learned that, as implemented by TSA and the Coast Guard, there are weaknesses in the program. Indeed, the Government Accountability Office has identified serious shortcomings with the TWIC program, as implemented, that may undermine the program's intended purpose and make it difficult to justify costs, particularly the costs to workers.

I want to emphasize workers because when we first began this program, there were a number of us on the committee who wanted to do several things, wanted to provide more centers where TWIC cards could be accessible because many of the longshoremen and other workers were finding it difficult in their schedule to be able to secure one.

I secured a TWIC card to be able to determine how the process works. The biometrics issue came out from the 9/11 reports. It was suggested that biometrics would be the way to go, and so the TWIC card was designed that way, to deal with biometrics.

Unfortunately, all those efforts of trying to make it accessible didn't answer the question of whether or not it was going to be effective. Again, I remember trying to get around-the-clock sites where longshoremen and others who worked in these areas could get it, according to their shifts. Some of them are out for many days and months at a time.

Specifically, GAO's review of the pilot tests aimed at assessing the technology and operational impact of using the TWIC with card readers show that the test results were incomplete, inaccurate, and unreliable for informing Congress and for developing a regulation about the readers.

GAO found that challenges related to pilot planning, data collection, and reporting effected the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of the pilot results. GAO determined that these issues call into question the program's premise and effectiveness in enhancing security.

In response, I introduced H.R. 3202, with the support of subcommittee Chairwoman MILLER as an original cosponsor, to ensure that Congress received an independent—I want to make it very clear that this is very important—an independent scientific assessment of the program and to require the Secretary to ensure a corrective action plan in response to the assessment. The required assessment should give Congress the information it needs to determine how best to proceed with the program.

I want to point out that in committee, language was integrated that clarified that any pending rulemaking would not be impacted by this bill and refine the scope of the assessment we are seeking, made it more pointed, and made it very clear that any rulemaking would not be interfered with.

I think that is the right way for Congress to work. The department has said that the final rule for biometric readers will be published in January 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that we can continue to be on that schedule. We were hoping that it was going to be earlier, but we hope that this report will be more helpful to Congress in determining how, ultimately, this program will work.

There is great interest in the final rule; particularly, there is interest in how many ports and vessels will be required to install readers for biometric cards.

If the final rule requires only a limited number of vessels in ports to have biometrics readers, as has been previously proposed by the department, we will certainly need to have a discussion about what this means for the approximately 2 million truckers, longshoremen, and port workers who today are required to carry biometric cards to do their jobs.

We want an effective system. I believe it could be effective. I believe it is valuable. I believe people should be carded going into security areas or sensitive areas, and I think we have gotten our workers to be able to understand it as well, if it works right for them.

So we will look forward to this process where we continue to collaborate, and this legislation will be helpful as such.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just have some closing remarks to emphasize that the idea of the Transportation Worker Identification card, the TWIC card, was to promote security and standardization.

It was a common credential that enables facility and vessel operators, as well as Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement entities to verify the identity of individuals, a step that was not feasible prior to TWIC implementation, with potentially thousands of different facility-specific credentials, which is why many of us supported—and I strongly support—the TWIC card. I want it to work.

TWIC also allows transportation workers to move among facilities, vessels, and geographic regions as needed for routine demands during emergencies while still maintaining security. In the interest of security and in order to provide proper stewardship of appropriated funds and collected TWIC funds or fees, this legislation was introduced, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act, to really get a better investment for our money.

I am looking forward to a comprehensive assessment that will, in essence, be done by a not-for-profit laboratory and so that the many problems and vulnerabilities that persist in this program can be either eliminated or corrected.

We want to work with our, if you will, our partners, the Coast Guard, the Transportation Security Agency, and many others. As we all know, national security has to be for all of us our highest priority, particularly Members of Congress, and it certainly is for those of us in the Homeland Security Committee.

So I would ask my colleagues, again, to support H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act, and move us closer to completing our commitment after 9/11, which is to make this country the most secure country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, my chairwoman and collaborator, Mrs. MILLER, for her assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act.

When Congress enacted the SAFE Ports Act in 2006, we directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a biometric credential program to ensure that individuals

with unescorted access to sensitive areas in ports and vessels were vetted and known.

However, we have learned that, as implemented by TSA and the Coast Guard, there are weaknesses in the program.

Indeed, the Government Accountability Office has identified serious shortcomings with the TWIC program, as implemented, that may undermine the program's intended purpose and make it difficult to justify program costs, particularly the costs to workers.

Specifically, GAO's review of the pilot test aimed at assessing the technology and operational impact of using the TWIC with card readers showed that the test's results were incomplete, inaccurate, and unreliable for informing Congress and for developing a regulation about the readers.

GAO found that challenges related to pilot planning, data collection, and reporting affected the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of the pilot results.

GAO determined that these issues call into question the program's premise and effectiveness in enhancing security.

In response, I introduced H.R. 3202, with the support of Subcommittee Chairman MILLER as an original cosponsor, to ensure that Congress receives an independent scientific assessment of the program and to require the Secretary to issue a corrective action plan in response to the assessment.

The required assessment should give Congress the information it needs to determine how best to proceed with the program.

I want to point out that in Committee, language was integrated to ensure that clarified that pending rulemaking would not be impacted by the bill and refined the scope of the assessment we are seeking.

The Department has said that the final rule for biometric readers will be published in January 2015.

There is great interest in that final rule, particularly there is interest in how many ports and vessels will be required to install readers for biometric cards.

If the final rule requires only a limited number of vessels and ports to have biometric readers, as has been previously proposed by the Department, we will certainly need to have a discussion about what this means for the approximately 2 million truckers, longshoremen and port workers who today are required to carry biometric cards to do their jobs.

In closing, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman MILLER for the bipartisan nature of the work on this and all the bills that originate in our subcommittee and thank you and your staff for their cooperation.

As a Houstonian, I have a special appreciation for what is at stake. We owe it to the men and women that rely on our Nation's ports for their livelihoods to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, and the author of the legislation, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 3202, the ''Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act.''

The Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act directs the Secretary of Homeland Security (DHS) to submit to Congress and the Comptroller General (GAO) a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program at enhancing security or reducing security risks for maritime facilities and vessels.

I introduced, H.R. 3202, in response to this GAO TWIC Report on the Weaknesses in the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) Reader Pilot program that impacted the accuracy, and reliability of the system.

The GAO report stated that data collection and retention was done in an incomplete and inconsistent manner during the pilot, further undermining the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of the data collected at pilot sites.

Problems identified included by the GAO report included:

Installed TWIC readers and access control systems could not collect required data on TWIC reader use, and TSA and the independent test agent did not employ effective compensating data collection measures.

Reported transaction data did not match underlying documentation.

Pilot documentation did not contain complete TWIC reader and access control system characteristics.

Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the independent test agent did not record clear baseline data for comparing operational performance at access points with TWIC readers.

TSA and the independent test agent did not collect complete data on malfunctioning TWIC cards.

Pilot participants did not document instances of denied access.

TSA and the independent test agent did not collect consistent data on the operational impact of using TWIC cards with readers.

Pilot site reports did not contain complete information about installed TWIC readers' and access control systems' design.

This seeks to address the problems outlined in the GAO report by directing the Secretary to issue a corrective action plan based on the assessment that responds to the findings of a cost-benefit analysis of the program and enhances security or reduces security risk for such facilities and vessels.

Following the assessment the Comptroller General, within 120 days must: review the extent to which the submissions implement certain recommendations issued by the Comptroller General, and inform Congress as to the responsiveness of the submission.

Prohibits the Secretary from issuing a final rule requiring the use of transportation security card readers until: the Comptroller General informs Congress that the submission is substantially responsive to the GAO recommendations, and the Secretary issues an updated list of transportation security card readers that are compatible with active transportation security cards.

My congressional district is located in Houston, Texas, which is home to one of the world's busiest ports.

The Port of Houston is critical infrastructure:

According to the Department of Commerce in 2012, Texas exports totaled $265 billion.

The Port of Houston is a 25-mile-long complex of diversified public and private facilities located just a few hours' sailing time from the Gulf of Mexico.

In 2012 ship channel-related businesses contribute 1,026,820 jobs and generate more than $178.5 billion in statewide economic impact.

For the past 11 consecutive years, Texas has outpaced the rest of the country in exports.

1st ranked US port in foreign tonnage

2nd ranked US port in total tonnage.

7th ranked US container port by total TEUs in 2012.

Largest Texas port with 46% of market share by tonnage.

Largest Texas container port with 96% market share in containers by total TEUs in 2012.

Largest Gulf Coast container port, handling 67% of US Gulf Coast container traffic in 2012.

2nd ranked US port in terms of cargo value (based on CBP Customs port definitions).

The Government Accountability Office (GAO), reports that this port, and its waterways, and vessels are part of an economic engine handling more than $700 billion in merchandise annually.

The Port of Houston houses approximately 100 steamship lines offering services that link Houston with 1,053 ports in 203 countries.

The Port of Houston has a $15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide.

The bill will address the underlying concerns regarding Transportation Worker Identification Credentials documented by the Government Accountability Office report published in May 2013.

When Congress enacted the SAFE Ports Act in 2006, we directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a biometric credential program to ensure that individuals with unescorted access to sensitive areas in ports and vessels were vetted and known.

However, under the Homeland Security Committee's oversight responsibilities we learned that, as implemented by TSA and the Coast Guard, there are weaknesses in the program.

One of the greatest engines our economy has is the Port of Houston, which hosts a $15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide.

The Port of Houston petrochemical complex supplies over 40 percent of the nation's base petrochemical manufacturing capacity.

What happens at the Port of Houston affects the entire nation.

For this reason, I introduced H.R. 3202, with the support of Subcommittee Chairman MILLER as an original cosponsor, to ensure that Congress receives an independent scientific assessment of the program and to require the Secretary to issue a corrective action plan in response to the assessment.

Indeed, the Government Accountability Office has identified serious shortcomings with the TWIC program, as implemented, that may undermine the program's intended purpose and make it difficult to justify program costs, particularly the costs to workers.

Other considerations for security are in the infrastructure necessary to make sure that there is an ability to electronically check the credential of workers as they enter ports.

The required assessment should give Congress the information it needs to determine how best to proceed with the program.

I want to point out that in committee, language was integrated to ensure that pending rulemaking would not be impacted by the bill and refined the scope of the assessment we are seeking.

The Department has said that the final rule for biometric readers will be published in January 2015.

There is great interest in that final rule, particularly there is interest in how many ports and vessels will be required to install readers for biometric cards.

If the final rule requires only a limited number of vessels and ports to have biometric readers, as has been previously proposed by the Department, we will certainly need to have a discussion about what this means for the approximately 2 million truckers, longshoremen and port workers who today are required to carry biometric cards to do their jobs.

BILL BACKGROUND

The nationwide recognition of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) promotes security and standardization.

A common credential enables facility and vessel operators as well as federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement entities to verify the identity of individuals—a step that was not feasible prior to TWIC implementation with potentially thousands of different facility-specific credentials.

TWIC also allows transportation workers to move among facilities, vessels, and geographic regions as needed for routine market demands and during emergencies, while still maintaining security.

"In the interest of security and in order to provide proper stewardship of appropriated funds and collected TWIC fees, I introduced legislation to insist that DHS demonstrate how the TWIC Program will improve maritime security.

The Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act will require the Secretary of Homeland Security to complete and submit to Congress and GAO a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the TWIC Program at enhancing or reducing security risks for maritime facilities and vessels.

The comprehensive assessment will be completed by an independent, not-for-profit laboratory.

Many problems and vulnerabilities persist and will have to be resolved if the TWIC Program is to ever realize the security benefits envisioned by Congress.

I want to express my appreciation to Chairman MILLER for the bipartisan nature of the work on this and all the bills that originate in our subcommittee and thank you and your staff for their cooperation.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to associate myself with many of the comments that my ranking member on the subcommittee has made in regards to maritime security. It is interesting on Homeland Security, both our subcommittee and the full committee as well, how we do work in a very bipartisan fashion.

Really, the first and foremost responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense, whether it's national security or homeland security. With all the issues that are facing our Nation, we think about the potential for terrorist attacks, and this piece of legislation really focusing on the maritime security of our ports throughout our Nation is, I think, so incredibly important, and so I am just delighted that we were finally able to bring it to the floor.

I would certainly, again, urge all my colleagues to support this very strong, very bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3202, the "Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act," introduced by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Border and Maritime, Rep. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3202 seeks to ensure that Transportation Worker Identification Credential program, as implemented by TSA and the Coast Guard, deliver the security benefits that Congress envisioned in the SAFE Port Act of 2006.

We have worked hard, on a bipartisan basis, to make this program work.

However, as documented in multiple reports on the program produced by the Government Accountability Office, TWIC has not lived up to our expectations.

Meanwhile, working-class Americans whose livelihoods depend on accessing ports and vessels have borne the costs of this troubled program.

Longshoremen, truck drivers, and others are paying hard-earned money for biometric cards that may offer only limited security value.

The bill before us today would require an independent assessment of the TWIC program and mandate the Secretary issue a corrective action plan in response to the assessment.

The required assessment should give Congress the information it needs to determine how best to proceed with the program.

The bill does not, however, delay the long-overdue final rule for deployment of TWIC readers, which is expected to limit significantly the ports required to utilize biometric readers.

If that is the case, and depending on the outcome of the assessment required by the bill, Congress may need to examine whether requiring workers who do not need to access ports with biometric readers should continue to be required to purchase a biometric credential.

For today, I look forward to speedy approval of this bill by the House and hope it will be considered by the Senate and signed by the President in short order.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3202, the "Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act."

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3202, the Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act. This measure responds to a key recommendation made by the Government Accountability Office, to conduct a security assessment of the effectiveness of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC).

The TWIC program is a joint-run program in the Department of Homeland Security between the U.S. Coast Guard and the Transportation Security Administration. The program, which is intended to provide secure access control, uses biometric credentials to limit access to secure areas of ports or vessels only to those individuals that actually need access. Unfortunately, the TWIC program remains incomplete, which has resulted in significant uncertainty for our nation's transportation and maritime industry.

While regulations were in place beginning in 2007 for maritime workers to purchase the biometric credentials, regulations requiring the issuance of card readers remain incomplete, and have been significantly delayed. These delays come despite the issuance of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking more than a year ago to finally issue biometric readers. However, no final rule has been issued. The significant program delays have resulted in maritime workers having to pay to renew their credentials after five years, despite no biometric readers being required within that timeframe. These delays, coupled with a scathing GAO recommendation calling into question the underlying security value of the TWIC program, raise very serious questions about the future of this program.

It is therefore important that Congress pass this legislation, which is responsive to the GAO's most recent recommendation on the program: an independent security assessment of the TWIC program. It is my hope that the Congress will observe the findings of this assessment, and consider reforming this program, if necessary.

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for their important oversight and legislative work on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3202, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3846) to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States

Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3846

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 411. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION; COMMISSIONER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, AND OPERATIONAL OFFICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department an agency to be known as United States Customs and Border Protection.

''(b) COMMISSIONER OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—There shall be at the head of United States Customs and Border Protection a Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection (in this section referred to as the 'Commissioner'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(c) DUTIES.—The Commissioner shall—

''(1) ensure the interdiction of persons and goods illegally entering or exiting the United States;

''(2) facilitate and expedite the flow of legitimate travelers and trade;

''(3) detect, respond to, and interdict terrorists, drug smugglers and traffickers, human smugglers and traffickers, and other persons who may undermine the security of the United States, in cases in which such persons are entering, or have recently entered, the United States;

''(4) safeguard the borders of the United States to protect against the entry of dangerous goods;

''(5) oversee the functions of the Office of International Trade established under section 402 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (19 U.S.C. 2072; Public Law 109–347);

''(6) enforce and administer all customs laws of the United States, including the Tariff Act of 1930;

''(7) enforce and administer all immigration laws, as such term is defined in paragraph (17) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)), as necessary for the inspection, processing, and admission of persons who seek to enter or depart the United States, and as necessary to ensure the detection, interdiction, removal, departure from the United States, short-term detention, and transfer of persons unlawfully entering, or who have recently unlawfully entered, the United States, in coordination with United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Citizenship and Immigration Services;

''(8) develop and implement screening and targeting capabilities, including the screening, reviewing, identifying, and prioritizing of passengers and cargo across all international modes of transportation, both inbound and outbound;

''(9) enforce and administer the laws relating to agricultural import and entry inspection referred to in section 421;

''(10) in coordination with the Secretary, deploy technology to collect the data necessary for the Secretary to administer the biometric entry and exit data system pursuant to section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b);

''(11) In coordination with the Under Secretary for Management of the Department, ensure United States Customs and Border Protection complies with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and the Department's acquisition management directives for major acquisition programs of United States Customs and Border Protection;

''(12) enforce and administer—

''(A) the Container Security Initiative program under section 205 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 945; Public Law 109–347); and

''(B) the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism program under sections 211 through 223 of such Act (6 U.S.C. 961-973);

''(13) establish the standard operating procedures described in subsection (k);

''(14) carry out the training required under subsection (l); and

''(15) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by law or delegated by the Secretary.

''(d) DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.—There shall be in United States Customs and Border Protection a Deputy Commissioner who shall assist the Commissioner in the management of United States Customs and Border Protection.

''(e) UNITED STATES BORDER PATROL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection the United States Border Patrol.

''(2) CHIEF.—There shall be at the head of the United States Border Patrol a Chief, who shall be a uniformed law enforcement officer chosen from the ranks of the United States Border Patrol and who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The United States Border Patrol shall—

''(A) serve as the law enforcement office of United States Customs and Border Protection with primary responsibility for interdicting persons attempting to illegally enter or exit the United States or goods being illegally imported to or exported from the United States at a place other than a designated port of entry;

''(B) deter and prevent illegal entry of terrorists, terrorist weapons, persons, and contraband; and

''(C) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(f) OFFICE OF AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection an Office of Air and Marine Operations.

''(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Air and Marine Operations an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Air and Marine Operations shall—

''(A) serve as the law enforcement office within United States Customs and Border Protection with primary responsibility to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illicit drugs, and other contraband across the borders of the United States in the air and maritime environment;

''(B) oversee the acquisition, maintenance, and operational use of United States Customs and Border Protection integrated air and marine forces;

''(C) provide aviation and marine support for other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency needs, as appropriate; and

''(D) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(g) OFFICE OF FIELD OPERATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection an Office of Field Operations.

''(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Field Operations an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Field Operations shall coordinate the enforcement activities of United States Customs and Border Protection at United States air, land, and sea ports of entry to—

''(A) deter and prevent terrorists and terrorist weapons from entering the United States at such ports of entry;

''(B) conduct inspections at such ports of entry to safeguard the United States from terrorism and illegal entry of persons;

''(C) prevent illicit drugs, agricultural pests, and contraband from entering the United States;

''(D) in coordination with the Commissioner, facilitate and expedite the flow of legitimate travelers and trade;

''(E) administer the National Targeting Center established under paragraph (4); and

''(F) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(4) NATIONAL TARGETING CENTER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Office of Field Operations a National Targeting Center.

''(B) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—There shall be at the head of the National Targeting Center an Executive Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations.

''(C) DUTIES.—The National Targeting Center shall—

''(i) serve as the primary forum for targeting operations within United States Customs and Border Protection to collect and analyze traveler and cargo information in advance of arrival in the United States;

''(ii) identify, review, and target travelers and cargo for examination;

''(iii) coordinate the examination of entry and exit of travelers and cargo; and

''(iv) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Assistant Commissioner.

''(5) ANNUAL REPORT ON STAFFING.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the staffing model for the Office of Field Operations, including information on how many supervisors, front-line United States Customs and Border Protection officers, and support personnel are assigned to each Field Office and port of entry.

''(h) OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND INVESTIGATIVE LIAISON.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection an Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison.

''(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison shall—

''(A) develop, provide, coordinate, and implement intelligence capabilities into a cohesive intelligence enterprise to support the execution of the United States Customs and

Border Protection duties and responsibilities;

''(B) collect and analyze advance traveler and cargo information;

''(C) establish, in coordination with the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, as appropriate, intelligence-sharing relationships with Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies and intelligence agencies; and

''(D) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(i) OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection an Office of International Affairs.

''(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of International Affairs an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of International Affairs, in collaboration with the Office of International Affairs of the Department, shall—

''(A) coordinate and support United States Customs and Border Protection's foreign initiatives, policies, programs, and activities;

''(B) coordinate and support United States Customs and Border Protection's personnel stationed abroad;

''(C) maintain partnerships and information sharing agreements and arrangements with foreign governments, international organizations, and United States agencies in support of United States Customs and Border Protection duties and responsibilities;

''(D) provide necessary capacity building, training, and assistance to foreign border control agencies to strengthen global supply chain and travel security;

''(E) coordinate mission support services to sustain United States Customs and Border Protection's global activities;

''(F) coordinate, in collaboration with the Office of Policy of the Department, as appropriate, United States Customs and Border Protection's engagement in international negotiations; and

''(G) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(j) OFFICE OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in United States Customs and Border Protection an Office of Internal Affairs.

''(2) ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.—There shall be at the head of the Office of Internal Affairs an Assistant Commissioner, who shall report to the Commissioner.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Internal Affairs shall—

''(A) investigate criminal and administrative matters and misconduct by officers, agents, and other employees of United States Customs and Border Protection;

''(B) perform investigations of United States Customs and Border Protection applicants and periodic reinvestigations (in accordance with section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341; Public Law 108–458)) of officers, agents, and other employees of United States Custom and Border Protection, including investigations to determine suitability for employment and eligibility for access to classified information;

''(C) conduct polygraph examinations in accordance with section 3(1) of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–376);

''(D) perform inspections of United States Customs and Border Protection programs, operations, and offices;

''(E) conduct risk-based covert testing of United States Customs and Border Protection operations, including for nuclear and radiological risks;

''(F) manage integrity of United States Customs and Border Protection counter-intelligence operations, including conduct of counter-intelligence investigations;

''(G) conduct research and analysis regarding misconduct of officers, agents, and other employees of United States Customs and Border Protection; and

''(H) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(k) STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish—

''(A) standard operating procedures for searching, reviewing, retaining, and sharing information contained in communication, electronic, or digital devices encountered by United States Customs and Border Protection personnel at United States ports of entry;

''(B) standard use of force procedures officers and agents of United States Customs and Border Protection may employ in the execution of their duties, including the use of deadly force and procedures for deescalating confrontations, where possible;

''(C) a uniform, standardized, and publically-available procedure for processing and investigating complaints against officers, agents, and employees of United States Customs and Border Protection for violations of professional conduct, including the timely disposition of complaints and a written notification to the complainant of the status or outcome, as appropriate, of the related investigation, in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Privacy Act' or the 'Privacy Act of 1974');

''(D) an internal, uniform reporting mechanism regarding incidents involving the use of deadly force by an officer or agent of United States Customs and Border Protection, including an evaluation of the degree to which the procedures required under subparagraph (B) were followed; and

''(E) standard operating procedures, acting through the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine Operations and in coordination with the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and the Office of Privacy of the Department, to provide command, control, communication, surveillance, and reconnaissance assistance through the use of unmanned aerial systems, including the establishment of—

''(i) a process for other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to submit mission requests;

''(ii) a formal procedure to determine whether to approve or deny such a mission request;

''(iii) a formal procedure to determine how such mission requests are prioritized and coordinated;

''(iv) a process for establishing agreements with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies regarding reimbursement for such mission costs; and

''(v) a process regarding the protection and privacy of data and images collected by United States Customs and Border Protection through the use of unmanned aerial systems.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CERTAIN NOTIFICATIONS.—The standard operating procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall require—

''(A) in the case of a search of information conducted on an electronic device by United States Customs and Border Protection personnel, the Commissioner to notify the individual subject to such search of the purpose and authority for such search, and how such individual may obtain information on reporting concerns about such search; and

''(B) in the case of information collected by United States Customs and Border Protection through a search of an electronic device, if such information is transmitted to another Federal agency for subject matter assistance, translation, or decryption, the Commissioner to notify the individual subject to such search of such transmission.

''(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may withhold the notifications required under paragraphs (1)(C) and (2) if the Commissioner determines that such notifications would impair national security, law enforcement, or other operational interests.

''(B) TERRORIST WATCH LISTS.—

''(i) SEARCHES.—If the individual subject to search of an electronic device pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) is included on a Government-operated or Government-maintained terrorist watch list, the notifications required under paragraph (2) shall not apply.

''(ii) COMPLAINTS.—If the complainant using the process established under subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) is included on a Government-operated or Government-maintained terrorist watch list, the notification required under such subparagraph shall not apply.

''(4) UPDATE AND REVIEW.—The Commissioner shall review and update every three years the standard operating procedures required under this subsection.

''(5) AUDITS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall develop and annually administer an auditing mechanism to review whether searches of electronic devices at or between United States ports of entry are being conducted in conformity with the standard operating procedures required under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1). Such audits shall be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and shall include the following:

''(A) A description of the activities of officers and agents of United States Customs and Border Protection with respect to such searches.

''(B) The number of such searches.

''(C) The number of instances in which information contained in such devices that were subjected to such searches was retained, copied, shared, or entered in an electronic database.

''(D) The number of such devices detained as the result of such searches.

''(E) The number of instances in which information collected from such device was subjected to such searches was transmitted to a another Federal agency, including whether such transmission resulted in a prosecution or conviction.

''(6) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING OTHER NOTIFICATIONS.—The standard operating procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall require—

''(A) in the case of an incident of the use of deadly force by United States Customs and Border Protection personnel, the Commissioner to notify the appropriate congressional committees; and

''(B) the Commissioner to provide to such committees a copy of the evaluation pursuant to subparagraph (D) of such paragraph not later than 30 days after completion of such evaluation.

''(6) REPORT ON UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.—The Commissioner shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that reviews whether the use

of unmanned aerial systems are being conducted in conformity with the standard operating procedures required under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1). Such reports—

''(A) shall be submitted with the President's annual budget;

''(B) may be submitted in classified form if the Commissioner determines that such is appropriate, and

''(C) shall include—

''(i) a detailed description of how, where, and for how long data and images collected through the use of unmanned aerial systems by United States Customs and Border Protection is collected and stored; and

''(ii) a list of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies that submitted mission requests in the previous year and the disposition of such requests.

''(l) TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall require all agents and officers of United States Customs and Border Protection to participate in a specified amount of continuing education (to be determined by the Commissioner) to maintain an understanding of Federal legal rulings, court decisions, and departmental policies, procedures, and guidelines.

''(2) ENSURING TRAINING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commissioner shall develop a database system that identifies for each United States Customs and Border Protection officer or agent, by port of entry or station—

''(A) for each training course, the average time allocated during on-duty hours within which training must be completed;

''(B) for each training course offered, the duration of training and the average amount of time an officer must be absent from work to complete such training course; and

''(C) certification of each training course by a supervising officer that the officer is able to carry out the function for which the training was provided, and if training has been postponed, the basis for postponing such training.

''(3) USE OF DATA.—The Commissioner shall use the information developed under paragraph (2) to—

''(A) develop training requirements for United States Customs and Border Protection officers to ensure that such officers have sufficient training to conduct primary and secondary inspections at Untied States ports of entry; and

''(B) measure progress toward achieving the training requirements referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(m) SHORT TERM DETENTION STANDARDS.—

''(1) ACCESS TO FOOD AND WATER.—The Commissioner shall make every effort to ensure that adequate access to food and water is provided to an individual apprehended and detained by a United States Border Patrol agent between a United States port of entry as soon as practicable following the time of such apprehension or during subsequent short term detention.

''(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION ON DETAINEE RIGHTS AT BORDER PATROL PROCESSING CENTERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall ensure that an individual apprehended by a United States Border Patrol agent is provided with information concerning such individual's rights, including the right to contact a representative of such individual's government for purposes of United States treaty obligations.

''(B) FORM.—The information referred to in subparagraph (A) may be provided either verbally or in writing, and shall be posted in the detention holding cell in which such individual is being held. The information shall be provided in a language understandable to such individual.

''(3) DAYTIME REPATRIATION.—When practicable, repatriations shall be limited to daylight hours and avoid locations that are determined to have high indices of crime and violence.

''(4) SHORT TERM DETENTION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'short term detention' means detention in a United States Border Patrol processing center for 72 hours or less, before repatriation to a country of nationality or last habitual residence.

''(5) REPORT ON PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND STANDARDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the procurement process and standards of entities with which United States Customs and Border Protection has contracts for the transportation and detention of individuals apprehended by agents or officers of United States Customs and Border Protection. Such report should also consider the operational efficiency of contracting the transportation and detention of such individuals.

''(6) REPORT ON INSPECTIONS OF SHORT-TERM CUSTODY FACILITIES.—The Commissioner shall—

''(A) annually inspect all facilities utilized for short term detention; and

''(B) make publically available information collected pursuant to such inspections, including information regarding the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) and, where appropriate, issue recommendations to improve the conditions of such facilities.

''(n) WAIT TIMES TRANSPARENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall—

''(A) publish live wait times at the 20 United States airports that support the highest volume of international travel (as determined by available Federal flight data);

''(B) make information about such wait times available to the public in real time through the United States Customs and Border Protection Web site;

''(C) submit to the appropriate congressional committees quarterly reports that include compilations of all such wait times and a ranking of such United States airports by wait times; and

''(D) provide adequate staffing at the United States Customs and Border Protection information center to ensure timely access for travelers attempting to submit comments or speak with a representative about their entry experiences.

''(2) CALCULATION.—The wait times referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall be determined by calculating the time elapsed between an individual's entry into the United States Customs and Border Protection inspection area and such individual's clearance by a United States Customs and Border Protection officer.

''(o) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish such other offices or Assistant Commissioners (or other similar officers or officials) as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the missions, duties, functions, and authorities of United States Customs and Border Protection.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary exercises the authority provided pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days before exercising such authority.

''(p) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting in any manner the existing authority of any other Federal agency, including the Transportation Security Administration with respect to the duties of United States Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (c).''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) TREATMENT.—Section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be treated as if included in such Act as of the date of the enactment of such Act, and, in addition to the functions, missions, duties, and authorities specified in such amended section 411, United States Customs and Border Protection shall continue to perform and carry out the functions, missions, duties, and authorities under section 411 of such Act as in existence on the day before such date of enactment, and section 415 of such Act.

(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), nothing in this Act may be construed as affecting in any manner any rule or regulation issued or promulgated pursuant to any provision of law, including section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any such rule or regulation shall continue to have full force and effect on and after such date.

(B) OTHER ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), nothing in this Act may be construed as affecting in any manner any action, determination, policy, or decision pursuant to section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any such action, determination, policy, or decision shall continue to have full force and effect on and after such date.

(c) CONTINUATION IN OFFICE.—

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The individual serving as the Commissioner of Customs on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may serve as the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection on and after such date of enactment until a Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection is appointed under section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) OTHER POSITIONS.—The individuals serving as Assistant Commissioners and other officers and officials under section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may serve as the appropriate Assistant Commissioners and other officers and officials under such section 411 as amended by subsection (a) of this section unless the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection determines that another individual should hold such position or positions.

(d) REFERENCE.—

(1) TITLE 5.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security'' and inserting ''Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security''.

(2) OTHER REFERENCES.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, any reference in law or regulations to the ''Commissioner of Customs'' or the ''Commissioner of the Customs Service'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 411 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 411. Establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection; Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, and operational offices.''.

SEC. 3. REPEALS.

Sections 416, 418, and 443 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 216, 218, and 253), and the items relating to such sections in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act, are repealed.

SEC. 4. CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in title I—

(A) in section 102(f)(10) (6 U.S.C. 112(f)(10)), by striking ''the Directorate of Border and Transportation Security'' and inserting ''Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection''; and

(B) in section 103(a)(1) (6 U.S.C. 113(a)(1))—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''An Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.'' and inserting ''A Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''A Director of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement.'' and inserting ''A Director for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.'';

(2) in title IV—

(A) by striking the title heading and inserting ''**BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY**''; and

(B) in subtitle A—

(i) by striking the subtitle heading and inserting ''**Border, Maritime, and Transportation Security Responsibilities and Functions**''; and

(ii) in section 402 (6 U.S.C. 202)—

(I) in the section heading, by striking ''**RESPONSIBILITIES**'' and inserting ''**BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES**''; and

(II) by striking '', acting through the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security,'';

(C) in subtitle B—

(i) by striking the subtitle heading and inserting ''**United States Customs and Border Protection**'';

(ii) in section 412(b) (6 U.S.C. 212), by striking ''United States Customs Service'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States Customs and Border Protection'';

(iii) in section 413 (6 U.S.C. 213), by striking ''available to the United States Customs Service or'';

(iv) in section 414 (6 U.S.C. 214), by striking ''United States Customs Service'' and inserting ''United States Customs and Border Protection''; and

(v) in section 415 (6 U.S.C. 215)—

(I) in paragraph (7), by inserting before the colon the following: '', and of United States Customs and Border Protection on the day before the effective date of the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act''; and

(II) in paragraph (8), by inserting before the colon the following: '', and of United States Customs and Border Protection on the day before the effective date of the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act'';

(D) in subtitle C—

(i) by striking section 424 (6 U.S.C. 234) and inserting the following new section:

''SEC. 424. PRESERVATION OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AS A DISTINCT ENTITY.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Transportation Security Administration shall be maintained as a distinct entity within the Department.''; and

(ii) in section 430 (6 U.S.C. 238)—

(I) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department an Office for Domestic Preparedness.'';

(II) in subsection (b), by striking the second sentence; and

(III) in subsection (c)(7), by striking ''Directorate'' and inserting ''Department''; and

(E) in subtitle D—

(i) in section 441 (6 U.S.C. 251)—

(I) by striking the section heading and inserting ''**TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS**''; and

(II) by striking ''Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(ii) by amending section 444 (6 U.S.C. 254) to read as follows:

''SEC. 444. EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may impose disciplinary action on any employee of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Customs and Border Protection who willfully deceives Congress or agency leadership on any matter.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 401 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 201) is repealed.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title IV and inserting the following:

''TITLE IV—BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY'';

(2) by striking the item relating to subtitle A of title IV and inserting the following:

''Subtitle A—Border, Maritime, and Transportation Security Responsibilities and Functions'';

(3) by striking the item relating to section 401;

(4) by striking the item relating to subtitle B of title IV and inserting the following:

''Subtitle B—United States Customs and Border Protection'';

(5) by striking the item relating to section 441 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 441. Transfer of functions.''; and

(6) by striking the item relating to section 442 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 442. United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.''.

SEC. 5. REPORTS AND ASSESSMENTS.

(a) REPORT ON CONTRACT MANAGEMENT ACQUISITION AND PROCUREMENT PERSONNEL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and biennially thereafter, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on—

(1) the number of contract management acquisition and procurement personnel assigned to the Office of Technology Innovation and Acquisition (or successor office) of United States Customs and Border Protection, categorized by position;

(2) the average aggregate value of the contracts each contract officer, contract specialist, and contract officer representative employee is responsible for managing; and

(3) the number of additional acquisition and procurement personnel, categorized by position, and contract management specialists United States Customs and Border Protection would need to ensure compliance with Federal acquisition standards, departmental management directives, and United States Customs and Border Protection contracting needs.

(b) REPORT ON MIGRANT DEATHS.—Not later 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall, to the extent practicable, make publically available information that the United States Border Patrol has collected on migrant deaths occurring along the United States-Mexico border, including information on the following:

(1) The number of documented migrant deaths.

(2) The location where such migrant deaths occurred.

(3) To the extent possible, the cause of death for each migrant.

(4) The extent to which border technology, physical barriers, and enforcement programs have contributed to such migrant deaths.

(5) A description of United States Customs and Border Protection programs or plans to reduce the number of migrant deaths along the border, including an assessment on the effectiveness of water supply sites and rescue beacons.

(c) REPORT ON BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on United States Customs and Border Protection's Business Transformation Initiative, including locations where the Initiative is deployed, the types of equipment utilized, a description of protocols and procedures, information on wait times at such locations since deployment, and information regarding the schedule for deployment at new locations.

(d) REPORT ON UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN APPREHENDED AT THE BORDER.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on unaccompanied alien children apprehended at the borders of the United States. Such report shall include the following:

(1) Information on the number, nationality, age, and location of the apprehensions of such unaccompanied alien children in the current fiscal year and for each of the three prior fiscal years.

(2) The average length of time an unaccompanied alien child is in the custody of United States Customs and Border Protection before being transferred to the custody of another Federal agency in the current fiscal year and for each of three prior fiscal years.

(3) A description of current and planned activities to discourage efforts to bring unaccompanied alien children to the United States without authorization.

(4) A description of training provided to officers and agents of United States Customs

and Border Protection regarding unaccompanied alien children, including the number of such officers and agents who are so trained.

(5) An assessment of the existing officers, agents, and resources of United States Customs and Border Protection being utilized to address unaccompanied alien children.

(6) An assessment of whether current facilities utilized by United States Customs and Border Protection to house unaccompanied alien children are adequate to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and standards regarding housing, feeding, and providing medical care for such children.

(7) An identification and assessment of the factors causing unaccompanied alien children to migrate to the United States, including an assessment of how perceptions of enforcement policies and economic and social conditions, including incidents of violence, in countries of origin or last habitual residence may be attributed to a rise in attempted entries into the United States.

(8) Information on United States Border Patrol resources spent to care for unaccompanied alien children in the custody of the United States Border Patrol, including the number of United States Border Patrol agents assigned to care for unaccompanied alien children.

(9) Future estimates of Department of Homeland Security resources needed to care for expected increases in unaccompanied alien children.

(10) An identification of any operational or policy challenges impacting the Department of Homeland Security as a result of any expected increase in unaccompanied alien children.

(11) Information on any additional resources necessary to carry out United States Customs and Border Protection's responsibilities with respect to unaccompanied alien children.

(e) PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS.—Not later 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall assess the physical infrastructure and technology needs at the 20 busiest land ports of entry (as measured by United States Customs and Border Protection) with a particular attention to identify ways to—

(1) improve travel and trade facilitation;

(2) reduce wait times;

(3) improve physical infrastructure and conditions for individuals accessing pedestrian ports of entry;

(4) enter into long-term leases with nongovernmental and private sector entities;

(5) enter into lease-purchase agreements with nongovernmental and private sector entities; and

(6) achieve cost savings through leases described in paragraphs (4) and (5).

(f) UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy for its Unmanned Aerial Systems program. Such strategy shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) The mission and goals of such program.

(2) The expected level of unmanned aerial systems operations.

(3) The funding and anticipated stakeholder needs and resource requirements of such program.

(g) REPORT ON BIOMETRIC EXIT DATA CAPABILITY AT AIRPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the efforts of United States Customs and Border Protection, in conjunction with the Directorate Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, to evaluate technologies to provide a biometric exit capability at airports. Such report shall include the technologies tested, the results of such tests to date, plans for any future testing, and a schedule of anticipated deployment of those or other technologies.

(h) CBP OFFICER TRAINING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the current capacity of United States Customs and Border Protection to hire, train, and deploy additional United States Customs and Border Protection officers, including an assessment of any additional resources necessary to hire, train, and deploy United States Customs and Border Protection officers to meet staffing needs, as identified by the United States Customs and Border Protection staffing model.

(i) REPORT ON THE SECURITY OF UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BORDERS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall develop and implement specific metrics for measuring the status of security of United States international borders at and between ports of entry, including measuring the effectiveness of current border security resource allocations uniformly across all United States Customs and Border Protection sectors, informed by input from individuals and relevant stakeholders who live and work near such borders, and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on such metrics and such status.

(j) PERSONAL SEARCHES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on supervisor-approved personal searches conducted in the previous year by United States Customs and Border Protection personnel. Such report shall include the number of personal searches conducted in each sector and field office, the number of invasive personal searches conducted in each sector and field office, whether personal searches were conducted by Office of Field Operations or United States Border Patrol personnel, and how many personal searches resulted in the discovery of contraband.

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES.

(a) NORTH AND CENTRAL AMERICAN BORDER SECURITY COOPERATION INITIATIVE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall engage with the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico to assess the specific needs of the countries of Central America to maintain the security of the international borders of such countries and determine the support needed by such countries from the United States, Canada, and Mexico, to meet such needs.

(b) CARIBBEAN COOPERATION INITIATIVE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall engage with appropriate officials of the governments of the countries of the Caribbean to establish a program to assess the specific needs of such countries to address the unique challenges of maritime border security.

(c) MEXICO'S SOUTHERN BORDER SECURITY INITIATIVE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall engage with appropriate officials of the Government of Mexico to assess the specific needs to help secure Mexico's southern border from undocumented aliens, drugs, weapons and other contraband.

(d) REPORTING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the assessment of needs carried out under this section.

SEC. 7. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR PORT OF ENTRY STATUS.

The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall give priority consideration to an application for port of entry status submitted by any commercial airport if such airport served at least 100,000 deplaned international passengers in the previous calendar year.

SEC. 8. TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security may not enter into or renew an agreement with the government of a foreign country for a trusted traveler program administered by United States Customs and Border Protection unless the Secretary certifies in writing that such government—

(1) routinely submits to INTEPOL for inclusion in INTERPOL's Stolen and Lost Travel Documents database information about lost and stolen passports and travel documents of the citizens and nationals of such country; or

(2) makes available to the United States Government the information described in paragraph (1) through another means of reporting.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress established the Foreign Language Award Program (FLAP) to incentivize employees at United States ports of entry to utilize their foreign language skills on the job by providing a financial incentive for the use of the foreign language for at least ten percent of their duties after passage of competency tests. FLAP incentivizes the use of more than two dozen languages and has been instrumental in identifying and utilizing United States Customs and Border Protection officers and agents who are proficient in a foreign language.

(2) In 1993, Congress provided for dedicated funding for this program by stipulating that certain fees collected by United States Customs and Border Protection to fund FLAP.

(3) Through FLAP, foreign travelers are aided by having an officer at a port of entry who speaks their language, and United

States Customs and Border Protection benefits by being able to focus its border security efforts in a more effective manner.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that FLAP incentivizes United States Customs and Border Protection officers and agents to attain and maintain competency in a foreign language, thereby improving the efficiency of operations for the functioning of United States Customs and Border Protection's security mission, making the United States a more welcoming place when foreign travelers find officers can communicate in their language, and helping to expedite traveler processing to reduce wait times.

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act, and I certainly want to thank my colleagues, the chairman of the full Homeland Security Committee, Mr. MCCAUL, and the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and my ranking member on the subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

The Homeland Security Committee has a strong history of collaboration and bipartisanship, and I think this bill illustrates our ability to find consensus as we work to strengthen the homeland.

This is a very important day not only for the men and women of Customs and Border Protection, CBP, but also for the U.S. House of Representatives. This past week actually marks the 10-year anniversary of the release of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations to Congress. While most of these recommendations were implemented, unfortunately, several remained unfulfilled or incomplete.

Among one of the most important incomplete recommendations was for Congress to create a single, principal point of oversight and review for homeland security. The fractured jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security has certainly limited Congress' ability to provide effective guidance to the third largest agency in the Federal Government. In the 10 years since the Department was created, it has never had a comprehensive reauthorization; and, as a result, components such as Customs and Border Protection have never been authorized in statute since being transferred to the Department of Homeland Security through the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

While there remain several committees with overlapping oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, I believe this legislation that is on the floor today is a testament that this body can still work together to fulfill Congress' primary responsibilities under the Constitution.

As I mentioned, CBP, with more than 44,000 law enforcement officers and agents, has never been formally authorized in statute. As a result, CBP operates on devolved authority granted to the Secretary of Homeland Security and on guidance provided by Congress through annual appropriation bills rather than from specific authority accorded to the component by its authorizers.

H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act, is the first attempt by Congress since the passage of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security to clearly delineate the current authorities and responsibilities of the largest Federal law enforcement entity in our Nation. The fact that this agency has been operating for as long as they have without a clear statutory mandate from Congress and the American people certainly is a problem that needs to be corrected.

The Homeland Security Act, when passed nearly 12 years ago, was sort of a snapshot in time that reflects the choices made by Congress to quickly cobble together 22 agencies. Now is the time to update the statute and make changes where necessary to reflect the current security missions of the Department within CBP, which have significantly evolved over the last decade.

For example, after DHS was created, most of the authority for the work CBP currently performs was vested in a position called the Under Secretary of Border and Transportation Security. And if you haven't heard of it lately, it is because it was eliminated by then-Secretary Chertoff in 2005. Nonetheless, the position remains in law. I use that as an example.

So this bill is a first step in fixing outdated provisions from the source legislation that created the Department. Congress has the responsibility to give the Department of Homeland Security and its components the necessary direction through the regular authorization process, and this measure is a very important first step in doing so.

This bill provides a basic outline of the missions and responsibilities that we give to the Commissioner of CBP and its subcomponents—such as the Office of Field Operations, the United States Border Patrol, the Office of Air and Marine Operations, the Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison, and the Office of International Affairs—so they know what this Congress expects.

In addition to fixing the outdated provisions in the law, this legislation goes a long way in ensuring transparency and oversight in CBP. This bill also contains strong accountability measures to ensure that agents and officers respect civil rights, civil liberties and use force policies, especially with regard to the use of deadly force.

With the ongoing crisis of unaccompanied children crossing the border in ever-increasing numbers, making sure that we understand the root causes of the surge is vitally important as well. This bill includes a provision that takes a very hard look at why these children are coming so that we can provide the men and women of the Border Patrol and CBP the tools to stem the tide.

Issues like the recent surge remind us of why we need to continually update the authorities of key law enforcement agencies within the Department of Homeland Security. CBP's mission continues to change, and this Congress has a duty to give our officers and the agents proper authorities to carry out their important work.

Finally, I want to commend the work and the assistance of CBP and the Department of Homeland Security over the past 2 years since we have started the intricate task of cleaning up the Homeland Security Act. Their assistance really helped to make this bill much better.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this good government, commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing concerning H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act of 2014,'' which was favorably reported out of your Committee on June 11, 2014.

Given that numerous provisions in the bill are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I appreciate that you have addressed these provisions in response to the Committee's concerns. As a result, in order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will forego action on H.R. 3846. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not

in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3846, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act of 2014.'' I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters in the report accompanying H.R. 3846 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing concerning H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act,'' which your Committee ordered reported on June 11, 2014.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on the provisions in our jurisdiction and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3846, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.'' I acknowledge that by foregoing a sequential referral on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek an appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on the Judiciary as H.R. 3846 moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud original cosponsor of the bill sponsored by my subcommittee chairman, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER). We are working throughout this Congress in a bipartisan manner, and it seems that our particular subcommittee has been particularly energized by a number of issues that have come to the attention of the American people.

This is an authorization bill that is long overdue. U.S. Customs and Border Protection is among the largest and most significant of the Department of Homeland Security's components. CBP is charged with ensuring the security of America's borders while facilitating legitimate trade and travel.

I want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to just offer my appreciation for the hardworking men and women that come under CBP. They are on the border. They are on the northern and southern borders. They are in our ports, both airports and seaports, and so I think it is appropriate for us to take a moment and express our appreciation.

Might I also, just as another aside, express my appreciation for the transportation security work of the TSOs. As we were working on their issues, we lost one of our very brave agents in the last year. All of them should be appreciated.

Again, despite the essential nature of CBP's mission, it has not been authorized in law since the recognition of the Department of Homeland Security announced by Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff 9 years ago this month. It is imperative that CBP is authorized in law to ensure that Congress can conduct proper oversight of the agency and its programs. This legislation does just that.

I am very pleased to have been part of crafting legislation that really responds to an important need: giving the guidelines and infrastructure and structure to make sure that we have a security arm of the DHS that really works, that we appreciate, and that has a guideline to operate effectively. I am pleased that the bill includes several amendments offered by Democratic members during consideration by the Homeland Security Committee.

Again, I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON of the full committee for their bipartisan efforts, working with Chairman MILLER and myself on this legislation.

I was particularly pleased that the committee accepted an amendment I offered to help address the recent surge in the number of unaccompanied children entering the U.S. at increasingly younger ages, particularly in my home State of Texas. Let me be very clear: this is a humanitarian crisis and an issue that I think we are finding our way forward on, and I hope as we are passing this legislation, we will also pass the emergency supplemental that is needed for this issue and many others. This issue requires immediate attention from Congress given that the welfare of so many children is at stake.

I am also pleased that, during committee consideration, an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) was adopted to enhance CBP's oversight of an adherence to short-term detention standards at these facilities. While these facilities are not intended to house individuals for long-term immigration detention, it is imperative that basic standards are adhered to in order to ensure the health and well-being of people, including children in CBP custody.

So many of us have gone to the border in years past. I have been in many detention facilities over the years as I have served on this committee. We know that standards are important for whatever facility that we have. Whether they are detention facilities for adults who are coming across illegally or other resources that are needed, we must have a standard.

I am also pleased that the committee accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) stating that CBP may not enter into or renew a Trusted Traveler Program agreement with a foreign government unless that government reports lost and stolen passport data to Interpol. We know that passengers on Malaysia Airlines Flight 370 were traveling on stolen passports, and that enormous tragedy is still unsolved.

While the U.S. has relatively limited ability to ensure foreign governments utilize Interpol's database, encouraging them to report their own lost and stolen passports improves the quality of Interpol's list used by the U.S. to screen travelers to and from our country.

That said, I was disappointed the committee did not accept an amendment I offered to increase, by an additional 2,000, the number of CBP officers deployed at our ports of entry. I think we are seeing that there have been a number of State efforts that this number of CBP officers might have countered, and I look forward to us continuing to pursue opportunities to increase those numbers.

Congress recently provided the resources necessary to hire 2,000 additional CBP officers, but still more are needed. I understand current budgetary constraints, but so many of the challenges CBP faces at our ports of entry are related to or affected by persistent staffing shortages. Congress has a responsibility to do its part to alleviate these shortages, and I hope to continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this important issue.

That said, I strongly support the bill and am pleased that Customs and Border Protection will, for the first time in the years that they have been organized, in 2014, under the present chairman and myself, the ranking member, be authorized in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, who has been a very passionate advocate for this particular piece of legislation. It really has been under his direction that we have worked on this very much together.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security and the ranking member, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for their hard work and efforts in trying to secure the border, first and foremost, but also in achieving what has never been achieved before, and that is an authorization bill for Customs and Border Patrol.

In the history of the Congress, this is the first time. It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that we do this. It is very important that we support our men and women in blue and in green, Customs and Border Patrol, for the hard work and dedication day in and day out in what some would say is a thankless job. What we are doing, what Chairwoman MILLER and Ranking Member JACKSON LEE have done, for the first time Congress has recognized them and validated them in their mission to secure the border that they do day in and day out.

I need not go into details about the latest border crisis that we are suffering through. Certainly the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) knows as well as I do that this is a crisis that demands action, a call to action, and a solution from Congress.

I believe that authorizing CBP is a first step, but it is also the first step toward this committee authorizing the entire Department of Homeland Security. It is my goal within the next year, for the first time in the history of Congress, to authorize the Department of Homeland Security.

And shame on us, shame on Congress for never authorizing this Department. You don't think that impacts morale? You don't think it gives a misguided message from the Congress that we don't support them? I think, above all, what this bill does is it says: we support you; we support you in your job.

These Border Patrol officers that I see down there, these agents, they get rocks thrown at them. They get shot at. They have to deal in harsh conditions and the heat. And the customs agents at the ports of entry, I can't think of—someone would say ''thankless,'' but I can't think of a more important job in terms of protecting the sovereignty of the United States and protecting our borders day in and day out from threats that come in.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, if 60,000 children can just walk right across our border in the Rio Grande Valley sector, what does that say about our state of border security? What does that say? I met with the general of SOUTHCOM, General Kelly, and he told me: If they are coming in, what else is coming into the United States?

That is why this bill is so important, that is why border security is so important. I pledge to my committee members and to this Congress that we are going to get this job done. This is the first step, the beginning and the first step to finally getting this job done. We can report back to the American people that we have finally once and for all secured the border of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act, and thank Chairwoman MILLER for her hard work on this legislation. This measure would authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the first time ever. It also provides greater transparency, accountability and oversight of the nation's largest law enforcement agency. U.S. Customs and Border Protection has an important mission of securing the homeland, while simultaneously ensuring the flow of legitimate trade and travel at our nation's borders.

The Commissioner of CBP must oversee an agency that includes the Office of Field Operations, the U.S. Border Patrol, the Office of Air and Marine, and numerous other subcomponents responsible for a range of missions from acquiring and maintaining technology on the border, to conducting polygraph investigations to ensure new hires do not have derogatory backgrounds. As an agency with more than 44,000 Federal Law Enforcement Officers, it is absolutely essential that Congress authorize CBP, and other DHS components, on a routine basis.

This past week marked the ten year anniversary of the release of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations to Congress. Among the most important incomplete recommendations was for Congress to create a single, principal point of oversight and review for homeland security. Unfortunately, the number of committees and subcommittees overseeing DHS has only increased since this recommendation was first offered, and has resulted in significant strains on DHS leadership, who are required to answer to multiple Committees that sometimes provide contradictory guidance.

Authorizing the Department and its components like CBP, thus fulfilling our obligations as an authorizing committee, remains my top priority for this Committee. As Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, I can certainly attest that fractured jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security has limited Congress' ability to provide effective guidance to DHS. In the ten years since the Department was created, it has never had a comprehensive reauthorization. Similarly, components such as U.S. Customs and Border Protection, have never been authorized in statute since being transferred to the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, despite undergoing significant reorganizations in the nearly twelve years since the Department's establishment.

Thus, I want to thank my colleagues, and especially Chairman CAMP and the Committee on Ways and Means, for their collaboration in bringing this legislation to the Floor.

This measure has strong bipartisan support, and includes more than 30 amendments offered by Committee members of both parties, during the subcommittee and full committee markups. As a result, this measure passed the Committee unanimously, which truly represents the cooperation we strive to achieve. I would like to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON for his work on this bill and the contributions of our Democratic Members.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which will authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the first time, and will provide greater transparency, accountability, and oversight over this important component.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me offer just a few thoughts. I am delighted to associate myself with a very important point that the chairman of the committee made, and I will use the terminology ''authorization equals affirmation.''

It is important for us in this Congress to affirm an agency that is handling some of the most precious responsibilities, alongside of the intelligence community, alongside of the United

States military, Defense. It is Homeland Security. That is why this is a first start toward making sure that we are, in fact, looking to affirm or reauthorize the importance of this particular agency.

What I would say is that, when we were crafting this bill along with my chairwoman as she introduced this legislation, we were somewhat before this rising surge, and we began to think about what we needed to do to get in front of it. I am very glad that I laid the framework in my language in the bill dealing with having DHS find out what are the causes, how do we address the issue of unaccompanied children that are coming. We might have used the term ''surge.'' It was a surge, but it wasn't at that point.

I believe that facts are crucial, and I think it is important that this bill will encourage some of the things that have already been done. The President has met with the three Presidents of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador to determine and assess what the reasons are, how extreme the violence is. The stories are horrific.

And then, of course, to separate out the children who are running toward the men and women in green and begin to look at the border and securing the border, which none of us quarrel with. We realize that there have been some strides—we have worked with the Mexican government—but we also know that drug cartels, drug smugglers, sex traffickers, and human traffickers still prevail, because bad guys are always prevailing. We have to make sure that mixed into those bad guys that have those particular desires are not terrorists that will come and disturb this community or this Nation.

I think this bill lays a good framework for us to collaborate with so many others.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER for the bipartisan nature of the work on this bill, and the bills that originate from our committee. I would like to say that this is only the beginning.

I am looking forward to our committee partnering with Judiciary, and that we look to a reauthorization of ICE, which is a partner to the work that is being done on Homeland Security. I think it can be done. We have set a good model here today. As we make our way through the Department of Homeland Security, we have set a very good model on how we can affirm the vitality, the vigorousness, and the crucialness of these subagencies in providing for domestic security.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I would just advise, Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so if the gentlewoman would like to close, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I am going to conclude my remarks by indicating that I want to, again, express my appreciation for the work that we have done.

As a Houstonian, and as the chairman indicated, we are Texans, we see this, we have seen it, we live with our neighbors, but, more importantly, we live with our friends on the border. Members of Congress are our friends, are our neighbors, and they are a part of this great Nation as well. It gives me a special sense of pride and responsibility to be able to work with their needs.

As someone who has representation over one of the largest ports, along with some of my other colleagues in Houston, the Houston port, these are very important issues. I think America needs to realize that when we safeguard our ports, provide for these agents, and give them an infrastructure of authorization, we affirm them. We are securing the homeland.

I think the border towns have handled this humanitarian crisis with great valor and a great sense of what America is all about. We need to respond to their needs, but we also need to address this question from a perspective of the humanitarian issue that it is and a balanced perspective of securing the border.

I think we have begun that process with this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.''

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill, sponsored by my Subcommittee Chairman, the gentlelady from Michigan, Mrs. MILLER.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection is among the largest and most significant of the Department of Homeland Security's components.

CBP is charged with ensuring the security of America's borders while facilitating legitimate trade and travel.

Despite the essential nature of CBP's mission, it has not been authorized in law since the reorganization of the Department of Homeland Security announced by Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff nine years ago this month.

It is imperative that CBP is authorized in law to ensure that Congress can conduct proper oversight of the agency and its programs.

This legislation does just that.

I am pleased that the bill includes several amendments offered by Democratic Members during consideration by the Homeland Security Committee.

I was particularly pleased that the Committee accepted an amendment I offered to help address the recent surge in the number of unaccompanied children entering the U.S., at increasingly younger ages, particularly in my home state of Texas.

This issue requires immediate attention from Congress, given that the welfare of so many children is at stake.

I am also pleased that during Committee consideration an amendment offered by the gentlelady from California, Ms. SANCHEZ, was adopted to enhance CBP's oversight of and adherence to short-term detention standards at its facilities.

While these facilities are not intended to house individuals for long-term immigration detention, it is imperative that basic standards are adhered to in order to ensure the health and wellbeing of people, including children, in CBP custody.

I am also pleased that the Committee accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. SWALWELL, stating that CBP may not enter into or renew a trusted traveler program agreement with a foreign government unless that government reports lost and stolen passport data to INTERPOL.

We know that passengers on Malaysia Airlines Flight 370 were traveling on stolen passports.

While the U.S. has relatively limited ability to ensure foreign governments utilize INTERPOL's database, encouraging them to report their own lost and stolen passports improves the quality of INTERPOL's lists used by the U.S. to screen travelers to and from our country.

That said, I was disappointed that the Committee did not accept an amendment I offered to increase by an additional 2,000 the number of CBP officers deployed at our ports of entry.

Congress recently provided the resources necessary to hire 2,000 additional CBP officers, but still more are needed.

I understand current budgetary constraints, but so many of the challenges CBP faces at our ports of entry are related to or affected by persistent staffing shortages.

Congress has a responsibility to do its part to alleviate those shortages and I hope to continue to work with my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, on this important issue.

That said, I strongly support the bill and am pleased that Customs and Border Protection will, for the first time, be authorized in its current form.

In closing, I would like to thank the gentlelady from Michigan, Mrs. MILLER, for the bipartisan process.

I believe we produced a solid bill that should garner broad bi-partisan support in the House today.

I am particularly pleased that at this time when there is so much rancor about the Administration's response to the influx of fleeing unaccompanied children at our Southwest Border, we are standing together to authorize resources for the CBP to continue to do its part.

With that Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say in closing, first of all, I thought that the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. MCCAUL, made some excellent, excellent remarks. One of the things that he said that is absolutely true, and I know all of us feel this, is every time we talk to a CBP officer, one of the men and

women who so bravely secure our borders, they can't quite believe that Congress has never authorized their agency. It is not a great thing for their morale that we have never really paid them the attention that they deserve.

So I think this bill is, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, such an important first step for this Congress to be able to do that.

With the humanitarian crisis that is happening at our southern border with this tsunami of unaccompanied children that is coming in, we all see the video each and every day of our brave men and women, our CBP officers, trying to handle that. They have responsibilities there, things that they are doing there that are taking them away, quite frankly, as they are handling the children, taking them away from their duties and responsibilities of stopping the drug cartels, et cetera, from entering our borders. I just think this bill is incredibly important.

I would also mention as well, as we talk about the issues on the southern border, which are certainly in all of our news each and every day, but America has more than one border. We have the northern border as well. I see the dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, is on the floor. He and I, both being from the northern border State of Michigan, have worked together very diligently on northern border issues. We have in Michigan the two busiest northern border crossings on the entire northern tier of our Nation there. Again, our CBP officers have stopped so many that wish our Nation harm, whether that is human smuggling or drug smuggling or what have you, we have some unique dynamics on the northern border as well, as well as our maritime border.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important bill. Again, securing the homeland is certainly foremost of all of our responsibilities.

I would once again urge our colleagues to support H.R. 3846, the United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.''

The bill before us today seeks to authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for the first time since the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security.

As one of the largest operational components within DHS, CBP is charged with the critical, dual mission of securing our Nation's borders while facilitating legitimate trade and travel.

It is imperative that CBP is authorized in law in a manner consistent with its current organizational structure.

Only then can Congress conduct full and appropriate oversight of the agency and its activities.

The bill before us today serves that purpose by establishing CBP, its leadership structure, and its functions in law.

I am pleased to say that H.R. 3846 is a bipartisan product that has benefitted from input from Members on both sides of the aisle during the Committee process. Democratic Members of the Committee on Homeland Security offered important amendments on unaccompanied children crossing the border; electronic searches at the border; standards at short-term detention facilities; and professionalism and accountability for CBP personnel.

I want to congratulate the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, Rep. CANDICE MILLER and Rep. JACKSON LEE, for their hard work on this measure.

The bill before us today reflects the results of the bipartisan spirit in which they conduct their work, and it should be something all Members can give their strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3846, the ''United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3846, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3696) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3696

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—SECURING THE NATION AGAINST CYBER ATTACK

SEC. 101. HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002 DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(19) The term 'critical infrastructure' has the meaning given that term in section 1016(e) of the USA Patriot Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

''(20) The term 'critical infrastructure owner' means a person that owns critical infrastructure.

''(21) The term 'critical infrastructure operator' means a critical infrastructure owner or other person that manages, runs, or operates, in whole or in part, the day-to-day operations of critical infrastructure.

''(22) The term 'cyber incident' means an incident, or an attempt to cause an incident, that, if successful, would—

''(A) jeopardize or imminently jeopardize, without lawful authority, the security, integrity, confidentiality, or availability of an information system or network of information systems or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

''(B) constitute a violation or imminent threat of violation of law, security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies related to such a system or network, or an act of terrorism against such a system or network; or

''(C) result in the denial of access to or degradation, disruption, or destruction of such a system or network, or the defeat of an operations control or technical control essential to the security or operation of such a system or network.

''(23) The term 'cybersecurity mission' means activities that encompass the full range of threat reduction, vulnerability reduction, deterrence, incident response, resiliency, and recovery activities to foster the security and stability of cyberspace.

''(24) The term 'cybersecurity purpose' means the purpose of ensuring the security, integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguarding, an information system or network of information systems, including protecting such a system or network, or data residing on such a system or network, including protection of such a system or network, from—

''(A) a vulnerability of such a system or network;

''(B) a threat to the security, integrity, confidentiality, or availability of such a system or network, or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

''(C) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy such a system or network; or

''(D) efforts to gain unauthorized access to such a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network.

''(25) The term 'cyber threat' means any action that may result in unauthorized access to, exfiltration of, manipulation of, harm of, or impairment to the security, integrity, confidentiality, or availability of an information system or network of information systems, or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting such a system or network.

''(26) The term 'cyber threat information' means information directly pertaining to—

''(A) a vulnerability of an information system or network of information systems of a government or private entity;

''(B) a threat to the security, integrity, confidentiality, or availability of such a system or network of a government or private entity, or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

''(C) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy such a system or network of a government or private entity;

''(D) efforts to gain unauthorized access to such a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network; or

''(E) an act of terrorism against an information system or network of information systems.

''(27) The term 'Federal civilian information systems'—

''(A) means information, information systems, and networks of information systems that are owned, operated, controlled, or licensed for use by, or on behalf of, any Federal agency, including such systems or networks used or operated by another entity on behalf of a Federal agency; but

''(B) does not include—

''(i) a national security system; or

''(ii) information, information systems, and networks of information systems that are owned, operated, controlled, or licensed solely for use by, or on behalf of, the Department of Defense, a military department, or an element of the intelligence community.

''(28) The term 'information security' means the protection of information, information systems, and networks of information systems from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction in order to provide—

''(A) integrity, including guarding against improper information modification or destruction, including ensuring nonrepudiation and authenticity;

''(B) confidentiality, including preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information; and

''(C) availability, including ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

''(29) The term 'information system' means the underlying framework and functions used to process, transmit, receive, or store information electronically, including programmable electronic devices, communications networks, and industrial or supervisory control systems and any associated hardware, software, or data.

''(30) The term 'private entity' means any individual or any private or publically-traded company, public or private utility (including a utility that is a unit of a State or local government, or a political subdivision of a State government), organization, or corporation, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

''(31) The term 'shared situational awareness' means an environment in which cyber threat information is shared in real time between all designated Federal cyber operations centers to provide actionable information about all known cyber threats.''.

SEC. 102. ENHANCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 226. ENHANCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY.

''The Secretary, in collaboration with the heads of other appropriate Federal Government entities, shall conduct activities for cybersecurity purposes, including the provision of shared situational awareness to each other to enable real-time, integrated, and operational actions to protect from, prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from cyber incidents.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SUBTITLE HEADING.—The heading for subtitle C of title II of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle C—Cybersecurity and Information Sharing''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by adding after the item relating to section 225 the following new item:

''Sec. 226. Enhancement of cybersecurity.'';

and

(B) by striking the item relating to subtitle C of title II and inserting the following new item:

''Subtitle C—Cybersecurity and Information Sharing''.

SEC. 103. PROTECTION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 102, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 227. PROTECTION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

''(a) PROTECTION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall coordinate, on an ongoing basis, with Federal, State, and local governments, national laboratories, critical infrastructure owners, critical infrastructure operators, and other cross sector coordinating entities to—

''(A) facilitate a national effort to strengthen and maintain secure, functioning, and resilient critical infrastructure from cyber threats;

''(B) ensure that Department policies and procedures enable critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators to receive real-time, actionable, and relevant cyber threat information;

''(C) seek industry sector-specific expertise to—

''(i) assist in the development of voluntary security and resiliency strategies; and

''(ii) ensure that the allocation of Federal resources are cost effective and reduce any burden on critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators;

''(D) upon request of entities, facilitate and assist risk management efforts of such entities to reduce vulnerabilities, identify and disrupt threats, and minimize consequences to their critical infrastructure;

''(E) upon request of critical infrastructure owners or critical infrastructure operators, provide education and assistance to such owners and operators on how they may use protective measures and countermeasures to strengthen the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure; and

''(F) coordinate a research and development strategy to facilitate and promote advancements and innovation in cybersecurity technologies to protect critical infrastructure.

''(2) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) manage Federal efforts to secure, protect, and ensure the resiliency of Federal civilian information systems using a risk-based and performance-based approach, and, upon request of critical infrastructure owners or critical infrastructure operators, support such owners' and operators' efforts to secure, protect, and ensure the resiliency of critical infrastructure from cyber threats;

''(B) direct an entity within the Department to serve as a Federal civilian entity by and among Federal, State, and local governments, private entities, and critical infrastructure sectors to provide multi-directional sharing of real-time, actionable, and relevant cyber threat information;

''(C) build upon existing mechanisms to promote a national awareness effort to educate the general public on the importance of securing information systems;

''(D) upon request of Federal, State, and local government entities and private entities, facilitate expeditious cyber incident response and recovery assistance, and provide analysis and warnings related to threats to and vulnerabilities of critical information systems, crisis and consequence management support, and other remote or on-site technical assistance with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies to Federal, State, and local government entities and private entities for cyber incidents affecting critical infrastructure;

''(E) engage with international partners to strengthen the security and resilience of domestic critical infrastructure and critical infrastructure located outside of the United States upon which the United States depends; and

''(F) conduct outreach to educational institutions, including historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic serving institutions, Native American colleges, and institutions serving persons with disabilities, to encourage such institutions to promote cybersecurity awareness.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require any private entity to request assistance from the Secretary, or require any private entity requesting such assistance to implement any measure or recommendation suggested by the Secretary.

''(b) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTORS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall designate critical infrastructure sectors (that may include subdivisions of sectors within a sector as the Secretary may determine appropriate). The critical infrastructure sectors designated under this subsection may include the following:

''(1) Chemical.

''(2) Commercial facilities.

''(3) Communications.

''(4) Critical manufacturing.

''(5) Dams.

''(6) Defense Industrial Base.

''(7) Emergency services.

''(8) Energy.

''(9) Financial services.
''(10) Food and agriculture.
''(11) Government facilities.
''(12) Healthcare and public health.
''(13) Information technology.
''(14) Nuclear reactors, materials, and waste.
''(15) Transportation systems.
''(16) Water and wastewater systems.
''(17) Such other sectors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(c) SECTOR SPECIFIC AGENCIES.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the relevant critical infrastructure sector and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall recognize the Federal agency designated as of November 1, 2013, as the 'Sector Specific Agency' for each critical infrastructure sector designated under subsection (b). If the designated Sector Specific Agency for a particular critical infrastructure sector is the Department, for the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall carry out this section. The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of each such Sector Specific Agency shall—

''(1) support the security and resilience activities of the relevant critical infrastructure sector in accordance with this subtitle; and

''(2) provide institutional knowledge and specialized expertise to the relevant critical infrastructure sector.

''(d) SECTOR COORDINATING COUNCILS.—

''(1) RECOGNITION.—The Secretary, in collaboration with each critical infrastructure sector and the relevant Sector Specific Agency, shall recognize and partner with the Sector Coordinating Council for each critical infrastructure sector designated under subsection (b) to coordinate with each such sector on security and resilience activities and emergency response and recovery efforts.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Sector Coordinating Council for a critical infrastructure sector designated under subsection (b) shall—

''(i) be comprised exclusively of relevant critical infrastructure owners, critical infrastructure operators, private entities, and representative trade associations for the sector;

''(ii) reflect the unique composition of each sector; and

''(iii) as appropriate, include relevant small, medium, and large critical infrastructure owners, critical infrastructure operators, private entities, and representative trade associations for the sector.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—No government entity with regulating authority shall be a member of the Sector Coordinating Council.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall have no role in the determination of the membership of a Sector Coordinating Council.

''(3) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Sector Coordinating Council for a critical infrastructure sector shall—

''(A) serve as a self-governing, self-organized primary policy, planning, and strategic communications entity for coordinating with the Department, the relevant Sector-Specific Agency designated under subsection (c), and the relevant Information Sharing and Analysis Centers under subsection (e) on security and resilience activities and emergency response and recovery efforts;

''(B) establish governance and operating procedures, and designate a chairperson for the sector to carry out the activities described in this subsection;

''(C) coordinate with the Department, the relevant Information Sharing and Analysis Centers under subsection (e), and other Sector Coordinating Councils to update, maintain, and exercise the National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan in accordance with section 229(b); and

''(D) provide any recommendations to the Department on infrastructure protection technology gaps to help inform research and development efforts at the Department.

''(e) SECTOR INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS CENTERS.—

''(1) RECOGNITION.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the relevant Sector Coordinating Council and the critical infrastructure sector represented by such Council, and in coordination with the relevant Sector Specific Agency, shall recognize at least one Information Sharing and Analysis Center for each critical infrastructure sector designated under subsection (b) for purposes of paragraph (3). No other Information Sharing and Analysis Organizations, including Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, may be precluded from having an information sharing relationship within the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center established pursuant to section 228. Nothing in this subsection or any other provision of this subtitle may be construed to limit, restrict, or condition any private entity or activity utilized by, among, or between private entities.

''(2) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to such other activities as may be authorized by law, at least one Information Sharing and Analysis Center for a critical infrastructure sector shall—

''(A) serve as an information sharing resource for such sector and promote ongoing multi-directional sharing of real-time, relevant, and actionable cyber threat information and analysis by and among such sector, the Department, the relevant Sector Specific Agency, and other critical infrastructure sector Information Sharing and Analysis Centers;

''(B) establish governance and operating procedures to carry out the activities conducted under this subsection;

''(C) serve as an emergency response and recovery operations coordination point for such sector, and upon request, facilitate cyber incident response capabilities in coordination with the Department, the relevant Sector Specific Agency and the relevant Sector Coordinating Council;

''(D) facilitate cross-sector coordination and sharing of cyber threat information to prevent related or consequential impacts to other critical infrastructure sectors;

''(E) coordinate with the Department, the relevant Sector Coordinating Council, the relevant Sector Specific Agency, and other critical infrastructure sector Information Sharing and Analysis Centers on the development, integration, and implementation of procedures to support technology neutral, real-time information sharing capabilities and mechanisms within the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center established pursuant to section 228, including—

''(i) the establishment of a mechanism to voluntarily report identified vulnerabilities and opportunities for improvement;

''(ii) the establishment of metrics to assess the effectiveness and timeliness of the Department's and Information Sharing and Analysis Centers' information sharing capabilities; and

''(iii) the establishment of a mechanism for anonymous suggestions and comments;

''(F) implement an integration and analysis function to inform sector planning, risk mitigation, and operational activities regarding the protection of each critical infrastructure sector from cyber incidents;

''(G) combine consequence, vulnerability, and threat information to share actionable assessments of critical infrastructure sector risks from cyber incidents;

''(H) coordinate with the Department, the relevant Sector Specific Agency, and the relevant Sector Coordinating Council to update, maintain, and exercise the National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan in accordance with section 229(b); and

''(I) safeguard cyber threat information from unauthorized disclosure.

''(3) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 for the Cybersecurity and Communications Office of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to use not less than $25,000,000 for any such year for operations support at the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center established under section 228(a) of all recognized Information Sharing and Analysis Centers under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

''(f) CLEARANCES.—The Secretary—

''(1) shall expedite the process of security clearances under Executive Order 13549 or successor orders for appropriate representatives of Sector Coordinating Councils and the critical infrastructure sector Information Sharing and Analysis Centers; and

''(2) may so expedite such processing to—

''(A) appropriate personnel of critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators; and

''(B) any other person as determined by the Secretary.

''(g) PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the critical infrastructure sectors designated under subsection (b), such sectors' Sector Specific Agencies recognized under subsection (c), and the Sector Coordinating Councils recognized under subsection (d), shall—

''(1) conduct an analysis and review of the existing public-private partnership model and evaluate how the model between the Department and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators can be improved to ensure the Department, critical infrastructure owners, and critical infrastructure operators are equal partners and regularly collaborate on all programs and activities of the Department to protect critical infrastructure;

''(2) develop and implement procedures to ensure continuous, collaborative, and effective interactions between the Department, critical infrastructure owners, and critical infrastructure operators; and

''(3) ensure critical infrastructure sectors have a reasonable period for review and comment of all jointly produced materials with the Department.

''(h) RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING NEW AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees recommendations on how to expedite the implementation of information sharing agreements for cybersecurity purposes between the Secretary and critical information owners and critical infrastructure operators and other private entities. Such recommendations shall address the development and utilization of a scalable form that retains all privacy and other protections in such agreements in existence as of such date, including Cooperative and Research Development Agreements. Such recommendations should also include any additional authorities or resources that may be needed to carry out the implementation of any such new agreements.

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—No provision of this title may be construed as modifying, limiting, or otherwise affecting the authority of any other Federal agency under any other provision of law.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 226 (as added by section 102) the following new item:

''Sec. 227. Protection of critical infrastructure and information sharing.''.

SEC. 104. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by sections 102 and 103, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 228. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (referred to in this section as the 'Center'), which shall be a Federal civilian information sharing interface that provides shared situational awareness to enable real-time, integrated, and operational actions across the Federal Government, and share cyber threat information by and among Federal, State, and local government entities, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, private entities, and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators that have an information sharing relationship with the Center.

''(b) COMPOSITION.—The Center shall include each of the following entities:

''(1) At least one Information Sharing and Analysis Center established under section 227(e) for each critical infrastructure sector.

''(2) The Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center to collaborate with State and local governments.

''(3) The United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team to coordinate cyber threat information sharing, proactively manage cyber risks to the United States, collaboratively respond to cyber incidents, provide technical assistance to information system owners and operators, and disseminate timely notifications regarding current and potential cyber threats and vulnerabilities.

''(4) The Industrial Control System Cyber Emergency Response Team to coordinate with industrial control systems owners and operators and share industrial control systems-related security incidents and mitigation measures.

''(5) The National Coordinating Center for Telecommunications to coordinate the protection, response, and recovery of national security emergency communications.

''(6) Such other Federal, State, and local government entities, private entities, organizations, or individuals as the Secretary may consider appropriate that agree to be included.

''(c) CYBER INCIDENT.—In the event of a cyber incident, the Secretary may grant the entities referred to in subsection (a) immediate temporary access to the Center as a situation may warrant.

''(d) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Center shall—

''(1) promote ongoing multi-directional sharing by and among the entities referred to in subsection (a) of timely and actionable cyber threat information and analysis on a real-time basis that includes emerging trends, evolving threats, incident reports, intelligence information, risk assessments, and best practices;

''(2) coordinate with other Federal agencies to streamline and reduce redundant reporting of cyber threat information;

''(3) provide, upon request, timely technical assistance and crisis management support to Federal, State, and local government entities and private entities that own or operate information systems or networks of information systems to protect from, prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from cyber incidents;

''(4) facilitate cross-sector coordination and sharing of cyber threat information to prevent related or consequential impacts to other critical infrastructure sectors;

''(5) collaborate and facilitate discussions with Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, Sector Specific Agencies, and relevant critical infrastructure sectors on the development of prioritized Federal response efforts, if necessary, to support the defense and recovery of critical infrastructure from cyber incidents;

''(6) collaborate with the Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, Sector Specific Agencies, and the relevant critical infrastructure sectors on the development and implementation of procedures to support technology neutral real-time information sharing capabilities and mechanisms;

''(7) collaborate with the Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, Sector Specific Agencies, and the relevant critical infrastructure sectors to identify requirements for data and information formats and accessibility, system interoperability, and redundant systems and alternative capabilities in the event of a disruption in the primary information sharing capabilities and mechanisms at the Center;

''(8) within the scope of relevant treaties, cooperate with international partners to share information and respond to cyber incidents;

''(9) safeguard sensitive cyber threat information from unauthorized disclosure;

''(10) require other Federal civilian agencies to—

''(A) send reports and information to the Center about cyber incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities affecting Federal civilian information systems and critical infrastructure systems and, in the event a private vendor product or service of such an agency is so implicated, the Center shall first notify such private vendor of the vulnerability before further disclosing such information;

''(B) provide to the Center cyber incident detection, analysis, mitigation, and response information; and

''(C) immediately send and disclose to the Center cyber threat information received by such agencies;

''(11) perform such other duties as the Secretary may require to facilitate a national effort to strengthen and maintain secure, functioning, and resilient critical infrastructure from cyber threats;

''(12) implement policies and procedures to—

''(A) provide technical assistance to Federal civilian agencies to prevent and respond to data breaches involving unauthorized acquisition or access of personally identifiable information that occur on Federal civilian information systems;

''(B) require Federal civilian agencies to notify the Center about data breaches involving unauthorized acquisition or access of personally identifiable information that occur on Federal civilian information systems without unreasonable delay after the discovery of such a breach; and

''(C) require Federal civilian agencies to notify all potential victims of a data breach involving unauthorized acquisition or access of personally identifiable information that occur on Federal civilian information systems without unreasonable delay, based on a reasonable determination of the level of risk of harm and consistent with the needs of law enforcement; and

''(13) participate in exercises run by the Department's National Exercise Program, where appropriate.

''(e) INTEGRATION AND ANALYSIS.—The Center, in coordination with the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department, shall maintain an integration and analysis function, which shall —

''(1) integrate and analyze all cyber threat information received from other Federal agencies, State and local governments, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, private entities, critical infrastructure owners, and critical infrastructure operators, and share relevant information in near real-time;

''(2) on an ongoing basis, assess and evaluate consequence, vulnerability, and threat information to share with the entities referred to in subsection (a) actionable assessments of critical infrastructure sector risks from cyber incidents and to assist critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators by making recommendations to facilitate continuous improvements to the security and resiliency of the critical infrastructure of the United States;

''(3) facilitate cross-sector integration, identification, and analysis of key interdependencies to prevent related or consequential impacts to other critical infrastructure sectors;

''(4) collaborate with the Information Sharing and Analysis Centers to tailor the analysis of information to the specific characteristics and risk to a relevant critical infrastructure sector; and

''(5) assess and evaluate consequence, vulnerability, and threat information regarding cyber incidents in coordination with the Office of Emergency Communications of the Department to help facilitate continuous improvements to the security and resiliency of public safety communications networks.

''(f) REPORT OF CYBER ATTACKS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NETWORKS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States an annual report that summarizes major cyber incidents involving Federal civilian agency information systems and provides aggregate statistics on the number of breaches, the extent of any personally identifiable information that was involved, the volume of data exfiltrated, the consequential impact, and the estimated cost of remedying such breaches.

''(g) REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE CENTER.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Sector Coordinating Councils and appropriate Federal Government entities, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States an annual report on—

''(1) the capability and capacity of the Center to carry out its cybersecurity mission in

accordance with this section, and sections 226, 227, 229, 230, 230A, and 230B;

''(2) the extent to which the Department is engaged in information sharing with each critical infrastructure sector designated under section 227(b), including—

''(A) the extent to which each such sector has representatives at the Center; and

''(B) the extent to which critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators of each critical infrastructure sector participate in information sharing at the Center;

''(3) the volume and range of activities with respect to which the Secretary collaborated with the Sector Coordinating Councils and the Sector-Specific Agencies to promote greater engagement with the Center; and

''(4) the volume and range of voluntary technical assistance sought and provided by the Department to each critical infrastructure owner and critical infrastructure operator.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 227 (as added by section 103) the following new item:

''Sec. 228. National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.''.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center established under section 228 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a) of this section, in carrying out its cybersecurity mission (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 101) in accordance with this Act and such section 228 and sections 226, 227, 229, 230, 230A, and 230B of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this Act.

SEC. 105. CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by sections 102, 103, and 104, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 229. CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish Cyber Incident Response Teams to—

''(1) upon request, provide timely technical assistance and crisis management support to Federal, State, and local government entities, private entities, and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators involving cyber incidents affecting critical infrastructure; and

''(2) upon request, provide actionable recommendations on security and resilience measures and countermeasures to Federal, State, and local government entities, private entities, and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators prior to, during, and after cyber incidents.

''(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall coordinate with the relevant Sector Specific Agencies, if applicable.

''(c) CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE PLAN.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, and Federal, State, and local governments, shall develop, regularly update, maintain, and exercise a National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan which shall—

''(1) include effective emergency response plans associated with cyber threats to critical infrastructure, information systems, or networks of information systems;

''(2) ensure that such National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan can adapt to and reflect a changing cyber threat environment, and incorporate best practices and lessons learned from regular exercises, training, and after-action reports; and

''(3) facilitate discussions on the best methods for developing innovative and useful cybersecurity exercises for coordinating between the Department and each of the critical infrastructure sectors designated under section 227(b).

''(d) UPDATE TO CYBER INCIDENT ANNEX TO THE NATIONAL RESPONSE FRAMEWORK.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies and in accordance with the National Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan under subsection (c), shall regularly update, maintain, and exercise the Cyber Incident Annex to the National Response Framework of the Department.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 228 (as added by section 104) the following new item:

''Sec. 229. Cyber incident response and technical assistance.''.

SEC. 106. STREAMLINING OF DEPARTMENT CYBERSECURITY ORGANIZATION.

(a) CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION DIRECTORATE.—The National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security shall, after the date of the enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the ''Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Directorate''. Any reference to the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Directorate of the Department.

(b) SENIOR LEADERSHIP OF THE CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION DIRECTORATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 103(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(K) Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection.

''(L) Deputy Under Secretary for Cybersecurity.

''(M) Deputy Under Secretary for Infrastructure Protection.''.

(2) CONTINUATION IN OFFICE.—The individuals who hold the positions referred to in subparagraphs (K), (L), and (M) of subsection (a) of section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) as of the date of the enactment of this Act may continue to hold such positions.

(c) REPORT ON IMPROVING THE CAPABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE.—To improve the operational capability and effectiveness in carrying out the cybersecurity mission (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 101) of the Department of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on—

(1) the feasibility of making the Cybersecurity and Communications Office of the Department an operational component of the Department;

(2) recommendations for restructuring the SAFETY Act Office within the Department to protect and maintain operations in accordance with the Office's mission to provide incentives for the development and deployment of anti-terrorism technologies while elevating the profile and mission of the Office, including the feasibility of utilizing third-party registrars for improving the throughput and effectiveness of the certification process.

(d) REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY ACQUISITION CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall assess the effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security's acquisition processes and the use of existing authorities for acquiring cybersecurity technologies to ensure that such processes and authorities are capable of meeting the needs and demands of the Department's cybersecurity mission (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 101). Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the Department's acquisition processes for cybersecurity technologies.

(e) RESOURCE INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall make available Department of Homeland Security contact information to serve as a resource for Sector Coordinating Councils and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators to better coordinate cybersecurity efforts with the Department relating to emergency response and recovery efforts for cyber incidents.

TITLE II—PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION ON CYBERSECURITY

SEC. 201. PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

(a) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall, on an ongoing basis, facilitate and support the development of a voluntary, industry-led set of standards, guidelines, best practices, methodologies, procedures, and processes to reduce cyber risks to critical infrastructure. The Director, in coordination with the Secretary—

(A) shall—

(i) coordinate closely and continuously with relevant private entities, critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators, Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, and other relevant industry organizations, and incorporate industry expertise to the fullest extent possible;

(ii) consult with the Sector Specific Agencies, Federal, State and local governments, the governments of other countries, and international organizations;

(iii) utilize a prioritized, flexible, repeatable, performance-based, and cost-effective approach, including information security measures and controls, that may be voluntarily adopted by critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators to help them identify, assess, and manage cyber risks;

(iv) include methodologies to—

(I) identify and mitigate impacts of the cybersecurity measures or controls on business confidentiality; and

(II) protect individual privacy and civil liberties;

(v) incorporate voluntary consensus standards and industry best practices, and align with voluntary international standards to the fullest extent possible;

(vi) prevent duplication of regulatory processes and prevent conflict with or superseding of regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, and processes; and

(vii) include such other similar and consistent elements as determined necessary; and

(B) shall not prescribe or otherwise require—

(i) the use of specific solutions;

(ii) the use of specific information technology products or services; or

(iii) that information technology products or services be designed, developed, or manufactured in a particular manner.

(2) LIMITATION.—Information shared with or provided to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Secretary of Homeland Security for the purpose of the activities under paragraph (1) may not be used by any Federal, State, or local government department or agency to regulate the activity of any private entity.

(b) AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by sections 102, 103, 104, and 105, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 230. PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

''(a) MEETINGS.—The Secretary shall meet with the Sector Coordinating Council for each critical infrastructure sector designated under section 227(b) on a biannual basis to discuss the cybersecurity threat to critical infrastructure, voluntary activities to address cybersecurity, and ideas to improve the public-private partnership to enhance cybersecurity, in which the Secretary shall—

''(1) provide each Sector Coordinating Council an assessment of the cybersecurity threat to each critical infrastructure sector designated under section 227(b), including information relating to—

''(A) any actual or assessed cyber threat, including a consideration of adversary capability and intent, preparedness, target attractiveness, and deterrence capabilities;

''(B) the extent and likelihood of death, injury, or serious adverse effects to human health and safety caused by an act of terrorism or other disruption, destruction, or unauthorized use of critical infrastructure;

''(C) the threat to national security caused by an act of terrorism or other disruption, destruction, or unauthorized use of critical infrastructure; and

''(D) the harm to the economy that would result from an act of terrorism or other disruption, destruction, or unauthorized use of critical infrastructure; and

''(2) provide recommendations, which may be voluntarily adopted, on ways to improve cybersecurity of critical infrastructure.

''(b) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Starting 30 days after the end of the fiscal year in which the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013 is enacted and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the state of cybersecurity for each critical infrastructure sector designated under section 227(b) based on discussions between the Department and the Sector Coordinating Council in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary shall maintain a public copy of each report, and each report may include a nonpublic annex for proprietary, business-sensitive information, or other sensitive information. Each report shall include, at a minimum information relating to—

''(A) the risk to each critical infrastructure sector, including known cyber threats, vulnerabilities, and potential consequences;

''(B) the extent and nature of any cybersecurity incidents during the previous year, including the extent to which cyber incidents jeopardized or imminently jeopardized information systems;

''(C) the current status of the voluntary, industry-led set of standards, guidelines, best practices, methodologies, procedures, and processes to reduce cyber risks within each critical infrastructure sector; and

''(D) the volume and range of voluntary technical assistance sought and provided by the Department to each critical infrastructure sector.

''(2) SECTOR COORDINATING COUNCIL RESPONSE.—Before making public and submitting each report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide a draft of each report to the Sector Coordinating Council for the critical infrastructure sector covered by each such report. The Sector Coordinating Council at issue may provide to the Secretary a written response to such report within 45 days of receiving the draft. If such Sector Coordinating Council provides a written response, the Secretary shall include such written response in the final version of each report required under paragraph (1).

''(c) LIMITATION.—Information shared with or provided to a Sector Coordinating Council, a critical infrastructure sector, or the Secretary for the purpose of the activities under subsections (a) and (b) may not be used by any Federal, State, or local government department or agency to regulate the activity of any private entity.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 229 (as added by section 105) the following new item:

''Sec. 230. Public-private collaboration on cybersecurity.''.

SEC. 202. SAFETY ACT AND QUALIFYING CYBER INCIDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Support Anti-Terrorism By Fostering Effective Technologies Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 441 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 862(b) (6 U.S.C. 441(b))—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED ANTI-TERRORISM TECHNOLOGIES'' and inserting ''DESIGNATION OF ANTI-TERRORISM AND CYBERSECURITY TECHNOLOGIES'';

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''and cybersecurity'' after ''anti-terrorism'';

(C) in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), by inserting ''or cybersecurity'' after ''anti-terrorism'' each place it appears; and

(D) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by inserting ''or cybersecurity technology'' after ''Anti-terrorism technology''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or qualifying cyber incidents'' after ''acts of terrorism'';

(2) in section 863 (6 U.S.C. 442)—

(A) by inserting ''or cybersecurity'' after ''anti-terrorism'' each place it appears;

(B) by inserting ''or qualifying cyber incident'' after ''act of terrorism'' each place it appears; and

(C) by inserting ''or qualifying cyber incidents'' after ''acts of terrorism'' each place it appears;

(3) in section 864 (6 U.S.C. 443)—

(A) by inserting ''or cybersecurity'' after ''anti-terrorism'' each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting ''or qualifying cyber incident'' after ''act of terrorism'' each place it appears; and

(4) in section 865 (6 U.S.C. 444)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading, by inserting ''OR CYBERSECURITY'' after ''ANTI-TERRORISM'';

(ii) by inserting ''or cybersecurity'' after ''anti-terrorism'';

(iii) by inserting ''or qualifying cyber incidents'' after ''acts of terrorism''; and

(iv) by inserting ''or incidents'' after ''such acts''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) QUALIFYING CYBER INCIDENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualifying cyber incident' means any act that the Secretary determines meets the requirements under subparagraph (B), as such requirements are further defined and specified by the Secretary.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A qualifying cyber incident meets the requirements of this subparagraph if—

''(i) the incident is unlawful or otherwise exceeds authorized access authority;

''(ii) the incident disrupts or imminently jeopardizes the integrity, operation, confidentiality, or availability of programmable electronic devices, communication networks, including hardware, software and data that are essential to their reliable operation, electronic storage devices, or any other information system, or the information that system controls, processes, stores, or transmits;

''(iii) the perpetrator of the incident gains access to an information system or a network of information systems resulting in—

''(I) misappropriation or theft of data, assets, information, or intellectual property;

''(II) corruption of data, assets, information, or intellectual property;

''(III) operational disruption; or

''(IV) an adverse effect on such system or network, or the data, assets, information, or intellectual property contained therein; and

''(iv) the incident causes harm inside or outside the United States that results in material levels of damage, disruption, or casualties severely affecting the United States population, infrastructure, economy, or national morale, or Federal, State, local, or tribal government functions.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of clause (iv) of subparagraph (B), the term 'severely' includes any qualifying cyber incident, whether at a local, regional, state, national, international, or tribal level, that affects—

''(i) the United States population, infrastructure, economy, or national morale, or

''(ii) Federal, State, local, or tribal government functions.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 for the Department of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to use not less than $20,000,000 for any such year for the Department's SAFETY Act Office.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION ON NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act (except that this section shall not

apply in the case of section 202 of this Act and the amendments made by such section 202) do not—

(1) create or authorize the issuance of any new regulations or additional Federal Government regulatory authority; or

(2) permit regulatory actions that would duplicate, conflict with, or supercede regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION ACTIVITIES TO TRACK INDIVIDUALS' PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

Nothing in this Act shall permit the Department of Homeland Security to engage in the monitoring, surveillance, exfiltration, or other collection activities for the purpose of tracking an individual's personally identifiable information.

SEC. 206. CYBERSECURITY SCHOLARS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall determine the feasibility and potential benefit of developing a visiting security researchers program from academia, including cybersecurity scholars at the Department of Homeland Security's Centers of Excellence, as designated by the Secretary, to enhance knowledge with respect to the unique challenges of addressing cyber threats to critical infrastructure. Eligible candidates shall possess necessary security clearances and have a history of working with Federal agencies in matters of national or domestic security.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL STUDY ON THE RESILIENCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE NATION'S POWER GRID.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of other departments and agencies, as necessary, shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to conduct research of the future resilience and reliability of the Nation's electric power transmission and distribution system. The research under this subsection shall be known as the ''Saving More American Resources Today Study'' or the ''SMART Study''. In conducting such research, the National Research Council shall—

(1) research the options for improving the Nation's ability to expand and strengthen the capabilities of the Nation's power grid, including estimation of the cost, time scale for implementation, and identification of the scale and scope of any potential significant health and environmental impacts;

(2) consider the forces affecting the grid, including technical, economic, regulatory, environmental, and geopolitical factors, and how such forces are likely to affect—

(A) the efficiency, control, reliability and robustness of operation;

(B) the ability of the grid to recover from disruptions, including natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(C) the ability of the grid to incorporate greater reliance on distributed and intermittent power generation and electricity storage;

(D) the ability of the grid to adapt to changing patterns of demand for electricity; and

(E) the economic and regulatory factors affecting the evolution of the grid;

(3) review Federal, State, industry, and academic research and development programs and identify technological options that could improve the future grid;

(4) review studies and analyses prepared by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) regarding the future resilience and reliability of the grid;

(5) review the implications of increased reliance on digital information and control of the power grid for improving reliability, resilience, and congestion and for potentially increasing vulnerability to cyber attack;

(6) review regulatory, industry, and institutional factors and programs affecting the future of the grid;

(7) research the costs and benefits, as well as the strengths and weaknesses, of the options identified under paragraph (1) to address the emerging forces described in paragraph (2) that are shaping the grid;

(8) identify the barriers to realizing the options identified and suggest strategies for overcoming those barriers including suggested actions, priorities, incentives, and possible legislative and executive actions; and

(9) research the ability of the grid to integrate existing and future infrastructure, including utilities, telecommunications lines, highways, and other critical infrastructure.

(b) COOPERATION AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the National Research Council receives full and timely cooperation, including full access to information and personnel, from the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Energy, including the management and operating components of the Departments, and other Federal departments and agencies, as necessary, for the purposes of conducting the study described in subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months from the date on which the Secretary enters into the agreement with the National Research Council described in subsection (a), the National Research Council shall submit to the Secretary and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the findings of the research required by that subsection.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for 2014 for the Department of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to obligate and expend not more than $2,000,000 for the National Research Council report.

TITLE III—HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE

SEC. 301. HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by sections 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, and 201, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 230A. CYBERSECURITY OCCUPATION CATEGORIES, WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT, AND STRATEGY.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the 'Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act'.

''(b) CYBERSECURITY OCCUPATION CATEGORIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop and issue comprehensive occupation categories for individuals performing activities in furtherance of the cybersecurity mission of the Department.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the comprehensive occupation categories issued under paragraph (1) are used throughout the Department and are made available to other Federal agencies.

''(c) CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall assess the readiness and capacity of the workforce of the Department to meet its cybersecurity mission.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum, include the following:

''(A) Information where cybersecurity positions are located within the Department, specified in accordance with the cybersecurity occupation categories issued under subsection (b).

''(B) Information on which cybersecurity positions are—

''(i) performed by—

''(I) permanent full time departmental employees, together with demographic information about such employees' race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and veterans status;

''(II) individuals employed by independent contractors; and

''(III) individuals employed by other Federal agencies, including the National Security Agency; and

''(ii) vacant.

''(C) The number of individuals hired by the Department pursuant to the authority granted to the Secretary in 2009 to permit the Secretary to fill 1,000 cybersecurity positions across the Department over a three year period, and information on what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the implementation of such authority.

''(D) Information on vacancies within the Department's cybersecurity supervisory workforce, from first line supervisory positions through senior departmental cybersecurity positions.

''(E) Information on the percentage of individuals within each cybersecurity occupation category who received essential training to perform their jobs, and in cases in which such training is not received, information on what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the provision of such training.

''(F) Information on recruiting costs incurred with respect to efforts to fill cybersecurity positions across the Department in a manner that allows for tracking of overall recruiting and identifying areas for better coordination and leveraging of resources within the Department.

''(d) WORKFORCE STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop, maintain, and, as necessary, update, a comprehensive workforce strategy that enhances the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the cybersecurity workforce of the Department.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The comprehensive workforce strategy developed under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a multiphased recruitment plan, including relating to experienced professionals, members of disadvantaged or underserved communities, the unemployed, and veterans;

''(B) a 5-year implementation plan;

''(C) a 10-year projection of the Department's cybersecurity workforce needs; and

''(D) obstacles impeding the hiring and development of a cybersecurity workforce at the Department.

''(e) INFORMATION SECURITY TRAINING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a process to verify on an ongoing basis that individuals employed by independent contractors who serve in cybersecurity positions at the Department receive initial and recurrent information security training comprised of general security awareness training necessary to perform their job functions, and role-based security training that is commensurate with assigned responsibilities. The Secretary shall maintain documentation to ensure that training provided to an individual under this subsection meets or exceeds requirements for such individual's job function.

''(f) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees annual updates regarding the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (c), information on the progress of carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subsection (d), and information on the status of the implementation of the information security training required under subsection (e).

''(g) GAO STUDY.—The Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General of the United States with information on the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (c) and progress on carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subsection (d). The Comptroller General shall submit to the Secretary and the appropriate congressional committees a study on such assessment and strategy.

''(h) CYBERSECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the feasibility of establishing a Cybersecurity Fellowship Program to offer a tuition payment plan for undergraduate and doctoral candidates who agree to work for the Department for an agreed-upon period of time.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 230 (as added by section 201) the following new item:

''Sec. 230A. Cybersecurity occupation categories, workforce assessment, and strategy.''.

SEC. 302. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by sections 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 201, and 301 is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 230B. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may exercise with respect to qualified employees of the Department the same authority that the Secretary of Defense has with respect to civilian intelligence personnel and the scholarship program under sections 1601, 1602, 1603, and 2200a of title 10, United States Code, to establish as positions in the excepted service, appoint individuals to such positions, fix pay, and pay a retention bonus to any employee appointed under this section if the Secretary determines that such is needed to retain essential personnel. Before announcing the payment of a bonus under this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a written explanation of such determination. Such authority shall be exercised—

''(A) to the same extent and subject to the same conditions and limitations that the Secretary of Defense may exercise such authority with respect to civilian intelligence personnel of the Department of Defense; and

''(B) in a manner consistent with the merit system principles set forth in section 2301 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) CIVIL SERVICE PROTECTIONS.—Sections 1221 and 2302, and chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the positions established pursuant to the authorities provided under paragraph (1).

''(3) PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this subsection.

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter for four years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a detailed report (including appropriate metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period) that discusses the processes used by the Secretary in implementing this section and accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans' preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by a qualified employee.

''(c) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term 'qualified employee' means an employee who performs functions relating to the security of Federal civilian information systems, critical infrastructure information systems, or networks of either of such systems.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 230A (as added by section 301) the following new item:

''Sec. 230B. Personnel authorities.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014. I have worked on this for a long time and introduced this bill with my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman PAT MEEHAN. I would also like to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Ranking Member CLARKE of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, for all their hard work in forging this bipartisan bill. These efforts once again prove that we can work together, despite our differences, to craft legislation that improves our national security and helps protect American critical infrastructure from devastating cyber attacks.

Just last week, the Homeland Security Committee heard testimony that we are at a pre-9/11 mindset when it comes to cybersecurity and that the government needs to do a better job at warning the public about the dangers of attacks on networks we rely upon. That was from the 9/11 Commission itself.

Cyber vulnerabilities in our Nation's critical infrastructure are an Achilles heel in our homeland security defenses. Let me be very clear. The cyber threat is real and it is happening right now. The Internet has become the next battlefield for warfare, but unlike land, sea, and air, cyber attacks occur at the speed of light, they are global, and they are more difficult to attribute.

Criminals, hacktivists, terrorists, and nation-state actors such as Russia, China, and Iran are increasingly using malicious malware to hack into U.S. companies for espionage purposes or financial gain, our defense systems to steal our sensitive military information, and our critical infrastructure to gain access to our gas lines, power grids, and water systems.

Iranian hackers, for example, continue to attack the American financial services sector to shut down Web sites and restrict America's access to their bank accounts. Additionally, Iran continues to build more sophisticated cyber weapons to target U.S. energy companies and has demonstrated these capabilities when they attacked Saudi Arabia's national oil company, Aramco, and erased critical files on 30,000 computers. We cannot allow rogue nations like Iran to be able to shut things down and have capabilities that match our defenses. That would be a game-changer for our national security.

The Chinese, in particular, are hacking into major U.S. companies to give their industries competitive economic advantages in our global economy. I applaud the recent efforts taken by the Justice Department for indicting five members of the Chinese government for conducting cyber espionage attacks against U.S. industry, but more needs

to be done. Those indictments send a clear message to our adversaries that cyber espionage and theft of American intellectual property, trade secrets, military blueprints, and jobs will not be tolerated.

A recent McAfee and Center for Strategic and International Studies report on the economic impact of cyber crime found an annual effect of roughly $455 billion globally, with 200,000 jobs lost in the United States alone as a result. In fact, former Director of the NSA, General Keith Alexander, described cyber espionage and the loss of American intellectual property and innovation as ''the greatest transfer of wealth in history.''

A recent poll conducted by Defense News revealed that our top Nation's top security analysts see cyber attacks as the greatest threat to our Nation. In fact, Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified earlier this year that: ''Critical infrastructure, particularly the systems used in water management, oil, and gas pipelines, electrical power distribution, and mass transit, provides an enticing target to malicious actors.''

□ 1645

A cyber attack on U.S. critical infrastructure—such as gas pipelines, financial services, transportation, and communication networks—could result in catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, and national security.

High-profile retail breaches like the ones at Target and Neiman Marcus that compromised the personal information of over 110 million American consumers resonate with Americans, but as bad as those breaches were, a successful cyber attack on our critical infrastructure could cause much more damage in terms of lives lost and monetary damage. We cannot and will not wait for a catastrophic 9/11-scaled cyber attack to occur before moving greatly needed cybersecurity legislation.

The National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act ensures that DHS and not the military is responsible for domestic critical infrastructure protection.

Specifically, H.R. 3696 ensures that there is a ''civilian interface'' to the private sector to share real-time cyber threat information across the critical infrastructure sectors, particularly in light of the Snowden revelations.

Importantly, the bill protects civil liberties by putting a civilian agency with the Nation's most robust privacy and civil liberties office in charge of preventing personal information from being shared. While also prohibiting any new regulatory authority, this bill builds upon the groundwork already laid by industry and DHS to facilitate critical infrastructure protection and incidence response efforts.

This bipartisan bill, which is rare in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, is a product of 19 months of extensive outreach and great collaboration with all stakeholders, including more than 300 meetings with experts, industry, government agencies, academics, privacy advocates, and other committees of jurisdiction.

We went through several drafts and countless hours of negotiations to bring this commonsense legislation to the floor with support from all of the critical infrastructure sectors.

I will enter in the RECORD some of the letters of support, representing over 33 trade associations from across industry sectors, U.S. businesses, national security experts, and privacy and civil liberty advocates.

Specifically, we have received support letters from the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Chemistry Council, AT&T, Boeing, Con Edison, the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation, GridWise Alliance, and multiple trade associations in the energy sector and the financial services sector, Information Technology Industry Council, the Internet Security Alliance, Rapid7, National Defense Industrial Association, Professional Services Council, Oracle, Entergy, Pepco, Verizon, and Symantec.

I believe that is a very impressive showing on behalf of the privacy advocates and also the private sector.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
January 14, 2014.

Re H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013'' (NCCIP Act)

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL, Chairman,
Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON, Ranking Member,
Hon. PATRICK MEEHAN, Subcommittee Chairman,
Hon. YVETTE CLARKE, Subcommittee Ranking Member,
House Homeland Security Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), its over half a million members, countless additional supporters and activists, and 53 affiliates nationwide, we write in regard to H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013 (NCCIP Act). We have reviewed this legislation and have found that information sharing provisions in this bill do not undermine current privacy laws.

As we testified before the Committee last year, it is crucial that civilian agencies like the Department of Homeland Security lead domestic cybersecurity efforts and the NCCIP Act makes strides towards that end. The bill directs DHS to coordinate cybersecurity efforts among non-intelligence government agencies and critical infrastructure entities. The NCCIP Act smartly does that by focusing on coordination and information sharing within current law and leveraging existing structures that have proven successful in the past. Unlike H.R. 624, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA), your bill does not create broad exceptions to the privacy laws for cybersecurity. Instead, it strengthens private-public partnerships by supporting existing Information Sharing and Analysis Centers and Sector Coordinating Councils and reinforces voluntary sharing under current statutes that already provide for many cybersecurity scenarios.

We commend the Committee for advancing cyber legislation that is both pro-security and pro-privacy and we look forward to working with you further on this matter. Please contact Michelle Richardson, Legislative Counsel, at 202–715–0825 or mrichardson@aclu.org for more information.

Sincerely,

LAURA W. MURPHY,
Director,
MICHELLE RICHARDSON,
Legislative Counsel.

AMERICAN GAS ASSOCIATION, EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
January 8, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.
Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: We write to thank you and your colleagues for your outreach in drafting H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013'' (the ''NCCIP Act'').

Like you, we are very focused on protecting the nation's critical energy infrastructure from the impacts of a cyber event. While thankfully the nation has yet to experience a cyber attack that has damaged infrastructure, we appreciate that the House Committee on Homeland Security has taken the time and effort to craft legislation that attempts to help address the preparedness for and response to such events should they occur in the future.

The undersigned associations represent the vast majority of electric and gas utilities. We are proud of the efforts our members have undertaken, collectively and individually, to improve the reliability and resiliency of their systems. In the gas sector, this encompasses a variety of public, private and, jointly developed public-private sector cybersecurity standards designed to protect pipeline infrastructure and ensure safe and reliable gas delivery. In the electric sector, this includes mandatory and enforceable cybersecurity standards already in place. Developed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation for review and approval by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and applicable Canadian governmental authorities, these standards ensure that owners, users, and operators of the North American bulk electric system meet a baseline level of security.

Even considering those measures, the issue of liability after a cyber event creates serious concerns for us and our members. In particular, we are deeply concerned that no matter what steps are taken, our members could face costly and unnecessary litigation in state or federal courts after a cyber event that would serve no purpose.

Therefore, we applaud Section II of the NCCIP Act, specifically the section seeking to clarify the scope of the Support Anti-Terrorism By Fostering Effective Technologies Act of 2002 (the ''SAFETY Act''). The language of the SAFETY Act statute as well as its Final Rule have always made clear that the protections offered by the law applies to

cyber events, and indeed that the SAFETY Act applies regardless of whether a ''terrorist'' group conducted such an attack. However, in practice there has been some hesitancy on the part of industry to utilize the SAFETY Act to protect against federal claims arising out of cyber attacks due to the requirement that the attack be deemed an ''act of terrorism'' by the Secretary of Homeland Security before liability protections become available.

The decision to include in H.R. 3696 a provision that explicitly allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to declare that a ''qualifying cyber incident'' triggers the liability protections of the SAFETY Act is an excellent one. Removing the need to link a cyber attack to an ''act of terrorism'' is a good step. While state liability actions remain a concern, the industry and vendors of cyber security technologies and services will be much more likely to use the SAFETY Act program, thereby fulfilling the law's original intent of promoting the widespread deployment of products and services that can deter, defend against, respond to, mitigate, defeat, or otherwise mitigate a variety of malicious events, including those related to cyber security.

We share your goal of protecting the nation's critical infrastructure from cyber threats and appreciate your efforts to address this important national security issue. We look forward to continuing to work together to ensure H.R. 3696 remains focused on these principles as it moves through the legislative process.

Respectfully,

AMERICAN GAS ASSOCIATION,
AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE,
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

AT&T SERVICES, INC.,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: We applaud you and your staff for working so hard to update and streamline the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to address today's cyber security challenges. In your efforts to update the important role of the Department of Homeland Security within the national policy framework for critical infrastructure protection, you and your staff have actively listened to multiple stakeholder concerns to ensure that the best aspects of existing private public partnerships, which are the hallmark of our nation's efforts to address cyber threats, remain as such.

Your bill joins other important items introduced by your colleagues in the 113th Congress. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues to forge a bipartisan legislative framework for the practice of cybersecurity in the coming decade that encourages continued private sector investment in innovation and cyber education and provides legal clarity in the day-to-day operational world of identifying and addressing cyber threats in a globally interconnected network of networks.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY P. MCKONE.

JANUARY 13, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: The undersigned organizations, representing the financial services industry, appreciate your efforts to introduce H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act. We welcome your leadership in this crucial fight against cyber threats and your work in forging this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

While Congress considers much needed legislative action, our associations and the financial services industry have taken major steps to address the cybersecurity threats facing the Nation's critical infrastructure. The financial services sector continues to invest in our infrastructure, has improved coordination among institutions of all sizes, and is continually enhancing our partnerships with government.

H.R. 3696 recognizes the necessary partnership between the private and public sectors that is required to better protect our Nation's cybersecurity infrastructure. Among other provisions, this bill would strengthen existing mechanisms such as the Financial Services Sector Coordinating Council (FSSCC) and the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center (FS–ISAC) that help our sector identify threats, respond to cyber incidents and coordinate with government partners. These organizations work closely with partners throughout the government, including our sector specific agency, the Department of Treasury, as well as the Department of Homeland Security. Each agency has a civilian mission and plays a unique role in sector cybersecurity efforts and both work to strengthen the sector's understanding of the threat environment.

Additionally H.R. 3696 seeks to improve the provisioning of security clearances for those involved in cybersecurity information sharing. Your recognition that this is a system that demands improvement is strongly supported by our industry and we further encourage the expansion of this to specifically include individuals within critical infrastructure responsible for key aspects of network defense or mitigation. It is essential that all sizes of institutions within critical infrastructure receive access to classified threat information in a timely manner.

Finally, H.R. 3696 expands the existing Support Anti-Terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies Act (SAFETY Act) to provide important legal liability protections for providers and users of certified cybersecurity technology in the event of a qualified Cybersecurity incident. We urge Congress to work with the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that, should this provision be adopted, the expanded SAFETY Act is implemented in a manner that does not duplicate or conflict with existing regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or the evolving voluntary National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) Cybersecurity Framework. An expansion of the program must be coupled with additional funding to enable DHS to handle the increased scope of program and subsequent increase in applicants. Further, it is incumbent that an expansion enables DHS to streamline its SAFETY Act review and approval process so as not to discourage participation in the program.

Our sector has actively engaged in the implementation of Executive Order 13636 and the development by the National Institute of Standards and Technology of a Cybersecurity Framework. We believe the process outlined in H.R. 3696 should reflect the Framework developed through this cross-sector collaborative process.

Each of our organizations and respective member firms have made cybersecurity a top priority. We are committed to working with you as you lead in this crucial fight for cybersecurity of critical infrastructure.

American Bankers Association, The Clearing House, Consumer Bankers Association, Credit Union National Association (CUNA), Electronic Funds Transfer Association, Financial Services—Information Sharing and Analysis Center (FS–ISAC), Financial Services Roundtable, Independent Community Bankers Association (ICBA) Investment Company Institute, NACHA—The Electronic Payments Association, National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA).

Mr. MCCAUL. I want to give a great deal of thanks not only to the Members involved, but to the staff on this committee on both sides of the aisle who have worked countless hours to bring this bill to its fruition on the floor of the House.

I also would like to bring special attention to the endorsement from the ACLU. They refer to H.R. 3696 as ''both pro-security and pro-privacy.'' When have we heard these two coming together?

Striking a balance between security and privacy, I believe, is one of the most difficult challenges in developing cybersecurity legislation, and I am so very proud that this committee and this bill achieves that goal.

I want to close with the threat that I see out there from cyber. People ask me: What keeps you up at night? We can talk about al Qaeda, Mr. Putin, or ISIS in Iraq and Syria, we can talk about our border and the threats south of the border, but when I see our offensive capability and what we can do offensively, knowing at night that we don't have the defensive capability to stop attacks not only to steal things, not only criminal IP theft, not just espionage, but the power to shut things down and to bring this country to its knees with a cyber 9/11, Mr. Speaker, is really what keeps me up at night.

My father was a World War II bombardier on a B–17. He flew over 32 missions in Europe in support of the D-day invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. In his days, bombs won that war.

We have a new kind of warfare out there. It is a digital warfare, and the game has changed. It is done anonymously. There are no boundaries to this cyber threat any more. It can come from anywhere, at any time, without being able to attribute it back to the source from where the attack came from.

This bill will for the first time codify DHS' ability—and the NCCIC, which is their cyber command, to better defend and support critical infrastructure in the United States that we so heavily depend on, and it will ultimately protect not only our economy and our infrastructure, but ultimately protect the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation to protect America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014, and I am pleased to be here today as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

This bipartisan legislation gives the Department of Homeland Security the legislative authority it needs to carry out its cyber mission and to help protect our Nation's critical infrastructure from cyber attacks and intrusions.

The approach taken in this bill is very much in line with DHS' approach since 2007, when President Bush designated the Department as the lead Federal civilian agency for cybersecurity.

This is a dual mission. DHS is responsible for working with Federal civilian agencies to protect Federal IT networks and the dot-gov domain. At the same time, DHS is responsible for effectively partnering with the private sector to raise its level of cyber hygiene and foster greater cybersecurity.

I am pleased that H.R. 3696 authorizes the 247 operations of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, also referred to as NCCIC. The NCCIC has been the epicenter for information sharing about the activities of cyberterrorists and criminals and the reporting of cyber incidents by critical infrastructure owners and operators.

Additionally, the bill codifies ongoing efforts to raise the level of cybersecurity within critical infrastructure sectors. Specifically, it authorizes the development and implementation, in coordination with the private sector, of voluntary risk-based security standards.

This provision essentially codifies the process that the National Institute of Standards and Technology, also known as NIST, undertook pursuant to an executive order that President Obama issued in February of 2013.

Under the approach taken in this bill, we are asking business and government to come together to find an adaptable and cooperative cybersecurity framework, not an off-the-shelf or check-the-box solution, to raise the level of cybersecurity across the Nation.

I am pleased that the measured and targeted approach taken to working with the private sector was supported by the American Civil Liberties Union, which called our bill ''pro-security and pro-privacy.''

The President said it best:

> It is the policy of the United States to enhance the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure and to maintain a cyber environment that encourages efficiency, innovation, and economic prosperity while promoting safety, security, business confidentiality, privacy, and civil liberties.

While I am also pleased about all we do with respect to the Department's mission to work with the private sector on cybersecurity, I am a bit disappointed that key language that clarifies DHS' roles with respect to other Federal agencies and protection of the dot-gov domain is not in the bill before you today.

Unfortunately, the striking of these provisions appears to have been the price the Committee on Homeland Security had to pay to get this important legislation to the floor.

It seems that the provisions that would have given DHS specific authority to respond in a more timely manner to Federal network breaches were opposed by another committee chairman. Unfortunately, that chairman has willfully chosen to ignore reality.

The reality is that since 2008, DHS has assumed responsibility for working with agencies to protect the dot-gov domain, not the Office of Management and Budget.

It is my hope that, as this legislation moves through the legislative process, there will be progress on efforts to ensure that the law reflects this reality.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3696, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, who has spent, I must say, countless hours advancing this bill, meeting with the private sector and privacy groups to get to this point where we are today.

I want to commend you, sir, for a job well done.

Mr. MEEHAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.

Before I really talk about the substance, I want to associate myself for a moment with the comments and very effective commentary of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), but his closing, I think, really summed it up. It is not just what we are doing; but why does this matter? Why does this matter now?

We have generated tremendous economic prosperity by virtue of the creation of a global Internet, but the fact of the matter is that while this has closed our world and enabled instantaneous communications and other kinds of benefits, it has also created a situation, for the first time in the history of our Nation, in which we aren't protected by two oceans and, effectively, two friendly countries on our borders. Now, we are able to be accessed from anywhere in the world at a moment's notice.

It was instructive to me that I often used to say, when we were handling a case, that you let the evidence be put in through the words of the witnesses. If you pay attention to the words of the witness, that is more powerful than what you can say.

It is instructive to me that the first thing former CIA Director and former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta did when he stepped down as Secretary of Defense was to travel to New York and warn not just New York, but this Nation about the potential impact of what he termed a ''cyber Pearl Harbor.''

As a result, this is a critically important and timely issue that we are working on. As importantly, it has been addressed in an effective bipartisan fashion.

In the wake of more aggressive and escalating cyber attacks on our Nation's critical infrastructure, including our financial systems, NASDAQ, and the recent Neiman Marcus and Target breaches of Americans' personal information, we bring H.R. 3696 to the House floor.

□ 1700

Cyber attacks and cyber hacks are now front and center in our homeland, and the media is reporting more now than ever on what cyber targets already know—that the threat is constant and evolving.

Americans expect Congress to act.

We who serve in Congress and government know all too well that the cyber threat is real and imminent and can do catastrophic damage and destruction to the critical infrastructure of our Nation—our bridges, tunnels, oil and gas pipelines, water systems, financial systems and their markets, air traffic control systems, and more. Today, the U.S. House of Representatives takes a significant step forward in protecting and securing cyberspace through the cyber infrastructure act that we have put on the floor today.

I am very proud of this bill and of all of the good work and due diligence that went into it. Chairman MCCAUL and I and our staffs held over 300 stakeholder meetings to ensure we got this legislation right.

I want to thank as well my good friends on the other side of the aisle—Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON and subcommittee Ranking Member YVETTE CLARKE—for their leadership and their work collectively on this.

This is bipartisan legislation but not just amongst those of us working together here within the House. As the chairman identified, it has also been supported by private sector stakeholders, by the ACLU. In fact, the ACLU has called it—and the chairman as well—pro-security and pro-privacy. That is because, very notably, this bill puts the Department of Homeland Security, a civilian agency with the Nation's first-created and most robust privacy office, in charge of preventing personal information from getting inadvertently caught in the net, which is a big, important part of the work that has been done here.

This bill builds upon the Department of Homeland Security's unique public-private partnership in securing the Nation's critical infrastructure, and it codifies the Department's critical cybersecurity mission. Public-private is important, as 90 percent of the assets in the cyber world are in the private sector. The Department of Homeland Security works with the other Federal Government partners in a collaborative effort to secure our Nation against cyber attacks, and this bill cements DHS' critical role.

Specifically, this bill requires the Department to collaborate with industry to facilitate both the protection of our infrastructure and our response to a cyber attack. The bill, very importantly, strengthens DHS' civilian, transparent interface to allow real-time cyber threat sharing across the critical infrastructure sectors. This legislation also strengthens the integrity of our Nation's information systems, and it makes it more difficult for online hackers to compromise consumer and personal information, like we saw in Target, and it prevents hackers from stealing Americans' business and intellectual property—another point well driven home by the chairman in talking about jobs and of the hundreds of billions of dollars in research and development that are stolen from America by virtue of these cyber attacks.

The ability of these attacks to take place at the level of sophistication necessary to penetrate some of the world's most mature networks should come as no surprise. Foreign adversaries, including China, Iran, and Russian criminal enterprises, have spent years and have invested billions of dollars into crafting and securing the tools and intelligence necessary to target American citizens. Whether it is the theft of wealth or intelligence or that of launching a malicious attack on our Nation's energy, transportation, or chemical networks, American lives and livelihoods remain at risk without sufficient security.

Last year, President Obama issued an executive order on cybersecurity because Congress failed to act on this issue, but the threshold of securing our Nation in the 21st century cannot rely on executive orders and Presidential directives. As Members of Congress, we have the responsibility to act in a way that best protects the American citizens. Our enemies live and breathe to catch us asleep at the switch, and I am unwilling, as my colleagues are, to stand by, speechless, when they are asked, What did you do to prevent a cyber attack? Now is the time to show them what we have and what we can do.

This bill doesn't address every issue in cybersecurity, and it is not a comprehensive cybersecurity fix, but it is a giant and critical step forward. Together, we can unite our Nation against those who wish to do us harm, and I have no doubt that we can get it done. In fact, we have no other choice. I urge the support of H.R. 3696.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I believe the gentlewoman from New York has a few additional speakers, so I am prepared to close once the gentlewoman does.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act.

In October of 2012, Hurricane Sandy wreaked havoc up and down the east coast, including in my home State of New Jersey. According to the Department of Energy, between 2003 and 2012, close to 700 power outages occurred due to weather-related events, costing the Nation an annual average of $18 billion to $33 billion. Even worse, in 2012, Hurricane Sandy carried an estimated price tag of between $40 billion and $52 billion, and as we have seen recently, our power systems are exposed to cyber attacks more than ever before.

Disasters, whether manmade or by Mother Nature, are a drain on our Nation's economy and expose us to other potentially more harmful attacks on our financial industry, water and waste systems, chemical, telecommunications, and energy sectors. Put simply, it is clear that our electric grid needs an upgrade. That is why I am pleased that, during the committee process, the committee unanimously supported my amendment, H.R. 2962, the SMART Grid Study Act.

The study will be conducted by the National Research Council in full cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security and other government agencies as necessary, and will provide a comprehensive assessment of actions necessary to expand and strengthen the capabilities of the electric grid to prepare for, respond to, mitigate, and recover from a natural disaster or a cyber attack. Further, it was supported by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the Demand Response and Smart Grid Coalition, and the American Public Power Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, Chairman MEEHAN, and Ranking Member CLARKE for really showing us what a bipartisan effort is all about. At Homeland Security, we all have a common goal, which is to keep the homeland and the Nation safe. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the cochair of the House Cybersecurity Caucus.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3696, H.R. 2952, and H.R. 3107.

I want to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON, Chairman MEEHAN, and Ranking Member CLARKE for their hard work in bringing these bills to the floor today.

Most especially and in particular, I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL, the chairman of the full Homeland Security Committee, who also serves with me as a founder and a cochair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus. I want to thank him for his dedication to bringing these bills to the floor today and for his commitment to enacting strong cybersecurity legislation. In today's political climate, moving significant reform in a consensus manner is exceptionally difficult, and this success reflects Chairman MCCAUL's bipartisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that we depend on cyberspace and the Internet every day. It is vitally important to the American people. It is an inseparable part of our everyday lives. It is in everything that we do—vital to everything from banking to national security—but it is also highly contested. Unfortunately, the pace of the threats is ever-increasing. We see them every day, whether it is the theft of personal information or of credit card information that is used for criminal intent or whether it is the theft of intellectual property that costs America its competitiveness and jobs. We also know of the threats to our critical infrastructure in particular, both to our electric grid and to our financial system—things that I have been calling attention to for years now.

We must tap into our creative and innovative spirit to address today's challenges and position ourselves to be agile in the face of both today's threats as well as tomorrow's. I believe that the three bills that are before us today,

in conjunction with the information sharing and other measures passed by this House earlier in this Congress, will help to enable a better future for our Nation's cyberspace capabilities.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that we will never be 100 percent secure in cyberspace. It is an ever-evolving and moving threat, and we will never be 100 percent secure. Yet I do know this: that we can close that aperture of vulnerability down to something that is much more manageable, and I urge my colleagues to support the bills that are before us today.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership, and I strongly urge the support of these three bills.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. If the gentleman from Texas has no more speakers, then, in closing, I urge the passage of H.R. 3696. It is legislation that will enhance DHS' ability to execute its cybersecurity mission. I am particularly pleased that it includes language that I authored to help ensure that DHS has the cyber workforce it needs to execute that mission.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as the subcommittee chair, Mr. MEEHAN, for their leadership and their vision, and for their understanding that this is something that keeps us up at night, that this is something that this body must move forward to address—that this is a 21st century threat for which we cannot sit idly by and do nothing about. Their leadership on H.R. 3696 and on the suite of cyber legislation on the floor today speaks volumes to moving us in the right direction.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 3696, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me echo the sentiments of the gentlewoman from New York.

I want to thank you and Mr. MEEHAN for your work on this bill. You are truly the workhorses—the engines—behind this bill, and I want to thank you for helping us get to this point where we are today.

Congressman LANGEVIN, we were talking about cybersecurity before it was cool to talk about cybersecurity.

Forming the Cybersecurity Caucus, I think, raises awareness of Members of Congress about how important this issue really is, because, I think, when you talk about this issue, Mr. Speaker, people's eyes tend to glaze over. They don't understand how important this is in protecting the American people.

This is a national security bill. I don't believe partisan politics has a place in that. I was at The Aspen Institute with Jane Harman, who served on our committee and on the Intelligence Committee for many years, who also believes that our adversaries don't care whether we are Democrat or Republican. They care about the fact that we are Americans, and they want to hit us. We have adversaries who want to hit us—China, Russia, Iran, and countless others—in the cybersecurity space.

This is a pro-security and pro-privacy bill. I had a reporter ask me, How could you possibly get the ACLU to agree on any security bill? It protects Americans' privacy but also their security through the private civilian interface to the private sector, and that is how we do it. It is not through the military. The NSA has a foreign intelligence role, and the DHS has a domestic critical infrastructure role. Of course, Director Alexander called cybersecurity and what has happened in recent years the largest transfer of wealth in history.

□ 1715

So when the American people say: Why is this so important; the largest transfer of wealth in American history? Why is this so important? Because cyber can bring down things, can shut down things in a 9/11 style.

We have a historical moment in this Congress to pass the first cybersecurity bill through the House and Senate and be signed into law in the history of the Congress. As this bill passes—I hope, in a few minutes—and we send it over to the Senate, I hope our colleagues on the Senate side will respond to this.

They have made great progress on the Senate side in getting work done on cybersecurity. We have a unique opportunity and a great moment here to pass this bill out of the House, get it married with the Senate bill in a bipartisan way to protect the American people, and get it signed into law by the President, something that we very rarely have seen in this Congress. So I think it is a very historic moment.

To close, Mr. Speaker, when 9/11 happened, a lot of people did a lot of finger pointing around here and pointed to Members of Congress and to the executive branch and said: What did you do to stop this? What did you do to stop this?

We had a 9/11 Commission that pointed out all the vulnerabilities and the things that we didn't do as Members of Congress. I don't want that to happen again today. I want to be able to say, Mr. Speaker, if, God forbid, we get hit, and we get hit hard in a cyber attack against the United States of America, that we as Members of Congress and members of this committee did everything within our power to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the great work we have done together. I look forward to the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 24, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013.'' The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I will waive further consideration of this bill in Committee, notwithstanding any provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. This waiver, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as waiving, reducing, or affecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

This waiver is also given with the understanding that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee for conferees on H.R. 3696 as well as any similar or related legislation.

I ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the report on H.R. 3696 and also be placed in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 24, 2014.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.'' I acknowledge your Committee's jurisdictional interest in this legislation and agree that by forgoing a sequential referral on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on H.R. 3696 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving H.R. 3696 or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include your letter and this response in the report accompanying H.R. 3696 as well as the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology as H.R. 3696 moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013,'' which your Committee reported on February 5, 2014.

H.R. 3696 contains provisions within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee, and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill, contingent on the removal of subsection (h) ''Protection of Federal Civilian Information Systems,'' (beginning at line 17 of page 23 of the reported version). This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on the Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013.'' I acknowledge that by foregoing further action on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. Moving forward, subsection (h), referred to in your letter, will be removed from H.R. 3696 prior to consideration on the House floor. As you have requested, I would support your effort to seek an appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include your letter and this response in the report accompanying H.R. 3696 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as H.R. 3696 moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.'' As you are aware, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Homeland Security, but the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a jurisdictional interest in the bill and has requested a sequential referral.

However, given your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, I will not insist on a sequential referral of H.R. 3696. I do so with the understanding that, by foregoing such a referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters, and the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 3696 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.'' I acknowledge that by foregoing a sequential referral on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Energy and Commerce with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek an appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce as H.R. 3696 moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3696, the National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership on the protection of our nation's critical infrastructure.

Several Jackson Lee amendments were included in the H.R. 3696, the ''National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2014.''

I submit to the committee for its consideration the following five amendments that would:

Identify the best methods for developing exercise to challenge the security measures taken to protect critical infrastructure from cyber attacks or incidents;

Assure efforts to conduct outreach to education institutions to promote cybersecurity awareness;

Provide better coordination for cyber incident emergency response and recovery;

Explore the benefits of establishing a visiting scholars program; and

Prioritized response efforts to aid in recovery of critical infrastructure from cyber incidents.

The Jackson Lee amendments improved H.R. 3696:

The first Jackson Lee amendment supports discussions among stakeholders on the best methods of developing innovative cybersecurity exercises for coordinating between the Department and each of the critical infrastructure sectors designated under section 227.

The second Jackson Lee amendment directs the Secretary to conduct outreach to universities, which shall include historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic serving institutions, Native American colleges and institutions serving persons with disabilities to promote cybersecurity awareness.

The third Jackson Lee amendment directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to make available Department contact information to serve as a resource for Sector Coordinating Councils and critical infrastructure owners and critical infrastructure operators to better coordinate cybersecurity efforts with the agency related to emergency response and recovery efforts for cyber incidents.

The fourth Jackson Lee amendment directs the Department of Homeland Security to determine the feasibility and potential benefit of developing a visiting security researchers program from academia, including cybersecurity scholars at the Department of Homeland Security's Centers of Excellence.

The fifth Jackson Lee amendment directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to collaborate with Sector Coordinating Councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, Sector Specific Agencies, and relevant critical infrastructure sectors on the development of prioritized response efforts, if necessary, to support the defense and recovery of critical infrastructure from cyber incidents.

Global dependence on the Internet and particularly the interconnected nature of the cyber-space makes cyber security a very difficult public policy challenge, but H.R. 3696 is making a significant step forward in addressing cyber security threats.

Cyber thieves work around the clock to probe and breach computer systems resulting in the largest unlawful transfer of wealth in history.

H.R. 3696 emphases on public/private partnerships and information sharing is a critically important first step in combating illegal, damaging and expensive data breaches. This legislation already addresses many useful and essential cybersecurity tools and initiatives such as: enhanced education, increased research, information sharing, data breach security and technical assistance strategies.

H.R. 3639 will allow the Department of Homeland Security to partner with and support the efforts of critical infrastructure owners and operators to secure their facilities and guide the agency in its work to create resources to support the global mission of infrastructure protection, which is vital to the nation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3696.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today as an original cosponsor of this legislation, the National Cyber Security and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act.

This bipartisan legislation gives the Department of Homeland Security Congressional Authority to more fully carry out its civilian cyber mission, and to increase protection for our national critical infrastructure.

Importantly, this legislation also gives the Committee on Homeland Security a robust oversight position to make sure the Department carries out an innovative and cooperative relationship with industry, to protect the nation's privately owned critical infrastructure.

By giving DHS specific civilian authorities, it codifies what the President has already set into motion with his Cyber Executive Order 13636, issued in February of 2013, but Executive Authority goes only so far, and the President has said that his efforts cannot take the place Congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, we have stepped up to the plate. The legislation that Mr. MCCAUL and I worked on together, directs Federal agencies and private industry to coordinate the development and implementation of voluntary risk-based security standards, and codifies the ongoing process that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and private industry have taken on.

We are asking that business and government find an adaptable and cooperative cyber security framework, for both government and private companies, not an off-the-shelf, or check-the-box solution.

We must depend on strong private sector leadership and accountability to focus on our nation's most pressing cyber vulnerabilities, protecting critical systems that when disrupted could cause catastrophic damage to our citizens. I believe this legislation will allow that process to move forward.

The President said it best, "It is the policy of the United States to enhance the security and resilience of the Nation's critical infrastructure and to maintain a cyber environment that encourages efficiency, innovation, and economic prosperity while promoting safety, security, business confidentiality, privacy and civil liberties."

Critical infrastructure provides the essential services that underpin American society, and I suggest that the owners and operators of America's critical infrastructure are in a unique position to manage their own business risks with the help of civilian government agencies, to develop operational approaches that can make our critical infrastructure protected and durable.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked long and hard with the chairman to hammer out privacy and liability concerns held by myself, and many others, on both sides of the aisle.

There are no broad exceptions to the current privacy laws in this legislation, and it focuses on information sharing using existing structures. In fact, the ACLU commended the construction of this legislation by saying, ". . . it is both pro-security and pro-privacy . . ."

We still have much work to do to achieve a higher level of cyber security in this country, and internationally.

We must approach the cyber threat arena in a way that is consistent with traditional American values, and by leading on the issue of respecting personal privacy in the efforts to achieve cyber security, we must continue to respect the safeguards for our constitutional right of freedom of speech.

The wrong way is to assume that we must cede all of our personal privacy and freedoms to remain safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3696, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2952) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2952

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013'' or the ''CIRDA Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (18) as paragraphs (16) through (19), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

''(15) The term 'Sector Coordinating Council' means a private sector coordinating council that is—

''(A) recognized by the Secretary as such a Council for purposes of this Act; and

''(B) comprised of representatives of owners and operators of critical infrastructure within a particular sector of critical infrastructure.''.

SEC. 3. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) STRATEGIC PLAN; PUBLIC-PRIVATE CONSORTIUMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 318. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall transmit to Congress a strategic plan to guide the overall direction of Federal physical security and cybersecurity technology research and development efforts for protecting critical infrastructure, including against all threats. Once every 2 years after the initial strategic plan is transmitted to Congress under this section, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress an update of the plan.

''(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The strategic plan shall include the following:

''(1) An identification of critical infrastructure security risks and any associated security technology gaps, that are developed following—

''(A) consultation with stakeholders, including the Sector Coordinating Councils; and

''(B) performance by the Department of a risk/gap analysis that considers information received in such consultations.

''(2) A set of critical infrastructure security technology needs that—

''(A) is prioritized based on risk and gaps identified under paragraph (1);

''(B) emphasizes research and development of those technologies that need to be accelerated due to rapidly evolving threats or rapidly advancing infrastructure technology; and

''(C) includes research, development, and acquisition roadmaps with clearly defined objectives, goals, and measures.

''(3) An identification of laboratories, facilities, modeling, and simulation capabilities that will be required to support the research, development, demonstration, testing, evaluation, and acquisition of the security technologies described in paragraph (2).

''(4) An identification of current and planned programmatic initiatives for fostering the rapid advancement and deployment of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection. The initiatives shall consider opportunities for public-private partnerships, intragovernment collaboration, university centers of excellence, and national laboratory technology transfer.

''(5) A description of progress made with respect to each critical infrastructure security risk, associated security technology gap, and critical infrastructure technology need identified in the preceding strategic plan transmitted under this section.

''(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate with the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall consult with—

''(1) the critical infrastructure Sector Coordinating Councils;

''(2) to the extent practicable, subject matter experts on critical infrastructure protection from universities, colleges, including historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic- serving institutions, and tribal colleges and universities, national laboratories, and private industry;

''(3) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies that conduct research and development for critical infrastructure protection; and

''(4) State, local, and tribal governments as appropriate.

''SEC. 319. REPORT ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology,

shall transmit to Congress a report on the Department's utilization of public-private research and development consortiums for accelerating technology development for critical infrastructure protection. Once every 2 years after the initial report is transmitted to Congress under this section, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress an update of the report. The report shall focus on those aspects of critical infrastructure protection that are predominately operated by the private sector and that would most benefit from rapid security technology advancement.

''(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall include—

''(1) a summary of the progress and accomplishments of on-going consortiums for critical infrastructure security technologies;

''(2) in consultation with the Sector Coordinating Councils and, to the extent practicable, in consultation with subject-matter experts on critical infrastructure protection from universities, colleges, including historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges and universities, national laboratories, and private industry, a prioritized list of technology development focus areas that would most benefit from a public-private research and development consortium; and

''(3) based on the prioritized list developed under paragraph (2), a proposal for implementing an expanded research and development consortium program, including an assessment of feasibility and an estimate of cost, schedule, and milestones.''.

(2) LIMITATION ON PROGRESS REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (b)(5) of section 318 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall not apply with respect to the first strategic plan transmitted under that section.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such title the following:

''Sec. 318. Research and development strategy for critical infrastructure protection.

''Sec. 319. Report on public-private research and development consortiums.''.

(c) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY CLEARINGHOUSE.—Section 313 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 193) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY CLEARINGHOUSE.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—Under the program required by this section, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, and in coordination with the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, shall designate a technology clearinghouse for rapidly sharing proven technology solutions for protecting critical infrastructure.

''(2) SHARING OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS.—Technology solutions shared through the clearinghouse shall draw from Government-furnished, commercially furnished, and publically available trusted sources.

''(3) TECHNOLOGY METRICS.—All technologies shared through the clearinghouse shall include a set of performance and readiness metrics to assist end-users in deploying effective and timely solutions relevant for their critical infrastructures.

''(4) REVIEW BY PRIVACY OFFICER.—The Privacy Officer of the Department appointed under section 222 shall annually review the clearinghouse process to evaluate its consistency with fair information practice principles issued by the Privacy Officer.''.

(d) EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGY CLEARINGHOUSE BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent evaluation of, and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on, the effectiveness of the clearinghouses established and designated, respectively, under section 313 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by this section.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2952, the Critical Infrastructure Research Development Advancement, or what we call the CIRDA, Act.

This legislation was passed out of full committee with unanimous bipartisan support, and I would like to thank my good friend, the ranking member on the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Committee, Ms. CLARKE, for cosponsoring and supporting this legislation.

One of the committee's most important duties is to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure. The CIRDA Act will change the way the Department of Homeland Security develops protections for critical infrastructure by creating and facilitating access to new and existing technologies.

Currently, there are barriers within the Department that inhibit strategizing for and, ultimately, the purchasing of the best tools that our country has to offer. The CIRDA Act will direct DHS to facilitate the development of a research and development strategy for critical infrastructure security technologies as well as explore the feasibility of expanding use of public-private R&D consortiums.

Our Nation must have access to new security technologies, and a public-private partnership can help spur innovation and economic competitiveness for entities that protect our Nation's defense systems, essential networks, Americans' financial information, chemical facilities, and the many other areas of our economy that are vital for the protection and confidence of Americans and our way of life.

This is critically important, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact of the nature, when we are dealing with cyber, what we are dealing with is not just the ability of what we can do today to create a defense, but the recognition of those on the other side who are looking to try to exploit our defenses. It is a constant chess game that is taking place.

Whatever we are able to do, immediately somebody is looking for a way to try to get around those protections and compromise them. As a result, we have to be able to have the best capacity, generated either in the private sector or in the government sector, and the ability to get those best protections to the places where they need to be the quickest and the most efficiently.

Finally, the legislation will designate a ''Technology Clearinghouse,'' where proven security tools can be rapidly shared among government and private partners. Keeping pace with the rapidly evolving variables of the threat to our Nation and the technological achievements only enhances our ability to combat attacks to the U.S.' critical infrastructure.

I urge support for the CIRDA Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013.'' The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I will waive further consideration of this bill in Committee, notwithstanding any provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. This waiver, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as waiving, reducing, or affecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

This waiver is also given with the understanding that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will be added as a recipient of the report required to be provided by the General Accounting Office in Section 3 of the bill.

Additionally, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-

Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee for conferees on H.R. 2952 as well as any similar or related legislation.

I ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the report on H.R. 2952 and also be placed in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Act of 2013.'' I acknowledge that by forgoing a sequential referral on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation. In addition, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will be added as a recipient of the report provided by the General Accountability Office, required by Section 3 of this legislation, in the final version of text voted on by the full House.

Finally, I will include your letter and this response in the report accompanying H.R. 2952 as well as the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2952, the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), the chairman of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, for introducing this very vital legislation. I appreciate him working with me and the rest of the committee to bring a thoughtful and bipartisan bill to the floor today.

In May, the Department of Justice released the names of five members of the Chinese People's Liberation Army that are suspected of carrying out cyber attacks against American companies for over 8 years. These indictments underscore the significant cyber vulnerabilities that the Department of Homeland Security works to identify and to thwart.

Some of the Department's most important efforts are targeted at protecting our critical infrastructure systems, such as communication systems and the electric grid. These systems have complex technological components that Americans expect will function without a glitch.

To carry out this mission, DHS is constantly researching and developing new technologies and defenses to help protect our infrastructure. This R&D is extremely important to the safety of American infrastructure.

At the same time, Congress must do proper oversight to ensure that it is done in an effective and efficient and focused way. That is why I cosponsored this act, which requires DHS to have a research and development strategy for critical infrastructure protection. This strategy is to be focused on identifying the most immediate threats and then developing a comprehensive set of initiatives to address them. It directs DHS to employ public-private partnerships, intragovernmental collaboration, University Centers for Excellence, and national laboratory technology transfers to make sure that DHS is working with state-of-the-art researchers and facilities. This strategy will help DHS keep ahead of the rapidly evolving cybersecurity attack that we hear about each and every day.

I am confident that, with the focused measures set forth in this bill and increased attention to the importance of science and technology in our antiterrorism efforts, we can be better equipped to defend America's critical infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, cyberterrorists and cyber criminals are constantly innovating. We must do more to protect against these threats and foster great resilience of critical infrastructure networks to such threats. H.R. 2952 will make sure that we fight the new threats of this era with the most advanced technology solutions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2952, the CIRDA Act, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) for making it possible for us to have this on the floor today and to bring this new piece of legislation to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express as well, as I close, once again, my appreciation for the tremendous collaborative working relationship with my colleague, Ms. CLARKE, and her staff and the staffs from both committees who have worked extensively to put these bills in the position that they have.

It is a joy to be part of something here in this Congress in a bipartisan fashion, in which people are working together to solve problems that challenge us all.

In my closing, I will include in the RECORD a letter in support of H.R. 2952 that is written by the Security Industry Association. These are the folks that represent over 470 suppliers of electronic physical security and other kinds of solutions.

SECURITY INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
September 12, 2013.

Hon. PAT MEEHAN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MEEHAN: The Security Industry Association (SIA) would like to express its strong support for H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Act of 2013'' (CIRDA). SIA represents more than 470 suppliers of electronic physical security solutions and countless technology leaders who design and install the security systems that protect millions of Americans each day in our nation's cities and towns, schools, factories, government buildings, transportation systems, ports, and other components of critical infrastructure. Owners and operators of these facilities work closely with SIA members as trusted advisors to ensure that cutting edge security technology solutions are adopted to prevent crime and terrorist attack.

SIA believes the CIRDA legislation will help the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) set clear and measureable R&D priorities that will accelerate the development of cutting-edge security technologies to protect critical infrastructure. More specifically, we strongly support the provision of H.R. 2952 that will require the development of a R&D strategy by the DHS Science and Technology Directorate that draws upon the expertise of Sector Coordinating Councils to identify security risks and technology gaps. With this essential information, DHS will be in a better position to communicate with the private sector about the security technologies that are most needed to prevent emerging threats to our homeland. SIA is pleased to serve on the Emergency Services Sector Coordinating Council and would be pleased to identify Subject Matter Experts from our membership to contribute to the development of this proposed R&D strategy and the Critical Infrastructure Protection Technology Clearinghouse provided for in your legislation.

Thank you for your leadership in introducing this important piece of legislation. SIA appreciates the priority this legislation places upon public-private partnerships and we look forward to working with you to ensure swift passage of CIRDA this year.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. ERICKSON,
Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. MEEHAN. The essence of what this is is the recognition by those who are in the industry that the Department of Homeland Security needs to be able to set clear and measurable R&D priorities that will accelerate the development of cutting-edge security technologies to protect the critical infrastructure.

When we are out there so frequently, what we hear from people is the concern: I have been attacked. What do I do to protect myself? And they turn to the Department of Homeland Security for advice.

As I said at an earlier point, the reality is that, while the responsibility

rests with the Department and in the government to be able to facilitate the protection of the homeland and our assets, the reality is that 90 percent of these assets are placed within the private sector, and it is, in fact, there where much of, as much of, in fact, maybe some of the most pioneering research and development is accomplished.

One of the other realities we face, and I think the gentlelady pointed to it so well, this concept of innovation, when we often think of innovation in a positive way. It usually is a positive thing. It means somebody is always thinking of a new and better way to accomplish a task.

But criminals do that, too, and so do those who want to do us harm; and no matter how good our protections are, there is the reality that somebody else, the moment that it goes online, is looking for a way to get around it. That means that we have to have the capacity to have the ability to work quickly and effectively; then, once those who are in a position to know what is best, to be able to communicate down the line. So not just the big company that is situated someplace in New York City, but the small manufacturer in the middle of Kansas who is still worried about their R&D, can have access to the same kinds of protections.

This bill allows that kind of collaboration to take place, working through the clearinghouse in the Department of Homeland Security. That is why I think it is so important that we take this step forward. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2952, the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013, sponsored by Chairman MEEHAN.

This legislation is vital in our nation's efforts to protect our critical infrastructure from attacks. The Department of Homeland Security has identified 16 sectors of the U.S. economy so vital, that disruption or destruction would result in catastrophic life-threatening or life-altering challenges. The CIRDA Act will assist the Department by encouraging the development and procurement of new technologies aimed at infrastructure protection.

I thank Chairman MEEHAN for his efforts in crafting thoughtful legislation that will enhance DHS' research and development tools, streamline its public-private coordination efforts, while ensuring that technological and product solutions are shared between the Department and its private sector partners.

This bill is a bipartisan effort that was passed out of both subcommittee and full committee by voice vote, and I thank the subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member for their work.

I urge support for H.R. 2952.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act.''

H.R. 2952 requires the Department to have a well-developed Research and Development strategy to work in targeted ways to advance cybersecurity, particularly within the critical infrastructure sector.

Keeping pace with cybercriminals, hackers, and others who seek to exploit vulnerabilities in critical IT networks is a major challenge for the Federal government and its partners in the private sector.

Americans take for granted that when they flip a switch, their lights will come on, when they pick up a phone, there will be a ringtone and when they pick up their Smartphone, they will have a signal.

The reliability and functioning of these systems is dependent on computer systems, often Internet-based systems.

Recently, we have seen the damage that can be done when systems are breached. The database breach at Target, a major retailer, involved 70 million stolen records, which affected over a hundred million people.

The true cost of these kinds of breaches is almost unknowable because of the complexity of the crimes, and the sometimes-untraceable use of the stolen information.

What we do know is that hackers are breaching the networks of large corporate companies, gaining access to proprietary industry information, as well as consumer data.

The Department of Homeland Security is the lead Federal agency responsible for researching and developing more advanced and effective cybersecurity technologies to defend Americans from such attacks.

The legislation before us today creates a technology clearinghouse to help promote partnerships with laboratories and universities throughout the Nation for research on how to enhance not only the cyber but the physical of critical infrastructure.

I am pleased that it directs DHS to seek out new ways to better collaboration with its Centers of Excellence on this research.

I am confident that the teams at Jackson State University and Tougaloo College in Mississippi, which are part of the Centers of Excellence network, can make valuable contributions to this effort.

On a bipartisan basis, this Committee has developed a record for championing homeland security research and development while, at the same time, demanding accountability of DHS to ensure solid decision-making drives the expenditure of limited R&D dollars.

I urge my fellow colleagues to support H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013''.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2952, a bill that will create a research and development strategy for critical infrastructure security technologies to protect critical American infrastructure from physical and cyber-attacks.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I believe that the technology and protection of our critical infrastructure falls short in addressing the cyber-attacks we face on a daily basis.

We are in dire need of new security technologies to keep pace with rapidly evolving threats and the rapid advancement of the infrastructure itself.

This bill requires the Homeland Security Department to facilitate the development of a research and development (R&D) strategy for critical infrastructure security technologies.

The measure requires the Homeland Security Department, within 180 days of enactment and every two years thereafter, to submit to Congress a strategic plan for research and development efforts addressing the protection of critical infrastructure.

The plan must identify critical infrastructure security risks and any associated security technology gaps

The department also must submit a report to Congress, within 180 days of enactment and every two years thereafter, on departmental use of public-private consortiums to develop technology to protect such infrastructure.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the bill would cost less than $500,000 annually in 2014 and 2015, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local or tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of this bill is a small price to pay for the increased security and safety it will provide once it has been successfully implemented.

In closing, I would like to state that I have always advocated for strengthening our Department of Homeland Security and giving the department the proper tools to protect our country.

It is important that we continue to help support the agencies that protect us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2952, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY BOOTS-ON-THE-GROUND ACT

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3107) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 226. CYBERSECURITY OCCUPATION CATEGORIES, WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT, AND STRATEGY.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the 'Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act'.

''(b) CYBERSECURITY OCCUPATION CATEGORIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop and issue comprehensive occupation categories for individuals performing activities in furtherance of the cybersecurity mission of the Department.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the comprehensive occupation categories issued under paragraph (1) are used throughout the Department and are made available to other Federal agencies.

''(c) CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall assess the readiness and capacity of the workforce of the Department to meet its cybersecurity mission.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum, include the following:

''(A) Information where cybersecurity positions are located within the Department, specified in accordance with the cybersecurity occupation categories issued under subsection (b).

''(B) Information on which cybersecurity positions are—

''(i) performed by—

''(I) permanent full time departmental employees, together with demographic information about such employees' race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and veterans status;

''(II) individuals employed by independent contractors; and

''(III) individuals employed by other Federal agencies, including the National Security Agency; and

''(ii) vacant.

''(C) The number of individuals hired by the Department pursuant to the authority granted to the Secretary in 2009 to permit the Secretary to fill 1,000 cybersecurity positions across the Department over a three year period, and information on what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the implementation of such authority.

''(D) Information on vacancies within the Department's cybersecurity supervisory workforce, from first line supervisory positions through senior departmental cybersecurity positions.

''(E) Information on the percentage of individuals within each cybersecurity occupation category who received essential training to perform their jobs, and in cases in which such training is not received, information on what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the provision of such training.

''(F) Information on recruiting costs incurred with respect to efforts to fill cybersecurity positions across the Department in a manner that allows for tracking of overall recruiting and identifying areas for better coordination and leveraging of resources within the Department.

''(d) WORKFORCE STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop, maintain, and, as necessary, update, a comprehensive workforce strategy that enhances the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the cybersecurity workforce of the Department.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The comprehensive workforce strategy developed under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a multiphased recruitment plan, including relating to experienced professionals, members of disadvantaged or underserved communities, the unemployed, and veterans;

''(B) a 5-year implementation plan;

''(C) a 10-year projection of the Department's cybersecurity workforce needs; and

''(D) obstacles impeding the hiring and development of a cybersecurity workforce at the Department.

''(e) INFORMATION SECURITY TRAINING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a process to verify on an ongoing basis that individuals employed by independent contractors who serve in cybersecurity positions at the Department receive initial and recurrent information security training comprised of general security awareness training necessary to perform their job functions, and role-based security training that is commensurate with assigned responsibilities. The Secretary shall maintain documentation to ensure that training provided to an individual under this subsection meets or exceeds requirements for such individual's job function.

''(f) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees annual updates regarding the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (c), information on the progress of carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subsection (d), and information on the status of the implementation of the information security training required under subsection (e).

''(g) GAO STUDY.—The Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General of the United States with information on the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (c) and progress on carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subsection (d). The Comptroller General shall submit to the Secretary and the appropriate congressional committees a study on such assessment and strategy.

''(h) CYBERSECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the feasibility of establishing a Cybersecurity Fellowship Program to offer a tuition payment plan for undergraduate and doctoral candidates who agree to work for the Department for an agreed-upon period of time.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 225 the following new item:

''Sec. 226. Cybersecurity occupation categories, workforce assessment, and strategy.''.

SEC. 2. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 1 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 227. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may exercise with respect to qualified employees of the Department the same authority that the Secretary of Defense has with respect to civilian intelligence personnel and the scholarship program under sections 1601, 1602, 1603, and 2200a of title 10, United States Code, to establish as positions in the excepted service, appoint individuals to such positions, fix pay, and pay a retention bonus to any employee appointed under this section if the Secretary determines that such is needed to retain essential personnel. Before announcing the payment of a bonus under this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a written explanation of such determination. Such authority shall be exercised—

''(A) to the same extent and subject to the same conditions and limitations that the Secretary of Defense may exercise such authority with respect to civilian intelligence personnel of the Department of Defense; and

''(B) in a manner consistent with the merit system principles set forth in section 2301 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) CIVIL SERVICE PROTECTIONS.—Sections 1221 and 2302, and chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the positions established pursuant to the authorities provided under paragraph (1).

''(3) PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this subsection.

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter for four years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a detailed report (including appropriate metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period) that discusses the processes used by the Secretary in implementing this section and accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans' preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by a qualified employee.

''(c) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term 'qualified employee' means an employee who performs functions relating to the security of Federal civilian information systems, critical infrastructure information systems, or networks of either of such systems.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 226 (as added by section 1 of this Act) the following new item:

''Sec. 227. Personnel authorities.''.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION REGARDING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional amounts are authorized to be appropriated by reason of this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3107, which is the Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act, and it is sponsored by the ranking member of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, Ms. YVETTE CLARKE of New York. This critical piece of legislation is necessary to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security can address gaps in the Department's cybersecurity workforce.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, as it will direct the Department to assess its cyber workforce, create occupational classifications, and develop a cybersecurity workforce strategy.

Throughout the past year, our subcommittee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to identify the cyber threat to our Nation's critical infrastructure, as well as to assess the Department's ability to prevent major cyber attacks. Through our oversight capacity, we have identified areas where Congress can act to neutralize this evolving threat. I am particularly proud of the work we did to tweak this legislation and to incorporate it into the larger committee cyber bill.

I believe that today's markup will go a long way in supporting this mission, and I urge support for this crucial piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3107, the Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act. This is a bill I introduced to address fundamental challenges in the cyber workforce at the Department of Homeland Security. It has gained bipartisan support, as acknowledged by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), our chairman.

Since the attacks of September 11, the urgent need to fill critical national security positions at times has led to actions that may have inadvertently heightened our vulnerability and fostered an over-reliance on private contractors. From a recruitment and retention standpoint, it is critical that the Department of Homeland Security clearly identifies job classifications for the cyber positions it seeks to fill. That was one of the major conclusions of the Cyber Skills Task Force that the Homeland Security Advisory Committee assembled at the request of then-DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano in 2012.

I introduced the Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act to implement a number of the task force's key recommendations.

First, the bill directs DHS to develop and issue comprehensive occupation classifications for persons performing activities in furtherance of the Department's cybersecurity missions.

Secondly, the bill requires the Secretary to assess the readiness and capacity of the Department to meet its cybersecurity mission. As part of the assessment, the Department has to identify where positions are located, whether these positions are vacant, and whether they are held by full-time employees or contractors.

Thirdly, the bill requires the Secretary to develop a comprehensive workforce strategy. This strategy will be implemented to enhance the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the Department's cybersecurity workforce.

Finally, the bill requires the Secretary to establish and maintain a process to verify that individuals employed by private contractors who serve in cybersecurity positions at the Department receive initial and recurrent information security training.

H.R. 3107 takes a holistic approach to the challenge of recruiting, training, and retraining the cybersecurity workforce that DHS needs.

I thank Ranking Member MEEHAN for all of his support and for all of the work that we have done together in a bipartisan way to bring this legislation to the floor, as well as the suite of cybersecurity legislation that we brought forth to the floor today.

I want to also thank the staff of both the committee and my office for the work and the diligence that they have put into bringing forth what I call real 21st century legislation. It is very important legislation. And our very way of life depends on its success.

Since 2008, the Department of Homeland Security has been the lead Federal civilian agency for cybersecurity. It has been responsible for working with Federal agencies to secure their IT networks, and the private sector, particularly critical infrastructure owners and operators, to raise the level of cyber hygiene and address threats in a timely manner.

My legislation will help ensure that DHS has the workforce it needs to execute these critical responsibilities. For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3107.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the gentlewoman's presentation of this issue, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to conclude my remarks on this bill by pointing to the preparation that went into this bill. I would also recognize the importance of not just this issue and the challenges that we face with the complexity of this issue but to recognize that in order for the Department to fulfill its mission, they have to have the kind of workforce that is capable of doing it. And in areas like this, that requires a skilled workforce and, some would say, a uniquely skilled workforce.

I think the gentlewoman's wisdom in recognizing that once you develop that skilled workforce, when 90 percent of the assets are out in the private sector, it does not take too long before that private sector comes knocking on the door and starts to say, we want your people out here. And so wisely, the gentlewoman has pointed to allowing us to have a plan in place that looks at the three Rs: readiness, recruitment, and retention. And that is the essence of what we want to try to do with this very, very important legislation. We want to give some flexibility and control to the Department to not only train and make sure we have got the best next generation of those who will commit themselves to our Nation by service through the Department and protecting our homeland but, once they have developed those skills, that we are able, as much as possible, to retain them within here by virtue of allowing them the capacity and flexibility to do the work that they do best. There will still be plenty of opportunity to find bright people in the private sector as well. But we have got to make sure the mission of homeland security is not affected.

For those reasons, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 3107, the ''Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act''.

I would like to commend Subcommittee Ranking Member CLARKE for her commitment to addressing a critical issue for the Department of Homeland Security—how to recruit and retain a robust cybersecurity workforce.

There is an urgent need for greater protection of our cyber infrastructure, with the rate and intensity of system breaches at an all-time high and the mounting source of cyber threats.

The Department of Homeland Security is the lead Federal agency for protecting the government's Internet platform ''.gov'' and for partnering with the private sector on cybersecurity.

Attracting the best and brightest in the cybersecurity field has been a chronic challenge for the Department. In an effort to come up with some effective strategies to overcome that challenge, in July 2012, then-Secretary Janet Napolitano directed the Homeland Security Advisory Committee to assemble a ''Task Force on CyberSkills''.

The Task Force issued a series of recommendations that included the adoption of a list of mission-critical cybersecurity tasks and a model for assessing the competency and progress of the existing and future DHS mission-critical cybersecurity workforce.

H.R. 3107 adopts many of the Task Force's key recommendations.

For instance, in order to recruit the Department with the cyber workforce it needs, H.R. 3107 requires DHS to have comprehensive occupation classifications to categorize what types of work will be done in each position.

Today, DHS does not utilize a uniform classification system and, as a result, positions get posted that offer little clarity on what knowledge, skills, and experience is sought.

Sophisticated cyber mission-critical skills are not a dime-a-dozen, and Federal agencies have to compete among themselves, and especially private sector employers for talent.

This bill seeks to ensure that DHS has an effective approach to attracting, hiring, and retaining a mission-critical cybersecurity workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3107, the Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act, sponsored by Ranking Member CLARKE.

H.R. 3107 includes important provisions to bolster the cybersecurity workforce at the Department of Homeland Security. Across our nation, businesses, colleges and universities are transforming their organizations to include strong and robust cybersecurity practices. It is essential that DHS is hiring the best and the brightest that this emerging field has to offer. The Department's efforts to protect the homeland from an attack depend on it.

The legislation offered by Ms. CLARKE was introduced and passed out of the committee with bipartisan support and we were pleased to have worked with her to adjust the language to mirror the workforce provisions in the full committee's cyber bill. It will require the Department to take inventory of its cyber workforce, including those of other Federal agencies. Subsequently, the Secretary will be required to present to Congress a workforce strategy, focused on how to attract and maintain top cybersecurity experts.

These new provisions will help ensure the Department has a coherent plan to address their need to hire cyber professionals and fill those much needed positions.

I would like to thank Ranking Member CLARKE for all of her work on this important subject, I urge support for the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3107, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4250) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Sunscreen Innovation Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.

Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subchapter I—Nonprescription Sunscreen Active Ingredients

''SEC. 586. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subchapter:

''(1) The term 'Advisory Committee' means the Nonprescription Drug Advisory Committee or any successor to such Committee.

''(2) The terms 'generally recognized as safe and effective' and 'GRASE' mean generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the product's labeling, as described in section 201(p).

''(3) The term 'GRASE determination' means, with respect to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, a determination of whether such ingredients or combination of ingredients is generally recognized as safe and effective and not misbranded for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the product's labeling, as described in section 201(p).

''(4) The term 'nonprescription' means not subject to section 503(b)(1).

''(5) The term 'pending request' means each request submitted to the Secretary—

''(A) for consideration for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system;

''(B) that was deemed eligible for such review by publication of a notice of eligibility in the Federal Register prior to the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act; and

''(C) for which safety and effectiveness data has been submitted to the Secretary prior to such date of enactment.

''(6) The term 'sponsor' means the person submitting the request under section 586A(a), including a time and extent application under section 586B, or the person that submitted the pending request.

''(7) The term 'sunscreen active ingredient' means an active ingredient that is intended for application to the skin of humans for purposes of absorbing, reflecting, or scattering radiation.

''(8) The term 'sunscreen' means a product containing one or more sunscreen active ingredients.

''SEC. 586A. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

''(a) REQUESTS.—Any person may submit a request to the Secretary for a determination of whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof (including dosage form, dosage strength, and route of administration) is generally recognized as safe and effective and not misbranded.

''(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) CURRENTLY MARKETED SUNSCREENS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the marketing of sunscreens that are lawfully marketed in the United States on or before the date of enactment of this subchapter.

''(2) ENSURING SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to alter the Secretary's authority to prohibit the marketing of a sunscreen that is not safe and effective or to impose restrictions on the marketing of a sunscreen to ensure safety and effectiveness.

''(3) OTHER PRODUCTS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the Secretary's regulation of products other than sunscreens.

''(c) SUNSET.—This subchapter shall cease to be effective at the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this subchapter.

''SEC. 586B. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a request under section 586A(a), not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of such request, the Secretary shall—

''(1) determine whether the request is eligible for further review under sections 586C and 586D, as described in subsection (b);

''(2) notify the sponsor of the Secretary's determination; and

''(3) make such determination publicly available in accordance with subsection (c).

''(b) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible for review under sections 586C and 586D, a request shall be for a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, that—

''(A) is not included in the stayed sunscreen monograph in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations; and

''(B) has been used to a material extent and for a material time, as described in section 201(p)(2).

''(2) TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATION.—A sponsor shall include in a request under section 586A(a) a time and extent application including all the information required to meet the standard described in paragraph (1)(B).

''(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(1) REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—If a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is determined to be eligible for further review under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall make the request publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.—Sponsors shall identify any information which the sponsor considers to be confidential information described in paragraph (1).

''(3) CONFIDENTIALITY DURING ELIGIBILITY REVIEW.—The information contained in a request under section 586A(a) shall remain confidential during the Secretary's consideration under this section of whether the request is eligible for further review.

''SEC. 586C. DATA SUBMISSION; FILING DETERMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a request under section 586A(a) that is determined to be eligible under section 586B for further review under this section and section 586D—

''(1) the Secretary shall, in notifying the public under section 586B(a)(3) of such eligibility determination, invite the sponsor of the request and any other interested party to submit, in support of or otherwise relating to a GRASE determination—

''(A) published and unpublished data and other information related to the safety and effectiveness of the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients for its intended nonprescription uses; or

''(B) any other comments; and

''(2) not later than 60 days after the submission of such data and other information by the sponsor, including any revised submission of such data and other information following a refusal to file under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

''(A)(i) issue a written notification to the sponsor determining that the request under section 586A(a), together with such data and other information, is sufficiently complete to conduct a substantive review and make such notification publicly available; and

''(ii) file such request; or

''(B) issue a written notification to the sponsor refusing to file the request and stating the reasons for the refusal and why the data and other information submitted is not sufficiently complete to conduct a substantive review and make such notification publicly available;

''(3) the Secretary shall, in filing a request under paragraph (2)—

''(A) invite the public to submit further comments with respect to such filing; and

''(B) limit such public comment, and the comment period under paragraph (1), to the period ending on the date that is 60 days after such filing;

''(4) if the Secretary refuses to file the request—

''(A) the sponsor may, within 30 days of receipt of written notification of such refusal, seek a meeting with the Secretary regarding whether the Secretary should file the request; and

''(B) the Secretary shall convene the meeting; and

''(5) following any such meeting—

''(A) if the sponsor asks that the Secretary file the request (with or without amendments to correct any purported deficiencies to the request) the Secretary shall file the request over protest, issue a written notification of the filing to the sponsor, and make such notification publicly available; and

''(B) if the request is so filed over protest, the Secretary shall not require the sponsor to resubmit a copy of the request for purposes of such filing.

''(b) REASONS FOR REFUSAL TO FILE REQUEST.—The Secretary may refuse to file a request submitted under section 586A(a) if the Secretary determines the data or other information submitted by the sponsor under this section are not sufficiently complete to conduct a substantive review with respect to such request.

''(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(1) REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make data and other information submitted in connection with a request under section 586A(a) publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.—Sponsors or any other individual submitting data or other information under this section shall identify any information which the sponsor or individual considers to be confidential information described in paragraph (1).

''SEC. 586D. GRASE DETERMINATION.

''(a) REVIEW OF NEW REQUEST.—

''(1) PROPOSED ORDER BY CDER.—In the case of a request under section 586A(a), the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research shall—

''(A) not later than 300 days after the date on which the request is filed under section 586C(a), complete the review of the request and issue a proposed order determining that—

''(i) the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of the request—

''(I) is GRASE; and

''(II) is not misbranded;

''(ii) the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of the request—

''(I) is not GRASE; or

''(II) is misbranded; or

''(iii) additional information is necessary to allow the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research to complete the review of such request;

''(B) within such 300-day period, convene a meeting of the Advisory Committee to review the request under section 586A(a): and

''(C) if the Director fails to issue such proposed order within the 300-day period referred to in subparagraph (A), transmit the request to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs for review.

''(2) PROPOSED ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—With respect to a request transmitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under paragraph (1)(C), the Commissioner shall, not later than 60 days after the date of such transmission, issue—

''(A) a proposed order described in paragraph (1)(A)(i);

''(B) a proposed order described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii); or

''(C) a proposed order described in paragraph (1)(A)(iii).

''(3) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER; PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed order issued under paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to a request shall—

''(A) be published in the Federal Register; and

''(B) solicit public comments for a period of not more than 45 days.

''(4) FINAL ORDER BY CDER.—In the case of a proposed order under paragraph (1)(A) or (2) with respect to a request, the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research shall—

''(A) issue a final order with respect to the request—

''(i) in the case of a proposed order under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) or subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), not later than 90 days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3)(B); or

''(ii) in the case of a proposed order under paragraph (1)(A)(iii) or paragraph (2)(C), not later than 210 days after the date on which the sponsor submits the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed order; or

''(B) if the Director fails to issue such final order within such 90- or 210-day period, as applicable, transmit such proposed order to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs for review.

''(5) FINAL ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—With respect to a proposed order transmitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under paragraph (4)(B), the Commissioner shall issue a final order with respect to such proposed order not later than 60 days after the date of such transmission.

''(b) REVIEW OF PENDING REQUESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The review of a pending request shall be carried out by the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Sections 586B and 586C shall not apply with respect to any pending request.

''(3) PROPOSED ORDER BY CDER.—The Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research shall—

''(A) within the timeframe applicable under paragraph (4), complete the review of the request and issue a proposed order determining that—

''(i) the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of the pending request—

''(I) is GRASE; and

''(II) is not misbranded;

''(ii) the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of the pending request—

''(I) is not GRASE; or

''(II) is misbranded; or

''(iii) additional information is necessary to allow the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research to complete the review of the pending request; and

''(B) if the Director fails to issue such proposed order within the timeframe applicable under paragraph (4), transmit the pending request to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs for review.

''(4) TIMEFRAME FOR ISSUANCE OF PROPOSED ORDER BY CDER.—The Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research shall issue a proposed order, as required by paragraph (3)(A)—

''(A) in the case of a pending request for which the Food and Drug Administration has issued a feedback letter before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, not later than 45 days after such date of enactment; and

''(B) in the case of a pending request for which the Food and Drug Administration has not issued a feedback letter before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

''(5) PROPOSED ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—With respect to a pending request transmitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under paragraph (3)(B), the Commissioner shall, not later than 60 days after the date of such transmission, issue—

''(A) a proposed order described in paragraph (3)(A)(i);

''(B) a proposed order described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii); or

''(C) a proposed order described in paragraph (3)(A)(iii).

''(6) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER; PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed order issued under paragraph (3) or (5) with respect to a pending request shall—

''(A) be published in the Federal Register; and

''(B) solicit public comments for a period of not more than 45 days.

''(7) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—For a proposed order issued under paragraph (3)(A)(iii) or (5)(C) requesting additional information, an Advisory Committee meeting shall be convened if the sponsor requests, or the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research or the Commissioner of Food and Drugs decides, to convene such a meeting for the purpose of reviewing the pending request.

''(8) FINAL ORDER BY CDER.—In the case of a proposed order under paragraph (3)(A) or (5) with respect to a request, the Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research shall—

''(A) issue a final order with respect to the request—

''(i) in the case of a proposed order under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (3)(A) or subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (5), not later than 90 days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3)(B); or

''(ii) in the case of a proposed order under paragraph (3)(A)(iii) or paragraph (5)(C)—

''(I) if the Advisory Committee is not convened pursuant to paragraph (7), not later than 210 days after the date on which the sponsor submits the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed order; or

''(II) if the Advisory Committee is convened pursuant to paragraph (7), not later than 270 days after date on which the sponsor submits such additional information; or

''(B) if the Director fails to issue such final order within such 90-, 210-, and 270-day period, as applicable, transmit such proposed order to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs for review.

''(9) FINAL ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—With respect to a proposed order transmitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under paragraph (8)(B), the Commissioner shall issue a final order with respect to such proposed order not later than 60 days after the date of such transmission.

''(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(1) LIMITATIONS.—The Food and Drug Administration—

''(A) shall not be required to convene the Advisory Committee—

''(i) more than once with respect to any request under section 586A(a) or any pending request; or

''(ii) more than twice in any twelve month period with respect to the review of submissions under this section; and

''(B) shall not be required to submit more than 3 submissions to the Advisory Committee per meeting.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—In appointing the members of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary may select to serve temporarily as voting members on the Advisory Committee—

''(A) members of other Federal advisory committees; or

''(B) consultants from outside of the Department of Health and Human Services who have substantive expertise regarding sunscreen active ingredients.

''(d) NO DELEGATION.—Any responsibility vested by this section in the Commissioner of Food and Drugs is not delegable.

''(e) EFFECT OF FINAL ORDER.—

''(1) CONTENT.—A final order under subsection (a)(4), (a)(5), (b)(8), or (b)(9) with respect to a request under section 586A(a) or a pending request shall determine that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of the request—

''(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded; or

''(B) is not GRASE or is misbranded.

''(2) ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final order determining that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded, the active ingredient or combination of active ingredients shall be permitted to be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce, for use under the conditions subject to the final order, in accordance with all requirements applicable to drugs not subject to section 503(b)(1).

''(3) ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED NOT TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final order determining that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE or is misbranded, the active ingredient or combination of active ingredients shall not be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce, for use under the conditions subject to the final order, unless an application submitted pursuant to section 505(b) with respect to such active ingredient or combination of active ingredients is approved.

''SEC. 586E. REPORTS.

''(a) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

''(1) submit a report reviewing the overall progress of the Secretary in carrying out this subchapter to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

''(2) include findings on—

''(A) the progress made in completing the review of pending requests; and

''(B) the role of the Office of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs in issuing determinations with respect to pending requests, including the number of requests transferred to the Office of the Commissioner under section 586D.

''(b) SECRETARY'S REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall issue a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives describing actions taken under this section. Each report under this subsection shall be posted on the Internet site of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The reports under this subsection shall include—

''(A) a review of the progress made in issuing GRASE determinations for pending requests, including the number of pending requests—

''(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request, measured from the date of the original request for an eligibility determination submitted by the sponsor;

''(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and not misbranded;

''(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

''(iv) for which a determination has not been made, an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

''(B) a review of the progress made in issuing in a timely manner GRASE determinations for requests submitted under section 586A(a), including the number of such requests—

''(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request;

''(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and not misbranded;

''(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

''(iv) for which a determination has not been made, an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

''(C) a description of the staffing and resources relating to the costs associated with the review and decisionmaking pertaining to requests under this subchapter;

''(D) a review of the progress made in meeting the deadlines with respect to processing requests under this subchapter;

''(E) to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, recommendations for process improvements in the handling of pending and new requests, including the advisory committee review process; and

''(F) recommendations for expanding the applicability of this subchapter to nonprescription active ingredients that are not related to the sunscreen category of over-the-counter drugs.

''(c) METHOD.—The Secretary shall publish the reports required under subsection (b) in the manner the Secretary determines to be the most effective for efficiently disseminating the report, including publication of the report on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.''.

SEC. 3. GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall issue guidance, in accordance with good guidance practices, on the implementation of, and compliance with, subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 2, including guidance on—

(A) the criteria for determining whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients has been used to a material extent and for a material time, as described in section 201(p)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(p)(2));

(B) the format and content of a safety and effectiveness data submission; and

(C) the safety and efficacy standards for determining whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is generally recognized as safe and effective, as defined in section 586 of such subchapter I.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to collections of information made for purposes of guidance under this subsection.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PENDING ISSUANCE OF FINAL GUIDANCE.—Irrespective of whether final guidance under subsection (a) has been issued—

(1) persons may, beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, make submissions under subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 2; and

(2) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall review and act upon such submissions in accordance with such subchapter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act, which seeks to address an important area of public concern by

strengthening the sunscreen ingredient review process at the Food and Drug Administration.

I would like to remind everyone that skin cancer is the most prevalent kind of cancer in America. Each year, there are more new cases of skin cancer than breast, prostate, lung, and colon cancer combined. By 2015, it is estimated that one in 50 Americans will develop melanoma in their lifetime. Melanoma also happens to be one of the most common forms of cancer in young adults, particularly young women.

Even though the Food and Drug Administration has listed action on sunscreen ingredient applications as a priority since 2008, no new sunscreen ingredients have been approved by the FDA. In fact, none have been approved in 15 years. This is despite the fact that eight sunscreen applications have been pending at the FDA, some as far back as 2002.

I might add that we find ourselves in this predicament, even though in Europe and other places around the world, new sunscreen ingredients are being introduced into sunscreen products.

This past April, the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on the Sunscreen Innovation Act, where all of the expert witnesses, including the FDA, were in agreement that the current approval process is broken and in need of reform.

So the objective of the Sunscreen Innovation Act is twofold: first, to expedite the review of pending applications at FDA; and, second, to create a timely and transparent process for new applications to be reviewed and acted on.

The framework outlined in this legislation strikes an appropriate balance between consumer safety and access to the very best sunscreen product. The bill we have before us today reflects a bipartisan agreement reached in consultation with the Food and Drug Administration and outside stakeholders, such as the PASS Coalition and Environmental Working Group.

I want to give a particular thanks to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for sponsoring this legislation with me. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, who worked with us closely throughout the entire process, and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their assistance in reaching the agreement that allowed this legislation to come to the floor.

I urge all my colleagues to support the bill. At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act. This legislation proves that this body can work together, not only across the aisle but with the agencies under our jurisdiction and also with the industries concerned. This legislation has the support of everyone.

□ 1745

There is no opposition to it, and that includes the industry, it includes the health people, it also includes the environmentalists, and it includes the administration. UV rays from the Sun are, it is understood, increasing the amount of melanoma amongst our people enormously—800 percent amongst young women, and 400 percent amongst young men over the past 40 years.

Sunscreens sold in the United States today do not offer the same level of protection as sunscreen sold in Europe, Canada, Australia, and other countries. In fact, the last over-the-counter sunscreen ingredient was approved by FDA in the 1990s. Some sunscreen ingredients have been waiting review by FDA for over a decade.

This is inexcusable, and it should not be permitted because FDA has taken so long to review these applications. It is clear that increased accountability is needed at the agency to ensure these pending sunscreen applications are reviewed in a timely and speedy manner.

I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Mr. WHITFIELD, for his leadership and fine work on this, and also Chairman UPTON for his outstanding work, and I want to congratulate my friends, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. WAXMAN, for the good work which they have done on this legislation.

Indeed, the staffs on both sides of the committee have been remarkable in what it is they have done on this matter, and it is interesting to note that we have the strong support of the American Academy of Dermatology, the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the Melanoma Research Alliance, the Environmental Working Group, and the Melanoma Research Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert letters from those agencies into the RECORD.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DERMATOLOGY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2014.

Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: The American Academy of Dermatology Association (Academy), which represents more than 13,000 dermatologists nationwide, commends you for working together to amend H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act, which would ensure that sunscreen ingredients are reviewed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) within a predictable timeframe. The Academy applauds you for your work with stakeholders on this legislation and is pleased to offer its support for the Committee-passed amended bill, which has the potential to reduce Americans' risk for skin cancer by ensuring that they have access to the safest, most effective sunscreens available.

Skin cancer is the most common cancer in the United States and one in five Americans will develop skin cancer in their lifetime. Dermatologists diagnose more than 3.5 million cases and treat more than 2.2 million people with skin cancer every year in the U.S. Research has shown that sunscreen helps reduce the risk of skin cancer and is essential to protecting the public from UV radiation. Proper use of sunscreen combined with access to the safest, most effective ingredients available will go a long way toward reducing these statistics.

We applaud you for working together to amend this legislation, which will ensure that sunscreen ingredients are thoroughly and expeditiously reviewed in a timely manner. We support allowing the Nonprescription Drugs Advisory Committee (NDAC) to provide recommendations on sunscreen ingredients to the FDA, and are pleased to see a provision under the amended bill that would allow the Secretary to appoint members of other federal advisory committees or outside consultants with substantive expertise regarding sunscreen active ingredients to the NDAC when sunscreen ingredients are reviewed. We are also in favor of the provisions within the amended legislative language that strengthen Congressional oversight by requiring reporting of FDA's activities and progress in the review of sunscreen ingredients.

We appreciate your continued leadership on this issue and look forward to working with you in the fight against skin cancer. If you have any questions or if we can provide any additional information, please contact Christine O'Connor, the Academy's Associate Director, Congressional Policy at coconnor@aad.org or (202) 609–6330; or Niva Haynes, the Academy's Manager, Congressional Policy at nhaynes@aad.ord or (202) 712–2608.

Sincerely,
BRETT M. COLDIRON, MD, FAAD,
President, American Academy of Dermatology Association.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY CANCER ACTION NETWORK,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2014.

Re Letter of support for legislation to improve the FDA process for approving new sunscreen ingredients

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHNNY ISAKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REED, SENATOR ISAKSON, REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL, On behalf of the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN), I am writing to express my support for legislation to reform the current Food and Drug Administration sunscreen approval process. ACS CAN is the nonprofit, nonpartisan advocacy affiliate of the American Cancer Society.

As you know, despite dramatic increases in rates of melanoma and skin cancer, the last time the FDA approved a new sunscreen ingredient was during the 1990's. H.R. 4250, now pending in the House Energy and Commerce Committee, provides a solid basis for coming to an agreement on a new and workable FDA review process for approving new sunscreen ingredients. Ultimately the goal is to provide Americans with access to the most up-to-date, safe and effective sunscreen technology now available in Europe while preserving FDA's important authority to ensure the safety of over the counter products like sunscreen. The review process in place today does not work.

We believe that it is important for Americans to have access to the latest sunscreen technology to help curb the current skin cancer epidemic in the United States and that is why ACS CAN has joined the Public Access to SunScreens (PASS) Coalition. The PASS Coalition is a multi-stakeholder coalition formed to advocate for a regulatory pathway to market for new, safe and effective sunscreen ingredients. Specifically, the purpose of the Coalition is to develop reforms that guarantee a timely review by the Food & Drug Administration (FDA) of pending Time and Extent Applications (TEAs) for over-the-counter (OTC) sunscreen ingredients.

ACS CAN would like to thank you for supporting H.R. 4250, and we look forward to working with you to resolve any concerns regarding the legislation so that Americans have access to the most effective and safe sunscreens.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER W. HANSEN,
President, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network.

BASF,
May 5, 2014.

Re Letter of Support for the Sunscreen Innovation Act (S. 2141/H.R. 4250)

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHNNY ISAKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REED, SENATOR ISAKSON, REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: On behalf of BASF Corporation, I am writing to express support for the Sunscreen Innovation Act (S. 2141 and H.R. 4250) and thank you for your leadership on this important issue. BASF Corporation is the North American affiliate of BASF SE. Our portfolio includes chemicals, plastics, crop protection products and performance products. Through science and innovation, we enable our customers in nearly every industry to meet the current and future needs of society. We sum up this contribution in our corporate purpose: We create chemistry for a sustainable future.

Among the products in BASF's portfolio are sunscreen filters. BASF is a leading innovator and manufacturer of sunscreen filters. We currently have three applications for sunscreen filters pending at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA)—including one since 2002. These ingredients have been available to consumers globally since the 1990s. Moreover, there are additional sunscreen filters we would like to submit for FDA approval. Given the amount of time the current applications have been pending, you can understand why it is important that the current process for consideration of new sunscreen ingredients needs to be improved.

BASF Corporation supports the Sunscreen Innovation Act because it creates a transparent and predictable review process of new sunscreen ingredients and guarantees a decision by FDA on applications for new ingredients within a defined timeframe. We believe Americans should have access to the latest sunscreen technology to help curb the current skin cancer epidemic in the United States. This is why we joined the Public Access to SunScreens (PASS) Coalition, a multi-stakeholder coalition formed to advocate for a regulatory pathway to market for new, safe and effective sunscreen ingredients.

We look forward to working with you to enact this legislation as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

STEVEN J. GOLDBERG,
Vice President and Associate General Counsel, Regulatory and Government Affairs, BASF Corporation.

MELANOMA RESEARCH ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2014.

Re Letter of Support for H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHNNY ISAKSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REED, SENATOR ISAKSON, REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: On behalf of the Melanoma Research Alliance (MRA), I am writing to convey MRA's support for the Sunscreen Innovation Act (5. 2141 and H.R. 4250). MRA supports the Sunscreen Innovation Act because it will reform the current sunscreen approval process and encourages Congress to enact this critical legislation as soon as possible.

As you know, despite dramatic increases in rates of melanoma and skin cancer, the last time the FDA approved a new sunscreen ingredient is the 1990s. The Sunscreen Innovation Act will provide Americans access to the latest sunscreen technology, which addresses America's growing skin cancer epidemic and fosters innovation in sunscreen. Its provisions create a transparent and predictable review process and guarantees that safe and effective products reach consumers within a defined timeframe.

MRA is a public charity that accelerates the pace of scientific discovery and its translation in order to eliminate suffering and death due to melanoma by funding innovative research programs to improve melanoma prevention, diagnosis, staging, and treatment. In addition, MRA works with allies in government, non-profit, and industry to promote awareness about melanoma among the public.

As you know, in the U.S., one person dies every hour from melanoma and the numbers of skin cancer cases have risen dramatically. Sadly, many skin cancers could be prevented simply by reducing exposure to UV radiation, the leading environmental factor in the development of skin cancer.

We believe that it is important for Americans to have access to the latest sunscreen technology to help curb the current skin cancer epidemic in the United States and that is why we joined the Public Access to SunScreens (PASS) Coalition. The PASS Coalition is a multi-stakeholder coalition formed to advocate for a regulatory pathway to market for new, safe and effective sunscreen ingredients. Specifically, the purpose of the Coalition is to develop reforms that guarantee a timely review by the Food & Drug Administration (FDA) of pending Time and Extent Applications (TEAs) for over-the-counter (OTC) sunscreen ingredients.

There is unprecedented opportunity to make a difference in the future course of melanoma and other skin cancers. We are especially grateful for your leadership in the fight against melanoma. Despite recent progress in the field, much more needs to be done until melanoma prevention is effectively addressed.

MRA would like to thank you for introducing the Sunscreen Innovation Act. We look forward to working with you to enact this legislation this summer.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

WENDY K.D. SELIG,
MRA President and Chief Executive Officer.

MELANOMA RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2014.

Re Letter of Support for H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act

DEAR SENATOR REED, SENATOR ISAKSON, REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: On behalf of The Melanoma Research Foundation (MRF) I am writing to express my support for the Sunscreen Innovation Act (S. 2141 and H.R. 4250). The MRF supports the Sunscreen Innovation Act because it will reform the current sunscreen approval process and encourages Congress to enact this critical legislation as soon as possible.

As you know, despite dramatic increases in rates of melanoma and skin cancer, the last time the FDA approved a new sunscreen ingredient is the 1990s. The Sunscreen Innovation Act will provide Americans access to the latest sunscreen technology, which addresses America's growing skin cancer epidemic and fosters innovation in sunscreen. Its provisions create a transparent and predictable review process and guarantees that safe and effective products reach consumers within a defined timeframe.

The Melanoma Research Foundation (MRF) is the largest independent organization devoted to melanoma. The MRF is a 501(c) (3) nonprofit organization. Committed to the support of medical research in finding effective treatments and eventually a cure for melanoma, the MRF also educates patients, caregivers and physicians about the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of melanoma.

Just one blistering sunburn at an early age can double a person's chance of developing melanoma. Regular use of sunscreen can greatly reduce the risk. The FDA's inaction over the past 12 years has prevented consumers from having access to new sunscreen products that could potentially save their lives.

We believe that it is important for Americans to have access to the latest sunscreen technology to help curb the current skin cancer epidemic in the United States and that is why we joined the Public Access to SunScreens (PASS) Coalition. The PASS Coalition is a multi-stakeholder coalition formed to advocate for a regulatory pathway to market for new, safe and effective sunscreen ingredients. Specifically, the purpose of the Coalition is to develop reforms that guarantee a timely review by the Food & Drug Administration (FDA) of pending Time and Extent Applications (TEAs) for over-the-counter (OTC) sunscreen ingredients.

The MRF would you like to thank you for introducing the Sunscreen Innovation Act. We look forward to working with you to enact this legislation this summer.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY ANTONUCCI,

National Director of Advocacy and Volunteer Services, The Melanoma Research Foundation.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to observe that the staff has performed extraordinary work on this matter. I want to congratulate and thank Greg Sunstrum on my staff, as well as Taylor Booth, John Stone, Carly McWilliams, and Eric Flamm for their hard work on the legislation, and I want to recognize members of the PASS Coalition for their hard work and advocacy on behalf of this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this very important bipartisan legislation to indeed help protect the public health. H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act, is just that.

The growing rate of skin cancer in the U.S., including melanoma, is indeed alarming. According to the American Cancer Society, more Americans are diagnosed with skin cancer every year than breast, prostate, lung, and colon cancer combined, and in 2015, this year, one in every 50 of our constituents is going to be diagnosed with melanoma. We have got to take every step that we can to combat this public health crisis.

Sadly, advancements in sunscreen have failed to keep pace with the increased awareness of the harm overexposure to the Sun can cause. The FDA has not approved a new nonprescription sunscreen ingredient for nearly 20 years, despite the fact that several applications have been pending at the agency for products that have been used safely and effectively in Europe and other parts of the world.

The review process that these products have to go through at the FDA is, quite simply, broken. It needs to be fixed, and that is what this legislation does.

I particularly want to commend the work that my good friend from the great State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and Mr. WHITFIELD and members of our entire committee, as this bill passed with unanimous support as we moved through the process. We wanted to come up with a solution to allow the FDA to fix the problem, and that is what this bill does.

The Sunscreen Innovation Act is going to address the current backlog of applications pending at the FDA, as well as establish a predictable and transparent review process for new applications, incorporating meaningful input from experts and the public.

The bill also establishes the number of timeframes for decisionmaking at the FDA and remove administrative hurdles identified by the FDA to the sunscreen approval process. More importantly, it is going to allow Americans to benefit from these products sooner, while ensuring that they are indeed safe and effective.

We have had great success in our Energy and Commerce Committee this Congress, with over a dozen public health bills that have already been signed into law, obviously all bipartisan, and I am confident that this commonsense bill which received, again, unanimous support at our committee will soon be part of our strong record of results.

In fact, I am told that this is the 61st bill that our committee has reported out that will be approved on the House floor. That is a pretty good record of achievement.

This one really, like the others, has a real impact on all of our constituents. It gives the FDA the rightful tools, so that we can get to the bottom of the problem which impacts one in 50 Americans.

So, again, I want to compliment Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WAXMAN, and others for helping deliver this bill to the House floor, and I look forward to a strong vote—hopefully voice—in a few minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so if the gentleman, my good friend, Mr. WHITFIELD, is ready, I am prepared to yield back with the strong urging to my colleagues to support this bill—which is strongly bipartisan—unanimously brought forward to the Congress and which has the strong support of both industry, government, and health groups.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, once again, thank Mr. DINGELL, and I appreciate his naming the staff because there was a lot of negotiations with FDA on this bill, and Taylor Booth on my staff and other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee staff, as named by Mr. DINGELL, I want to give special thanks to them, and also, we appreciate the efforts of Mr. PITTS, who is the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Without the help of him, Mr. PALLONE, and their staffs, we would not have been able to bring this bill to the floor. So I would urge everyone to support it, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4250, the Sunscreen Innovation Act. This legislation will support the important work of the Richard David Kann Melanoma Foundation of Palm Beach County, Florida.

Melanoma is the deadliest form of skin cancer, killing one American every fifty minutes. Residents of Florida are especially vulnerable to the cancer-causing ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The Sunscreen Innovation Act will help Floridians protect themselves with the latest radiation-blocking sunscreen ingredients.

I would like to thank the Richard David Kann Melanoma Foundation for their tireless work in preventing and detecting skin cancer, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4250, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. WELLSTONE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH AND EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 594) to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 594

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2014''.

SEC. 2. INITIATIVE THROUGH THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

Section 404E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''Muscoskeletal'' and inserting ''Musculoskeletal''; and

(B) by inserting ''Becker, congenital muscular dystrophy, limb-girdle muscular dystrophy,'' after ''Duchenne,'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''genetics,'' at the second place it appears; and

(ii) by inserting ''cardiac and pulmonary function, and'' after ''imaging,''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and sharing of data'' after ''regular communication'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''15'' and inserting ''18''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''and the Food and Drug Administration'' and inserting '', the Food and Drug Administration, and the Administration for Community Living'';

(II) by inserting ''and adults'' after ''children''; and

(III) by striking ''such as the Department of Education'' and inserting ''including the Department of Education and the Social Security Administration''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by inserting ''. but shall meet no fewer than two times per calendar year'' before the period; and

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''through the national research institutes'' and inserting ''through the agencies represented on the Coordinating Committee pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(A)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting ''public services,'' before ''and rehabilitative issues''; and

(II) by inserting '', studies to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of providing independent living resources and support to patients with various forms of muscular dystrophy, and studies to determine optimal clinical care interventions for adults with various forms of muscular dystrophy'' after ''including studies of the impact of such diseases in rural and underserved communities''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(D), by inserting after ''including new biological agents'' the following: ''and new clinical interventions to improve the health of those with muscular dystrophy''.

SEC. 3. SURVEILLANCE AND RESEARCH REGARDING MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY.

The second sentence of section 317Q(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b–18(b)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''and, to the extent possible, ensure that data be representative of all affected populations and shared in a timely manner''.

SEC. 4. INFORMATION AND EDUCATION.

Section 5(c) of the Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 247b–19(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''for pediatric and adult patients, including acute care considerations,'' after ''issuance of care considerations'';

(B) by inserting ''various'' before ''other forms of muscular dystrophy''; and

(C) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) in developing and updating care considerations under paragraph (2), incorporate strategies specifically responding to the findings of the national transitions survey of minority, young adult, and adult communities of muscular dystrophy patients; and''; and

(4) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by inserting ''various'' before ''other forms of muscular dystrophy''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the recognition to discuss this bipartisan, bicameral legislation that was introduced with Mr. ENGEL of New York, H.R. 594, the Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2014, or the MD CARE Act.

H.R. 594 has 113 bipartisan cosponsors. This bill makes targeted updates and improvements to legislation first passed by Congress in 2001 and then reauthorized in 2008. In each instance, these bills, including H.R. 594, have passed both subcommittee and full committee on voice votes and passed overwhelmingly on the floor under suspension, a trend I hope we can continue today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is supported by the totality of the muscular dystrophy community with over 20 organizations writing letters of support, including the Muscular Dystrophy Association and the Parent Project Muscular Dystrophy.

In short, the underlying law is a success story. Since its enactment, this law has successfully targeted limited Federal resources to improve clinical care across the muscular dystrophies.

Muscular dystrophy is not a single disease. It is a group of genetic disorders characterized by progressive weakness and the loss of voluntary muscles that control movement.

Muscular dystrophy affects hundreds of thousands of children and adults throughout the United States and worldwide. Some forms of muscular dystrophy are seen in infancy or childhood, while others may not appear until adulthood. The extent of muscle weakness, as well as rate of progression, varies based on where among a spectrum of muscular dystrophies a patient falls.

Since 2001, this law has successfully changed the lives of families impacted by all forms of muscular dystrophy. It has coordinated and focused Federal biomedical research on nine forms of muscular dystrophy, developed epidemiologic data, and created patient care guidelines.

Here is the good news: it has made a real difference. Since 2001, there have been 67 clinical trials of drugs or therapies for muscular dystrophy, and many can be traced to the basic research efforts stemming from this law.

In Duchenne muscular dystrophy alone, children are living 10 years longer, and many are now entering young adulthood. However, as we often heard, sometimes the law does not keep pace with science and medicine.

For example, when the original law was written, those children who are now going into adulthood would not have been able to look forward to such a favorable timeline. It does not make sense that we have developed care guidelines that have helped these patients live longer and then stop when they turn 18. This bill will address these issues with small, targeted updates to current law.

Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear about this. This bill creates no new programs, this bill creates no increases of authorizations of appropriations, nor does it create additional authorizations of appropriations. It simply proposes a small set of improvements intended to ensure that the program is focusing on the most critical areas that funding being provided today reflects current scientific and medical knowledge.

The bill is fiscally responsible because it makes the needed update in law to ensure that any money that is spent is not held back by an outdated statute.

I would like to thank Chairmen UPTON and PITTS, as well as Ranking Members WAXMAN and PALLONE for their help. I also want to thank the staff on both sides of the dais in the committee and the Capitol for their work in getting this bill to this point.

Specifically, I want to thank Clay Alspach, Katie Novaria, and Brenda Destro with the Energy and Commerce majority, and Hannah Green with the minority; from Mr. ENGEL's staff, Mark Iozzi and Heidi Ross, who negotiated with my staff in good faith from day one; and on my staff, I particularly want to thank my deputy chief of staff J.P. Paluskiewicz who led negotiations, as well as Katie Allen and my former staffer, Sarah Johnson.

This bill is bipartisan. It has a history of consensus. It is fiscally responsible and will benefit all Americans suffering from muscular dystrophy.

I urge everyone to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 594, the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I worked with the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, to introduce this bill, and I would personally like to thank him for his hard work and partnership developing the legislation and bringing it through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I would also like to thank our colleagues, Representatives WAXMAN, PALLONE, PITTS, and UPTON, for their support and effort to get this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, the MD CARE Act has always enjoyed full bipartisan support. Congress first approved it in 2001, we updated it in 2008, and we are doing the same now. I am pleased to see that this bipartisan tradition remains strong as we continue the fight against muscular dystrophy by taking up this legislation today.

As I am sure many of my colleagues already know and as Dr. BURGESS pointed out, muscular dystrophy is not a single disease, but a spectrum of genetic disorders resulting from progressive muscle weakness and degeneration.

Hundreds of thousands of children and adults currently suffer from various forms of muscular dystrophy in the United States and around the world.

□ 1800

Although there is still no cure, the MD CARE Act has played a critical role in improving the lives of those suffering from these lethal disorders. The MD CARE Act has successfully coordinated and focused biomedical research, established clinical care standards, improved data collection, and helped generate more than 65 clinical trials, more than 30 of which are still ongoing.

As a direct result of this law, the lifespan of the average American living with Duchenne muscular dystrophy—the most common form of muscular dystrophy in children—has increased by a full 10 years. That is a statistic of which we can be proud. This progress is substantial, and the law needs to be updated to reflect these developments.

As people live longer, their needs evolve. The legislation we are considering today responds to the changing needs of muscular dystrophy patients without requiring any additional authorization of appropriations. It will make targeted updates to the MD CARE Act, bringing our programs in line with the scientific advancements we have made since 2008 when the law was last updated.

The bill allows the Director of the National Institutes of Health to expand and intensify programs targeted at the nine most common forms of muscular dystrophy. It also enhances research at the Wellstone Centers of Excellence, strengthens the Muscular Dystrophy Coordinating Committee, updates data collection, and increases awareness of treatment options among medical professionals.

This bill is supported by 113 bipartisan cosponsors, and it has the full backing of the muscular dystrophy community. Passing H.R. 594 will make a huge difference in the lives of all those affected by muscular dystrophy. I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

I want to conclude by thanking majority and minority staff, which Dr. BURGESS mentioned, and I once again thank him for his partnership on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), chairman of the full committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of yet another very important health bill advanced by our Energy and Commerce Committee, H.R. 594, the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2014, or the MD CARE Act. The bill again demonstrates the continued bipartisan achievements of our committee, and particularly of the Health Subcommittee which has a proven track record of getting solutions put into law that have a profound, positive effect on Americans all across the country.

Muscular dystrophy, it is a complex group of diseases that affects the mobility and life expectancy of so many Americans. Current treatments can alleviate symptoms of the muscular dystrophies like Duchenne and slow muscle deterioration, but there is no treatment to reverse it. It is very sad. Even with the progress made by researchers, obviously a lot of work remains.

This legislation is going to help us find the answers to these diseases. The bill ensures the continuation of critical research at the NIH and updates language in the Public Health Service Act to reflect the latest scientific advances. In addition, the Muscular Dystrophy Coordinating Committee of HHS is going to be strengthened to accelerate the understanding of the impact of muscular dystrophy on patients; and, more importantly, it is going to work to find ways to expedite the approval of emerging therapies that will hopefully some day lead to a cure.

I want to particularly thank Dr. BURGESS and ELIOT ENGEL for their leadership on this bill, and also Chairman PITTS and Ranking Members WAXMAN and PALLONE.

I have to say that this is now the 62nd bill that our committee will have passed out of full committee that will pass on the House floor. We have than more a dozen bipartisan committee bills, public health bills that have already been signed into law. We hope this will be one of those as we advance this bill, as well as the Sunscreen Innovation Act, which we just passed a few minutes ago.

I know that this Congress can be remembered as the public health Congress, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation which passed by a voice vote unanimously in our committee. It sends a strong signal to those individuals and their families impacted by muscular dystrophy that Congress—yes, we are—is committed to finding a cure. We will find the resources to do this. This legislation is yet another step, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying this is a good bill, and I urge all Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 594, the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education (MD CARE) Amendments of 2014.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health oversee a number of research, surveillance, and educational efforts involving muscular dystrophy.

H.R. 594 will build upon the federal government's current activities regarding muscular dystrophy. Scientific advances have extended the lives of individuals living with forms of muscular dystrophy—like Duchenne. Today's legislation will help better incorporate the needs of adults with muscular dystrophy into current work in this area.

Congressman ENGEL and Congressman BURGESS should be recognized for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, and all of our staff for their work in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I support H.R. 594 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 594, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to Federal research on muscular dystrophy, and other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFE AND SECURE FEDERAL WEBSITES ACT OF 2014

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3635) to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3635

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Safe and Secure Federal Websites Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. ENSURING FUNCTIONALITY AND SECURITY OF NEW FEDERAL WEBSITES THAT COLLECT PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided under this subsection, an agency may not deploy or make available to the public a new Federal PII website until the date on which the chief information officer of the agency submits a certification to Congress that the website is fully functional and secure.

(2) TRANSITION.—In the case of a new Federal PII website that is operational on the date of the enactment of this Act, paragraph (1) shall not apply until the end of the 90-day period beginning on such date of enactment. If the certification required under paragraph (1) for such website has not been submitted to Congress before the end of such period, the head of the responsible agency shall render the website inaccessible to the public until such certification is submitted to Congress.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR BETA WEBSITE WITH EXPLICIT PERMISSION.—Paragraph (1) shall not

apply to a website (or portion thereof) that is in a development or testing phase, if the following conditions are met:

(A) A member of the public may access PII-related portions of the website only after executing an agreement that acknowledges the risks involved.

(B) No agency compelled, enjoined, or otherwise provided incentives for such a member to access the website for such purposes.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as applying to a website that is operated entirely by an entity (such as a State or locality) that is independent of the Federal Government, regardless of the receipt of funding in support of such website from the Federal Government.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given that term under section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FULLY FUNCTIONAL.—The term ''fully functional'' means, with respect to a new Federal PII website, that the website can fully support the activities for which it is designed or intended with regard to the eliciting, collection, storage, or maintenance of personally identifiable information, including handling a volume of queries relating to such information commensurate with the purpose for which the website is designed.

(3) NEW FEDERAL PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION WEBSITE (NEW FEDERAL PII WEBSITE).—The terms ''new Federal personally identifiable information website'' and ''new Federal PII website'' mean a website that—

(A) is operated by (or under a contract with) an agency;

(B) elicits, collects, stores, or maintains personally identifiable information of individuals and is accessible to the public; and

(C) is first made accessible to the public and collects or stores personally identifiable information of individuals, on or after October 1, 2012.

(4) OPERATIONAL.—The term ''operational'' means, with respect to a website, that such website elicits, collects, stores, or maintains personally identifiable information of members of the public and is accessible to the public.

(5) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION (PII).—The terms ''personally identifiable information'' and ''PII'' mean any information about an individual elicited, collected, stored, or maintained by an agency, including—

(A) any information that can be used to distinguish or trace the identity of an individual, such as a name, a social security number, a date and place of birth, a mother's maiden name, or biometric records; and

(B) any other information that is linked or linkable to an individual, such as medical, educational, financial, and employment information.

(6) RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.—The term ''responsible agency'' means, with respect to a new Federal PII website, the agency that is responsible for the operation (whether directly or through contracts with other entities) of the website.

(7) SECURE.—The term ''secure'' means, with respect to a new Federal PII website, that the following requirements are met:

(A) The website is in compliance with subchapter III of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.

(B) The website ensures that personally identifiable information elicited, collected, stored, or maintained in connection with the website is captured at the latest possible step in a user input sequence.

(C) The responsible agency for the website has taken reasonable efforts to minimize domain name confusion, including through additional domain registrations.

(D) The responsible agency requires all personnel who have access to personally identifiable information in connection with the website to have completed a Standard Form 85P and signed a non-disclosure agreement with respect to personally identifiable information, and the agency takes proper precautions to ensure only trustworthy persons may access such information.

(E) The responsible agency maintains (either directly or through contract) sufficient personnel to respond in a timely manner to issues relating to the proper functioning and security of the website, and to monitor on an ongoing basis existing and emerging security threats to the website.

(8) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. PRIVACY BREACH REQUIREMENTS.

(a) INFORMATION SECURITY AMENDMENT.—Subchapter III of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3550. Privacy breach requirements

''(a) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish and oversee policies and procedures for agencies to follow in the event of a breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information, including requirements for—

''(1) not later than 72 hours after the agency discovers such a breach, or discovers evidence that reasonably indicates such a breach has occurred, notice to the individuals whose personally identifiable information could be compromised as a result of such breach;

''(2) timely reporting to a Federal cybersecurity center, as designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

''(3) any additional actions that the Director finds necessary and appropriate, including data breach analysis, fraud resolution services, identity theft insurance, and credit protection or monitoring services.

''(b) REQUIRED AGENCY ACTION.—The head of each agency shall ensure that actions taken in response to a breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information under the authority or control of the agency comply with policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under subsection (a).

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report to Congress on agency compliance with the policies and procedures established under subsection (a).

''(d) FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY CENTER DEFINED.—The term 'Federal cybersecurity center' means any of the following:

''(1) The Department of Defense Cyber Crime Center.

''(2) The Intelligence Community Incident Response Center.

''(3) The United States Cyber Command Joint Operations Center.

''(4) The National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force.

''(5) Central Security Service Threat Operations Center of the National Security Agency.

''(6) The United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team.

''(7) Any successor to a center, team, or task force described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

''(8) Any center that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines is appropriate to carry out the requirements of this section.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''3550. Privacy breach requirements.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we, as Members of Congress, have been sent here to protect the people's right to privacy, not take it away. My bill, H.R. 3635, will help to instill confidence in Americans that their privacy and personal information is secure. H.R. 3635 will help ensure the functionality and security of Federal Web sites. The escalation of security breaches involving personally identifiable information has contributed to the loss of millions of records over the past few years, both within and outside the Federal Government.

Web sites that fail to meet their intended function are a waste of taxpayer dollars and can result in needless frustration to the end user who is trying to access a Federal service or benefit. The harm to the Federal Government is the loss of public trust, as well as potential legal liability or remediation costs that the taxpayer may ultimately bear.

H.R. 3635 guards against the loss of the public's trust by requiring agency chief information officers certify that Federal Web sites collecting personally identifiable information are fully functional and secure. In addition, the bill requires agencies to notify affected individuals that their personally identifiable information may have been compromised within 72 hours of a known or suspected data breach.

I would like to thank Chairman ISSA, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and Congressman CONNOLLY for their support of the bill, along with Chairman MCCAUL and committee staff.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we all agree that Federal agency Web sites must be secure in order to protect taxpayers from being the victims of an information security breach. For that reason, I support the measure before us, the Safe and Secure Federal Websites Act. The recent data breaches at Target, Neiman Marcus, and other retail establishments affected more than 100 million Americans. The importance of information security cannot be overstated.

It is the responsibility of Congress to ensure that the Federal Government is not the source of these types of data breaches and to ensure that the personally identifiable information of American citizens is not compromised through Federal Web sites. This bill would require agency chief information officers to certify to Congress the functionality and security of new or substantially modified Web sites that contain personally identifiable information. It would also require that existing Web sites that contain personally identifiable information meet these security requirements within 90 days.

We are not known for our speed around here, so I am not entirely sure that that will be enough for agencies to secure existing Web sites. I hope, as this bill moves forward in the legislation, the timeliness issue is addressed. However, overall, these requirements are positive, beginning steps in preventing harmful data breaches within the Federal Government.

I also want to take special time to mention and to thank Congressman CONNOLLY from Virginia for his positive contribution to this legislation and for his work on data security issues. Mr. CONNOLLY's amendment to this legislation closes the loopholes in Federal privacy requirements and streamlines Federal oversight of agency implementation of privacy policies and procedures pertaining to agency responses to security incidents involving personally identifiable information.

I join with the gentleman from Virginia in sincerely hoping that we can continue to work together to move this bill forward in a bipartisan manner. I also hope that we can work together to ensure that this bill is compatible with the existing framework of the Federal Security Management Act.

I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill has 126 cosponsors and passed out of committee with bipartisan support. I strongly urge passage of this bill to protect the privacy of Americans accessing Federal Web sites and support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3635, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANCE CORPORAL WESLEY G. DAVIDS AND CAPTAIN NICHOLAS J. ROZANSKI MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4919) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4919

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL WESLEY G. DAVIDS AND CAPTAIN NICHOLAS J. ROZANSKI MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan as well as the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Chairman ISSA, for their ability to pass this through committee and bring it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 4919, to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office.

Marine Lance Corporal Wesley Davids was 16 years old and still attending Dublin Scioto High School when he was inspired to serve our Nation following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. He was killed the day after his 20th birthday in May of 2005 while fighting in Iraq. He was a member of the Columbus-based Lima Company. Twenty-three total servicemembers from Lima Company died in Iraq. Marine Lance Corporal Davids died during a 96-hour period, Mr. Speaker, in which six members died and 15 were wounded.

Marine Lance Corporal Davids was always willing to lend a hand. His family and friends say he was full of energy, especially when it came to driving or working on cars. He was also a standout rower in high school and well-loved by his community. Crowds lined the street following his memorial service. He is survived by his parents, Jody and Michael, and brother, Steven, in Dublin, Ohio.

□ 1815

Captain Nicholas Rozanski attended Dublin High School and was a lifelong resident of Dublin, which he called ''God's country.''

He proudly served on multiple deployments to Kosovo and Iraq as a member of the Ohio National Guard before he was killed on April 4, 2012, while fighting in Afghanistan. He was described as a model leader who genuinely cared about the men under his command.

Captain Rozanski also was a very proud graduate of Ohio State University, and made a difference in his community by coaching youth soccer for nearly 15 years. He was an accomplished runner, having completed three marathons, and was described by his loved ones as mischievous and witty, with a sparkle in his eye, who loved nothing more than doting on his young daughters. He is survived by his wife, Jennifer; daughters, Emma Kathryn and Anna Elizabeth; his father, Jan Rozanski, and mother, Pamela Mitchell; along with many other family and friends in Dublin, Ohio.

These two heroes, Mr. Speaker, put their country before themselves, and made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, we honor their sacrifice, and that of their families. By naming this postal facility in Dublin, Ohio, after them, their bravery and honor will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues from Ohio and Michigan in the consideration of H.R. 4919, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive, in Dublin, Ohio, as the Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office.

As my friend from Ohio has noted, Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids grew up in Dublin, Ohio, and graduated from Dublin Scioto High School in 2003. After the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, Mr. Davids was inspired to

join the Marine Corps. He was deployed to Iraq with the 4th Marine Division, Marine Forces Reserve of Columbus, Ohio. On May 11, 2005, just one day after his 20th birthday, Lance Corporal Davids was tragically killed while conducting combat operations against enemy forces in Iraq.

Also a native of Dublin, Ohio, Captain Nicholas Rozanski graduated from Dublin High School in 1994 and Ohio State University in 1999. Nicholas came from a family that honors military service and signed up for the National Guard in 2003. After deployments to Kosovo in 2004 and Iraq in 2007, Captain Rozanski was deployed to Afghanistan as a member of the 37th Infantry Brigade Combat Team in 2012. On April 4, 2012, Captain Rozanski was killed by a Taliban suicide bomber in northern Afghanistan. He is survived by his loving wife and two daughters.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor these two fallen heroes, these sons of Ohio, who have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4919, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4919.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 594, PAUL D. WELLSTONE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH AND EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title of H.R. 594 is amended to read as follows: ''A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to Federal research on muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes.''

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 935, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3202, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3107, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 148, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

YEAS—253

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—148

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—31

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cleaver
Culberson
DesJarlais
Gabbard
Graves (MO)
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
McAllister
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Pompeo
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Shuster
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Wilson (SC)

□ 1857

Messrs. YARMUTH, BLUMENAUER, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, MCDERMOTT, TAKANO, HONDA, RUIZ, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ESSENTIAL TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL ASSESSMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3202) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—400

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—32

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cleaver
Cramer
Culberson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
McAllister
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Pompeo
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Wilson (SC)

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY BOOTS-ON-THE-GROUND ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3107) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 395, noes 8, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—395

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—8

Amash
Broun (GA)
Jones
Massie
Stockman
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Yoho

NOT VOTING—29

Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cleaver
Culberson
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Hunter
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
McAllister
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Pompeo
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Wilson (SC)

□ 1910

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4315, 21ST CENTURY ENDANGERED SPECIES TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–563) on the resolution (H. Res. 693) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4315) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMEMBERING DEMI BRAE CUCCIA: WORKING TO PREVENT TEEN DATING VIOLENCE

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember Demi Brae Cuccia. Demi was a student and cheerleader at Gateway High School in Monroeville, Pennsylvania, with an outgoing personality and big aspirations for a successful future. Next month, on August 15, we will mark the seventh anniversary of Demi's tragic death. She was murdered just one day after her 16th birthday.

Teen dating violence, like stalking and other kinds of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse, are reprehensible. No child should be subjected to abuse and violence. As a father of six, my heart goes out to Demi's family and friends, especially her parents, Dr. Gary and Jodi Cuccia.

The Cuccia family is working to educate western Pennsylvania students and families about how to recognize and prevent teen dating violence through the Demi Brae Cuccia Awareness Organization. It is my hope that their efforts can help spare other families from the tragedy of teen dating violence.

Please join me in remembering Demi and in thanking the Cuccias for their commitment to ending dating violence.

SUMMER MEALS

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, more than 21 million children nationwide and 825,000 in Illinois rely on free or reduced-price meals during the school year. Unfortunately, we often forget that these children can go hungry in the summer months, when they are not in school.

Recently, I visited the Share Our Strength Summer Meal Site in Palatine, Illinois. They provide summer meals to students who normally receive reduced-price breakfasts and lunches during the school year. As someone who was on the school breakfast and school lunch program myself, I know that it is imperative we work to reduce poverty in Illinois and that no child should have to miss their meal.

But our local communities cannot fight hunger on their own. That is why I will be cosponsoring the bipartisan Summer Meals Act, which will expand the USDA Summer Nutrition Program to help more children access quality meals during the summer months.

I believe that in the wealthiest nation in the world, no American child should go hungry, and no parent should have to make the difficult decision between paying rent or paying for groceries. Let's work together to stand up for our children by supporting summer food nutrition programs.

THE GREAT WAR—100 YEARS AGO

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was called the ''war to end all wars.'' It began on July 28, 1914, 100 years ago today. It concluded in 1918, only after millions had died. It was just the first of many wars in the last century.

It was at a stalemate in the bloody, deadly trenches of Europe in 1917 when tenacious American Doughboys entered the battle. It was World War I.

Over 100,000 young American warriors never returned. One was President Teddy Roosevelt's son, Quentin. Thousands more died from the Spanish flu that they contracted.

The last American survivor was Frank Buckles, Jr., who lived to be 110. I got to know Buckles, as did many other Members of Congress. His dying wish was that a memorial be erected on the Mall to honor all the Americans who fought in the Great War: those that returned, those that returned with the wounds of war, and those that did not return.

It is unfortunate and tragic that a memorial has not been erected because, as it has been said, the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that is just the way it is.

THE ENGLISH LEARNING AND INNOVATION ACT

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of improving educational opportunities for a group of students that our education system has left behind, English language learners, or ELLs. Even though English language learners are the fastest-growing student population in the United States, they score far behind their English-speaking peers and, more likely than others, lack the resources needed to succeed in our schools.

That is why I am introducing the English Learning and Innovation Act, which will create two grant programs to enable schools to better provide a high-quality education to students working to learn English.

As someone who grew up in Miami, I recognize the value of students who don't yet speak English who are building a vibrant community together.

This bill has the support of a number of organizations, including the NEA, NCLR, and the National Association for Bilingual Education. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking action to strengthen English language education.

ISRAEL

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of Israel and their defensive war against Hamas. Hamas is a terrorist organization. It is an arm of the Muslim Brotherhood. Its reason for existence is to destroy Israel. And Hamas desires a second Holocaust, although they won't acknowledge that the first happened. Hamas uses human shields to protect their weapons of terror.

They are not protesting occupation. Israel pulled completely out of the Gaza Strip, including uprooting more than 10,000 of their own citizens from their homes nearly 10 years ago.

Hamas has used the last decade to build a complex terrorist infrastructure, including tunnels designed solely to kill as many Israelis as possible. The U.S. should not be pressuring Israel to give Hamas breathing room. The complete defeat of Hamas and the dismantling of their terrorist infrastructure will be good for Israel's security and will be a decisive blow against international terrorism and the global jihad, which is good for our national security. We need to stand with Israel at this critical juncture.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY CHAPLAINS AND CAPTAIN MIKE CERULA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our Nation's military chaplains. It was 239 years ago this week, at the behest of George Washington, that the Army Chaplain Corps was created by the Continental Congress. These brave men and women, who serve in each branch of the military and are from all faiths and denominations, have served in every one of our Nation's wars.

Today I would like to acknowledge one of our Nation's military chaplains, Captain Mike Cerula, who is from Waterford, Erie County, Pennsylvania, and is currently serving with the 82nd Airborne at Fort Bragg.

Chaplain Cerula deployed to Iraq in 2011 and was previously acting brigade chaplain for the 411th Engineer Brigade. Military chaplains, like Chaplain Cerula, represent some of the best this country has to offer.

A favorite Bible verse of Chaplain Cerula's is from James 5:16, and I quote: ''The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.''

We thank you, Chaplain Cerula, along with all of our military chaplains, for your service, your sacrifice, and most importantly, your work to support the spiritual strength and wellness of those who serve in uniform.

CONGRATULATING COACH RON REAM

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my old high school football coach, Ron Ream, who was recently voted into the Florida Athletic Coaches Association Hall of Fame. I can't think of a man more deserving of this recognition.

Coach Ream is going on his 38th season as the head coach of the Benjamin Buccaneers, my alma mater, making him the longest-tenured coach in Palm Beach County.

The true measure of his legacy though is not in the record books, in championship games, or in winning seasons, but in the values and lessons he imparts on the young men that go through his football program.

With his guidance, I was able to go on to play tight end at Syracuse University and then at Washington and Jefferson College.

Coach Ream not only helped me succeed on the field, but he showed me the traits of a great leader and the value of hard work, which helped me succeed professionally well into my adulthood. I know that I wouldn't be where I am today if it wasn't for Coach Ream.

Congratulations, Coach. And go Bucs.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my privilege to coanchor today's CBC Special Order, along with my good friend and distinguished colleague from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD.

Every Monday when Congress is in session, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people for 60 minutes, the so-called CBC Hour of Power, where we get a chance to discuss an issue of relevance to this great country.

Today, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here to talk about halting the GOP march toward impeachment. We are going to address the troubling fact that the GOP appears to want to move forward this week with a lawsuit challenging the President's authority.

Now, I think most legal scholars will come to the conclusion that the House GOP lawsuit is baseless, it is frivolous, it is without merit. But the American people should pay attention to what is going to take place this week because the lawsuit is part of a continuing effort to delegitimize the President of the United States of America.

Now, I recognize, unfortunately, that there are some folks in this Chamber who believe that the President exceeded his authority on January 20, 2009, when he took the oath of office. And they have continued to accuse him of Presidential lawlessness ever since.

So during this Special Order hour, we are going to discuss the alleged lawlessness that has taken place, and I think we will be able to dismiss these allegations as nothing more than political broadsides leveled against a President who was elected by the people of this great country and reelected by the people of this great country.

And then we are also going to deal with the fact that there are so many other things that we, as a Congress, could be doing other than wasting taxpayer money related to a lawsuit that is sure to be thrown out of court. It is going to be thrown out because there is no congressional standing to sue the President. The Supreme Court has said this over and over again. There must be a particularized injury in order for one to get standing in Federal court, and Members of Congress lack it. That is what the Supreme Court has concluded.

There is also the issue of the political question doctrine: disputes between the two branches of government, the executive branch and the congressional legislative branch, are not to be resolved by the article III courts. They are to be resolved by the normal governmental processes put in place by our Constitution.

We are joined today by the distinguished chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, who has been a tremendous leader of our CBC over the 113th Congress. It is now my honor to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very, very much for yielding. I, again, want to thank my colleagues Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD for, again, leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour on an issue that should never have made it to this House floor. We shouldn't even have to consider halting the Republican leadership's irreverent and irresponsible march toward impeachment of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, since his election, the Republican leadership has shown nothing short of outright disrespect and disdain for the current President of the United States. In an effort to prevent the President from getting anything done during his first term or his second, the Republican leadership has completely ignored the democratic process. They prefer the obstruction and destruction of our Federal Government over working towards what is best for the American people.

Now Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans are posed to waste millions of taxpayer dollars on a lawsuit arguing against something they asked him to do. They are claiming to take issue with the President because he instructed the delay of the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans wanted to do away with that provision, not to mention the entire ACA. The President delayed the employer mandate from taking effect for 1 year in an effort to hear and act on Republicans' more reasonable concerns. And now they are trying to punish him for it. This makes absolutely no sense. Instead of focusing on the many issues facing our Nation, the Republican leadership is choosing to pull another political stunt that wastes our time and our tax dollars.

Through consistent obstruction, dysfunction, and a steadfast unwillingness to serve the American people, the Republican leadership continues to abuse their power while they demean and disgrace this House. When will they recognize that by attempting to damage the President's leadership and his legacy, they are only hurting the people that we are all sworn to serve?

□ 1930

When will they wake up and realize that this job is not about political gamesmanship? It is about doing the work we are asked to do by our constituents, and that work is to propose and pass legislation that creates opportunity for the American people, not to distract them with the silliness that Republicans have stirred up since day one of this administration.

Their inaction and petty behavior has caused this to be the least productive Congress in the history of this Nation. The President should sue the Congress for not doing their job. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve so much more than Republican leadership has given them. It is time to stop these ridiculous games and get to work on the real and serious business of this House.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chairlady of the CBC. The people of America deserve a Congress that does the business of the people and that deals with real issues that impact working families, the middle class, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

Instead, we get an agenda from the majority in the House of Representatives that is all about delay, destruction, and delegitimization of the President of the United States of America. This is a frivolous lawsuit that lacks any basis in law or in fact, and we need to get beyond the political gamesmanship and get back to doing the business of the people.

I am pleased that we have been joined by the gentlewoman from the Badger State, Representative GWEN MOORE, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee. I am honored to serve with her, a champion for working families, the poor, and the middle class.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Representative JEFFRIES. I was wondering if I could ask you some questions. You certainly are an officer of the court, you are an attorney, and so I wanted to ask you to expand a little bit on your contention that constitutional experts and legal scholars have commented that the lawsuit will fail for the lack of standing, that there is no injury here that anyone could point to, and to explain that to me a little bit more.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Chief Justice Rehnquist, in an opinion in 1997, Raines v. Byrd, made the point that individual Members of Congress do not have standing to bring lawsuits in court if they cannot point to a particularized or personal injury, which the GOP in this case will not be able to do because the injury that is being claimed relates to policy disputes, such as the ACA and the employer mandate, such as DACA, and such as the welfare work requirements. These are broad policy disputes, not particularized injuries.

The Court went on to point out that, if one of the Members of Congress were to retire tomorrow, he would no longer have a general claim. The claim would be possessed by his successor instead.

The claimed injury—referring to policy disputes—attaches to the Member's seat, a seat which the Member holds as trustee for his constituents, not as a prerogative of personal power. In other words, there is no standing for Members of Congress to bring a lawsuit against the President in the context of a policy dispute.

Ms. MOORE. Well, thank you so much for that clarification, Mr. JEFFRIES. So this doesn't pass a constitutional test, it doesn't pass a legal test, and it doesn't even pass the laugh test because I can tell you, for folks who have pursued repeal of the Affordable Care Act for over 50 times, not wanting to implement the employer mandate, to turn around and say, we have been injured because the President delayed it, does not pass the laugh test.

I tell you I have been elected to and served as a public servant since 1988, and I can tell you that Republicans have continuously chastised Democrats for their frivolous lawsuits.

Republicans have continuously claimed that people who have been injured by products—consumer products—should have a cap on their

claims, and yet, this frivolous lawsuit will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. So, while it may not have any standing, Mr. JEFFRIES, it certainly will cost hundreds of millions of dollars before that ruling will be made.

As a matter of fact, in this do-nothing Congress, we have, in fact, wasted money. It is not only that we wasted time; we are wasting money. Some examples of what we have done so far: we have spent $79 million so far in over 50 attacks on the Affordable Care Act; we have even shut the government down for 24 billion—that is billion with a B—dollars. So how much is it going to cost us, once again, to promote this frivolous lawsuit?

We are in session—this is the last week of Congress—and are we going to talk about helping young people with unaffordable interest rates on student loans? No. Are we going to talk about extending and reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank to help manufacturers that are in my district? No.

Are we going to talk about providing unemployment compensation for people who are suffering with no income through no fault of their own because of the economy? No. Are we going to talk about raising the minimum wage? Are we going to talk about reauthorizing terrorism risk insurance? No.

Are we going to talk about whether or not we will provide moneys to humanely and adequately discuss the crises on the borders of our country, the influx of children escaping violence in their home country? No. No. No. We are going to sue the President of the United States. This does not pass the legal test, the constitutional test, and it does not pass the laugh test.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her very eloquent and sharp observations with respect to the lack of merit to the GOP lawsuit that they are going to proceed with this week.

We now have also been joined by the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Representative BARBARA LEE, another distinguished member of the Budget Committee, someone who is a voice for the voiceless, a champion for the poor, and a fighter for the district that she represents in Congress.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, first of all, for your kind words and also for your continued leadership on this issue and so many other issues and especially in helping us, once again, beat the drum on behalf of the American people to make sure that people know exactly what the Republican Tea Party members are engaged in, in this body, so thank you very much to you and Congressman HORSFORD for this.

Also, I just want to say to Congresswoman FUDGE, our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to thank her for her diligent work as chair and especially in her continuing efforts to fight against the extreme ideology that deters us from the real work our constituents sent us here to do.

Once again, we are calling now tonight on Congress to get back to work putting Americans back to work. Rather than working together to create jobs, my Republican colleagues are pursuing a completely baseless lawsuit against President Obama at the expense of the American taxpayer. Mind you, never before has a sitting President been sued—not once.

This lawsuit is nothing more than a political ploy designed for those who really want impeachment without cost. These Tea Party Republicans are driving the Republican Party to become so extreme and too conservative for the American people.

To provide just one example, instead of voting on bipartisan immigration reform that would keep our families together, grow our economy, and enhance national security, the House has voted more than 50 times to repeal real health care reform that provides 54 million people with vital preventive health services like cancer screening.

We were sent here to Washington to help enhance the quality of life for the American people, not to engage in these lawsuits against the President for no reason.

We were sent to Washington to make America a better place, to create jobs, to grow the economy, to lift up the most vulnerable, and to build ladders of opportunity for the 46.5 million Americans, including 6 million children living in poverty today.

This lawsuit is another example of the unfounded, wasteful, and really unconscionable attacks on our President, who was twice elected by the American people. It does nothing to help the American people.

I tell you it is really troubling to see the extremists in the Republican Party marching down a path that is not based on fact, but, again, it is really nothing more than a political sideshow aimed at building its base, but it is a serious effort, I must say.

Remember when President Obama, Congressman JEFFRIES, when he was first elected, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL said that their goal was to make President Obama a one-term President?

Well, they didn't accomplish their goal, so now, they are trying something else, and really, it is quite shameful, and the fact is that it is being funded with taxpayer dollars. This is nothing short than a violation of our constituents' trust. It is exactly like $2.3 million spent to preserve discrimination during the DOMA case.

There is no constitutional or judicial precedent to adjudicate political disputes in the courts. We are ready, willing, and able to have a serious conversation about creating opportunities in the middle class for people who are fighting and aspiring to become part of the middle class, who are living on the edges and on the margins.

We are ready, we have been fighting for this, and we want to have some consensus with the Republicans, so we can move forward on this, rather than filing lawsuits to detract from the real work that the Republicans, once again, refuse to do.

Every day, I hear from my constituents about their real struggles. Too many of our constituents are looking for work. Too many are working full time, and they are still living on the edge in poverty. One in five American children still lives in poverty.

Too many people in my district and throughout the country face real challenges, challenges that Republicans continue to ignore while pursuing an ideologically motivated lawsuit.

It is about time we put these political ploys aside and get back to work. We need to stop this politically motivated, extreme, and disturbing march toward impeachment because that is where this is going, and hopefully, the public understands that, and we need to end the lawsuit. Instead, we need to pass comprehensive immigration reform and fix the broken system that is tearing families apart.

Also, we have got to pass the Voting Rights Act and protect the voting rights of all Americans. We need to put workers back to work and raise the minimum wage. We need to stop wasting taxpayer dollars on lawsuits and roll up our sleeves and get back to work. I believe that the American people are going to see right through this.

So I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressmen HORSFORD and JEFFRIES for giving us the chance to really pull back the veil on what is really taking place with regard to this lawsuit.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California. In the 113th Congress, we have had sequestration, $85 billion in randomly spread-out cuts across our budget impacting the American economy. We have had a government shutdown that was unnecessary, unreasonable, and reckless; it cost us $24 billion in lost economic productivity.

We have had a flirtation with the debt ceiling threatening the full faith and credit of the United States of America. Now, we have got a frivolous lawsuit against the President of the United States, and it leads me to ask the question: Is there such a thing as a four-ring circus?

Let me now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Representative ROBIN KELLY, my good friend and colleague from the freshman class, and a distinguished champion for her district.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, and I want to

thank Congressman HORSFORD and the Congressional Black Caucus for this very, very important special hour.

It is absolutely ridiculous what Speaker BOEHNER and his party want to do. It is a waste of time, as many of us have said, a waste of time, a waste of taxpayers' money, and it looks like nothing but a sideshow.

There are so many things we should be working on, things like immigration reform, pay equality, helping to stop the gun violence in our urban areas, and unemployment insurance that people so desperately need.

Again, Speaker BOEHNER has shown that he does not pay attention to what the public wants and cares about. Ninety percent of the public thinks we should expand background checks.

Seventy-four percent of NRA members think we should expand background checks, but he is not bringing that bill to the floor, but he is going to bring this bill to the floor when there is not even the public appetite for a lawsuit.

□ 1945

Many Americans, quite frankly, don't feel the President has abused his power. Because we don't listen and we do things like this, it is no wonder only 8 percent of the public thinks that Congress is doing a good job.

From day one, there has been a great disrespect for this President like no other in history. Some of my colleagues are shocked that he won the first time and can't seem to get over that he won again the second time. Well, we need to get over it, and you need to get over it because there are so many issues we can be working on. We should be trying to improve the quality of life of our constituents, our country, and, frankly, of the world.

As a freshman, this is not what I came to Congress to vote on. I came to Congress, like I assume most of us did, to make a difference, to have a public agenda and not a personal agenda and not an attacking agenda, and an agenda where, even though we disagree, we still show respect for each other.

So I again applaud you, Congressman, for holding this Special Order. This is extremely important. I hope the public is truly paying attention because this is shameful and, as I said in the beginning, ridiculous.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Let me now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). Although he does not have on one of his signature ties, he is the informal chair of the ''bowtie caucus'' and someone who has been a champion for the district he represents in New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, the gentleman from Nevada and the gentleman from New York who have done an outstanding job of managing these Special Orders, I would just like to thank them for the opportunity to come out and speak on this matter, this issue, this frivolous issue of where we find our Nation, a lack of respect for a man who won an election, as we have had elections throughout this Nation's history.

But we come to a point in history now where there is something wrong with this President. Something about him is illegitimate. Something about him just isn't right. Something about him has Members of this institution disrespecting him on a daily basis. He is the President of the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the world, the most powerful man in the world, and deserves the respect that we have given every other President that has held that office.

While millions of Americans are still out of work, my Republican colleagues are wasting time and money again. This time it is on a partisan lawsuit waged against the President and talk of impeachment. These actions are frivolous and shameful, and they pander to the most extreme wing of the Republican Party.

Every serious constitutional scholar sees the Republican lawsuit against the President for what it is: a desperate political stunt. And they have tried many times, as it was stated by colleagues prior to me, 50 times trying to repeal the law of the Nation, the Affordable Care Act—50 times. They will not stop at anything in order to have this President defeated and look as if he is a failure.

When has that been our history in this Nation? When has it come to that? This great democracy that we have has been a battle over ideas and a coming together in a bipartisan manner. You are over here, I am over there, but we come together on common issues to come to what is in the best interest of all Americans.

Why should a President have to have Members of this body or the Senate stand in front of him and say that ''I can't even stand to look at you.''

Where? Where in this Nation, the home of the free, the land of the brave, we hold these truths to be self-evident. Are they self-evident these days? Are they? The humanitarian issue we have at our border, I remember somewhere it saying, ''give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses.'' Now we say, ''Stop the bus at the border and go back.''

Where is this Nation going? It is a sad time in this country that we find ourselves at this point: Okay. This didn't work. We couldn't get him on that. His birth certificate, he showed up with that. Okay. Scratch that. I know what. Let's repeal the Affordable Care Act. Try 50 times. Okay. That didn't work. Hey, I have a new one. Let's just sue him.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, just because Republicans disagree with the President's policies or political persuasion doesn't give them the right to sue him. Even the Nation's most conservative Supreme Court Justices have said that the Congress cannot sue the President in these circumstances. Meanwhile, millions of Americans are out of work, including nearly 300,000 people in my home State of New Jersey. Instead of working together to create jobs, New Jerseyans are learning that the Republicans are at it again, wasting taxpayer time and money on frivolous lawsuits.

My constituents are outraged. But just because Republicans won't do their job, the President and Democrats in Congress will. I can remember prior to coming to Congress President Obama extending his hand on numerous occasions to work with the Congress, to work with the other side of the aisle, and he was just rebuffed.

Now that he says he will use executive privilege, executive order, now there is a problem once again. If you can't work with them, then he is going to have to go it alone and do what he has to do to make sure that this Nation has the things, the laws, to be, to continue to be the great Nation that it is. Democrats have a real jobs plan, the Make It In America plan, to put America back to work, to bring jobs back to our shores, to build roads and bridges, to create a better education system, and to lead the world in innovation.

My bill, the Green Jobs Act, is part of that plan and will expand access to capital for small businesses to create good-paying jobs in low-income communities.

We are ready to work. We are ready to work with this President. I think it is high time that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Okay. We tried everything. There is one more thing to try—working with this President to move this Nation forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for those very poignant observations.

I think, as you have pointed out, we are in a divided government context, and we understand there are going to be policy disagreements, but the objective should be to work toward finding common ground to improve the lives of those we were sent here to Washington to represent. Instead, we are in the midst of a campaign to continue to try to delegitimize the President.

It is over. The battle has been lost. The President was elected in 2008. He was reelected in 2012. It is time to put aside the political gamesmanship and figure out where we might be able to find common ground to advance an agenda that makes sense for the American people.

We said earlier that this lawsuit was a frivolous one, and I quoted Chief Justice Rehnquist, a leading conservative former Supreme Court Justice, as it relates to his position with respect to

congressional standing. I now want to quote another Justice of the Supreme Court who said in an opinion he wrote just last year, United States v. Windsor:

Our Constitution rejects a system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.

That was an opinion, and that wasn't written by Ruth Bader Ginsburg. That wasn't an opinion written by Justice Sotomayor, although I have great respect for those two Justices from the great State of New York. Those words were written by Anton Scalia, one of the most conservative Justices in the history of the Supreme Court. You can't just pop into court because you have a policy disagreement with the President.

And so I think we have dealt with the issue of the frivolous nature of this lawsuit, the fact that we are wasting the time and the treasure of the American people on a political joyride that will ultimately crash and burn in an article III court. In the meantime, we are neglecting our constitutional responsibilities here in the House of Representatives to actually deal with issues that impact the American people. And to touch upon what some of those issues could be, let me now yield to the coanchor of this CBC Special Order, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Let me thank my good friend and the coanchor for this hour, the gentleman from the Empire State, Mr. JEFFRIES.

Every time we have the opportunity to come to this floor, it is a humbling experience. And to all of my colleagues, led by our chair, the Honorable Representative from the State of Ohio, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, MARCIA FUDGE, thank you for your leadership and for demanding that we have an opportunity to be heard in this very important Special Order hour. I want to thank all of my colleagues who have come here tonight.

Tonight, at some level, my heart is heavy because, as many of my colleagues have expressed tonight, we came to Congress to get things done on behalf of the American people and the constituents that we serve.

We understand, as Congressman JEFFRIES just indicated, that this is a divided government. As the minority, we have to work within this honorable institution to try to advance the issues that we feel are important, but what we do not believe is that the majority should be able to unilaterally obstruct a governmental process that is the foundation of our democracy as a nation.

□ 2000

So tonight, this is a very important discussion because later this week, if the Speaker and the majority House Republicans have their way, they will do for the first time in history something that has never been done, which is to sue the American President because they don't agree with him.

This lawsuit, the Speaker Boehner-House Republican lawsuit against the President, has been characterized by many. USA Today's editorial board said ''it was a political sideshow.'' At a time when the American people are urging us to act on a number of important and serious and time-pressing matters, you, Mr. Speaker, and House Republicans are sacrificing precious taxpayer resources and time when we could be tackling a number of important issues that the American public want us to tackle.

Now, I just held a telephone town hall last week in my district. I had over 4,000 people on this telephone town hall. My district covers 52,000 square miles. It is a diverse district. Not everybody agrees with the President or his positions. But not one person on that call asked me to support you, Mr. Speaker, or the House Republicans in suing the President. In fact, many of them said, how is it that you have the authority to unilaterally act to obstruct this process and to deny the important issues that so many of us would like to have come before this body for an up or down vote? We understand that we are in the minority and we may not win, but in this democracy, the minority deserves to be heard.

Now, unfortunately, this body is about to take a 5-week recess. My constituents don't really understand how, after we have really accomplished very little, we can now take a ''recess,'' and the thing that you want to act on this week is to sue the President. Well, that shouldn't be. We shouldn't be going on recess, we shouldn't be wasting taxpayer money or time on frivolous, baseless lawsuits, because we have plenty of work to do.

So my question, Mr. Speaker, is: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of the majority of Americans who want us to jump-start the middle class, to maybe pass the Make It in America job creation agenda, or the infrastructure bills that are so desperately needed? Whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when Americans have demanded a raise so that they can have their wages keep up with the cost of living? Whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when you have already denied the extension of unemployment insurance benefits for over 3.5 million Americans since last December—33,800 Nevadans who are struggling, at no fault of their own, who need a bridge just to stay afloat? Whose side are you on? Are we going to honor our veterans and fix a broken VA system? Are we going to pass the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act to ensure that our most sacred Democrat right, our right to vote, is protected?

I know you want to recess so you can run home and have elections, but people need to vote, and we need to make sure that that right to vote is protected. So we need to pass and reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. Why can't we bring that bill up this week, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, whose side are you on when, overwhelmingly, the American public has asked us to pass comprehensive immigration reform, to secure our border, to actually put the necessary resources on the border, and to make sure that no other children are torn away from their mothers and their fathers?

So while House Democrats are working on these important issues, and many, many others, the American people just simply don't understand how it is that this week, of all weeks, the majority would decide in this House to spend precious time and resources suing the American President for the first time in history.

Instead of doing any of this, House Republicans are focused once again on partisan stunts that contribute nothing to the well-being of our Nation. Voting to sue the President is an insult to the hardworking American families who need this Congress to act, act on something, on anything, and to let us have an up-or-down vote.

Now, this lawsuit undermines what little remaining respect this House has left. So as new Members, we are pleading: give us our Congress back, let us work with our colleagues who want to work with us. There are Republicans who support some of these bills, but the leadership, the Speaker, and the House Republican leadership, won't let them. That is the truth.

Now, my colleague has talked about the fact that there is very little constitutional basis for this lawsuit. Let me just add a couple to those remarks. Constitutional law experts have weighed in. Laurence Tribe of Harvard University Law School described the lawsuit as a ''wholly meritless attempt to invoke the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary.''

Charles Tiefer of the University of Baltimore Law School called the lawsuit an ''embarrassing loser.''

The whole process leading up to this lawsuit has been tainted by partisan tactics as well. Just last week, Ranking Member Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER and other members of the Rules Committee introduced 11 amendments during markup of this baseless, unnecessary lawsuit against the President, and their only request was to allow more transparency and accountability if this were to go forward on how much money is being spent—taxpayer money, by the way—in funding this lawsuit.

So whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about fiscal responsibility and you won't even disclose or

allow the rules of this vote to have a level of transparency or accountability?

Let me just highlight a few of the amendments that these Democrats proposed:

Requiring the House general counsel to disclose how much has been spent on the lawsuit each week;

Prohibiting the hiring of any law firms or consultants who lobby Congress, because if they lobby Congress for a living, Congress shouldn't also be paying them on the side;

Prohibiting the hiring of any law firm or consultants who lobby on the Affordable Care Act implementation, or who have any financial stake in implementation of the Affordable Care Act;

Requiring disclosure of all contracts with lawyers and consultants 10 days before they are approved, requiring disclosure of where taxpayer money paying for this frivolous lawsuit is coming from, and which programs and offices' budgets are being reduced to pay for it.

These were the commonsense amendments that House Democrats on the Rules Committee proposed, and on a party line vote 7–4, the House majority, the Republicans, denied these commonsense transparency and accountability measures to be included.

So what is the rush? It shows that the Rules Committee Republicans are not serious. They are not serious about making this a transparent process because they know it is nothing more than a waste of time and money. This is a stunt, but it is a stunt that has a price, and the American public deserves to know just how much this is going to cost.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his observations and for pointing out the many issues that we in the House of Representatives could be addressing this week to deal with quality of life concerns of the American people, but instead we have been forced to come to the floor of the House of Representatives this evening to talk about this frivolous lawsuit that, if the majority gets its way, will be authorized later on this week.

I also want to point out that there is this troubling undercurrent that has also taken shape in the House of Representatives and amongst the conservative entertainment complex related to the allegedly unlawful actions of the President in what many of us view as a ''march toward impeachment.''

Now, some are going to say: Well, this is a Democratic conspiracy to rile up certain parts of the country, that is why we are raising the impeachment question. No, let's just go to the Record.

The distinguished gentleman from the 17th Congressional District in Texas at a town hall meeting in September of 2013:

I look at the President, I think he's violated the Constitution, I think he's violated the law. I think he's abused his power, but at the end of the day you have to say if the House decides to impeach him, if the House had an impeachment vote, it would probably impeach the President.

Those are not my words. Those are the words of the gentleman from the 17th Congressional District of this House.

The distinguished gentleman from the Third Congressional District in Utah:

This is an administration embroiled in a scandal that they created.

I am not clear what the scandal is that is being referenced.

It's a coverup. I'm not saying impeachment is the end game, but it's a possibility, especially if they keep doing little to help us learn more.

I can go on and on, but you have got the distinguished gentleman from Iowa:

''From my standpoint, if the President''—referencing executive actions—''we need to bring impeachment hearings immediately before the House of Representatives.''

These aren't our words. These are the words of people elected to the 113th Congress.

So that is why we are here to have a conversation with the American people. Do you think this is the issue that we should be debating and discussing as we are still trying to revive large segments of our economy, still struggling to recover from the aftermath of the Great Recession?

Now, this last statement from a member of the impeachment caucus here in the House of Representatives, the Congressman from Iowa, he referenced ''executive actions.''

Let's have a discussion about executive actions. This chart illustrates that President Obama actually has been a President in modern history who has been conservative in his approach with respect to executive actions. Upon entering his sixth year in office, President Obama issued 167 executive orders. As the chart illustrates, at this very same point, George W. Bush had issued 198 executive orders.

Where was the outrage when George Bush was engaging in his orgy of executive orders? Where was the outrage? Where was the outrage when President Ronald Reagan issued 381 executive orders, a pace that there is no way President Obama can match? It is just not clear to me where this is all coming from.

Let me now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada and/or the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for any parting observations.

Mr. HORSFORD. May I inquire to the Speaker how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

□ 2015

Mr. HORSFORD. To the gentleman from New York, as you indicated, this frivolous lawsuit really should not be entirely surprising, and we should not underestimate the lengths that the House Republicans are willing to take against this President.

This week, it is a vote to sue. After the recess that we shouldn't be taking, maybe it is impeachment proceedings, so this is a very serious issue and one that I wish every Member of this body will take seriously because what the Speaker and the House Republicans are asking us to do is a direct affront to our constituents who elected us to do a job.

Republicans can disagree with the President. That is not shocking, nor is it inappropriate. There are plenty of differences that divide many of us here in Washington—many of them, needlessly so—but Republican opposition during this Presidency has hit historic levels.

Many of my colleagues this evening have talked about the obstruction that has occurred from the very day this President was being sworn in by those in the majority in this body who have attempted to block him.

I believe in an America that still can do good things and big things. I believe in an America that honors its institutions and respects them. I believe in the institutions of these offices, even when I may not agree with the person who holds that position, but what I cannot do is stand by as a Member of Congress, someone who is here to serve the 700,000 people from my district who elected me, and to allow the Speaker and House Republicans to tear down this institution. It is too honorable.

The work we are supposed to be doing is too great. It is significant to the lives of the people who are counting on us to do something that is important to their lives.

So, again, I ask, Mr. Speaker: Whose side are you on? Because there is nothing in this lawsuit that is going to create a job, educate a child, help a small business owner, address the issues of health care in this country, fix what is broken with immigration; there is nothing this week that you or the House Republicans are doing with this baseless lawsuit that is going to solve a problem.

In fact, it is going to create new problems—constitutional problems—and it is going to create a debt that this institution and future generations will have to cover.

So we are here, raising our voices against what we believe to be an affront to the integrity of this body as a whole and to bring a focus back to the issues the American people so desperately want this Congress to work on.

So we are here tonight. We will be here working and willing to work. We are willing to cancel our recess to stay here and do the American public's business because that is what they expect us to do.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for those observations.

Under the House majority, the agenda has constituted the following: delay, destroy, defund, and delegitimize.

We just want to tackle issues relevant to the American people. Let's tackle the fact that America needs a raise. Let's tackle equal pay for equal work. Let's tackle infrastructure funding. Let's tackle our broken immigration system. Let's tackle the fact that we have got a gun violence problem in America.

Let's address the fact that the Supreme Court invalidated portions of section 5 of the historic Voting Rights Act. Let's stop the political gamesmanship.

In the remaining time that we have, let me yield to a championed distinguished member of the Homeland Security Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank the gentleman from New York.

I just want to take a moment to compliment both Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES for this Special Order, among others. I could not imagine, as we end this session, to have a more important statement to the American people. We want to work, and in a few days, we will be voting on an action to sue the President of the United States.

Let me refer you to Justice Antonin Scalia, who has said in United States v. Windsor:

> Our Constitution rejects a system in which Congress and the executive can pop immediately into court whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.

Former Chief Justice William Rehnquist wrote that while some European countries allow one branch of government to sue another, that is obviously not the regime that our Constitution establishes.

Our Constitution contemplates a more restricted role for article III courts. In fact, our Constitution clearly states the separation of the three branches of the government: the judiciary, the legislature, and, of course, the executive branch of government. That is the way it is supposed to be structured.

Now, we come and find ourselves with the legislature trying to step into leading the executive. The President has made it very clear. What has he done wrong?

We just heard the Speaker of the House tell the President with respect to the unaccompanied children: you can handle it. Well, frankly, I would make the argument that you are right. There are executive powers, and so the basis upon which this lawsuit is about to be projected, to me, evidences that we have lost our way.

As my colleagues have said as I was walking onto the floor, we still have the extension of unemployment insurance, the raising of minimum wage, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and the fixing of the veterans health system, which I hope that we will be able to do this week. If not, we should stay here and fix it for our veterans.

The Constitution is clear, and I want to say those branches of government again: the judiciary, legislative, and executive branches are separate. Scholars and conservative jurists have indicated that there is no reason for us to jump into court on the responsibilities of each particular branch.

Mr. Speaker, I would make the argument that this week is going to be 3 days of wasted time, and I know that there are people who disagree with the Affordable Care Act, immigration reform, the unaccompanied children—not one of those issues is attributable to the malfeasance of the President of the United States.

I don't know whether this is a substitute for impeachment, but I would make the argument that the President has committed nothing equal to impeachment, and this second class citizenship of a lawsuit certainly is inappropriate.

I believe the American people are much more interested in making sure that we follow what is good for them: creating jobs, protecting children, providing for education, and, Mr. Speaker, ending wars and fighting for what is right.

This is not the way the people of the United States value their principles to be misused. The executive, judiciary, and legislature are three separate branches. We are expected to do our separate duties.

I would, again, ask that we adhere to the Constitution by respecting these three separate branches of government. Let's do our job and provide for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk briefly about the GOP's march towards impeachment. But first let me make a distinction between impeachment and a lawsuit initiated by the House, qua House of Representatives.

Article II, Section 4 of the United States Constitution states: The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

In any impeachment inquiry, the Members of this branch of government must confront some preliminary questions to determine whether an impeachment is appropriate in a given situation.

The first of these questions is whether the individual whose conduct is under scrutiny falls within the category of President, Vice President, or "civil Officers of the United States" such that he is vulnerable to impeachment.

One facet of this question in some cases is whether the resignation of the individual under scrutiny forecloses further impeachment proceedings against him.

A second preliminary question is whether the conduct involved constitutes "treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors."

Now Mr. Speaker, whether we get to this point where we are actually considering impeachment of the President is a question that only the GOP Majority can answer. It appears that we are heading in that direction—even in the face of doubt from numerous experts as to whether the effort will succeed or not.

Indeed, it is a matter of historical fact that President Bush pushed this nation into a war that had little to do with apprehending the terrorists of September 11, 2001; and weapons of mass destruction, "WMD's" have yet to be found.

House Democrats refused to impeach President Bush.

Let me state that again: "House Democrats refused to impeach President George W. Bush."

Now I wish to turn to the resolution which the GOP Majority intends to put before this body in a last-ditch effort to stir their base before November.

Former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger testified before the Rules Committee two weeks ago and had this to say about the potential lawsuit:

> The House of Representatives lacks authority to bring such a suit. Because neither the Speaker nor even the House of Representatives has a legal concrete, particular and personal stake in the outcome of the proposed lawsuits, federal courts would have no authority to entertain such actions.
>
> Passage of the proposed resolution does nothing to change that. If federal judges were to undertake to entertain suits brought by the legislature against the President or other federal officers for failing to administer statutes as the House desires, the result would be an unprecedented aggrandizement of the political power of the judiciary.
>
> Such a radical liberalization of the role of unelected judges in matters previously entrusted to the elected branches of government should be rejected.

My colleagues on the other side argue that lawsuits by Congress to force the administration to enforce federal laws will prevent the president from exceeding his constitutional authority,

But the Supreme Court has constantly held that the exercise of executive discretion being taken by President Obama is within the president's powers under the Constitution.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in Article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

The constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely to be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

To satisfy the constitutional standing requirements in Article III, the Supreme Court imposes three requirements.

The plaintiff must first allege a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual or imminent, concrete, and particularized.

Second, the injury must be ''fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct, and'' third, the injury must be ''likely to be redressed by the requested relief.''

PRUDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the constitutional questions posed by the doctrine of standing, federal courts also follow a well-developed set of prudential principles that are relevant to a standing inquiry.

Similar to the constitutional requirements, these limits are ''founded in concern about the proper—and properly limited—role of the courts in a democratic society,'' but are judicially created.

Unlike their constitutional counterparts, prudential standing requirements ''can be modified or abrogated by Congress.''

If separation-of-powers principles require anything, it is that each branch must respect its constitutional role.

When a court issues a decision interpreting the Constitution or a federal law, the other branches must abide by the decision.

The Executive Branch's ability to fulfill its obligation to comply with judicial decisions should not be hampered by a civil action by Congress pursuant to this bill as my amendment to H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE ACT made clear.

And Mr. Speaker, a basic respect for separation of powers should inform any discussion of a lawsuit from both a Constitutional standpoint and a purely pragmatic one.

In our Constitutional Democracy, taking care that the laws are executed faithfully is a multifaceted notion.

And it is a well-settled principle that our Constitution imposes restrictions on Congress' legislative authority, so that the faithful execution of the Laws may present occasions where the President declines to enforce a congressionally enacted law, or delays such enforcement, because he must enforce the Constitution—which is the law of the land.

This resolution, like the bill we considered in the Judiciary Committee on which I serve and before this body, the H.R. 4138, The ENFORCE Act, has problems with standing, separation of powers, and allows broad powers of discretion incompatible with notions of due process.

The legislation would permit one House of Congress to file a lawsuit seeking declaratory and other relief to compel the President to faithfully execute the law.

These are critical problems. First, Congress is unlikely to be able to satisfy the requirements of Article III standing, which the Supreme Court has held that the party bringing suit have been personally injured by the challenged conduct.

In the wide array of circumstances incident and related to the Affordable Care Act in which the resolution would authorize a House of Congress to sue the president, that House would not have suffered any personal injury sufficient to satisfy Article III's standing requirement in the absence of a complete nullification of any legislator's votes.

Second, the resolution violates separation of powers principles by inappropriately having courts address political questions that are left to the other branches to decided.

And Mr. Speaker, I thought the Supreme Court had put this notion to rest as far back as Baker v. Carr, a case that hails from 1962. Baker stands for the proposition that courts are not equipped to adjudicate political questions—and that it is impossible to decide such questions without intruding on the ability of agencies to do their job.

Third, the resolution makes one House of Congress a general enforcement body able to direct the entire field of administrative action by bringing cases whenever such House deems a President's action to constitute a policy of non-enforcement.

This bill attempts to use the notion of separation of powers to justify an unprecedented effort to ensure that the laws are enforced by the president—and I say one of the least creative ideas I have seen in some time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to deliberate before we are at a bridge too far.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WHERE WILL THIS PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP TAKE US?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, Soviet Marshal Ogarkov announced that Korean Airlines Flight 7 had been ''terminated.'' The Soviets had shot down a civilian airliner, killing all 269 passengers aboard.

President Reagan immediately addressed the entire Nation about the tragedy and resolutely called for justice and for action. He then proceeded to accelerate work on America's missile defense system, worked with Congress on the Reagan defense buildup, building relationships with European allies, and enforced strong sanctions that ultimately bankrupted and brought down the once unshakable Soviet Union.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, another civilian airliner, Flight MH17, with 298 innocent people aboard, was shot down by Russian-backed separatists. On that same day, in which the conflict in Israel also escalated to new heights, The New York Times reported President Barack Obama's schedule as: ''a cheeseburger with fries at the Charcoal Pit in Delaware, a speech about infrastructure, and two splashy fundraisers in New York City.''

Mr. Speaker, where would America be today if we had elected Barack Obama in 1980? Where will this President's leadership take us tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COPTIC CHRISTIANS IN EGYPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) is recognized for the balance of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, there are not that many people in this country that are aware of the persecution that Christians are facing in the Middle East. Some people have a vague idea, but they can't identify the specific groups that are being targeted. Today, I want to talk about Coptic Christians in Egypt.

The Coptics are the native Christians of Egypt. They trace their origins nearly all the way to the beginning of Christianity. At one point, they were the largest religious group in Egypt, but now represent a minority. However, they are currently the largest religious minority in the region.

I have quite a few Coptic Christians in my district in Michigan, and I always hear the same thing: their families, friends, and fellow Christians are facing serious persecution and violence, and many have questioned whether or not it is worth staying in Egypt.

They are a group whose history, culture, and language is rooted in Egypt. Over the last couple of years, they have faced an increasingly violent environment. For example, on January 1, 2011, over 20 Coptic Christians were killed when a bomb went off in front of the Church of St. Mark in Alexandria. Such a devastating attack sent shock waves through the Coptic community. The bombing was officially declared the work of a suicide bomber.

After President Morsi was removed from power last year, many had held out hope that life for Coptic Christians under a new regime would bring change, stability, and security. Under President Morsi, they were not treated as equals, and the Muslim Brotherhood was certainly not a friend.

In 2013, there was a wave of violence and destruction following the ousting of President Morsi. Christian churches were attacked and burned. However, the reality for Coptics under their newest President isn't much different.

I think there is a very serious question that needs to be asked: What role should the U.S. play in protecting religious and ethnic minorities in countries to which the United States gives sufficient and significant foreign aid?

The United States gives, on average, more than $1.5 billion in aid to Egypt annually. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Egypt be officially recognized as a Tier 1 Country of Particular Concern. However, the State Department has not made that distinction.

Last year, I introduced the Support Democracy in Egypt Act to suspend further delivery of F–16s and Abrams tanks to Egypt until further review, to ensure that they were promoting democracy and stability in the region.

Even with a new government, after the coup that ousted President Morsi, there hasn't been enough progress in Egypt.

I don't think most Americans would be very appreciative to learn that their tax dollars are being sent to Egypt when that government continues to routinely persecute religious minorities, including Coptic Christians.

In the United States, the right to religious freedom is protected in our Constitution. It would seem to be in conflicts with our morals, values, and beliefs to be so supportive of regimes in Egypt that fail to protect the same rights for their citizens.

□ 2030

If we are helping to provide stability and security for the Egyptian state but not its most oppressed people, then, perhaps, we need to take a long look at our relationship with Egypt. Most Coptics want the same things as Americans: the ability to practice their faith free from persecution, provide stable lives for their friends and families free from violence, be able to speak freely in peace. At one point, I believe that the United States had the will to stand up to tyrants, dictators, and oppressive regimes, but the stories I hear from constituents about what is happening in Egypt contradict that belief.

If we aren't pressing hard to encourage a stable society in Egypt, one that won't persecute religious and ethnic minorities, then Egypt, itself, will never really realize stability. Egypt will always be in flux, vulnerable to radical elements that would seek to undermine and destroy any progress that is made.

We should be worried greatly about the Coptics in Egypt. They shouldn't have to flee their homes and leave their country behind because of their faith. They shouldn't have to worry about car bombings, suicide bombers, shootings, abductions, or any other kind of violence for which they have been targeted.

We should support Egypt in its transition to a more democratic state but also keep in mind that religious persecution is still very real. As I said in a previous floor speech, if we want friends in the Middle East, then we have to encourage respect for religious freedom and diversity, not just build strong governments and militaries. If we do this in Egypt, they will be more stable, and its people can live in greater peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BEYOND THE FEARS OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this great deliberative body that we are in. We have had a lot of debates and discussions here on the floor over the time that I have had the privilege to serve Americans and Iowans in the Fourth District of Iowa.

Coming into this year, early in the year—in late January—we held a conference in Cambridge, Maryland, a conference to get together and discuss our best legislative strategy for this calendar year, which is the balance of the 113th Congress that we are in, Mr. Speaker. The discussion, invariably, came around to the immigration issue. Now, the immigration issue is a political issue. It is, perhaps, the most complex issue that we have dealt with in the time that I have been here in Congress. It has implications and ramifications that go well beyond things that seem to be simplistic on their face.

In that discussion, it became very clear that House Republicans, at least, didn't want to move on anything that would give the opportunity by the majority leader in the Senate—Senator HARRY REID—and those who advocated for the Senate Gang of Eight bill to be able to attach any of that language on any bill that might emerge from the House. The consensus clearly—and it was 3 or 4–1, Mr. Speaker—was not to take up the immigration issue this year because the very sovereignty of the United States was put at risk, and there was no upside. The only beneficiaries out of it would be people who are unlawfully present in the United States, the people who are hiring cheap labor and profiting from that cheap labor, and the people who are on the other side of the aisle in the political party that recognizes that this country has 11 or more million people in it who are undocumented Democrats. They would like that number to be larger, and they would like to then document those Democrats so that they can be voting Democrats. I understand the motive, I believe, of the people on the other side of the aisle.

Without assigning a motive to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the policies that he has advocated for bring in millions of people who are unlawful to the United States, who have an unlawful presence. I will say that his DACA policy—his Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals is what he names it, and what I declare it to be is the Deferred Action for Criminal Aliens—has turned into a huge magnet. It is a magnet that has been attracting people from south of the border for a long time. The President issued the order in June of 2012.

It is an unconstitutional order, in my opinion. It is a considered constitutional opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I have put my own personal capital on the line to assert such points in the past and have prevailed. I do understand this ''separation of powers'' issue and this constitutional issue. When the Congress establishes immigration law, part of that law says that Federal immigration enforcement officers, when they encounter someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, have an obligation. The language is they ''shall'' place him in removal proceedings. Yet the President has issued an order that commands the Federal officers, including the ICE agents, to violate the law or to, say, ignore the law, which is the equivalent of violating the law, Mr. Speaker. This is what we are up against.

We have a President who taught constitutional law for 10 years at the University of Chicago's school of law as an adjunct professor—10 years of teaching the Constitution and all of these years to contemplate his oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, so help him God, and to take care—this is linked to the President's oath. It is not exactly the verbiage, but it is exactly the language in our Constitution that he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Instead, it appears that he has misinterpreted the words ''faithfully executed,'' and he has faithfully killed off the law. It didn't mean when written in the Constitution, ''faithfully executed,'' to kill off the law. What it meant was carry out the law, implement the law, enforce the law. That is what ''faithfully execute'' means. You would think that any adjunct professor, especially a constitutional law professor, would know that, Mr. Speaker, and I know that he does. Yet he still issued the DACA language. He still issued the Morton Memos.

When Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, came before the Judiciary Committee to testify on this DACA language and on the Morton Memos, she repeated many times in her testimony the language that is in the memo that came out, which is on an individual basis only. They created with the Morton Memos four different classes of people, Mr. Speaker, and if people came into the United States of America before their 18th birthdays—or successfully alleged that they did—and if they arrived here before December 31 of 2011, which conforms with the Senate Gang of Eight language, I might add, then they would be granted temporary legal status for 2 years in this country, and they were granted work permits—manufactured out of thin air. I say ''out of thin air'' because it is unconstitutional for the President to manufacture immigration law. The Constitution reserves immigration law for the United States Congress, not for the President of the United States.

In fact, there is a reason that we are article I. The Congress is article I because we are the most important of the three branches of government. They wanted the voice of the people to set the policy for America, and they wanted the President to carry it out. By the way, the President has lectured to that effect over here at a high school not very far from us. I believe the date was March 28 of 2011.

I know it was March 28 when they asked him: Why don't you pass the DREAM Act by executive order or executive edict?

The President said to them: You have been studying the Constitution. You are smart people. You know that Congress' job is to pass the laws, and my job is to enforce the laws, and the judiciary branch's job is to interpret the laws.

It was a very clean and concise analysis of the three branches of government. The President delivered that in a lecture on March 28, 2011. By June of 2012—I think that is how those dates worked out—the President had already gone back on the lecture he had given to the high school students and had decided that he could, after all, manufacture immigration law out of thin air. It is lawless to do that. The law doesn't allow him to do that. The supreme law of the land doesn't allow him to do that, but he pulled it off anyway.

What is the restraint, Mr. Speaker? What is the restraint that this Congress has?

These Members of Congress go home, and their constituents stand up in a town hall meeting, and they say: Restrain this President. Put the immigration law back in order. Enforce the law. Do not let this President defy the law or change the law.

They believe somehow that this Congress has the tools to restrain a President who has so little respect for the language that we have passed into law here in this Congress. Now, there is no way to get around certain pieces of language. There is no way to get around it. He will go around everything that there is a way around. He has checked the fences constantly—he has got minions of lawyers who are doing that—but he gets to a certain place where the law doesn't allow it any longer.

For example, the work component of welfare to work only existed within TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The President decided he would manufacture waivers so that the people who were collecting TANF benefits didn't have to work. The work requirement was suspended even though that language was written so that then-President Clinton couldn't suspend the work component of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. That was a big part of welfare reform; yet President Obama simply granted waivers and suspended the work component, so now there is no longer a work component that is effective in TANF.

That is not lawful. That is not constitutional. You have to litigate this thing through the courts to no end, and to get an answer back out of the courts before the President goes off to his never-never land of perpetual golfing outings is very, very difficult to do. The longer that we are in court, the more Federal judges are appointed by this President who are selected to agree with him. That is just Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and the work component.

Also, as to No Child Left Behind, waiver, waiver, waiver to the point where No Child Left Behind no longer has anything left. It has all been left behind, and the President has nullified it by executive edict even though it was a big piece of legislation that was passed in this Congress in a bipartisan way, negotiated and supported by then-Senator Teddy Kennedy and signed by President George Bush. This reflected at the time the will of the people.

Now, I am not taking any position, Mr. Speaker, that I support this, but I am suggesting this: the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. When Congress passes a law and a President signs the law, that is the law, and any subsequent President has an obligation to enforce that law and to carry it out unless and until the Congress should amend it. If the President should want to see the Congress repeal or amend a law, it is pretty easy for the President to find a Member of the House of Representatives to introduce a piece of legislation that reflects the wish and, perhaps, the will of the President. So there is a means to change it in the same way that there is a means to amend this Constitution that I carry in my jacket pocket each day.

This Constitution is the supreme law of the land. It guides us, and there is a provision to amend it. If we don't like the policy that results from this Constitution—the base document or the various amendments that are attached to it now after this course of history—we can amend the Constitution. We can bring it before the House and the Senate with a two-thirds vote, and we can message it to the States in its having been approved by the House and the Senate, and the States can set about ratifying an amendment to the Constitution.

Until then, I would say this, Mr. Speaker, to the President of the United States and to all who aspire to be President, to all who aspire to serve in the United States House, in the United States Senate, or in any capacity of trust with the people: understand that this is the supreme law of the land. You are bound by it until such time as it might be amended. You cannot redefine it, and you cannot wish it away, and you cannot ignore it. You cannot violate this supreme law of the land. It is the framework upon which all of our laws are written. It is an important, important document that sets about and defines the separation of powers—the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of government.

We have a President who has gone beyond the imagination of our Founding Fathers. He has gone beyond the fears that our Founding Fathers used when they drafted such a beautiful document, which has survived in pretty good health for these centuries that we have had it. The President has now gone to a place where he decides whether he is going to enforce a law or not, and he has the audacity to step up and just seek to change the law by press conference. He did this on ObamaCare. He stood out in the Rose Garden with the Great Seal of the United States, and he said he was now going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations in the country. Rather than requiring them to do what the rules of ObamaCare were written to require them to do, he was now going to require the insurance companies to do that with no charge—the insurance companies, no charge.

□ 2045

Now, I went back and checked, checked the law, ObamaCare. I checked all the rules that had been written. I checked to see if they had amended the rule in any way, if there had been a public comment period, if they followed the Administrative Procedures Act. Nothing. There is not an I dotted differently; there is not a T crossed differently.

The insurance companies stepped up to do what the President had commanded them to do by voice, verbally, in a press conference. That is not law. That is not a republic. That doesn't result even in a civilization.

Now we have this tragedy going on on the southern border that is a result of the President deciding that he could suspend law and decide not to enforce the law, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I will try to conform my comments into that time period.

Mr. Speaker, the immigration issue has emerged now as the number one topic in front of the American people again. I had hoped that we had set it aside. I had hoped that we would go through this year and that we would be focusing on the things that are so important to us.

This is a topic that has emerged because of the human trafficking and the human suffering that is taking place, and I would like to deliver a report on what I have seen just over this past

weekend and how it fits in with some of the other things I have been involved in, especially on our border.

As I listened to the dialogue emerge and I heard ideas emerging in our conference, it was important that I go down to the border and take a fresh look at the most porous component of our border, where they have the most illegal crossings along our 2,000-mile border with Mexico. This a was portion of the border that I had not traveled in the past.

When I add up the places that I have traveled for border inspection, it covers, I believe, every mile of California and Arizona and New Mexico in one fashion or another, whether it is by air or whether it is on the ground. Some of those times it is sitting down there at night listening and waiting for people to come across the border. I have been involved in the interdiction of illegal drugs. I have unloaded drugs out of the false beds of trucks and been there as part of the—I will say an observer in the team that is interdicting illegal aliens who are drug smugglers, who are MS–13.

That carries me on over into the Texas border where I have done several segments of it, but I had not been to the southern tip of Texas. I hadn't been to McAllen. I hadn't been to Brownsville and the region down there. So, since that is the most porous section now—or, I should say, the highest trafficking section now—I headed down that way last Friday night and arrived there relatively late Friday evening.

I got up early in the morning and went out to the mouth of the Rio Grande River. Of course the Rio Grande River is the dividing line through there between the United States and Mexico, between Texas and Mexico. There is a road that leads out to the gulf, and once you get out to the gulf, you can take about a 3-mile drive down the beach to the south to get to the outlet of the Rio Grande River.

So we drove down that 3 miles of sandy beach and down to the mouth of the Rio Grande River to observe that location where I would say, once we are forced into and once this Congress concludes that we should build a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border, I wanted to go to the place where you would set the furthest, most easterly cornerpost in order to start building the fence, the wall, and the fence. That is near the mouth of the Rio Grande River.

I went there, looked at that, set a flag there to locate the perimeter of the United States of America, observed as people from Mexico were waiting around out around the outlet of the Rio Grande River and easily can wade across that into the United States, as they can in many places along the river up and down the Rio Grande.

From there, I traveled back again and into Brownsville, where we visited three ports of entry in Brownsville and also a not-for-profit entity that was working under the auspices of Health and Human Services that was in the business of housing unaccompanied alien children until such time as they were relocated someplace into the United States.

From there, we traveled then to McAllen, where we received a briefing at the sector center, the border patrol sector, McAllen sector center, in a conference room with good people at the table; then from there, out into the detention area where they are incarcerating individuals that they are interdicting along the border.

Those numbers have diminished substantially over the last 3 to 4 weeks, Mr. Speaker, into some number that I recognize to be a little bit less than half of the peak amount that were pouring through into the United States illegally.

Then from there, we went into the holding facilities. We were freely able to walk through and look at everything that was there. Then we went over to a location of a large building that the Border Patrol had retrofitted in a very fast and, looked to me, like a very efficient setup turnaround to be prepared to handle a lot of unaccompanied alien children who were in a huge building with dividing segments in there, all of it air-conditioned, with Health and Human Services workers there playing barefoot soccer indoors in air-conditioning, which I am sure was a new experience for those kids that were there.

From there, we went out for a briefing with the Department of Public Safety and the Texas Rangers to get a different perspective, a perspective from the State and the State officials, the law enforcement officers that are eyes-on, hands-on, and they are engaged and they are working hand-in-glove with the Border Patrol, Customs, Border Protection, and ICE.

I have been impressed with our professional officers all the way along the way. Everybody in a uniform that I encountered was a good, solid, squared-away, professional individual that input good information to us.

After the Texas Department of Public Safety and Texas Rangers gave us their briefing, which lasted nearly 2 hours, then we went on out and rode with a Department of Public Safety officer who took us out to observe the night operations of helicopter surveillance overhead and the spotlights from the helicopters and the other devices that they have that help them locate people that are sneaking into America, whether they are being trafficked as human or whether they are drug trafficking going in.

Then, the next morning, we picked up and began to poke our way upstream towards Laredo. Well, first I should mention that I went to church at Sacred Heart Church there in McAllen, Texas, a Spanish mass, and went over next door to the parish center and the church parking lot where they have converted that into a relief center where they are processing people through and giving them a shower if they need it, medication if they need it, a light meal, and a bag of goodies to travel with before they go to the bus station to be bused up into the United States.

From that location, then we went out to a park where it has been in the national news consistently. The name of the park starts with the letter A. I can't repeat it from memory, Mr. Speaker, but there we saw many, many enforcement officers. We saw Border Patrol. We saw county sheriffs, a constable, and we also saw unmarked undercover officers that were there. They had the park pretty well covered.

There were a lot of people, a lot of Mexicans on the other side of the river who were playing in the water in the river, and jet skis were going back and forth. We know those jets ski are often used to ferry people across to the United States. It was unlikely for that to happen there that day because there was so much cover from law enforcement, but they were posted so consistently along that they did provide a deterrent.

So from there, we poked our way up the river to a small town. ''Ramos'' is pretty close to the spelling of it. It is a small. It is a short-lettered town, a relatively small town and an old town.

There, as we pulled up to the port of entry and took a look across the bridge into Mexico, there was an officer there that gave us a piece of information which is: If you are here from the United States Congress, thank you. Thank you for coming to see what is going on. If you want to see illegals crossing into the United States, take a right down there and drive up along that ridge, and there will be a place there where you can look out over the river. And if you sit there and wait an hour or so, you will see people crossing the river into the United States.

So we did pull up there and met with a couple of police officers, and then the Border Patrol came along. While we were there waiting, we were able to watch on the other side of the river, where a team of two on the Mexico side inflated a relatively large inflatable raft, larger than I expected at least. About the size of a pool table would be my guess.

They loaded a female, it turned out to be a pregnant female, into this raft. And you could watch as they just, late afternoon, roughly 4 or 4:30, just brazenly started across the river and ran that raft right on over into the United States side where they go out of sight because of the brush. They came directly over across the river.

The Border Patrol knew where they were. They would watch them. The city police could watch them.

That illegal immigrant that came into America in that raft, was helped onto the shore by one of the two coyotes that were in the raft, and was handed the two bags of her personal items that she had with her. The coyote who got off on the shore got back in the raft, and they pulled away from the shore and went back to Mexico.

The Border Patrol didn't get there in time to interdict the raft. They didn't seem to be as animated as I thought they would, which told me that it is a regular experience, not an irregular experience.

They did interdict the illegal, who appeared to be pregnant, and likely came over to the United States to claim credible fear and asylum. And of course, if she has the baby here, that baby will be an American citizen. As soon as that baby is of age, that child can then start the reunification process to bring all of its family over here into the United States.

That is what is going on on the border. And the officers that we were with while that happened said that they believe that the distraction that was created by bringing her over was a distraction that likely gave them an opportunity to smuggle a significant amount of illegal drugs across the river, probably upstream a ways, just out of sight of where we were and at a place where you can't drive.

That was, I think, the most significant observation that we had, to see that brazen crossing of the river. They knew the Border Patrol was watching them. They knew the city police were watching them. They could see us up there, and that didn't deter them. They went across the river anyway and dropped her off and skedaddled back to the Mexican side.

We even have video of them deflating the raft and folding it up and putting it in their vehicle. So surveillance would put a license number on that vehicle, and it should be traceable, and it should be easy enough to identify the people that are doing this. But we don't have the level of cooperation across the river in Mexico, according to the questions that I asked. We have a border that is not completely open, but it is a long, long ways from being closed, Mr. Speaker.

From there, we went on up the river and followed the border clear on into Laredo, where we took a tour from Customs and Border Protection in that very busy Laredo crossing there at Laredo, of the land freight, the semitrailers, as I took it, that are coming into the United States or leaving the United States. Forty-six percent of them in the southwest border come through Laredo. It is a huge crossing. The people there are professional. They use new technology to the extent that they can. There is just a lot of traffic.

As I look at this overall policy, we also visited with or were able to observe the processing of people who are, let's say, interdicted and apprehended for illegal entry into the United States. Here is what it comes down to, Mr. Speaker, along these lines:

The high number of unaccompanied alien children has been a problem that we have not encountered anywhere near to this magnitude before. There was a situation that about 10 to 11 percent used to be unaccompanied alien children. That number now has jumped up to 20 percent. At times, it runs substantially more than that.

When you have an unaccompanied alien child that comes into the United States, they are often smuggled across Mexico by a coyote.

So think of this, Mr. Speaker. A girl or a boy in a family—and the boys are 80 percent, and the girls are 20 percent of the overall universe that are coming into the United States—that little boy or that little girl, the family will come up with a number that is in the area of $6,000 each. The coyote often lives in the same neighborhood. He will gather together a group as large as he thinks he can manage, and they will pay him his $6,000 per child, and then they start about transporting these unaccompanied alien children who are accompanied by—actually accompanied by—a coyote. So they are accompanied.

□ 2100

It is 2,500 miles, they tell me, from El Salvador up to Brownsville. It is about 2,000 miles of Mexico altogether and about 500 miles through the jungle of El Salvador into Mexico.

So let's just say 2,000 miles. They will get on the train, called The Train of Death, The Beast, and ride on top of the train. They will perhaps get in the cars of the train, hang on to the sides of the train, and ride that train on up towards the United States.

We have been advised here in this Congress by people who have been on the ground before I arrived there that as many as 100 percent of the girls that are being transported are given birth control because the anticipation that they will be subjected to rape is so high that they want to be as sure as they can that even though they think that she will be raped, they don't want her pregnant with the product of rape. So they will go to the local pharmacy, where it doesn't require a prescription in those countries, and buy birth control pills and start their daughter on this—their 12-year-old daughter, their 13-year-old daughter their 14-, 15-, 16- or 17-year-old daughter, put her on birth control pills and put her on the train, all the while having an understanding that there was a high risk that she would be raped.

And the data that we got, the judgment that we got from the people that are taking care of these unaccompanied alien children, gave us these numbers: The lowest number they gave us on those that were raped on the way up was one-third. The highest number they gave was 70 percent. In one place, they told us that it makes no difference, boys or girls; they are victimized in the same proportion. Boys are victimized in the same proportion as the girls. I am not convinced that that is a reliable response, but it was repeated several times back to us. But I am convinced that it is a reliable response on the girls.

What kind of compassion is it, Mr. Speaker, that supports a policy, that is attracted by DACA, that would cause a family member—whether it is a mother and a father in, say, Guatemala, El Salvador, or Honduras, or an aunt and uncle, a grandparent, to go down to the pharmacy and buy birth control pills and bring them back and start the prescription of the birth control pills to your 12-year-old daughter, your 12-year-old granddaughter, your 12-year-old niece—13, 14, 15—and then hand her over to a coyote who is, by definition, a human trafficker and put her out there in the custody of the coyote. And she ends up on a bus. She ends up on a truck. She ends up on a train. She ends up raped. And if she gets to the United States alive, traumatized, she has still got to get across the river. She still has to get into the United States. And maybe she goes across on a boat. Maybe she goes across on a jet ski. Maybe the water is low and she is able to get across. Right now, it is too deep in that area for that to happen.

Swimming is a chance, but sometimes they drown. Sometimes they pick up sexually transmitted diseases. Sometimes they are killed along the way. Many, many, many times they are raped.

This is the product of DACA. This is the product of a feckless policy that is also a lawless policy, a policy that violates the existing law that says, you shall place them into removal proceedings. But the President has ordered, you shall not do so. He has ordered ICE to violate the law. And the result of that is, an advertisement, a magnet that goes down into Central America, that reminds them, if you can get to the United States, you get to stay. And especially if you send your children up, and they are unaccompanied by a family member or an adult. But there are also a good number of children who come with adults.

And they told us that often, it is a mother with one, two, or three children who has come all the way across Mexico through drug cartel land on the train of death, on the beast, or riding in some other form of transportation to arrive at the United States.

So here is what happens: if they live, if they get here, even though they are traumatized and they may have disease—although I didn't find evidence of

the magnitude of the incidence of the disease that I had been advised that there was—if they get here, and they are turning themselves over to the Border Patrol or surrendering to the first person they find—you might be walking along, watching birds along the Rio Grande river and have one or multiple illegals come out of the brush and surrender to you. They want to turn themselves over to the United States, especially the women and especially the children, but not so much the men.

And then what happens is, they are picked up by the Border Patrol. They are taken down to the station. They are identified as much as they can. A lot of them do have birth certificates on them. A lot of them have a phone number of them of some family member, some friend, some destination they want to go to in America. They are processed. They are put into a holding cell, along with—sometimes it is a whole mix of different ages, men and women, nursing mothers, little kids. They might all be put in there together while they identify them, before they sort them. And then they will be sorted out in these holding cells with young girls there, older girls here, mothers with babies here, and mothers with babies and kids here, adult males here, young males here. That mix is there.

Here is what this also comes to: If you look at the unaccompanied alien children that come into the United States, this number that is roughly 20 percent of the population of those that are interdicted now, here is the data from the Health and Human Services Web site, Office of Refugee Resettlement: it is 80 percent male. These are the unaccompanied alien children. So they are under the age of 18, up to and including 17. They are 80 percent male, and they are 83 percent older than 14, younger than 18. That means they are 15, 16, and 17 years old, Mr. Speaker. That is a high percentage in that range.

So here is how you calculate this. And that is, if you take 0.8, the 80 percent for male, and you multiply it by the percentage that are older teenagers—that is 83 percent that are 15, 16, and 17—multiply those two together, and you get 64 percent, which is right in that two-thirds category.

We have already crossed the line of more than 57,000 unaccompanied alien children who are interdicted down on the southern border, and that happened on June 15. So now we have got another month and a couple of weeks that have been racked up. We are easily over 60,000.

But here is a number to think about, Mr. Speaker: 60,000 unaccompanied alien children. And out of that 60,000, two-thirds of them are males of prime gang recruitment age. So that means that of the 60,000, 40,000 are right there for MS–13 to recruit or right there for the Gulf Cartel to recruit, right there to be part of those who go into the crime syndicates, as opposed to those who might have had an opportunity and might have had a different approach if they were not exposed to this kind of life.

You can go to any country in the world and identify the most dangerous demographic in any population and it is going to be young males. Young males cause the most trouble. They are the most violent. They commit the most crimes, whether they are sexual assault crimes or whether it is homicide, whether it is assault, whether it is theft, that comes out of that universe of young males.

You could go to a place where I think there is a low crime rate—and I haven't looked this up. I just don't hear of anything coming out of Iceland. So you could go to Iceland and pick the Icelandic boys that are 15, 16, and 17 years old. They are going to be the prime age where they are committing crimes—that and older, the 18 to 25 to 30 to 32, and then it starts to taper off again.

This is the universe that is coming out of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, the high gang recruitment age from some of the most violent countries in the world. As a matter of fact, the six most violent countries in the world with the highest homicide rates are south of Mexico. Eight of the top 10 countries with the highest homicide rates in the world are south of Mexico. We are bringing in young males to the tune of two-thirds of those that are coming across as unaccompanied alien children, two-thirds of them—40,000 of 60,000 at least since the beginning of this fiscal year, 15, 16, and 17 years old.

Now, there is one side of this that says, have compassion. They are only kids. There is another side that says, we should have some compassion for the American people. The American people are paying a price. They will pay a price in blood for these acts of this President. And the policy that they have is, they are just scattering them across the country. They will put them in a holding place until they can process them. Health and Human Services takes them into their custody. If they have a phone number in their pocket, they will call that phone number and say, can you send us a bus ticket? If you send us a bus ticket, we will put this person on the bus and send them to where you want them to go.

There is not a very reliable method of identifying any background checks on the people that are—let's say they are the recipients of the unaccompanied alien children that are here, those 17-year-old potential gang recruits. They could be crack houses. They could be meth houses. They could be cat houses. They could be stash houses. It could be an MS–13 headquarters. They get delivered there. They get put on a bus to get sent there. Sometimes they get escorted there. Sometimes Customs and Border Protection puts them in a car and drives them across the State of Texas to another location.

And when they do that, they have got two officers there. Sometimes those two officers are flying as few as one—they like to get a few more but as few as one of these individuals—to a place like Los Angeles from Laredo.

Laredo to Los Angeles, two Federal officers escorting a 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-year-old to Los Angeles. We are ending up with two round-trip plane tickets—often three round-trip plane tickets—and tie in a couple of hotel rooms to deliver and complete the crime.

And what has happened is—I read a case that was decided in December of 2013. So, December of last year, Mr. Speaker, and it was a Federal judge who had to rule on a case of human trafficking, human smuggling prosecution. And what had happened was, there was a mother in Virginia, an illegal alien mother who had unlawfully entered the United States and was living illegally in Virginia, who had collected some money and sent that off to a coyote in El Salvador. It might have been Guatemala, but I believe it was El Salvador. And she paid the human smuggler to smuggle her 10-year-old daughter from El Salvador to Virginia.

And so as the human smuggler, the coyote, smuggled the 10-year-old girl across the southern border to the United States, they were interdicted by the Border Patrol. And they have brought charges against the coyote, the human smuggler. And those were the Federal charges that the judge wrote his opinion on.

As he wrote in this opinion, and I will summarize, he said: This is the fourth case I have had in as many weeks of ICE—this child was turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. ICE had taken this child and delivered her to the illegal household of her biological mother in Virginia. That was the objective of the crime in the first place, to get her daughter illegally delivered into the illegal mother's household in the illegal household in Virginia. And as the coyote was interdicted with the 10-year-old at the border, and the Border Patrol caught them up and processed them over into ICE, and they filed charges for human trafficking, when the smuggler came across in front of the judge, he said: This is the fourth case that I have had in as many weeks, and it is appalling that the Federal Government—in this case, ICE—would complete the crime. Take the 10-year-old daughter and deliver her another 1,000 miles across America into the arms of her illegal mother, into an illegal household.

Now, that sounds like there are four cases that are an anomaly, Mr. Speaker. But those four cases, I wish they

were an anomaly. They are not. That is the standard today. And it is happening—not four times, not 40 times, not 400 times—thousands and thousands of times, this Federal Government is completing the crime of unlawful entry into the United States.

So if you are under 18—or you say you are under 18—and you come into America with your birth certificate and a phone number of where you would like to be delivered, the process becomes, you get processed. If you are under 14, they don't even take your fingerprints. Neither do they take a photograph that is attached to your identification to identify you by. So we don't know who these kids are.

□ 2115

If they have a phone number, Border Patrol will process them. They try to get them turned over to Health and Human Services within 72 hours, and when there is a backlog, it took longer. They were doing the best they could to comply with the law.

Health and Human Services hired nongovernment contractors to house, process, deliver, and distribute, and so this unaccompanied alien child then—no fingerprints, no pictures, but a shower, food, and a fresh set of clothes, and they will send that unaccompanied alien child then anywhere in America that they request to go.

Sometimes, they will get a bus ticket that is sent—that is paid for by the recipient household, and sometimes, they don't. They tell us they try not to have to buy those tickets out of your tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, but we know that is going on.

It is a welcome mat—it is a welcoming party for people that come into America, and by the way, if they have a birth certificate, Border Patrol then will take their identifying documents, stick them in a file, and give them a piece of paper that is printed off on a Border Patrol printer, the size of this piece of typing paper and the same texture.

It is a permission slip, or permiso, as they are calling it, that allows that illegal alien to stay in the United States, and they are supposed to promise that they are going to appear for a hearing.

Well, we know that not very many of them do appear for hearings, but if they do, they have already been coached to say that they have a credible fear of being persecuted in their home country for whatever reason. They make the argument that they have this credible fear, and then they are allowed to stay in America, essentially, as asylees.

This happens in a very, very high percentage of them, whether they are unaccompanied alien children—that is the highest percent that gets to stay. Mothers with children is the next highest percent that gets to stay.

When people are leaving the countries in Central America, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras in massive numbers by the thousands and nobody shows up having been deported to those countries, then what happens is they understand that the promises are true, your odds of being deported are now down to this—now, it is well less than 1 percent, and the promise of America will take care of you, America will give you your heat subsidy, your rent subsidy, your housing, your food stamps, your Obama phone, your ObamaCare, and now, the President wants to give you your lawyer.

All of that is part of the promise. Until we send people back, they are going to keep coming. The common denominator message that we received over and over again, Mr. Speaker, was that unless you send them back, that is the only way you can send the message ''don't come,'' is for people to lose their $5,000, $6,000, $7,000, $8,000 that they have invested in paying a coyote and being back in their home country, trying to save up some more money to come into America. That is a big chunk of money for people that are averaging less than $3,000 a year, on average, for their income.

We have a government policy that is a complete mess and a calamity. I believe that each of the law enforcement there are doing the job as best they can, and the rules of engagement prevent them from having a cohesive strategy that can actually secure the border.

We need to build a fence and a wall and a fence on the southern border to keep them on the other side of it, so they can't get in, and we need to call upon the border State Governors, in particular the Governor of Texas, to continue to do what he is doing—that is call up forces to secure the border, that is call up his National Guard—the Texas National Guard—to secure the border.

This Congress has an obligation to pass a resolution that calls upon the border State Governors to call up their National Guard to circumvent the Commander in Chief of the United States—constitutionally, I might add. It is the only way to secure the border. This President will not. He will not secure the border. The border State Governors can do this, I believe they will do this, and Congress has an obligation to fund them.

So I put a message out, Mr. Speaker, that we first need to pass a resolution in this Congress, and the resolution needs to say the President's DACA language, coupled with mostly the excuse of the 2008 legislation, his refusal to enforce immigration law, and his advertisement that we are not going to enforce the law that has penetrated deeply into Mexico and Central America has got to stop. The President has to reverse it. He has to start enforcing the law. That is job one.

The second one is—it is not going to happen, I don't believe he is going to do it, I don't think it is in his head or his heart, he has got another agenda, and so we call upon the border State Governors to call up their National Guard and enforce the border and commit the House at least to funding the border State Governors, so they can keep them on the line, and they can go to the other States for reinforcements, especially with sympathetic Governors.

Pass the little fix of the 2008 law, set it as a stand-alone bill, and send it over to the Senate because they are hiding behind it now and using that as an excuse not to enforce the law.

Another one, do not let these illegal aliens go north of the border any more than 50 miles. Keep them contained. Put them in housing that, if it is good enough for the United States military, it is good enough for those who have come into the United States illegally—yes, even if it is canvas, even if it is a tent city, we cannot be rewarding them with air-conditioned buildings and opulent digs scattered across the countryside.

Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to this. They are in the hands of the President. We need to call upon him to enforce the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2326

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLORES) at 11 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period:

CONFERENCE REPORT

H. REPT. 113–564

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230), making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components

of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''facility of the Department'' has the meaning given the term ''facilities of the Department'' in section 1701 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The terms ''hospital care'' and ''medical services'' have the meanings given such terms in section 1701 of title 38, United States Code.

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS TO CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDERS

SEC. 101. EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FOR VETERANS THROUGH THE USE OF AGREEMENTS WITH NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ENTITIES.

(a) EXPANSION OF AVAILABLE CARE AND SERVICES.—

(1) FURNISHING OF CARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Hospital care and medical services under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, shall be furnished to an eligible veteran described in subsection (b), at the election of such veteran, through agreements authorized under subsection (d), or any other law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, with entities specified in subparagraph (B) for the furnishing of such care and services to veterans.

(B) ENTITIES SPECIFIED.—The entities specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) Any health care provider that is participating in the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(ii) Any Federally-qualified health center (as defined in section 1905(l)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)(2)(B))).

(iii) The Department of Defense.

(iv) The Indian Health Service.

(2) CHOICE OF PROVIDER.—An eligible veteran who makes an election under subsection (c) to receive hospital care or medical services under this section may select a provider of such care or services from among the entities specified in paragraph (1)(B) that are accessible to the veteran.

(3) COORDINATION OF CARE AND SERVICES.—The Secretary shall coordinate, through the Non-VA Care Coordination Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the furnishing of care and services under this section to eligible veterans, including by ensuring that an eligible veteran receives an appointment for such care and services within the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration for the furnishing of hospital care and medical services.

(b) ELIGIBLE VETERANS.—A veteran is an eligible veteran for purposes of this section if—

(1)(A) as of August 1, 2014, the veteran is enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, including any such veteran who has not received hospital care or medical services from the Department and has contacted the Department seeking an initial appointment from the Department for the receipt of such care or services; or

(B) the veteran is eligible for hospital care and medical services under section 1710(e)(1)(D) of such title and is a veteran described in section 1710(e)(3) of such title; and

(2) the veteran—

(A) attempts, or has attempted, to schedule an appointment for the receipt of hospital care or medical services under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, but is unable to schedule an appointment within the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration for the furnishing of such care or services;

(B) resides more than 40 miles from the medical facility of the Department, including a community-based outpatient clinic, that is closest to the residence of the veteran;

(C) resides—

(i) in a State without a medical facility of the Department that provides—

(I) hospital care;

(II) emergency medical services; and

(III) surgical care rated by the Secretary as having a surgical complexity of standard; and

(ii) more than 20 miles from a medical facility of the Department described in clause (i); or

(D)(i) resides in a location, other than a location in Guam, American Samoa, or the Republic of the Philippines, that is 40 miles or less from a medical facility of the Department, including a community-based outpatient clinic; and

(ii)(I) is required to travel by air, boat, or ferry to reach each medical facility described in clause (i) that is 40 miles or less from the residence of the veteran; or

(II) faces an unusual or excessive burden in accessing each medical facility described in clause (i) that is 40 miles or less from the residence of the veteran due to geographical challenges, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) ELECTION AND AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible veteran described in subsection (b)(2)(A), the Secretary shall, at the election of the eligible veteran—

(A) place such eligible veteran on an electronic waiting list described in paragraph (2) for an appointment for hospital care or medical services the veteran has elected to receive under this section; or

(B)(i) authorize that such care or services be furnished to the eligible veteran under this section for a period of time specified by the Secretary; and

(ii) notify the eligible veteran by the most effective means available, including electronic communication or notification in writing, describing the care or services the eligible veteran is eligible to receive under this section.

(2) ELECTRONIC WAITING LIST.—The electronic waiting list described in this paragraph shall be maintained by the Department and allow access by each eligible veteran via www.myhealth.va.gov or any successor website for the following purposes:

(A) To determine the place of such eligible veteran on the waiting list.

(B) To determine the average length of time an individual spends on the waiting list, disaggregated by medical facility of the Department and type of care or service needed, for purposes of allowing such eligible veteran to make an informed election under paragraph (1).

(d) CARE AND SERVICES THROUGH AGREEMENTS.—

(1) AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into agreements for furnishing care and services to eligible veterans under this section with entities specified in subsection (a)(1)(B).

(B) AGREEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''agreement'' includes contracts, intergovernmental agreements, and provider agreements, as appropriate.

(2) RATES AND REIMBURSEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In entering into an agreement under paragraph (1) with an entity specified in subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary shall—

(i) negotiate rates for the furnishing of care and services under this section; and

(ii) reimburse the entity for such care and services at the rates negotiated pursuant to clause (i) as provided in such agreement.

(B) LIMIT ON RATES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), rates negotiated under subparagraph (A)(i) shall not be more than the rates paid by the United States to a provider of services (as defined in section 1861(u) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(u))) or a supplier (as defined in section 1861(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(d))) under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) for the same care or services.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may negotiate a rate that is more than the rate paid by the United States as described in clause (i) with respect to the furnishing of care or services under this section to an eligible veteran who resides in a highly rural area.

(II) HIGHLY RURAL AREA DEFINED.—In this clause, the term ''highly rural area'' means an area located in a county that has fewer than seven individuals residing in that county per square mile.

(C) LIMIT ON COLLECTION.—For the furnishing of care or services pursuant to an agreement under paragraph (1), an entity specified in subsection (a)(1)(B) may not collect any amount that is greater than the rate negotiated pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i).

(3) CERTAIN PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In entering into an agreement under paragraph (1) with an entity described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may use the procedures, including those procedures relating to reimbursement, available for entering into provider agreements under section 1866(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(a)). During the period in which such entity furnishes care or services pursuant to this section, such entity may not be treated as a Federal contractor or subcontractor by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor by virtue of furnishing such care or services.

(B) ENTITIES DESCRIBED.—The entities described in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) In the case of the Medicare program, any provider of service that has entered into a provider agreement under section 1866(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(a)); and

(ii) In the case of the Medicaid program, any provider participating under a State plan under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(4) INFORMATION ON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall provide to any entity with which the Secretary has entered into an agreement under paragraph (1) the following:

(A) Information on applicable policies and procedures for submitting bills or claims for authorized care or services furnished to eligible veterans under this section.

(B) Access to a telephone hotline maintained by the Department that such entity may call for information on the following:

(i) Procedures for furnishing care and services under this section.

(ii) Procedures for submitting bills or claims for authorized care and services furnished to eligible veterans under this section and being reimbursed for furnishing such care and services.

(iii) Whether particular care or services under this section are authorized, and the procedures for authorization of such care or services.

(e) OTHER HEALTH-CARE PLAN.—

(1) SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY.—Before receiving hospital care or medical services under this section, an eligible veteran shall provide to the Secretary information on any health-care plan described in paragraph (4) under which the eligible veteran is covered.

(2) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION TO NON-DEPARTMENT ENTITY.—Notwithstanding section 5701 of title 38, United States Code, for purposes of furnishing hospital care or medical services to an eligible veteran under this section, the Secretary shall disclose to the entity specified in paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (a) with which the Secretary has entered into an agreement described in such subsection—

(A) whether the eligible veteran is covered under a health-care plan described in paragraph (4); and

(B) whether the hospital care or medical services sought by the eligible veteran is for a medical condition that is related to a non-service-connected disability described in paragraph (3)(C).

(3) CARE FOR WHICH THE DEPARTMENT IS SECONDARILY RESPONSIBLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible veteran is covered under a health-care plan described in paragraph (4) and receives hospital care or medical services for a non-service-connected disability described in subparagraph (C), such health-care plan shall be primarily responsible for paying for such care or services, to the extent such care or services is covered by such health-care plan, and the Secretary shall be secondarily responsible for paying for such care or services in accordance with subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) RESPONSIBILITY FOR COSTS OF CARE.—In a case in which the Secretary is secondarily responsible for paying for hospital care or medical services as described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) the health care provider that furnishes such care or services pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) shall be responsible for seeking reimbursement for the cost of such care or services from the health-care plan described in paragraph (4) under which the eligible veteran is covered; and

(ii) the Secretary shall be responsible for promptly paying only the amount that is not covered by such health-care plan, except that such responsibility for payment may not exceed the rate determined for such care or services pursuant to subsection (d)(2).

(C) NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY DESCRIBED.—A non-service-connected disability described in this subsection is a non-service-connected disability (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)—

(i) that is incurred incident to a veteran's employment and that is covered under a workers' compensation law or plan that provides for payment for the cost of health care and services provided to the veteran by reason of the disability;

(ii) that is incurred as the result of a motor vehicle accident to which applies a State law that requires the owners or operators of motor vehicles registered in that State to have in force automobile accident reparations insurance;

(iii) that is incurred as the result of a crime of personal violence that occurred in a State, or a political subdivision of a State, in which a person injured as the result of such a crime is entitled to receive health care and services at such State's or subdivision's expense for personal injuries suffered as the result of such crime;

(iv) that is incurred by a veteran—

(I) who does not have a service-connected disability; and

(II) who is entitled to care (or payment of the expenses of care) under a health-care plan; or

(v) for which care and services are furnished under this section to a veteran who—

(I) has a service-connected disability; and

(II) is entitled to care (or payment of the expenses of care) under a health-care plan.

(4) HEALTH-CARE PLAN.—A health-care plan described in this paragraph—

(A) is an insurance policy or contract, medical or hospital service agreement, membership or subscription contract, or similar arrangement not administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, under which health services for individuals are provided or the expenses of such services are paid; and

(B) does not include any such policy, contract, agreement, or similar arrangement pursuant to title XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) VETERANS CHOICE CARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of receiving care and services under this section, the Secretary shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue to each veteran described in subsection (b)(1) a card that may be presented to a health care provider

to facilitate the receipt of care or services under this section.

(2) NAME OF CARD.—Each card issued under paragraph (1) shall be known as a ''Veterans Choice Card''.

(3) DETAILS OF CARD.—Each Veterans Choice Card issued to a veteran under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The name of the veteran.

(B) An identification number for the veteran that is not the social security number of the veteran.

(C) The contact information of an appropriate office of the Department for health care providers to confirm that care or services under this section are authorized for the veteran.

(D) Contact information and other relevant information for the submittal of claims or bills for the furnishing of care or services under this section.

(E) The following statement: ''This card is for qualifying medical care outside the Department of Veterans Affairs. Please call the Department of Veterans Affairs phone number specified on this card to ensure that treatment has been authorized.''.

(4) INFORMATION ON USE OF CARD.—Upon issuing a Veterans Choice Card to a veteran, the Secretary shall provide the veteran with information clearly stating the circumstances under which the veteran may be eligible for care or services under this section.

(g) INFORMATION ON AVAILABILITY OF CARE.—The Secretary shall provide information to a veteran about the availability of care and services under this section in the following circumstances:

(1) In the case of a veteran described in subsection (b)(1)(B), when the veteran enrolls in the patient enrollment system of the Department under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) When the veteran attempts to schedule an appointment for the receipt of hospital care or medical services from the Department but is unable to schedule an appointment within the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration for the furnishing of such care or services.

(3) When the veteran becomes eligible for hospital care or medical services under this section under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (b)(2).

(h) FOLLOW-UP CARE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that, at the election of an eligible veteran who receives hospital care or medical services from a health care provider in an episode of care under this section, the veteran receives such hospital care and medical services from such health care provider through the completion of the episode of care (but for a period not exceeding 60 days), including all specialty and ancillary services deemed necessary as part of the treatment recommended in the course of such hospital care or medical services.

(i) PROVIDERS.—To be eligible to furnish care or services under this section, a health care provider must—

(1) maintain at least the same or similar credentials and licenses as those credentials and licenses that are required of health care providers of the Department, as determined by the Secretary for purposes of this section; and

(2) submit, not less frequently than once each year during the period in which the Secretary is authorized to carry out this section pursuant to subsection (p), verification of such licenses and credentials maintained by such health care provider.

(j) COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require an eligible veteran to pay a copayment for the receipt of care or services under this section only if such eligible veteran would be required to pay a copayment for the receipt of such care or services at a medical facility of the Department or from a health care provider of the Department pursuant to chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of a copayment charged under paragraph (1) may not exceed the amount of the copayment that would be payable by such eligible veteran for the receipt of such care or services at a medical facility of the Department or from a health care provider of the Department pursuant to chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) COLLECTION OF COPAYMENT.—A health care provider that furnishes care or services to an eligible veteran under this section shall collect the copayment required under paragraph (1) from such eligible veteran at the time of furnishing such care or services.

(k) CLAIMS PROCESSING SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for an efficient nationwide system for processing and paying bills or claims for authorized care and services furnished to eligible veterans under this section.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall prescribe regulations for the implementation of such system.

(3) OVERSIGHT.—The Chief Business Office of the Veterans Health Administration shall oversee the implementation and maintenance of such system.

(4) ACCURACY OF PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that such system meets such goals for accuracy of payment as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of this section.

(B) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a quarterly report on the accuracy of such system.

(ii) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by clause (i) shall include the following:

(I) A description of the goals for accuracy for such system specified by the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(II) An assessment of the success of the Department in meeting such goals during the quarter covered by the report.

(iii) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall submit each report required by clause (i) not later than 20 days after the end of the quarter covered by the report.

(l) MEDICAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that any health care provider that furnishes care or services under this section to an eligible veteran submits to the Department any medical record related to the care or services provided to such eligible veteran by such health care provider for inclusion in the electronic medical record of such eligible veteran maintained by the Department upon the completion of the provision of such care or services to such eligible veteran.

(2) ELECTRONIC FORMAT.—Any medical record submitted to the Department under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent possible, be in an electronic format.

(m) TRACKING OF MISSED APPOINTMENTS.—The Secretary shall implement a mechanism to track any missed appointments for care or services under this section by eligible veterans to ensure that the Department does not pay for such care or services that were not furnished to an eligible veteran.

(n) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe interim final regulations on the implementation of this section and publish such regulations in the Federal Register.

(o) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that 75 percent of the amounts deposited in the Veterans Choice Fund established by section 802 have been exhausted, the Inspector General of the Department shall submit to the Secretary a report on the results of an audit of the care and services furnished under this section to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of payments by the Department for the cost of such care and services, including any findings and recommendations of the Inspector General.

(p) AUTHORITY TO FURNISH CARE AND SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not use the authority under this section to furnish care and services after the date specified in paragraph (2).

(2) DATE SPECIFIED.—The date specified in this paragraph is the date on which the Secretary has exhausted all amounts deposited in the Veterans Choice Fund established by section 802, or the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first.

(3) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish such date in the Federal Register and on an Internet website of the Department available to the public not later than 30 days before such date.

(q) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the publication of the interim final regulations under subsection (n), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the furnishing of care and services under this section that includes the following:

(A) The number of eligible veterans who have received care or services under this section.

(B) A description of the types of care and services furnished to eligible veterans under this section.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that 75 percent of the amounts deposited in the Veterans Choice Fund established by section 802 have been exhausted, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the furnishing of care and services under this section that includes the following:

(A) The total number of eligible veterans who have received care or services under this section, disaggregated by—

(i) eligible veterans described in subsection (b)(2)(A);

(ii) eligible veterans described in subsection (b)(2)(B);

(iii) eligible veterans described in subsection (b)(2)(C); and

(iv) eligible veterans described in subsection (b)(2)(D).

(B) A description of the types of care and services furnished to eligible veterans under this section.

(C) An accounting of the total cost of furnishing care and services to eligible veterans under this section.

(D) The results of a survey of eligible veterans who have received care or services under this section on the satisfaction of such eligible veterans with the care or services received by such eligible veterans under this section.

(E) An assessment of the effect of furnishing care and services under this section on wait times for appointments for the receipt of hospital care and medical services from the Department.

(F) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of continuing furnishing care and services under this section after the termination date specified in subsection (p).

(r) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the process of the Department for filling and paying for prescription medications.

(s) WAIT-TIME GOALS OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in this section, the term ''wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration'' means not more than 30 days from the date on which a veteran requests an appointment for hospital care or medical services from the Department.

(2) ALTERNATE GOALS.—If the Secretary submits to Congress, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report stating that the actual wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration are different from the wait-time goals specified in paragraph (1)—

(A) for purposes of this section, the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration shall be the wait-time goals submitted by the Secretary under this paragraph; and

(B) the Secretary shall publish such wait-time goals in the Federal Register and on an Internet website of the Department available to the public.

SEC. 102. ENHANCEMENT OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.

(a) OUTREACH TO TRIBAL-RUN MEDICAL FACILITIES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Director of the Indian Health Service, conduct outreach to each medical facility operated by an Indian tribe or tribal organization through a contract or compact with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) to raise awareness of the ability of such facilities, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations to enter into agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs under which the Secretary reimburses such facilities, Indian tribes, or tribal organizations, as the case may be, for health care provided to veterans who are—

(1) eligible for health care at such facilities; and

(2)(A) enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code; or

(B) eligible for hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of such section.

(b) PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish performance metrics for assessing the performance by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Indian Health Service under the memorandum of understanding entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS)'' in increasing access to health care, improving quality and coordination of health care, promoting effective patient-centered collaboration and partnerships between the Department and the Service, and ensuring health-promotion and disease-prevention services are appropriately funded and available for beneficiaries under both health care systems.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of the following:

(1) Entering into agreements for the reimbursement by the Secretary of the costs of direct care services provided through organizations receiving amounts pursuant to grants made or contracts entered into under section 503 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1653) to veterans who are otherwise eligible to receive health care from such organizations.

(2) Including the reimbursement of the costs of direct care services provided to veterans who are not Indians in agreements between the Department and the following:

(A) The Indian Health Service.

(B) An Indian tribe or tribal organization operating a medical facility through a contract or compact with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).

(C) A medical facility of the Indian Health Service.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INDIAN.—The terms ''Indian'' and ''Indian tribe'' have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1603).

(2) MEDICAL FACILITY OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The term ''medical facility of the Indian Health Service'' includes a facility operated by an Indian tribe or tribal organization through a contract or compact with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).

(3) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ''tribal organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 103. ENHANCEMENT OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with Papa Ola Lokahi and such other organizations involved in the delivery of health care to Native Hawaiians as the Secretary considers appropriate, enter into contracts or agreements with Native Hawaiian health care systems that are in receipt of funds from the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to grants awarded or contracts entered into under section 6(a) of the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act (42 U.S.C. 11705(a)) for the reimbursement of direct care services provided to eligible veterans as specified in such contracts or agreements.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''Native Hawaiian'', ''Native Hawaiian health care system'', and ''Papa Ola Lokahi'' have the meanings given those terms in section 12 of the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act (42 U.S.C. 11711).

SEC. 104. REAUTHORIZATION AND MODIFICATION OF PILOT PROGRAM OF ENHANCED CONTRACT CARE AUTHORITY FOR HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF VETERANS.

Section 403 of the Veterans' Mental Health and Other Care Improvements Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–387; 38 U.S.C. 1703 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''only during the'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''only during the period beginning on the date of the commencement of the pilot program under paragraph (2) and ending on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) PROGRAM LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program at locations in the following Veterans Integrated Service Networks (and such other locations as the Secretary considers appropriate):

''(A) Veterans Integrated Service Network 1.

''(B) Veterans Integrated Service Network 6.

''(C) Veterans Integrated Service Network 15.

''(D) Veterans Integrated Service Network 18.

''(E) Veterans Integrated Service Network 19.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''as of the date of the commencement of the pilot program under subsection (a)(2)'' and inserting ''as of August 1, 2014'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (k);

(4) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsections:

''(h) APPOINTMENTS.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that medical appointments for covered veterans—

''(1) are scheduled not later than 5 days after the date on which the appointment is requested; and

''(2) occur not later than 30 days after such date.

''(i) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall ensure that covered veterans are informed about the pilot program under this section.

''(j) USE OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section after the date of the enactment of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, the Secretary shall make use of contracts entered into before such date or may enter into new contracts.''; and

(5) in paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (k), as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section, by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ''; and''.

SEC. 105. PROMPT PAYMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMPT PAYMENT BY DEPARTMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall comply with section 1315 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the ''prompt payment rule''), or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling, in paying for health care pursuant to contracts entered into with non-Department of Veterans Affairs providers to provide health care under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLAIMS PROCESSING SYSTEM.—

(1) CLAIMS PROCESSING SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish and implement a system to process and pay claims for payment for hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished by non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(2) COMPLIANCE WITH PROMPT PAYMENT ACT.—The system established and implemented under paragraph (1) shall comply with all requirements of chapter 39, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Prompt Payment Act'').

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the timeliness of payments by the Secretary for hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished by non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(d) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) The results of a survey of non-Department health care providers who have submitted claims to the Department for hospital care, medical services, or other health care furnished to veterans for which payment is authorized under the laws administered by the Secretary during the one-year period preceding the submittal of the report, which survey shall include the following:

(A) The amount of time it took for such health care providers, after submitting such claims, to

receive payment from the Department for such care or services.

(B) A comparison of the amount of time under subparagraph (A) and the amount of time it takes such health care providers to receive payments from the United States for similar care or services provided to the following, if applicable:

(i) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(ii) Covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(e) SURVEY ELEMENTS.—In carrying out the survey, the Comptroller General shall seek responses from non-Department health care providers in a manner that ensures that the survey reflects the responses of such providers that—

(1) are located in different geographic areas;

(2) furnish a variety of different hospital care, medical services, and other health care; and

(3) furnish such care and services in a variety of different types of medical facilities.

SEC. 106. TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND OTHER HEALTH CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDERS TO THE CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICE OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective as of October 1, 2014, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall transfer the authority to pay for hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished through non-Department of Veterans Affairs providers from—

(A) the Veterans Integrated Service Networks and medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to

(B) the Chief Business Office of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) MANNER OF CARE.—The Chief Business Office shall work in consultation with the Office of Clinical Operations and Management of the Department to ensure that care and services described in paragraph (1) are provided in a manner that is clinically appropriate and in the best interest of the veterans receiving such care and services.

(3) NO DELAY IN PAYMENT.—The transfer of authority under paragraph (1) shall be carried out in a manner that does not delay or impede any payment by the Department for hospital care, medical services, or other health care furnished through a non-Department provider under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(b) BUDGET MATTERS.—The budget of the Department of Veterans Affairs for any fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act (as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) shall specify funds for the payment for hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished through non-Department of Veterans Affairs providers, including any administrative costs associated with such payment, as funds for the Chief Business Office of the Veterans Health Administration rather than as funds for the Veterans Integrated Service Networks or medical centers of the Department.

TITLE II—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

SEC. 201. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEMS AND MANAGEMENT PROCESSES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into one or more contracts with a private sector entity or entities described in subsection (b) to conduct an independent assessment of the hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished in medical facilities of the Department. Such assessment shall address each of the following:

(A) Current and projected demographics and unique health care needs of the patient population served by the Department.

(B) Current and projected health care capabilities and resources of the Department, including hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished by non-Department facilities under contract with the Department, to provide timely and accessible care to veterans.

(C) The authorities and mechanisms under which the Secretary may furnish hospital care, medical services, and other health care at non-Department facilities, including whether the Secretary should have the authority to furnish such care and services at such facilities through the completion of episodes of care.

(D) The appropriate system-wide access standard applicable to hospital care, medical services, and other health care furnished by and through the Department, including an identification of appropriate access standards for each individual specialty and post-care rehabilitation.

(E) The workflow process at each medical facility of the Department for scheduling appointments for veterans to receive hospital care, medical services, or other health care from the Department.

(F) The organization, workflow processes, and tools used by the Department to support clinical staffing, access to care, effective length-of-stay management and care transitions, positive patient experience, accurate documentation, and subsequent coding of inpatient services.

(G) The staffing level at each medical facility of the Department and the productivity of each health care provider at such medical facility, compared with health care industry performance metrics, which may include an assessment of any of the following:

(i) The case load of, and number of patients treated by, each health care provider at such medical facility during an average week.

(ii) The time spent by such health care provider on matters other than the case load of such health care provider, including time spent by such health care provider as follows:

(I) At a medical facility that is affiliated with the Department.

(II) Conducting research.

(III) Training or supervising other health care professionals of the Department.

(H) The information technology strategies of the Department with respect to furnishing and managing health care, including an identification of any weaknesses and opportunities with respect to the technology used by the Department, especially those strategies with respect to clinical documentation of episodes of hospital care, medical services, and other health care, including any clinical images and associated textual reports, furnished by the Department in Department or non-Department facilities.

(I) Business processes of the Veterans Health Administration, including processes relating to furnishing non-Department health care, insurance identification, third-party revenue collection, and vendor reimbursement, including an identification of mechanisms as follows:

(i) To avoid the payment of penalties to vendors.

(ii) To increase the collection of amounts owed to the Department for hospital care, medical services, or other health care provided by the Department for which reimbursement from a third party is authorized and to ensure that such amounts collected are accurate.

(iii) To increase the collection of any other amounts owed to the Department with respect to hospital care, medical services, and other health care and to ensure that such amounts collected are accurate.

(iv) To increase the accuracy and timeliness of Department payments to vendors and providers.

(J) The purchasing, distribution, and use of pharmaceuticals, medical and surgical supplies, medical devices, and health care related services by the Department, including the following:

(i) The prices paid for, standardization of, and use by the Department of the following:

(I) Pharmaceuticals.

(II) Medical and surgical supplies.

(III) Medical devices.

(ii) The use by the Department of group purchasing arrangements to purchase pharmaceuticals, medical and surgical supplies, medical devices, and health care related services.

(iii) The strategy and systems used by the Department to distribute pharmaceuticals, medical and surgical supplies, medical devices, and health care related services to Veterans Integrated Service Networks and medical facilities of the Department.

(K) The process of the Department for carrying out construction and maintenance projects at medical facilities of the Department and the medical facility leasing program of the Department.

(L) The competency of leadership with respect to culture, accountability, reform readiness, leadership development, physician alignment, employee engagement, succession planning, and performance management.

(2) PARTICULAR ELEMENTS OF CERTAIN ASSESSMENTS.—

(A) SCHEDULING ASSESSMENT.—In carrying out the assessment required by paragraph (1)(E), the private sector entity or entities shall do the following:

(i) Review all training materials pertaining to scheduling of appointments at each medical facility of the Department.

(ii) Assess whether all employees of the Department conducting tasks related to scheduling are properly trained for conducting such tasks.

(iii) Assess whether changes in the technology or system used in scheduling appointments are necessary to limit access to the system to only those employees that have been properly trained in conducting such tasks.

(iv) Assess whether health care providers of the Department are making changes to their schedules that hinder the ability of employees conducting such tasks to perform such tasks.

(v) Assess whether the establishment of a centralized call center throughout the Department for scheduling appointments at medical facilities of the Department would improve the process of scheduling such appointments.

(vi) Assess whether booking templates for each medical facility or clinic of the Department would improve the process of scheduling such appointments.

(vii) Assess any interim technology changes or attempts by Department to internally develop a long-term scheduling solutions with respect to the feasibility and cost effectiveness of such internally developed solutions compared to commercially available solutions.

(viii) Recommend actions, if any, to be taken by the Department to improve the process for scheduling such appointments, including the following:

(I) Changes in training materials provided to employees of the Department with respect to conducting tasks related to scheduling such appointments.

(II) Changes in monitoring and assessment conducted by the Department of wait times of veterans for such appointments.

(III) Changes in the system used to schedule such appointments, including changes to improve how the Department—

(aa) measures wait times of veterans for such appointments;

(bb) monitors the availability of health care providers of the Department; and

(cc) provides veterans the ability to schedule such appointments.

(IV) Such other actions as the private sector entity or entities considers appropriate.

(B) MEDICAL CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECT AND LEASING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.—In carrying out the assessment required by paragraph (1)(K), the private sector entity or entities shall do the following:

(i) Review the process of the Department for identifying and designing proposals for construction and maintenance projects at medical facilities of the Department and leases for medical facilities of the Department.

(ii) Assess the process through which the Department determines the following:

(I) That a construction or maintenance project or lease is necessary with respect to a medical facility or proposed medical facility of the Department.

(II) The proper size of such medical facility or proposed medical facility with respect to treating veterans in the catchment area of such medical facility or proposed medical facility.

(iii) Assess the management processes of the Department with respect to the capital management programs of the Department, including processes relating to the methodology for construction and design of medical facilities of the Department, the management of projects relating to the construction and design of such facilities, and the activation of such facilities.

(iv) Assess the medical facility leasing program of the Department.

(3) TIMING.—The private sector entity or entities carrying out the assessment required by paragraph (1) shall complete such assessment not later than 240 days after entering into the contract described in such paragraph.

(b) PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITIES DESCRIBED.—A private entity described in this subsection is a private entity that—

(1) has experience and proven outcomes in optimizing the performance of the health care delivery systems of the Veterans Health Administration and the private sector and in health care management; and

(2) specializes in implementing large-scale organizational and cultural transformations, especially with respect to health care delivery systems.

(c) PROGRAM INTEGRATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary enters into contracts with more than one private sector entity under subsection (a), the Secretary shall designate one such entity that is predominately a health care organization as the program integrator.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The program integrator designated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be responsible for coordinating the outcomes of the assessments conducted by the private entities pursuant to such contracts.

(d) REPORT ON ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after completing the assessment required by subsection (a), the private sector entity or entities carrying out such assessment shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Commission on Care established under section 202 a report on the findings and recommendations of the private sector entity or entities with respect to such assessment.

(2) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish such report in the Federal Register and on an Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs that is accessible to the public.

(e) NON-DEPARTMENT FACILITIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''non-Department facilities'' has the meaning given that term in section 1701 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 202. COMMISSION ON CARE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission, to be known as the ''Commission on Care'' (in this section referred to as the ''Commission''), to examine the access of veterans to health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs and strategically examine how best to organize the Veterans Health Administration, locate health care resources, and deliver health care to veterans during the 20-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) VOTING MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of 15 voting members who are appointed as follows:

(i) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, at least one of whom shall be a veteran.

(ii) Three members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, at least one of whom shall be a veteran.

(iii) Three members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, at least one of whom shall be a veteran.

(iv) Three members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, at least one of whom shall be a veteran.

(v) Three members appointed by the President, at least two of whom shall be veterans.

(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—Of the members appointed under subparagraph (A)—

(i) at least one member shall represent an organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code;

(ii) at least one member shall have experience as senior management for a private integrated health care system with an annual gross revenue of more than $50,000,000;

(iii) at least one member shall be familiar with government health care systems, including those systems of the Department of Defense, the Indian Health Service, and Federally-qualified health centers (as defined in section 1905(l)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)(2)(B)));

(iv) at least one member shall be familiar with the Veterans Health Administration but shall not be currently employed by the Veterans Health Administration; and

(v) at least one member shall be familiar with medical facility construction and leasing projects carried out by government entities and have experience in the building trades, including construction, engineering, and architecture.

(C) DATE.—The appointments of members of the Commission shall be made not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(B) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(4) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which eight voting members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(5) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(6) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(7) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The President shall designate a member of the commission to serve as Chairperson of the Commission. The Commission shall select a Vice Chairperson from among its members.

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—

(1) EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT.—The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of access to health care at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) MATTERS EVALUATED AND ASSESSED.—In undertaking the comprehensive evaluation and assessment required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall evaluate and assess the results of the assessment conducted by the private sector entity or entities under section 201, including any findings, data, or recommendations included in such assessment.

(3) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the President, through the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, reports as follows:

(A) Not later than 90 days after the date of the initial meeting of the Commission, an interim report on—

(i) the findings of the Commission with respect to the evaluation and assessment required by this subsection; and

(ii) such recommendations as the Commission may have for legislative or administrative action to improve access to health care through the Veterans Health Administration.

(B) Not later than 180 days after the date of the initial meeting of the Commission, a final report on—

(i) the findings of the Commission with respect to the evaluation and assessment required by this subsection; and

(ii) such recommendations as the Commission may have for legislative or administrative action to improve access to health care through the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out this section.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this section. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(d) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(B) OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES.—All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(3) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(B) COMPENSATION.—The Chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(5) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(e) TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the Commission submits the report under subsection (b)(3)(B).

(f) FUNDING.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make available to the Commission from amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary such amounts as the Secretary and the Chairperson of the Commission jointly consider appropriate for the Commission to perform its duties under this section.

(g) EXECUTIVE ACTION.—

(1) ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS.—The President shall require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and such other heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement each recommendation set forth in a report submitted under subsection (b)(3) that the President—

(A) considers feasible and advisable; and

(B) determines can be implemented without further legislative action.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the President receives a report under subsection (b)(3), the President shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and such other committees of Congress as the President considers appropriate a report setting forth the following:

(A) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of each recommendation contained in the report received by the President.

(B) For each recommendation assessed as feasible and advisable under subparagraph (A) the following:

(i) Whether such recommendation requires legislative action.

(ii) If such recommendation requires legislative action, a recommendation concerning such legislative action.

(iii) A description of any administrative action already taken to carry out such recommendation.

(iv) A description of any administrative action the President intends to be taken to carry out such recommendation and by whom.

SEC. 203. TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE ON REVIEW OF SCHEDULING SYSTEM AND SOFTWARE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) TASK FORCE REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, through the use of a technology task force, conduct a review of the needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to the scheduling system and scheduling software of the Department of Veterans Affairs that is used by the Department to schedule appointments for veterans for hospital care, medical services, and other health care from the Department.

(2) AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with a technology organization or technology organizations to carry out the review required by paragraph (1).

(B) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to assist the technology organization or technology organizations under subparagraph (A) in carrying out the review required by paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the technology task force required under subsection (a)(1) shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the findings and recommendations of the technology task force regarding the needs of the Department with respect to the scheduling system and scheduling software of the Department described in such subsection.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Proposals for specific actions to be taken by the Department to improve the scheduling system and scheduling software of the Department described in subsection (a)(1).

(B) A determination as to whether one or more existing off-the-shelf systems would—

(i) meet the needs of the Department to schedule appointments for veterans for hospital care, medical services, and other health care from the Department; and

(ii) improve the access of veterans to such care and services.

(3) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the receipt of the report required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish such report in the Federal Register and on an Internet website of the Department accessible to the public.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than one year after the receipt of the report required by subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall implement the recommendations set forth in such report that the Secretary considers are feasible, advisable, and cost effective.

SEC. 204. IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS OF VETERANS TO MOBILE VET CENTERS AND MOBILE MEDICAL CENTERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall improve the access of veterans to telemedicine and other health care through the use of mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs by providing standardized requirements for the operation of such centers.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The standardized requirements required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The number of days each mobile vet center and mobile medical center of the Department is expected to travel per year.

(B) The number of locations each center is expected to visit per year.

(C) The number of appointments each center is expected to conduct per year.

(D) The method and timing of notifications given by each center to individuals in the area to which the center is traveling, including notifications informing veterans of the availability to schedule appointments at the center.

(3) USE OF TELEMEDICINE.—The Secretary shall ensure that each mobile vet center and mobile medical center of the Department has the capability to provide telemedicine services.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than September 30 each year thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on access to health care through the use of mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers of the Department that includes statistics on each of the requirements set forth in subsection (a)(2) for the year covered by the report.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the use of mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers to provide telemedicine services to veterans during the year preceding the submittal of the report, including the following:

(i) The number of days each mobile vet center and mobile medical center was open to provide such services.

(ii) The number of days each center traveled to a location other than the headquarters of the center to provide such services.

(iii) The number of appointments each center conducted to provide such services on average per month and in total during such year.

(B) An analysis of the effectiveness of using mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers to provide health care services to veterans through the use of telemedicine.

(C) Any recommendations for an increase in the number of mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers of the Department.

(D) Any recommendations for an increase in the telemedicine capabilities of each mobile vet center and mobile medical center.

(E) The feasibility and advisability of using temporary health care providers, including locum tenens, to provide direct health care services to veterans at mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers.

(F) Such other recommendations on improvement of the use of mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers by the Department as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 205. IMPROVED PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF SCHEDULING AND WAIT-TIME METRICS IN DETERMINATION OF PERFORMANCE AWARDS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that scheduling and wait-time metrics or goals are not used as factors in determining the performance of the following employees for purposes of determining whether to pay performance awards to such employees:

(1) Directors, associate directors, assistant directors, deputy directors, chiefs of staff, and clinical leads of medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) Directors, assistant directors, and quality management officers of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall modify the performance plans of the directors of the medical centers of the Department and the directors of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks to ensure that such plans are based on the quality of care received by veterans at the health care facilities under the jurisdictions of such directors.

(2) FACTORS.—In modifying performance plans under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that assessment of the quality of care provided at health care facilities under the jurisdiction of a director described in paragraph (1) includes consideration of the following:

(A) Recent reviews by the Joint Commission (formerly known as the ''Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations'') of such facilities.

(B) The number and nature of recommendations concerning such facilities by the Inspector General of the Department in reviews conducted through the Combined Assessment Program, in the reviews by the Inspector General of community-based outpatient clinics and primary care clinics, and in reviews conducted through the Office of Healthcare Inspections during the two most recently completed fiscal years.

(C) The number of recommendations described in subparagraph (B) that the Inspector General of the Department determines have not been carried out satisfactorily with respect to such facilities.

(D) Reviews of such facilities by the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities.

(E) The number and outcomes of administrative investigation boards, root cause analyses, and peer reviews conducted at such facilities during the fiscal year for which the assessment is being conducted.

(F) The effectiveness of any remedial actions or plans resulting from any Inspector General recommendations in the reviews and analyses described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

(3) ADDITIONAL LEADERSHIP POSITIONS.—To the degree practicable, the Secretary shall assess the performance of other employees of the Department in leadership positions at Department medical centers, including associate directors, assistant directors, deputy directors, chiefs of staff, and clinical leads, and in Veterans Integrated Service Networks, including assistant directors and quality management officers, using factors and criteria similar to those used in the performance plans modified under paragraph (1).

(c) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCE GOALS.—For each fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall not include in the performance goals of any employee of a Veterans Integrated Service Network or medical center of the Department any performance goal that might disincentivize the payment of Department amounts to provide hospital care, medical services, or other health care through a non-Department provider.

SEC. 206. IMPROVED TRANSPARENCY CONCERNING HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PUBLICATION OF WAIT TIMES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register, and on a publicly accessible Internet website of each medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the wait-times for the scheduling of an appointment in each Department facility by a veteran for the receipt of primary care, specialty care, and hospital care and medical services based on the general severity of the condition of the veteran. Whenever the wait-times for the scheduling of such an appointment changes, the Secretary shall publish the revised wait-times—

(1) on a publicly accessible Internet website of each medical center of the Department by not later than 30 days after such change; and

(2) in the Federal Register by not later than 90 days after such change.

(b) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATABASE OF PATIENT SAFETY, QUALITY OF CARE, AND OUTCOME MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and make available to the public a comprehensive database containing all applicable patient safety, quality of care, and outcome measures for health care provided by the Department that are tracked by the Secretary.

(2) UPDATE FREQUENCY.—The Secretary shall update the database required by paragraph (1) not less frequently than once each year.

(3) UNAVAILABLE MEASURES.—For all measures that the Secretary would otherwise publish in the database required by paragraph (1) but has not done so because such measures are not available, the Secretary shall publish notice in the database of the reason for such unavailability and a timeline for making such measures available in the database.

(4) ACCESSIBILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the database required by paragraph (1) is accessible to the public through the primary Internet website of the Department and through each primary Internet website of a Department medical center.

(c) HOSPITAL COMPARE WEBSITE OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—

(1) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the provision by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of such information as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may require to report and make publicly available patient quality and outcome information concerning Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers through the Hospital Compare Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services or any successor Internet website.

(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED.—The information provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Measures of timely and effective health care.

(B) Measures of readmissions, complications of death, including with respect to 30-day mortality rates and 30-day readmission rates, surgical complication measures, and health care related infection measures.

(C) Survey data of patient experiences, including the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems or any similar successor survey developed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) Any other measures required of or reported with respect to hospitals participating in the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(3) UNAVAILABLE INFORMATION.—For any applicable metric collected by the Department of Veterans Affairs or required to be provided under paragraph (2) and withheld from or unavailable in the Hospital Compare Internet website or any successor Internet website, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish a notice on such Internet website stating the reason why such metric was withheld from public disclosure and a timeline for making such metric available, if applicable.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE SAFETY AND QUALITY METRICS.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the safety and quality metrics made publicly available by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under this section to assess the degree to which the Secretary is complying with the provisions of this section.

SEC. 207. INFORMATION FOR VETERANS ON THE CREDENTIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PHYSICIANS.

(a) IMPROVEMENT OF ''OUR DOCTORS'' INTERNET WEBSITE LINKS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HOMEPAGE.—A link to the ''Our Doctors'' health care providers database of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any successor database, shall be available on and through the homepage of the Internet website of the Department that is accessible to the public.

(2) INFORMATION ON LOCATION OF RESIDENCY TRAINING.—The Internet website of the Department that is accessible to the public shall include under the link to the ''Our Doctors'' health care providers database of the Department, or any successor database, the name of the facility at which each licensed physician of the Department underwent residency training.

(3) INFORMATION ON PHYSICIANS AT PARTICULAR FACILITIES.—The ''Our Doctors'' health care providers database of the Department, or any successor database, shall identify whether each licensed physician of the Department is a physician in residency.

(b) INFORMATION ON CREDENTIALS OF PHYSICIANS FOR VETERANS UNDERGOING SURGICAL PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each veteran who is undergoing a surgical procedure by or through the Department shall be provided information described in paragraph (2) with respect to the surgeon to be performing such procedure at such time in advance of the procedure as is appropriate to permit such veteran to evaluate such information.

(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph with respect to a surgeon described in paragraph (1) is as follows:

(A) The education and training of the surgeon.

(B) The licensure, registration, and certification of the surgeon by the State or national entity responsible for such licensure, registration, or certification.

(3) OTHER INDIVIDUALS.—If a veteran is unable to evaluate the information provided under paragraph (1) due to the health or mental competence of the veteran, such information shall be provided to an individual acting on behalf of the veteran.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT AND PLAN.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the following:

(A) The manner in which contractors under the Patient-Centered Community Care initiative of the Department perform oversight of the credentials of physicians within the networks of such contractors under the initiative.

(B) The oversight by the Department of the contracts under the Patient-Centered Community Care initiative.

(C) The verification by the Department of the credentials and licenses of health care providers furnishing hospital care and medical services under section 101.

(2) PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the submittal of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Comptroller General, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a plan to address any findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General included in such report.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the submittal of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall carry out such plan.

SEC. 208. INFORMATION IN ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE PRESIDENT ON HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FURNISHED THROUGH EXPANDED USE OF CONTRACTS FOR SUCH CARE.

The materials on the Department of Veterans Affairs in the budget of the President for a fiscal year, as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall set forth the following:

(1) The number of veterans who received hospital care and medical services under section 101

during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which such budget is submitted.

(2) The amount expended by the Department on furnishing care and services under such section during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which such budget is submitted.

(3) The amount requested in such budget for the costs of furnishing care and services under such section during the fiscal year covered by such budget, set forth in aggregate and by amounts for each account for which amounts are so requested.

(4) The number of veterans that the Department estimates will receive hospital care and medical services under such section during the fiscal years covered by the budget submission.

(5) The number of employees of the Department on paid administrative leave at any point during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which such budget is submitted.

SEC. 209. PROHIBITION ON FALSIFICATION OF DATA CONCERNING WAIT TIMES AND QUALITY MEASURES AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and in accordance with title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish policies whereby any employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who knowingly submits false data concerning wait times for health care or quality measures with respect to health care to another employee of the Department or knowingly requires another employee of the Department to submit false data concerning such wait times or quality measures to another employee of the Department is subject to a penalty the Secretary considers appropriate after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, including civil penalties, unpaid suspensions, or termination.

TITLE III—HEALTH CARE STAFFING, RECRUITMENT, AND TRAINING MATTERS

SEC. 301. TREATMENT OF STAFFING SHORTAGE AND BIENNIAL REPORT ON STAFFING OF MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) STAFFING SHORTAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 7412. Annual determination of staffing shortages; recruitment and appointment for needed occupations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Inspector General of the Department shall determine, and the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register, the five occupations of personnel of this title of the Department covered under section 7401 of this title for which there are the largest staffing shortages throughout the Department as calculated over the five-year period preceding the determination.

''(b) RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT.—Notwithstanding sections 3304 and 3309 through 3318 of title 5, the Secretary may, upon a determination by the Inspector General under paragraph (1) that there is a staffing shortage throughout the Department with respect to a particular occupation, recruit and directly appoint, during the fiscal year after the fiscal year during which such determination is made, qualified personnel to serve in that particular occupation for the Department.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7411 the following new item:

''7412. Annual determination of staffing shortages; recruitment and appointment for needed occupations.''.

(3) DEADLINE FOR FIRST DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding the deadline under section 7412 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), for the annual determination of staffing shortages in the Veterans Health Administration, the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall make the first determination required under such section, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register such determination, by not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INCREASE OF GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION RESIDENCY POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7302 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish medical residency programs, or ensure that already established medical residency programs have a sufficient number of residency positions, at any medical facility of the Department that the Secretary determines—

''(A) is experiencing a shortage of physicians; and

''(B) is located in a community that is designated as a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254e)).

''(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) allocate the residency positions under such paragraph among occupations included in the most current determination published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 7412(a) of this title; and

''(B) give priority to residency positions and programs in primary care, mental health, and any other specialty the Secretary determines appropriate.''.

(2) FIVE-YEAR INCREASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 7302(e) of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), during the five-year period beginning on the day that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase the number of graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department by up to 1,500 positions.

(B) PRIORITY.—In increasing the number of graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to medical facilities that—

(i) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, do not have a medical residency program; and

(ii) are located in a community that has a high concentration of veterans.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than October 1 each year thereafter until 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department.

(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) For the year preceding the submittal of the report, the number of graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department as follows:

(I) That were filled.

(II) That were not filled.

(III) That the Department anticipated filling.

(ii) With respect to each graduate medical education residency position specified in clause (i)—

(I) the geographic location of each such position; and

(II) if such position was filled, the academic affiliation of the medical resident that filled such position.

(iii) The policy at each medical facility of the Department with respect to the ratio of medical residents to staff supervising medical residents.

(iv) During the one-year period preceding the submittal of the report, the number of individuals who declined an offer from the Department to serve as a medical resident at a medical facility of the Department and the reason why each such individual declined such offer.

(v) During the one-year period preceding the submittal of the report, a description of—

(I) challenges, if any, faced by the Department in filling graduate medical education residency positions at medical facilities of the Department; and

(II) actions, if any, taken by the Department to address such challenges.

(vi) A description of efforts of the Department, as of the date of the submittal of the report, to recruit and retain medical residents to work for the Veterans Health Administration as full-time employees.

(c) PRIORITY IN SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO CERTAIN PROVIDERS.—Section 7612(b)(5) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B):

''(B) shall give priority to applicants pursuing a course of education or training toward a career in an occupation for which the Inspector General of the Department has, in the most current determination published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 7412(a) of this title, determined that there is one of the largest staffing shortages throughout the Department with respect to such occupation; and''.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each even-numbered year thereafter until 2024, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report assessing the staffing of each medical facility of the Department.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The results of a system-wide assessment of all medical facilities of the Department to ensure the following:

(i) Appropriate staffing levels for health care professionals to meet the goals of the Secretary for timely access to care for veterans.

(ii) Appropriate staffing levels for support personnel, including clerks.

(iii) Appropriate sizes for clinical panels.

(iv) Appropriate numbers of full-time staff, or full-time equivalents, dedicated to direct care of patients.

(v) Appropriate physical plant space to meet the capacity needs of the Department in that area.

(vi) Such other factors as the Secretary considers necessary.

(B) A plan for addressing any issues identified in the assessment described in subparagraph (A), including a timeline for addressing such issues.

(C) A list of the current wait times and workload levels for the following clinics in each medical facility:

(i) Mental health.

(ii) Primary care.

(iii) Gastroenterology.

(iv) Women's health.

(v) Such other clinics as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(D) A description of the results of the most current determination of the Inspector General

under subsection (a) of section 7412 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section, and a plan to use direct appointment authority under subsection (b) of such section 7412 to fill staffing shortages, including recommendations for improving the speed at which the credentialing and privileging process can be conducted.

(E) The current staffing models of the Department for the following clinics, including recommendations for changes to such models:

(i) Mental health.

(ii) Primary care.

(iii) Gastroenterology.

(iv) Women's health.

(v) Such other clinics as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(F) A detailed analysis of succession planning at medical facilities of the Department, including the following:

(i) The number of positions in medical facilities throughout the Department that are not filled by a permanent employee.

(ii) The length of time each position described in clause (i) remained vacant or filled by a temporary or acting employee.

(iii) A description of any barriers to filling the positions described in clause (i).

(iv) A plan for filling any positions that are vacant or filled by a temporary or acting employee for more than 180 days.

(v) A plan for handling emergency circumstances, such as administrative leave or sudden medical leave for senior officials.

(G) The number of health care providers of the Department who have been removed from their positions, have retired, or have left their positions for another reason, disaggregated by provider type, during the two-year period preceding the submittal of the report.

(H) Of the health care providers specified in subparagraph (G) who have been removed from their positions, the following:

(i) The number of such health care providers who were reassigned to other positions in the Department.

(ii) The number of such health care providers who left the Department.

(iii) The number of such health care providers who left the Department and were subsequently rehired by the Department.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 7619 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF EDUCATION DEBT REDUCTION PROGRAM.—

(1) MODIFICATION OF AMOUNT AND DURATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (1) of section 7683(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''$60,000'' and inserting ''$120,000''; and

(B) by striking ''$12,000 of such payments'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$24,000 of such payments may be made in each year of participation in the Program''.

(2) ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Such section is further amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(iii) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of such section, as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended by striking ''Subject to paragraph (2), the amount'' and inserting ''The amount''.

SEC. 303. CLINIC MANAGEMENT TRAINING FOR EMPLOYEES AT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) CLINIC MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a role-specific clinic management training program to provide in-person, standardized education on systems and processes for health care practice management and scheduling to all appropriate employees, as determined by the Secretary, at medical facilities of the Department.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The clinic management training program required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) Training on how to manage the schedules of health care providers of the Department, including the following:

(I) Maintaining such schedules in a manner that allows appointments to be booked at least eight weeks in advance.

(II) Proper planning procedures for vacation, leave, and graduate medical education training schedules.

(ii) Training on the appropriate number of appointments that a health care provider should conduct on a daily basis, based on specialty.

(iii) Training on how to determine whether there are enough available appointment slots to manage demand for different appointment types and mechanisms for alerting management of insufficient slots.

(iv) Training on how to properly use the appointment scheduling system of the Department, including any new scheduling system implemented by the Department.

(v) Training on how to optimize the use of technology, including the following:

(I) Telemedicine.

(II) Electronic mail.

(III) Text messaging.

(IV) Such other technologies as specified by the Secretary.

(vi) Training on how to properly use physical plant space at medical facilities of the Department to ensure efficient flow and privacy for patients and staff.

(B) ROLE-SPECIFIC.—The Secretary shall ensure that each employee of the Department included in the clinic management training program required by paragraph (1) receives education under such program that is relevant to the responsibilities of such employee.

(3) SUNSET.—The clinic management training program required by paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that is two years after the date on which the Secretary commences such program.

(b) TRAINING MATERIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the termination of the clinic management training program required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide training materials on health care management to each of the following employees of the Department that are relevant to the position and responsibilities of such employee upon the commencement of employment of such employee:

(A) Any manager of a medical facility of the Department.

(B) Any health care provider at a medical facility of the Department.

(C) Such other employees of the Department as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) UPDATE.—The Secretary shall regularly update the training materials required under paragraph (1).

TITLE IV—HEALTH CARE RELATED TO SEXUAL TRAUMA

SEC. 401. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SEXUAL TRAUMA COUNSELING AND TREATMENT TO VETERANS ON INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING.

Section 1720D(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or active duty for training'' and inserting '', active duty for training, or inactive duty training''.

SEC. 402. PROVISION OF COUNSELING AND TREATMENT FOR SEXUAL TRAUMA BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) EXPANSION OF COVERAGE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Subsection (a) of section 1720D of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2)(A) In operating the program required by paragraph (1), the Secretary may, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, provide counseling and care and services to members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserves) on active duty to overcome psychological trauma described in that paragraph.

''(B) A member described in subparagraph (A) shall not be required to obtain a referral before receiving counseling and care and services under this paragraph.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''a veteran'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) by striking ''that veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''that individual''.

(b) INFORMATION TO MEMBERS ON AVAILABILITY OF COUNSELING AND SERVICES.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''to veterans'' each place it appears; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''members of the Armed Forces and'' before ''individuals''.

(c) INCLUSION OF MEMBERS IN REPORTS ON COUNSELING AND SERVICES.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''to veterans'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''women veterans'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) by striking ''training under subsection (d).'' and inserting ''training under subsection (d), disaggregated by—

''(A) veterans;

''(B) members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserves) on active duty; and

''(C) for each of subparagraphs (A) and (B)—

''(i) men; and

''(ii) women.'';

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''veterans'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''women veterans'' and inserting ''individuals''; and

(B) by inserting '', including specific recommendations for individuals specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2)'' before the period at the end.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 403. REPORTS ON MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA.

(a) REPORT ON SERVICES AVAILABLE FOR MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 630 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the treatment and services available from the Department of Veterans Affairs for male veterans who experience military sexual trauma compared to such treatment and services available to female veterans who experience military sexual trauma.

(b) REPORTS ON TRANSITION OF MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA TREATMENT FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 630 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for five years, the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee established by section 320(a) of title 38, United States Code, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on military sexual trauma that includes the following:

(1) The processes and procedures utilized by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to facilitate transition of treatment of individuals who have experienced military sexual trauma from treatment provided by the Department of Defense to treatment provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) A description and assessment of the collaboration between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense in assisting veterans in filing claims for disabilities related to military sexual trauma, including permitting veterans access to information and evidence necessary to develop or support such claims.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA.—The term ''military sexual trauma'' means psychological trauma, which in the judgment of a mental health professional employed by the Department, resulted from a physical assault of a sexual nature, battery of a sexual nature, or sexual harassment which occurred while the veteran was serving on active duty, active duty for training, or inactive duty training.

(3) SEXUAL HARASSMENT.—The term ''sexual harassment'' means repeated, unsolicited verbal or physical contact of a sexual nature which is threatening in character.

(4) SEXUAL TRAUMA.—The term ''sexual trauma'' shall have the meaning given that term by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for purposes of this section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—OTHER HEALTH CARE MATTERS

SEC. 501. EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTED LIVING SERVICES FOR VETERANS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1705 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 38 U.S.C. 1710C note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on October 6, 2017.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking ''five-year''.

TITLE VI—MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility leases at the locations specified, and in an amount for each lease not to exceed the amount shown for such location (not including any estimated cancellation costs):

(1) For a clinical research and pharmacy coordinating center, Albuquerque, New Mexico, an amount not to exceed $9,560,000.

(2) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Brick, New Jersey, an amount not to exceed $7,280,000.

(3) For a new primary care and dental clinic annex, Charleston, South Carolina, an amount not to exceed $7,070,250.

(4) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Cobb County, Georgia, an amount not to exceed $6,409,000.

(5) For the Leeward Outpatient Healthcare Access Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, including a co-located clinic with the Department of Defense and the co-location of the Honolulu Regional Office of the Veterans Benefits Administration and the Kapolei Vet Center of the Department of Veterans Affairs, an amount not to exceed $15,887,370.

(6) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Johnson County, Kansas, an amount not to exceed $2,263,000.

(7) For a replacement community-based outpatient clinic, Lafayette, Louisiana, an amount not to exceed $2,996,000.

(8) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Lake Charles, Louisiana, an amount not to exceed $2,626,000.

(9) For outpatient clinic consolidation, New Port Richey, Florida, an amount not to exceed $11,927,000.

(10) For an outpatient clinic, Ponce, Puerto Rico, an amount not to exceed $11,535,000.

(11) For lease consolidation, San Antonio, Texas, an amount not to exceed $19,426,000.

(12) For a community-based outpatient clinic, San Diego, California, an amount not to exceed $11,946,100.

(13) For an outpatient clinic, Tyler, Texas, an amount not to exceed $4,327,000.

(14) For the Errera Community Care Center, West Haven, Connecticut, an amount not to exceed $4,883,000.

(15) For the Worcester Community-Based Outpatient Clinic, Worcester, Massachusetts, an amount not to exceed $4,855,000.

(16) For the expansion of a community-based outpatient clinic, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, an amount not to exceed $4,232,060.

(17) For a multispecialty clinic, Chattanooga, Tennessee, an amount not to exceed $7,069,000.

(18) For the expansion of a community-based outpatient clinic, Chico, California, an amount not to exceed $4,534,000.

(19) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Chula Vista, California, an amount not to exceed $3,714,000.

(20) For a new research lease, Hines, Illinois, an amount not to exceed $22,032,000.

(21) For a replacement research lease, Houston, Texas, an amount not to exceed $6,142,000.

(22) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Lincoln, Nebraska, an amount not to exceed $7,178,400.

(23) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Lubbock, Texas, an amount not to exceed $8,554,000.

(24) For a community-based outpatient clinic consolidation, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, an amount not to exceed $8,022,000.

(25) For a community-based outpatient clinic, Phoenix, Arizona, an amount not to exceed $20,757,000.

(26) For the expansion of a community-based outpatient clinic, Redding, California, an amount not to exceed $8,154,000.

(27) For the expansion of a community-based outpatient clinic, Tulsa, Oklahoma, an amount not to exceed $13,269,200.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR CLINIC IN TULSA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the expansion of the community-based outpatient clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma, authorized by subsection (a)(27), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that such clinic satisfies the following requirements:

(A) Consist of not more than 140,000 gross square feet.

(B) Have an annual cost per square foot of not more than the average market rate in Tulsa, Oklahoma, for an equivalent medical facility plus 20 percent.

(C) Satisfy the mandate of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans in Oklahoma with access to quality and efficient care.

(D) Expand clinical capacity in the region in which the clinic is located in a cost efficient manner based upon regional cost comparisons, taking into account the needs of current veterans and the potential demand by veterans for care in the future.

(E) Be the most cost effective option for the Department as predicted over a 30-year life cycle for such clinic.

(2) COST EFFECTIVE DETERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the most cost effective option over a 30-year life cycle would be to purchase or construct a facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma, instead of entering into a major medical facility lease in such location as authorized by subsection (a)(27), the Secretary shall not enter into such lease.

(B) MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT.—If the Secretary makes the determination described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary may request authority for a major medical facility project in Tulsa, Oklahoma, from Congress pursuant to section 8104(b) of title 38, United States Code.

(C) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—If the Secretary requests authority for the major medical facility project described in subparagraph (B), not later than 90 days after making the determination described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a detailed cost-benefit analysis of such major medical facility project.

SEC. 602. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITIES LEASES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Title 31, United States Code, requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to record the full cost of its contractual obligation against funds available at the time a contract is executed.

(2) Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11 provides guidance to agencies in meeting the statutory requirements under title 31, United States Code, with respect to leases.

(3) For operating leases, Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11 requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to record up-front budget authority in an ''amount equal to total payments under the full term of the lease or [an] amount sufficient to cover first year lease payments plus cancellation costs''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR OBLIGATION OF FULL COST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations provided in advance, in exercising the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into leases provided in this Act, the Secretary shall record, pursuant to section 1501 of title 31, United States Code, as the full cost of the contractual obligation at the time a contract is executed either—

(A) an amount equal to total payments under the full term of the lease; or

(B) if the lease specifies payments to be made in the event the lease is terminated before its full term, an amount sufficient to cover the first year lease payments plus the specified cancellation costs.

(2) SELF-INSURING AUTHORITY.—The requirements of paragraph (1) may be satisfied through the use of the self-insuring authority identified in title 40, United States Code, consistent with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11.

(c) TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) COMPLIANCE.—Subsection (b) of section 8104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) In the case of a prospectus proposing funding for a major medical facility lease, a detailed analysis of how the lease is expected to comply with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11 and section 1341 of title 31 (commonly referred to as the 'Anti-Deficiency Act'). Any such analysis shall include—

''(A) an analysis of the classification of the lease as a 'lease-purchase', 'capital lease', or 'operating lease' as those terms are defined in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11;

''(B) an analysis of the obligation of budgetary resources associated with the lease; and

''(C) an analysis of the methodology used in determining the asset cost, fair market value, and cancellation costs of the lease.''.

(2) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Such section 8104 is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h)(1) Not less than 30 days before entering into a major medical facility lease, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives—

''(A) notice of the Secretary's intention to enter into the lease;

''(B) a detailed summary of the proposed lease;

''(C) a description and analysis of any differences between the prospectus submitted pursuant to subsection (b) and the proposed lease; and

''(D) a scoring analysis demonstrating that the proposed lease fully complies with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11.

''(2) Each committee described in paragraph (1) shall ensure that any information submitted to the committee under such paragraph is treated by the committee with the same level of confidentiality as is required by law of the Secretary and subject to the same statutory penalties for unauthorized disclosure or use as the Secretary.

''(3) Not more than 30 days after entering into a major medical facility lease, the Secretary shall submit to each committee described in paragraph (1) a report on any material differences between the lease that was entered into and the proposed lease described under such paragraph, including how the lease that was entered into changes the previously submitted scoring analysis described in subparagraph (D) of such paragraph.''.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to in any way relieve the Department of Veterans Affairs from any statutory or regulatory obligations or requirements existing prior to the enactment of this section and such amendments.

TITLE VII—OTHER VETERANS MATTERS

SEC. 701. EXPANSION OF MARINE GUNNERY SERGEANT JOHN DAVID FRY SCHOLARSHIP.

(a) EXPANSION OF ENTITLEMENT.—Subsection (b)(9) of section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or spouse'' after ''child''.

(b) LIMITATION AND ELECTION ON CERTAIN BENEFITS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

''(2) LIMITATION.—The entitlement of an individual to assistance under subsection (a) pursuant to paragraph (9) of subsection (b) because the individual was a spouse of a person described in such paragraph shall expire on the earlier of—

''(A) the date that is 15 years after the date on which the person died; or

''(B) the date on which the individual remarries.

''(3) ELECTION ON RECEIPT OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.—A surviving spouse entitled to assistance under subsection (a) pursuant to paragraph (9) of subsection (b) who is also entitled to educational assistance under chapter 35 of this title may not receive assistance under both this section and such chapter, but shall make an irrevocable election (in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe) under which section or chapter to receive educational assistance.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3321(b)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''an individual'' and inserting ''a child''; and

(2) by striking ''such individual's'' each time it appears and inserting ''such child's''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, commencing on or after January 1, 2015.

SEC. 702. APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR PURPOSES OF ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONDITIONAL ON IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3679 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and subject to paragraphs (3) through (6), the Secretary shall disapprove a course of education provided by a public institution of higher learning to a covered individual pursuing a course of education with educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of this title while living in the State in which the public institution of higher learning is located if the institution charges tuition and fees for that course for the covered individual at a rate that is higher than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State in which the institution is located, regardless of the covered individual's State of residence.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, a covered individual is any individual as follows:

''(A) A veteran who was discharged or released from a period of not fewer than 90 days of service in the active military, naval, or air service less than three years before the date of enrollment in the course concerned.

''(B) An individual who is entitled to assistance under section 3311(b)(9) or 3319 of this title by virtue of such individual's relationship to a veteran described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) If after enrollment in a course of education that is subject to disapproval under paragraph (1) by reason of paragraph (2)(A) or (2)(B) a covered individual pursues one or more courses of education at the same public institution of higher learning while remaining continuously enrolled (other than during regularly scheduled breaks between courses, semesters or terms) at that institution of higher learning, any course so pursued by the covered individual at that institution of higher learning while so continuously enrolled shall also be subject to disapproval under paragraph (1).

''(4) It shall not be grounds to disapprove a course of education under paragraph (1) if a public institution of higher learning requires a covered individual pursuing a course of education at the institution to demonstrate an intent, by means other than satisfying a physical presence requirement, to establish residency in the State in which the institution is located, or to satisfy other requirements not relating to the establishment of residency, in order to be charged tuition and fees for that course at a rate that is equal to or less than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State.

''(5) The Secretary may waive such requirements of paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(6) Disapproval under paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to educational assistance under chapters 30 and 33 of this title.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (c) of section 3679 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), shall apply with respect to educational assistance provided for pursuit of a program of education during a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, that begins after July 1, 2015.

SEC. 703. EXTENSION OF REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF PENSION FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS COVERED BY MEDICAID PLANS FOR SERVICES FURNISHED BY NURSING FACILITIES.

Section 5503(d)(7) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''November 30, 2016'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''.

SEC. 704. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR COLLECTION OF FEES FOR HOUSING LOANS GUARANTEED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(B) in clause (iv), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024'';

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(4) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''October 1, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''.

SEC. 705. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

In each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the aggregate amount of awards and bonuses paid by the Secretary in a fiscal year under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title does not exceed $360,000,000.

SEC. 706. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO USE INCOME INFORMATION.

Section 5317(g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2016'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''.

SEC. 707. REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR PERFORMANCE OR MISCONDUCT.

(a) REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 713. Senior executives: removal based on performance or misconduct

''(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary may remove an individual employed in a senior executive position at the Department of Veterans Affairs from the senior executive position if the Secretary determines the performance or misconduct of the individual warrants such removal. If the Secretary so removes such an individual, the Secretary may—

''(A) remove the individual from the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5); or

''(B) in the case of an individual described in paragraph (2), transfer the individual from the senior executive position to a General Schedule position at any grade of the General Schedule for which the individual is qualified and that the Secretary determines is appropriate.

''(2) An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who—

''(A) previously occupied a permanent position within the competitive service (as that term is defined in section 2102 of title 5);

''(B) previously occupied a permanent position within the excepted service (as that term is defined in section 2103 of title 5); or

''(C) prior to employment in a senior executive position at the Department of Veterans Affairs, did not occupy any position within the Federal Government.

''(b) PAY OF TRANSFERRED INDIVIDUAL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the requirements of section 3594 of title 5, any individual transferred to a General Schedule position under subsection (a)(2) shall, beginning on the date of such transfer, receive the annual rate of pay applicable to such position.

''(2) An individual so transferred may not be placed on administrative leave or any other category of paid leave during the period during which an appeal (if any) under this section is ongoing, and may only receive pay if the individual reports for duty. If an individual so transferred does not report for duty, such individual shall not receive pay or other benefits pursuant to subsection (e)(5).

''(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after removing or transferring an individual from a senior executive position under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives notice in writing of such removal or transfer and the reason for such removal or transfer.

''(d) PROCEDURE.—(1) The procedures under section 7543(b) of title 5 shall not apply to a removal or transfer under this section.

''(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B) and subsection (e), any removal or transfer under subsection (a) may be appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of title 5.

''(B) An appeal under subparagraph (A) of a removal or transfer may only be made if such appeal is made not later than seven days after the date of such removal or transfer.

''(e) EXPEDITED REVIEW BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE.—(1) Upon receipt of an appeal under subsection (d)(2)(A), the Merit Systems Protection Board shall refer such appeal to an administrative judge pursuant to section 7701(b)(1) of title 5. The administrative judge shall expedite any such appeal under such section and, in any such case, shall issue a decision not later than 21 days after the date of the appeal.

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 7703 of title 5, the decision of an administrative judge under paragraph (1) shall be final and shall not be subject to any further appeal.

''(3) In any case in which the administrative judge cannot issue a decision in accordance with the 21-day requirement under paragraph (1), the removal or transfer is final. In such a case, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall, within 14 days after the date that such removal or transfer is final, submit to Congress and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report that explains the reasons why a decision was not issued in accordance with such requirement.

''(4) The Merit Systems Protection Board or administrative judge may not stay any removal or transfer under this section.

''(5) During the period beginning on the date on which an individual appeals a removal from the civil service under subsection (d) and ending on the date that the administrative judge issues a final decision on such appeal, such individual may not receive any pay, awards, bonuses, incentives, allowances, differentials, student loan repayments, special payments, or benefits.

''(6) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall provide to the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to any administrative judge to whom an appeal under this section is referred, such information and assistance as may be necessary to ensure an appeal under this subsection is expedited.

''(f) RELATION TO TITLE 5.—(1) The authority provided by this section is in addition to the authority provided by section 3592 or subchapter V of chapter 75 of title 5.

''(2) Section 3592(b)(1) of title 5 does not apply to an action to remove or transfer an individual under this section.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'individual' means—

''(A) a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5); or

''(B) any individual who occupies an administrative or executive position and who was appointed under section 7306(a) or section 7401(1) of this title.

''(2) The term 'misconduct' includes neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to accompany a position in a transfer of function.

''(3) The term 'senior executive position' means—

''(A) with respect to a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5), a Senior Executive Service position (as such term is defined in section 3132(a)(2) of title 5); and

''(B) with respect to an individual appointed under section 7306(a) or section 7401(1) of this title, an administrative or executive position.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''713. Senior executives: removal based on performance or misconduct.''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall establish and put into effect a process to conduct expedited reviews in accordance with section 713(d) of title 38, United States Code.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.—Section 1201.22 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall not apply to expedited reviews carried out under section 713(d) of title 38, United States Code.

(3) WAIVER.—The Merit Systems Protection Board may waive any other regulation in order to provide for the expedited review required under section 713(d) of title 38, United States Code.

(4) REPORT BY MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the actions the Board plans to take to conduct expedited reviews under section 713(d) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a). Such report shall include a description of the resources the Board determines will be necessary to conduct such reviews and a description of whether any resources will be necessary to conduct such reviews that were not available to the Board on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN LIMITATION ON INITIATION OF REMOVAL FROM SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—During the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, an action to remove an individual from the Senior Executive Service at the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, may be initiated, notwithstanding section 3592(b) of such title, or any other provision of law.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section or section 713 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be construed to apply to an appeal of a removal, transfer, or other personnel action that was pending before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RELATION TO TITLE 5.—With respect to the removal or transfer of an individual (as that term is defined in such section 713) employed at the Department of Veterans Affairs, the authority provided by such section 713 is in addition to the authority provided by section 3592 or subchapter V of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code.

TITLE VIII—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 801. APPROPRIATION OF AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and is appropriated, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $5,000,000,000 to carry out subsection (b). Such funds shall be available for obligation or expenditure without fiscal year limitation.

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS.—The amount appropriated under subsection (a) shall be used by the Secretary as follows:

(1) To increase the access of veterans to care as follows:

(A) To hire primary care and specialty care physicians for employment in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) To hire other medical staff, including the following:

(i) Physicians.

(ii) Nurses.

(iii) Social workers.

(iv) Mental health professionals.

(v) Other health care professionals as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(C) To carry out sections 301 and 302, including the amendments made by such sections.

(D) To pay for expenses, equipment, and other costs associated with the hiring of primary care, specialty care physicians, and other medical staff under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

(2) To improve the physical infrastructure of the Department as follows:

(A) To maintain and operate hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliary facilities, and other facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.

(B) To enter into contracts or hire temporary employees to repair, alter, or improve facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department that are not otherwise provided for under this paragraph.

(C) To carry out leases for facilities of the Department.

(D) To carry out minor construction projects of the Department.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The amount appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on how the Secretary has obligated the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) as of the date of the submittal of the report.

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) FUNDING PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a funding plan describing how the Secretary intends to use the amounts provided under subsection (a).

SEC. 802. VETERANS CHOICE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Veterans Choice Fund.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall administer the Veterans Choice Fund established by subsection (a).

(c) USE OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Veteran Choice Fund shall be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out section 101, including, subject to paragraph (2), any administrative requirements of such section.

(2) AMOUNT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) LIMITATION.—Except as provided by subparagraph (B), of the amounts deposited in the Veterans Choice Fund, not more than $300,000,000 may be used for administrative requirements to carry out section 101.

(B) INCREASE.—The Secretary may increase the amount set forth in subparagraph (A) with respect to the amounts used for administrative requirements if—

(i) the Secretary determines that the amount of such increase is necessary to carry out section 101;

(ii) the Secretary submits to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations of the Senate a report described in subparagraph (C); and

(iii) a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits the report under clause (ii).

(C) REPORT.—A report described in this subparagraph is a report that contains the following:

(i) A notification of the amount of the increase that the Secretary determines necessary under subparagraph (B)(i).

(ii) The justifications for such increased amount.

(iii) The administrative requirements that the Secretary will carry out using such increased amount.

(d) APPROPRIATION AND DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and is appropriated, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $10,000,000,000 to be deposited in the Veterans Choice Fund established by subsection (a). Such funds shall be available for obligation or expenditure without fiscal year limitation, and only for the program created under section 101.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—The amount appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Veterans Choice Fund is a supplement to but distinct from the Department of Veterans Affairs' current and expected level of non-Department care currently part of Department's medical care budget. Congress expects that the Department will maintain at least its existing obligations of non-Department care programs in addition to but distinct from the Veterans Choice Fund for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017.

SEC. 803. EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) DESIGNATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

And the House agree to the same.

For consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JEFF MILLER of Florida,
DOUG LAMBORN,
DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee,
BILL FLORES,
DAN BENISHEK,
MIKE COFFMAN,
BRAD R. WENSTRUP,
JACKIE WALORSKI,
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD,
CORRINE BROWN of Florida,
MARK TAKANO,
JULIA BROWNLEY of California,
ANN KIRKPATRICK,
TIMOTHY J. WALZ,
Managers on the part of the House.

BERNARD SANDERS,
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
PATTY MURRAY,
SHERROD BROWN,
JON TESTER,
MARK BEGICH,
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
MAZIE K. HIRONO,
RICHARD BURR,
JOHNNY ISAKSON,
MIKE JOHANNS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230), making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the House amendment to the Senate amendment. The differences between the House amendment, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

OVERVIEW

The House amendment to the Senate amendment to the Conference bill consists of provisions from the following House bills: H.R. 4810, the Veteran Access to Care Act of 2014, which passed the House on June 10, 2014, and H.R. 4031, the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014, which passed the House on May 21, 2014.

The Senate amendment consists of provisions from the following Senate bill: S. 2450, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, which was incorporated as a substitute amendment to H.R. 3230 and passed the Senate on June 11, 2014.

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS TO CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDERS

EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FOR VETERANS THROUGH THE USE OF AGREEMENTS WITH NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ENTITIES

Current Law

Section 1710 of title 38, United States Code (hereinafter, ''U.S.C.''), requires the Department of Veterans Affairs (hereinafter, ''VA'') to provide hospital care and medical services to eligible veterans. Section 1703 of title 38, U.S.C., authorizes VA to contract with non-Department facilities and providers to furnish hospital or medical services to eligible veterans when VA is not capable of providing economical care because of geographical inaccessibility or due to an inability to furnish such care or services required. Sections 1725 and 1728 of title 38, U.S.C., authorize VA to reimburse for certain types of care, such as emergency treatment, at non-Department facilities. Section 1786 of title 38, U.S.C., authorizes VA to provide needed post-delivery care and services. Section 8111 of title 38, U.S.C., authorizes VA to enter into sharing agreements at other government facilities. Section 8153 of title 38, U.S.C., authorizes a VA facility to enter into a contract or agreement with non-VA health care entities to secure healthcare services that are either unavailable or not cost-effective to provide at a VA facility.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to provide hospital and medical services to an eligible veteran, at the election of such veteran, through non-VA health care providers, who participate in the Medicare program, or at Federally Qualified Health Centers (hereinafter, ''FQHCs''), facilities funded by the Indian Health Service (hereinafter, ''IHS''), or Department of Defense (hereinafter, ''DOD''). It would also require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (hereinafter, ''the Secretary'') to coordinate the delivery of such non-VA care and services through the Non-VA Care Coordination Program.

For purposes of receiving non-VA care and services as a veteran enrolled in the VA health care system, the Senate amendment would define an eligible veteran as someone who is unable to schedule an appointment at a VA medical facility within VA's stated wait-time goals; resides more than 40 miles from the nearest VA medical facility; or, in the case of a veteran who resides in a State without a VA medical facility that provides hospital care, emergency medical services, and surgical care, resides 20 miles from such VA medical facility.

It would also authorize VA to enter into negotiated contracts with eligible non-VA

providers for the provision of care and services to an eligible veteran. Furthermore, it would authorize VA to establish contracts with non-VA providers at the Medicare rate or to negotiate a rate that is higher than the Medicare rate, only if VA is unable to find a health care provider that is able to provide such care and services at the Medicare rate.

House Amendment

The House amendment would require VA, for two years after enactment, to offer non-VA care at the Department's expense to any enrolled veteran who resides more than 40 miles from a VA medical facility or has waited longer than the VA's wait-time goals—as of June 1, 2014—for a medical appointment or has been notified by VA that an appointment is not available within VA's wait-time goals—as of June 1, 2014—and who elects to receive care at a non-VA facility. In furnishing such care, the House amendment would require VA to utilize existing contracts to the greatest extent possible; to reimburse any non-VA care providers with which VA has not entered into an existing contract, at the greater of the rate set by VA, TRICARE, or Medicare, for care received by an eligible veteran; and, ensure that a non-VA care authorization encompasses the complete episode of care but does not exceed sixty days.

It would also require VA to submit to Congress a quarterly report, which includes how many eligible veterans have received non-VA care or services.

Conference Agreement

The Conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with amendments to eligibility, payment rates and VA's obligation for payments for non-service-connected care or services. The conference substitute defines an eligible veteran as a veteran who is enrolled in the patient enrollment system as of August 1, 2014, or any veteran who enrolls after such date and who, at any time during the five-year period preceding such enrollment, served on active duty in a theater of combat operation. It also includes those veterans who live within 40 miles of a medical facility and are required to travel by air, boat, or ferry to access a VA medical facility or who face geographical challenges in accessing that medical facility. In calculating the distance from a nearest VA medical facility, it is the Conferees' expectation that VA will use geodesic distance, or the shortest distance between two points. The Conferees do not intend the 40-mile eligibility criteria included in this section to preclude veterans who reside closer than 40-miles from a VA facility from accessing care through non-VA providers, particularly if the VA facility the veteran resides near provides limited services.

Should an appointment not be available for a veteran within the established wait time goals and the veteran chooses to be seen by non-VA entities, the veteran will be informed by electronic means, or by a letter if the veteran so chooses, as to the care or services they are authorized to receive.

The rates for contracts established under this section shall be no more than the rates paid to a provider of services under Medicare with the exception VA may negotiate a higher rate for care provided to veterans residing in highly rural areas.

A ''Veterans Choice Card'' will be issued to each enrolled veteran for presentation to health care providers for the delivery of authorized medical care and services. This card will contain identifying information as well as contact and relevant information for authorization and claims procedures. The Secretary will provide information to veterans about the availability of care and services through the use of this card. The Conferees do not intend for any delays that may occur in the production of the ''Veterans Choice Card'' to delay the implementation of the choice program.

This election to receive care through a health care provider also includes what would be considered an episode of care up to a period of 60 days. The Conferees recognize that chronic conditions or illnesses may require episodes of care that extend beyond the 60 day limit. In such cases, the Conferees expect the Secretary to authorize additional episodes of care sufficient to complete the needed treatment or in the case of treatment needed to maintain a quality of life during a terminal illness.

For those veterans receiving hospital care or medical services for non-service-connected conditions, the Department is secondarily responsible. The health care provider that furnishes care or services shall be responsible for seeking reimbursement from the health care plan contract under which the eligible veteran is covered. Eligible veterans will pay a copayment for the receipt of hospital care or medical services under this section only if such eligible veteran would be required to pay a copayment for the receipt of care and services at a VA medical facility. Nothing in this section amends health plans not administered by the Department, including with respect to the terms and conditions of such coverage, reimbursement, and cost-sharing.

Numerous reports are required to document program implementation, establishment and success in meeting goals, utilization of and satisfaction in care and services delivered under this section, and Department expenditures.

The Conferees expect VA will provide care and services under this section at the choice of an eligible veteran if the veteran experiences the time or distance delays described in this section. When coordinating care for eligible veterans through the Non-VA Care Coordination program, the Department should attempt to ensure when an appointment is authorized, the eligible veteran receives care within an appropriate time period, as defined by medical necessity as determined by the referring physician, or a mandatory time period established by the Secretary when the request for care is not initiated by a physician, that all medical fees are appropriately paid and health care records are returned to the Department within the prescribed time. The Conferees also expect that VA will utilize providers who have demonstrated success providing a variety of care, to veterans under an integrated model of care and a proven ability to partner with the Federal government.

Congress has authorized a new program to provide care and choice to veterans, the funds made available for this program through section 802(d)(1) are available only to carry out this new program.

ENHANCEMENT OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Current Law

Subsection 1645(c) of title 25, U.S.C., requires VA and DOD to reimburse IHS, an Indian tribe, or a tribal organization for providing eligible beneficiaries with health care services. In 2010, VA and IHS signed an updated Memorandum of Understanding (hereinafter, ''MOU'') in order to establish ''mutual goals and objectives for ongoing collaboration between VA and IHS in support of their respective missions and to establish a common mission of serving our nation's American Indian and Alaska Native Veteran.'' This MOU set forth five goals, to be achieved through 12 areas of collaboration between VA and IHS. One of the areas of collaboration focused on increasing the availability of health care services through development of payment and reimbursement policies to support interagency care delivery.

As a result, in December 2012, VA and IHS signed a national reimbursement agreement to create a mechanism by which VA can reimburse IHS for health services provided to eligible veterans. This MOU only covers direct care services provided by IHS. In addition to providing direct care, IHS also contracts with Urban Indian Health Centers and Tribal Health Programs (hereinafter, ''THP'') to provide additional points of care to eligible Native Americans. VA has worked with individual THPs to negotiate separate reimbursement agreements to care for veterans. While VA's agreement with IHS only covers dual eligible veterans, the Department's agreements with health providers through the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium include coverage for all veterans. VA has not yet entered into reimbursement agreements with any Urban IHS Centers to treat veterans.

In April 2013 and June 2014, the Government Accountability Office (hereinafter, ''GAO'') issued two reports on the VA–IHS MOU. GAO's recommendations indicated that better definition of metrics and improved oversight and guidance would improve implementation of the MOU and its impact on access to care for veterans.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA, in consultation with IHS, to conduct more outreach to IHS tribal health programs to ensure they are aware of the opportunity to negotiate a reimbursement agreement.

It would require VA, in collaboration with IHS, to define metrics for implementing and overseeing existing partnership efforts under the current VA–IHS MOU.

Finally, it would require VA and IHS to jointly report to Congress, within 180 days of enactment, on the feasibility and advisability of entering into reimbursement agreements with Urban IHS Centers and including treatment of non-Native veterans as a reimbursable expense under existing reimbursement structures.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

ENHANCEMENT OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

Current Law

In October 2013, the VA Pacific Islands Health Care System (hereinafter, ''VAPIHCS'') entered into an MOU with Papa Ola Lokahi, the statutorily designated statewide coordinating body for the five Native Hawaiian Health Care Systems, in order to improve communication, collaboration, and cooperation regarding health care for Native Hawaiian veterans. The purpose statement of the MOU notes that both parties, ''hope to seek and develop greater means of achieving efficiency of care provided and to create future processes for VAPIHCS reimbursement for services provided to Native Hawaiian veterans referred to Papa Ola Lokahi by

VAPIHCS.'' VA estimated the average waiting time for a new patient requesting a primary care appointment at VAPIHCS was nearly 130 days, the highest in the nation. Due to the rural nature of the state, VAPIHCS has received funding above and beyond its Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation in Fiscal Year (hereinafter, ''FY'') 2012 and FY 2013, in order to account for the costs of beneficiary travel for eligible veterans to receive services on other islands. These numbers were $4.94 million and $4.65 million, respectively.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to enter into contracts or agreements with the Native Hawaiian health care systems for reimbursement of direct care services provided to eligible veterans.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

REAUTHORIZATION AND MODIFICATION OF PILOT PROGRAM OF ENHANCED CONTRACT CARE AUTHORITY FOR HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF VETERANS

Current Law

Section 403 of the Veterans' Mental Health and Other Care Improvements Act of 2008, Public Law 110–387, provided VA with authority to conduct a pilot program commonly known as Project ARCH (Access Received Closer to Home) in five Veterans Integrated Service Networks (hereinafter, ''VISNs''). The pilot program was to be carried out in at least five VISNs, restricted by various geographic and demographic factors. Locations included: Northern Maine; Farmville, Virginia; Pratt, Kansas; Flagstaff, Arizona; and, Billings, Montana. The aim of the pilot was to provide health care access to eligible veterans closer to home through a non-Department health care provider.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Committee substitute would extend Project ARCH within specified VISNs for veterans in highly rural areas who are enrolled in VA health care for an additional 2 years. It would also require appointments to be scheduled within 5 days from the date the provider accepts a referral from VA and requires these veterans receive care within 30 days from the date the appointment was made.

PROMPT PAYMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

In general, the Prompt Payment Act, as amended, requires executive branch agencies, including VA, to pay late-payment penalties when the Department does not pay commercial payments on time.

In March 2014, GAO reported that billing officials at one non-VA provider experienced ''lengthy delays'' in the processing of their claims, which in some cases took years. Additionally, GAO testified at a House Committee on Veterans' Affairs hearing on June 18, 2014, on claim processing discrepancies that delayed or denied payments for healthcare provided by non-VA providers.

According to GAO, these delays or denials create an environment where non-VA entities are hesitant to provide care due to fears they will not be paid for services provided. This hinders access to care for veterans who need non-VA services.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would provide a Sense of Congress that VA comply with section 1315 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (hereinafter, ''CFR''), (commonly known as the ''prompt payment rule'') in paying for health care pursuant to contracts with non-VA providers.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment that adds a GAO report on the timeliness of payments by VA for non-VA care and services. The Committee is concerned that the Department is not paying claims for services provided to veterans by non-Department providers in a timely manner. The Committee urges the Secretary to establish and implement a system for the processing and paying of those claims.

TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND OTHER HEALTH CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDERS TO THE CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICE OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Current Law

Under current law, section 1703 of title 38, U.S.C., VA may contract with non-Department facilities and providers to furnish hospital care or medical services to eligible veterans when VA is not capable of furnishing the care or services required or VA is not capable of providing economical care because of geographical inaccessibility. Further, VA has authority, under sections 1725 and 1728 of title 38, U.S.C., to reimburse for certain types of care, such as emergency treatment, at non-Department facilities.

The criteria for determining whether a veteran is eligible for non-VA care is established by each VISN or VA medical center. Committee oversight has determined that a decentralized eligibility determination process ensures eligibility is appropriate for each medical center's capacity and the needs of the veterans it serves. However, such decentralization has caused disparity in eligibility criteria throughout the VA health care system and in some cases has led to the determination of eligibility as subject to facility budget considerations rather than to the determination of what is best for the veteran.

The use of non-VA care has increased. In fact, non-VA care has been the subject of two recent reports by the GAO. Both reports highlighted vulnerabilities in VA's ability to manage and oversee utilization of and spending on non-VA care. In its May 2013 report, GAO noted VA's fee basis care spending had increased nearly $1.5 billion from FY 2008 through FY 2012 and had witnessed an increase in utilization of 19% during that same time period.

Without central oversight of non-VA care, VA has limited ability to collect and analyze data that could help to improve the program's management.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the Secretary to transfer the authority to pay for hospital care, medical services, and other health care through non-VA providers to the Chief Business Office from VA's VISNs and medical centers by October 1, 2014. It would also require the Chief Business Office to work with the Office of Clinical Operations and Management to ensure care and services are provided in a manner that is clinically appropriate and in the best interest of the veterans receiving such care and services.

Finally, in each FY after the date of enactment, the Secretary would be required to include in the Chief Business Office budget funds to pay for hospital care, medical services, and other health care provided through non-VA providers.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

TITLE II—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEMS AND MANAGEMENT PROCESSES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

VA operates the largest integrated health care system in the nation, comprised of 150 VA medical centers (hereinafter, ''VAMCs''), 820 community-based outpatient clinics, 135 community-living centers, 300 Vet Centers, 140 domiciliary treatment programs, and 70 mobile Vet Centers. These sites of care are divided amongst 21 VISNs. The VA health care system is overseen by the Veterans Health Administration (hereinafter, ''VHA''), which operates under the leadership of the VA Under Secretary for Health. VHA employs a staff of approximately 288,000 employees and oversees a medical care budget of approximately $55 billion. In addition to providing direct health care services to eligible veterans, caregivers, and dependents, VHA also conducts education and training programs for health care professionals and medical residents; operates an extensive medical research program; and, serves as the contingency back-up to the Department of Defense during national emergencies.

VHA directive 2010–027, ''VHA Outpatient Scheduling Processes and Procedures'' (hereinafter, ''the directive''), established on June 9, 2010, outlines the policy for implementing processes and procedures for scheduling outpatient appointments using the Veterans Health Information Systems and Technology Architecture (hereinafter, ''VistA''). The directive also provides detail regarding how to ensure staff is competent in the scheduling process. This directive is set to expire on June 30, 2015.

VA's Office of Inspector General (hereinafter, ''VAOIG''), GAO and a recent VA audit have identified significant problems with VA's ability to provide timely access to health care.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to enter into a contract with an independent third party for a 180-day assessment of: the process for scheduling appointments at each VA medical facility; the staffing level at and productivity of each VA medical facility; the organization, processes, and tools used to support clinical documentation and coding of inpatient services; the purchasing, distribution, and use of pharmaceuticals; and the performance of the Department in paying amounts owed to third parties and collecting amounts owed to the Department. The independent third party conducting the

assessment would be required to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's scheduling process and recommend any actions to be taken by the Department to improve its process for scheduling medical appointments.

The Senate amendment would also require VA to submit a report to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives (hereinafter, ''the Committees''), no later than 90 days after the date on which the independent third party completes the assessment, on the results of such assessment.

House Amendment

The House amendment would require an independent assessment of hospital care and medical services furnished in VA medical facilities. The independent assessment would address: the current and projected demographics and unique needs of the patient population served by VA; the Department's current and projected health care capabilities and resources; the authorities and mechanisms under which the Secretary may furnish hospital care and medical services at non-VA facilities; the appropriate system-wide access standard applicable to hospital care and medical services furnished by VA; the current organization, processes, and tools used to support clinical staffing; VA's staffing levels and productivity standards; information technology strategies; and, VHA' s business processes. Further, the independent assessment would include: an identification of improvement areas; recommendations for how to address such improvement areas; the business case associated with making such improvements; and findings and supporting analysis on how credible conclusions were established.

It would also require the Secretary to designate a program integrator if VA enters into contracts with more than one private sector entity to conduct the independent assessment. The program integrator would be required to be responsible for coordinating the outcomes of the assessments conducted by the private entities.

Finally, the House amendment would require VA to submit to the Committees a report, no later than 10 months after entering into a contract with a private entity, on the findings of the independent assessment and a subsequent report, no later than 120 days after the date of the submission of the first report, which would be required to include VA's action plan for fully implementing the recommendations of the independent assessment.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision with amendments to broaden the breadth of the assessment to include: VA leadership; access to care; length of stay management; patient experience; workflow; care transitions; mechanisms by which VA ensures timely payments to nonVA care providers; pharmaceutical; supply and device purchasing; distribution and use; scheduling; and medical construction, maintenance and leasing.

The Conferees expect that the assessment will produce outcomes that identify improvement areas outlined both qualitatively and quantitatively, taking into consideration Department of Veterans Affairs' directives and industry benchmarks from outside the Federal Government. The assessment is also expected to provide supporting analysis on how credible conclusions were established. The business cases associated with and the recommendations for how to address these identified improvement areas relating to structure, accountability, process changes, technology, capabilities and usage, staff compliance, training effectiveness, and other relevant drivers of performance are expected to better inform the Commission on Care in its work.

COMMISSION ON CARE

Current Law

Precedent exists for establishing an independent commission in response to concerns regarding the care provided to our nation's servicemembers and veterans. In 2007, ''the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors,'' known as the Dole-Shalala Commission, was established in response to reports of substandard conditions and mismanagement at Walter Reed Army Hospital. The subsequent report and recommendations issued by the Dole-Shalala Commission have been critical to improving the health care, benefits, and services available to our nation's veterans in recent years.

Another independent, high-level commission, the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (''CARES'') Commission has been utilized in recent history to examine and recommend improvements for addressing a host of challenges facing VHA, such as how best to align VA's health care system to deliver care to veterans.

Physical infrastructure plays a significant role in VA's ability to provide high quality care to veterans. With more than 2 million new veterans enrolling into the VA health care system since 2009, and veterans experiencing extended wait times for appointments, it is essential that VA facility leasing programs and maintenance projects are completed on time and within budget.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would establish a Commission on Access to Care to examine the access of veterans to health care and strategically examine how best to organize VHA, locate health care resources, and deliver health care to veterans. The Commission would be required to report initial findings and recommendations within 90 days of its first meeting, and would be required to provide a final report within 180 days of such meeting.

The Senate amendment would also establish an Independent Commission on Department of Veterans Affairs Construction Projects to review current construction and maintenance projects and the medical facility leasing program in order to identify any issues the Department may be experiencing as it carries out these projects. The Commission would be required to report to the Secretary and Congress not later than 120 days after enactment any recommendations for improving how VA carries out its construction and maintenance projects. Following submission of the Commission's report, the Secretary would have 60 days to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of implementing the recommendations of the Commission, including a timeline for the implementation of such recommendations.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision on the Commission on Care with an amendment to include a representative with familiarity with medical facility construction and leasing projects. This amendment would allow the Commission on Care to examine how VA's physical infrastructure impacts VA's ability to provide high quality care to veterans and eliminate the need for a separate Independent Commission on Department of Veterans Affairs Construction Projects. Further, the Conference substitute increases the number of voting members to 15, eliminates non-voting members, and allows for appointment by the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate. It is the expectation of the Conferees that the membership of the Commission on Care will represent and reflect a bipartisan, cross-section of VHA users.

The Commission on Care may also consider looking at the relationship and communication structure between the VHA and the Veterans Benefits Administration. The Conferees are concerned the two administrations do not communicate and lack synergy to ensure that veterans' benefits and services are rendered in a timely, safe, and veteran focused manner.

TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE ON REVIEW OF SCHEDULING SYSTEM AND SOFTWARE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

VHA presently relies on an outpatient scheduling system that is more than 25 years-old. In October 2001, due to an aging system with various limitations that hindered its effectiveness, VHA launched a scheduling replacement initiative. This process was wrought with setbacks, including failed information technology (hereinafter, ''IT'') management and acquisition practices. After expending $127 million on that effort, VA was only able to obtain defective software that could not be fixed and did not achieve the intended goal. Further, reports by GAO and VAOIG have repeatedly highlighted challenges with the use of the Electronic Wait List (hereinafter, ''EWL''), an inability to connect with the consult management system, and other change management challenges regarding training for medical appointment schedulers.

Utilizing the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2011, VA started the 21st Century Medical Scheduling contest in order to encourage commercial vendors to develop solutions VA can use and to mitigate risks VA identified in previous attempts to replace the existing Medical Scheduling Package. The contest ended on September 30, 2013, and three winners were identified and awarded slightly over $3 million for their efforts. VA is currently pursuing modernization of VistA; thus, there has been renewed focus within the Department on how to improve its functionality and user experiences across the board. VA recently held Industry Days and one-on-one demonstrations with potential vendors in order to choose an off-the-shelf product as part of a long-term scheduling package replacement strategy.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to review, through the use of a technology task force, the needs of the Department with respect to the scheduling system and scheduling software. The task force would be required to issue a report to propose specific actions that VA can take to improve its scheduling software and determine whether an existing off-the-shelf system would meet the Department's needs within 45 days of enactment. VA would be required to publish the report in the Federal Register and on a publicly accessible website. VA would also be

required to implement any feasible, advisable, and cost-effective recommendations set forth in the report within one year of its receipt.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision. The Conferees expect VA to utilize the Northern Virginia Technology Task Force to implement this section. The Task Force previously provided a pro-bono review for Arlington National Cemetery.

IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS OF VETERANS TO MOBILE VET CENTERS AND MOBILE MEDICAL CENTERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

In May 2014, VHA's Office of Rural Health published a fact sheet reporting that, of the Nation's 22 million veterans, 5.3 million live in rural areas. Currently, there are 70 mobile vet centers operating around the country providing readjustment counseling and information resources to veterans in rural areas. Mobile vet centers in some areas also provide limited telemedicine services. VA, however, has not issued any standard procedures for the operation of mobile vet centers. Currently, regional managers determine how a mobile vet center is employed and utilized. As a result, mobile vet centers are vulnerable to inconsistencies.

In addition to mobile vet centers, VA uses mobile medical units (hereinafter, ''MMUs'') to increase access to care for rural veterans. As of March 2013, VA operated eight MMUs. In May 2014, VAOIG issued an audit of VA MMUs, which found that VA lacked critical information regarding the number, locations, purpose, patient workloads, operation costs, and operations of MMUs. VAOIG recommended that VA improve oversight of MMUs.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to improve access to health care services, including telemedicine, by standardizing requirements for the operation of mobile vet centers. It would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report to Congress on the use of mobile vet centers as well as recommended improvements for access to telemedicine and health care via mobile vet centers.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment to require VA to use MMUs as well as mobile vet centers to improve access to care for veterans, particularly those residing in rural areas.

IMPROVED PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

Under current law, chapter 45, chapter 53, and other provisions of title 5, U.S.C., VA has the authority to provide awards to certain employees. For example, chapter 45 of title 5, U.S.C., provides VA with authority to grant cash awards to employees in recognition of performance.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the Secretary to ensure that scheduling and wait-time metrics are not used as factors in determining the performance of certain employees for purposes of determining whether to pay performance awards to such employees. It would also require the Secretary to remove from the performance goals of any VISN or VA medical center employee, any performance goal that might disincentivize the payment of Department amounts to provide health care through non-VA providers.

The Senate amendment would also require the Secretary to modify the performance plans of the directors of VISNs and VA medical centers to ensure that such plans are based on the quality of care received by veterans at VA medical facilities, including reviews and recommendations concerning such facilities by the VAOIG and the Joint Commission.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

IMPROVED TRANSPARENCY CONCERNING HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

VHA operates the largest integrated health care system in the nation, providing care to nearly 6.5 million veterans, survivors, and their dependents every year. According to GAO, between FY 2005 and FY 2012, the number of outpatient medical appointments at VA has increased by roughly 45 percent. VA' s own data on wait times for FY 2010 suggested it was seeing virtually all its primary and specialty care appointments within the 30 days of desired date requirement that had been established in 1995. As a result, in FY 2011, VHA shortened its goal of scheduling both primary and specialty care appointments to 14 days. While VA did not publicly publish data related to wait times, it did attempt to encourage accountability by incorporating the wait-time goal metric into the performance contracts of VISN and VAMC directors.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the Secretary to publish wait-times for scheduling an appointment at VA facilities in the Federal Register and on a public website of each medical center within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act. It would also require VA to publish, on the Internet, current wait times for appointments in primary and specialty care at each VA medical center.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

INFORMATION FOR VETERANS ON THE CREDENTIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PHYSICIANS

Current Law

In FY 2013, 18,342 physicians; 991 dentists; 50,862 registered nurses; 23,729 licensed practical nurses, licensed vocational nurses, and nurse assistants; and 12,102 non-physician providers delivered care to nearly 6.5 million veterans, survivors, and their dependents. VA makes information regarding its health care providers available to its patients and the public through the ''Our Doctors'' section on the website for each of VA's medical centers. Congressional oversight has determined that these websites contain limited information regarding the credentials for VA's physicians.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to improve the information available to veterans regarding residency training in the ''Our Doctors'' database located on each VA medical facility's website. It would also require VA to provide information regarding a physician's credentials to a veteran, or an individual acting on behalf of a veteran, prior to undergoing a surgical procedure by or through VA.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

INFORMATION IN ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE PRESIDENT ON HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FURNISHED THROUGH EXPANDED USE OF CONTRACTS FOR SUCH CARE

Current Law

Under current law, section 1105 of title 31, U.S.C., the President submits a budget for the U.S. Government that includes a message, summary and supporting information.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the Secretary to include information in the Department's budget submission regarding hospital care and medical services furnished through expanded use of contracts.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

PROHIBITION ON FALSIFICATION OF DATA CONCERNING WAIT TIMES AND QUALITY MEASURES AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

In May 2014, concerns about VA's scheduling practices, including excessive wait times, were identified in the VAOIG's interim report regarding the alleged patient deaths at the Phoenix Health Care System. The results indicated that 1,700 veterans were waiting for a primary care appointment but had not been placed on the EWL. In its report, the VAOIG noted that, as a direct result of not properly placing veterans on the EWL, the leadership at the Phoenix Health Care System had radically understated the amount of time new patients waited for their primary care appointments.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to establish disciplinary procedures within 60 days of enactment of this Act for employees who knowingly submit false data pertaining to wait times and quality measures or knowingly require another employee of the Department to submit false data concerning such wait times or quality measures to another employee of the Department.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

TITLE III—HEALTH CARE STAFFING, RECRUITMENT, AND TRAINING MATTERS

TREATMENT OF STAFFING SHORTAGE AND BIENNIAL REPORT ON STAFFING OF MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

Subsection 3304(a) of title 5, U.S.C., authorizes federal agencies to appoint, without regard to certain hiring preferences and competitive service selection requirements, candidates directly to positions for which a severe shortage of candidates or a critical hiring need has been identified.

VA's own nation-wide access audit determined that VA faces staffing challenges and needs additional health care professionals, such as primary care physicians, specialty care physicians, and administrative and support staff, to improve access to high quality health care for veterans. These reviews and Congressional oversight have identified the federal government's long hiring process as a barrier to recruiting qualified health care professionals to the VA health care system.

Furthermore, GAO and VAOIG have reported that inadequate staffing and gaps in hiring health care professionals at VA medical facilities throughout the country have adverse effects on patient care. These adverse effects include increased wait times and delays in scheduling appointments. Current law, however, is silent on requiring periodic assessments of VA's staffing and succession planning process.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VAOIG to annually identify the five occupations of health care providers with the largest staffing shortages and would authorize VA to utilize direct appointment authority to fill such openings in an expedited manner. It would also give priority for VA' s Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program to individuals pursuing a medical degree with the intent to specialize in occupations identified by the VAOIG.

It would also require VA to submit a report to the Committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of and not later than December 31, biennially, thereafter through 2024, on staffing at each VA medical facility. Such report would be required to include: the results of a system-wide assessment of all VA medical facilities, including a plan for addressing any issues identified in such assessment; a list of the current wait times, workload levels, and staffing models for certain clinics; the results of the most current VAOIG findings regarding staffing shortages and VA's plan to use direct appointment authority to fill such staffing shortages; an analysis of succession planning at VA medical facilities; and the number of VA health care providers who have been removed, retired, or left their positions for other reasons.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to establish medical residency programs or ensure sufficient numbers of medical residency positions at facilities with existing programs in areas experiencing a shortage of physicians or located in a community that is designated as a health professional shortage area. It would also increase the number of graduate medical education residency positions by up to 1,500 over five years with a priority for primary care, mental health, and other specialties as VA determines appropriate. Finally, it would require an annual report to Congress.

The Conference encourages VA to explore options of partnering with private sector and affiliate hospitals who could potentially provide vacant space to VA for care.

EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Current Law

Section 7601, et seq. of title 38, U.S.C., provides VA with authority to carry out the VA Health Professionals Education Assistance Program (hereinafter, ''HPEAP'') to provide scholarships, tuition assistance, debt reduction assistance, and other educational programs to VA health care professionals. HPEAP serves as a recruitment and retention tool for the Department. For example, the Education Debt Reduction Program (hereinafter, ''EDRP''), which provides educational assistance to VHA employees in an effort to maintain staffing levels, has assisted 10,055 individuals from FY 2002 through FY 2013. However, VA has acknowledged EDRP has experienced lower than expected utilization rates because it requires participants to pay student loan expenses upfront which are reimbursed later by the Department. As a result, the number of participants defaulting on their loans and subsequently being removed from the program is higher than anticipated.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute would extend VA's authority to operate HPEAP through December 31, 2019. It would also increase the cap on debt reduction payments to an individual participant from $60,000 to $120,000. These amendments would bring VA's Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program in line with other similar federal programs and ensure VA has the authority to provide appropriate incentives to attract health care professionals.

CLINIC MANAGEMENT TRAINING FOR EMPLOYEES AT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

Timely access to health care requires efficient clinic management. As early as 2005, GAO noted that VHA lacked standardized training programs for scheduling. Further, VHA has no leadership or management training in access to care management. GAO, VAOIG and VA's Office of Medical Inspector have identified standardization of clinic management training regarding availability of providers' schedules as a VA management challenge. Specific VA medical centers that have experienced difficulty with standardized scheduling processes are the VA San Diego Health Care System, the Cheyenne, Wyoming, VA Medical Center, and the Phoenix VA Healthcare System. Moreover, the tone of VHA's directive entitled *Outpatient Scheduling Processes and Procedures* is written in a manner that offers guidance rather than specific policy, seemingly allowing for discretion regarding its implementation.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require VA to implement a clinic management training program to provide in-person, standardized education on health care management to all VA managers and health care providers. Such training program would be required to include training on: managing the schedules of VA health care providers; the appropriate number of appointments that a VA health care provider should conduct on a daily basis; managing appointments; the proper use of VA' s appointment scheduling system; optimizing the use of technology; and the proper use of physical plant space at VA medical facilities.

It would also require VA to carry out the clinic management training program for two years and would require VA to update training materials on an ongoing basis and provide such training materials to relevant officials, as appropriate. Updating of training materials will need to account for new IT such as a new scheduling system or electronic access to care dash board.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

TITLE IV—HEALTH CARE RELATED TO SEXUAL TRAUMA

EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SEXUAL TRAUMA COUNSELING AND TREATMENT TO VETERANS ON INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING

Current Law

Section 1720D of title 38, U.S.C., requires VA to provide counseling and appropriate care and services to veterans to overcome psychological trauma, which in the judgment of a VA mental health professional, resulted from a physical assault of a sexual nature, battery of a sexual nature, or sexual harassment which occurred while the veteran was serving on active duty or active duty for training (otherwise known as military sexual trauma) (hereinafter, ''MST''). Veterans who experienced MST while serving on active duty or active duty for training are included under this authority. However, veterans who experienced MST while on inactive duty for training—for example, those who were assaulted during weekend drill training for the National Guard and Reserve—are not included.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would amend section 1720D of title 38, U.S.C., to provide VA with the authority to provide counseling, care and services to veterans, and certain other servicemembers who may not have veteran status, who experienced sexual trauma while serving on inactive duty for training.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

PROVISION OF COUNSELING AND TREATMENT FOR SEXUAL TRAUMA BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Current Law

Under current law, section 1720D of title 38, U.S.C., VA has the authority to provide counseling, care and services to veterans who experienced sexual trauma while serving on active duty or active duty for training.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would expand eligibility for care and services for MST at a

VA facility to active duty servicemembers. Active duty servicemembers would not be required to initially be seen by DOD and receive a referral before seeking treatment at a VA facility for MST. It would take effect on the date that is one year after the date of enactment.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate position.

REPORTS ON MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA

Current Law

Section 1720D of title 38, U.S.C., states that ''each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report on the counseling, care, and services provided to veterans pursuant to this section.'' However, there is no language requiring an assessment.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the VA–DOD Joint Executive Committee to conduct an annual assessment for the next five years of the processes and procedures regarding the transition and continuum of care from the DOD to VA for individuals who have experienced MST. The assessment would also include the processes and collaboration by the agencies to assist individuals filing a claim for MST related disability. Additionally, VA would be required to submit a report to Congress no later than 630 days from the date of enactment of the Act on the treatment and services available for male veterans who experience MST compared to such treatment and services available to female veterans. It would take effect on the date that is 270 days after the date of enactment of the Act.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

TITLE V—OTHER HEALTH CARE MATTERS

EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTED LIVING SERVICES FOR VETERANS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

Current Law

Section 1705 of Public Law 110–181, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008,'' requires: (1) VA, in collaboration with the Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center, to carry out a five-year pilot program to assess the effectiveness of providing assisted living services to veterans with traumatic brain injury (hereinafter, ''TBI'') to enhance their rehabilitation, quality of life, and community integration; (2) at least one part of the pilot program to be carried out in a VISN that contains a VA polytrauma center; (3) special consideration to be given to veterans in rural areas; and, (4) VA to report to the Committees on the pilot program. To comply with this requirement, VA awarded a national contract to 20 contractors at more than 150 sites of care across the U.S. However, statutory authority for this pilot program expires on September 30, 2014.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference agreement extends the statutory authority for VA to operate the pilot program from September 30, 2014, to October 6, 2017.

TITLE VI—MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES

AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES

Current Law

Under current law, section 8104 of title 38, U.S.C., Congressional authorization is required prior to entering into any VA major medical facility lease that has an average annual rent of $1,000,000 or above.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would authorize VA to enter into 26 major medical facility leases in 17 states and Puerto Rico.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment to include a lease authorization for a VA community-based outpatient clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in an amount not to exceed $13.27 million. In enacting such leases, the Conferees would like the Secretary to consider any potential cost, energy and schedule savings that might be offered by standardized design elements and off-site construction methods, including prefabricated components and panelized structures.

BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITIES LEASES

Current Law

Section 8104 of title 38, U.S.C., requires authorization of any major medical facility construction project or lease. Subsections (a)(1)(A) and (a)(1)(B) of section 1341 of title 31, U.S.C., prohibit any government employee from entering into contracts, or making or authorizing expenditures and obligations that exceed the amount of appropriated funds for such expenditures.

Appendix B of the Office of Management and Budget's (hereinafter, ''OMB'') Circular A–11 (hereinafter, ''Circular'') describes the processes through which budgetary treatment of leasepurchase and leases of capital assets will be consistent with scorekeeping rules originally promulgated in connection with the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 and the Anti-Deficiency Act. According to the Circular, at the time an Agency enters into a binding commitment, the Agency must obligate sufficient budget authority to cover associated legal obligations to the government, consistent with the requirements of the Anti-Deficiency Act. For lease-purchases or capital leases, this consists of the net present value of the total estimated legal obligations over the entire life of the contract. For operating leases, this can consist of either an amount sufficient to cover the lease payments for the first year plus a sufficient amount to cover any costs associated with cancellation of the contract, if the contract includes a cancellation clause, or an amount sufficient to cover the annual lease payment, if the lease is funded through a self-insuring fund such as the General Services Administration's Federal Building Fund.

After receiving information about how VA has exercised the authority provided in prior VA major medical facilities leasing authorizations, the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter, ''CBO'') concluded in 2012 that VA has been entering into binding obligations for the full period of the lease, without regard to the scorekeeping rules contained in the Circular.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would require the funding prospectus of a proposed lease to include a detailed analysis of how the lease is expected to comply with OMB's Circular and the AntiDeficiency Act. It also directs VA, at least 30 days before entering into a lease, to submit to the Committees: (1) notice of the intention to enter into, and a detailed summary of, such lease; (2) a description and analysis of any differences between the lease prospectus submitted and the proposed lease; and (3) a scoring analysis demonstrating that the proposed lease fully complies with OMB's Circular. VA must also report any material differences between the proposed lease and the lease entered, no later than 30 days after entering into a lease.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

TITLE VII—OTHER VETERANS MATTERS

EXPANSION OF MARINE GUNNERY SERGEANT JOHN DAVID FRY SCHOLARSHIP

Current Law

Public Law 111–32, the ''Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009,'' amended the Post–9/11 GI Bill to establish the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship for the children of servicemembers who died in the line of duty after September 10, 2001. Eligible children are entitled to 36 months of benefits at the 100 percent level and may use the benefit until their 33rd birthday.

Currently, surviving spouses of servicemembers who died in the line of duty are only eligible to receive survivors' and dependents' educational assistance (hereinafter, ''Chapter 35''). Chapter 35 benefits provide a spouse up to $1,003 per month as a full-time college student, which may require the spouse to find other sources of income or funding to offset the high cost of education. Additionally, recipients of Chapter 35 do not receive a separate living allowance.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to include surviving spouses of members of the Armed Forces who died or die in the line of duty after September 10, 2001. It would amend subsection (b)(9) of section 3311 of title 38, U.S.C., to expand the ability to receive the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to surviving spouses. It would limit the entitlement of the surviving spouse to the date that is 15 years after the date of the servicemember's death or the date the surviving spouse remarries, whichever is earlier. Further, a surviving spouse, who is entitled both under amended section 3311 and under Chapter 35, would be required to make an irrevocable election to receive educational assistance under either amended section 3311 or Chapter 35. Finally, this provision would make a necessary conforming amendment to subsection (b)(4) of section 3321 of title 38, U.S.C.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate position with an effective date of January 1, 2015.

APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR PURPOSES OF ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND POST–9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONDITIONAL ON IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS

Current Law

Section 3313 of title 38, U.S.C., authorizes VA to pay in-state tuition and fees for veterans attending a public educational institution using their Post–9/11 GI Bill educational benefits. However, a veteran may not always qualify for in-state tuition rates.

Several states currently assist all or certain veterans by recognizing them as in-state students for purposes of attending a public educational institution, regardless of length of residency in the state where the veteran is attending college. Yet, many states require transitioning veterans to meet stringent residency requirements before they can be considered in-state residents. Federal law is silent on this matter.

Recently-separated veterans may not be able to meet state residency requirements where they choose to attend school because they were stationed elsewhere during their military service, and once enrolled, they may not be able to legally establish residency because of their status as full-time students. The federal educational assistance provided to veterans by VA was designed, in part, to help them develop the skills and background necessary to make a successful transition from military service to a civilian life and career.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would amend section 3679 of title 38, U.S.C., by adding a new subsection (c) to require VA to disapprove courses of education provided by public institutions of higher learning that charge tuition and fees at more than the in-state resident rate for veterans within three years from discharge from a period of at least 90 days service in the military, irrespective of the veteran's current state of residence, if the veteran is living in the state in which the institution is located while pursuing that course of education. Pursuant to subsection (c), this provision would apply to veterans using the educational assistance programs administered by VA under chapters 30 and 33 of title 38, U.S.C., and to dependent beneficiaries using Post–9/11 GI Bill benefits during the three years after the veteran's discharge. If the veteran or dependent enrolls within three years after the veteran's discharge, the requirement to charge no more than the in-state tuition rate would apply for the duration the individual remains continuously enrolled at the institution.

Subsection (c)(4) would permit a public educational institution to require a covered individual to demonstrate an intent, by means other than satisfying a physical presence requirement, to eventually establish residency in that state or to meet requirements unrelated to residency in order to be eligible for the in-state tuition rate. This section would also provide VA discretion to waive the established requirements in a circumstance where it is deemed appropriate in regards to approval of a specific course of education. Any disapproval of courses pursuant to these new requirements would apply only with respect to benefits provided under chapters 30 and 33 of title 38. This provision would apply to programs of education that begin during academic terms after July 1, 2015.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

EXTENSION OF REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF PENSION FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS COVERED BY MEDICAID PLANS FOR SERVICES FURNISHED BY NURSING FACILITIES

Current Law

Section 5503 of title 38, U.S.C., sets forth the criteria under which eligibility for income-based pension payments and aid and attendance allowances are affected by domiciliary or nursing home residence. In instances where a veteran, or surviving spouse, has neither a spouse nor a child, and is receiving Medicaid-covered nursing home care, the veteran or surviving spouse is eligible to receive no more than $90 per month in VA pension or death pension payments. Under current law, this authority shall expire on November 30, 2016. This authority has been extended several times, most recently pursuant to Public Law 112–260, the ''Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012.''

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Committee substitute would amend section 5503(d)(7) to extend, through September 30, 2024, current eligibility restrictions for recipients of a VA pension who receive Medicaid-covered nursing home care. The VA pension program should not be used to subsidize other federal benefit programs. Further, pension recipients should have available funds for incidentals and personal expenses.

EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR COLLECTION OF FEES FOR HOUSING LOANS GUARANTEED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

Under VA's home loan guaranty program, VA may guarantee a loan made to eligible servicemembers, veterans, reservists, and certain un-remarried surviving spouses for the purchase (or refinancing) of houses, condominiums, and manufactured homes. Section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, U.S.C., sets forth a loan fee table that lists funding fees, expressed as a percentage of the loan amount, for different types of loans.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Committee substitute would extend VA's authority to collect certain funding fees through September 30, 2024, by amending the fee schedule set forth in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, U.S.C.

LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Current Law

Under current law, chapter 45, chapter 53, and other provisions of title 5, U.S.C., VA has the authority to provide awards to certain employees. For example, chapter 45 of title 5 provides VA with authority to grant cash awards to employees in recognition of performance.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment would, for each of FYs 2014 through 2016, prohibit the Secretary from paying awards or bonuses under chapters 45 or 53 of title 5, U.S.C., or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision with an amendment that would, for each of FYs 2014 through 2024, cap the amount of awards or bonuses payable under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, U.S.C., or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title, at $360 million. It is the Conferees' expectation that this cap not disproportionately impact lower-wage employees.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO USE INCOME INFORMATION

Current Law

Certain benefit programs administered by VA, including pension for wartime veterans and compensation for Individual Unemployability are available only to beneficiaries whose annual income is below a certain level. VA must have access to verifiable income information in order to ensure that those receiving benefits under its income-based programs are not earning a greater annual income than the law permits.

Section 6103(1)(7)(D) of title 26, U.S.C., authorizes the release of certain income information by the Internal Revenue Service (hereinafter, ''IRS'') or the Social Security Administration (hereinafter, ''SSA'') to VA for the purposes of verifying income of applicants for VA needs-based benefits. Section 5317(g) of title 38, U.S.C., provides VA with temporary authority to obtain and use this information. Under current law, this authority expires on September 30, 2016.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Committee substitute would extend for eight years, until September 30, 2024, VA's authority to obtain information from the IRS or the SSA for income verification purposes for needs-based benefits.

REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR PERFORMANCE OR MISCONDUCT

Current Law

Under current law, section 7543 of title 5, U.S.C., career appointees in the Senior Executive Service (hereinafter, ''SES'') may be removed from government service for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to accompany a position in a transfer of function. Senior executives removed as a result of these conduct-related issues are entitled to certain rights, including at least 30 days advance written notice; a reasonable time but not less than seven days to reply; representation by an attorney or other representative; a written decision from the

agency involved; and appeal rights to the Merit Systems Protection Board (hereinafter, ''MSPB'').

Under current law, section 3592 of title 5, U.S.C., career appointees in the SES may be removed from the SES and placed into a non-SES position for performance-related issues. This removal may occur at any time during a one-year probationary period or at any time for less than fully successful executive performance. Generally, senior executives removed from the SES and placed into a civil service position are entitled to an informal hearing before the MSPB.

Also under current law, section 3592(b) of title 5, U.S.C., there is a 120–day moratorium from removing a career appointee in the SES following the appointment of the head of the agency or the SES employee's immediate supervisor.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would provide the Secretary with the authority to remove or demote any individual from the SES if the Secretary determines the performance of the individual warrants such removal and requires the Secretary to notify Congress within 30 days of removing or demoting a senior executive under this authority. The senior executive would be allowed an opportunity for an expedited review by the MSPB. Under such expedited appeal, the senior executive would have seven days to appeal a removal or demotion and the MSPB would be required to adjudicate the appeal within 21 days.

The MSPB would be required to establish and implement a process to conduct expedited reviews and submit to Congress a report on their established process within 30 days of enactment.

The Senate amendment would also provide authority for the Secretary to immediately remove senior executives notwithstanding the 120–day moratorium in current law.

House Amendment

The House amendment would provide the Secretary with the authority to remove or demote any individual from the SES if the Secretary determines the performance of the individual warrants such removal and requires the Secretary to notify Congress within 30 days of removing or demoting a senior executive under this authority.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute generally adopts the Senate provision with an amendment to change the level of review at the MSPB. The substitute requires that the expedited review by the MSPB be conducted by an Administrative Judge at the MSBP, and if the MSPB Administrative Judge does not conclude their review within 21 days then the removal or demotion is final. The substitute does not allow for any further appeal beyond the Administrative Judge, and does not allow for a second level review by the three-person board at the MSPB. The substitute also requires that if the senior executive is removed, and then appeals VA's decision, the senior executive is not entitled to any type of pay, bonus, or benefit while appealing the decision of removal. Furthermore, the substitute requires that if a senior executive is demoted, and then appeals VA's decision, the employee may only receive any type of pay, bonus, or benefit at the rate appropriate for the position they were demoted to, and only if the individual shows up for duty, while appealing the decision of demotion. The substitute requires that the MSPB submit to Congress a plan within 14 days of enactment of how the expedited review would be implemented. The substitute also adds language to include title 38 SES equivalents under this new authority and includes ''misconduct'' along with ''poor performance'' as a reason to remove or demote a senior executive.

TITLE VIII—OTHER MATTERS

APPROPRIATION OF AMOUNTS

Current Law

Congress uses an appropriation to provide funding for discretionary spending programs of the Federal government.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would authorize and appropriate for FYs 2014, 2015, and 2016, the emergency funds necessary to carry out this Act.

In addition, the Senate amendment would make available, at the end of FYs 2014 and 2015, unobligated balances in VA's medical care accounts (medical services, medical support and compliance, and medical facilities) for the hiring of additional health care professionals.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute authorizes and appropriates $5 billion to increase veterans access to care through the hiring of physicians and other medical staff and by improving VA's physical infrastructure.

VETERANS CHOICE FUND

Current Law

There is no provision of law establishing a Veterans Choice Fund.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute establishes in the Treasury a fund to be known as the Veterans Choice Fund to carry out the expanded availability of hospital care and medical services for veterans created by section 101 of the Conference substitute. The Conference substitute also authorizes and appropriates $10 billion for deposit in the Veterans Choice Fund.

EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS

Current Law

Congress may exempt the budgetary effects of a provision from certain enforcement procedures by designating it as an emergency requirement. An emergency designation causes the spending and revenue effects estimated to result from such bills as exempt for purposes of enforcing budget procedures.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment would designate this Act as an emergency requirement under the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 and the Concurrent Resolution on the budget for FY 2010.

House Amendment

The House amendment contained no similar provision.

Conference Agreement

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

JEFF MILLER,
DOUG LAMBORN,
DAVID P. ROE OF TENNESSEE,
BILL FLORES,
DAN BENISHEK,
MIKE COFFMAN,
BRAD R. WENSTRUP,
JACKIE WALORSKI,
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD,
CORRINE BROWN,
MARK TAKANO,
JULIA BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA,
ANN KIRKPATRICK,
TIMOTHY J. WALZ,
Managers on the part of the House.

BERNARD SANDERS,
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
PATTY MURRAY,
SHERROD BROWN,
JON TESTER,
MARK BEGICH,
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
MAZIE K. HIRONO,
RICHARD BURR,
JOHNNY ISAKSON,
MIKE JOHANNS,
JOHN MCCAIN,
TOM COBURN,
MARCO RUBIO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE REGARDING EARMARKS AND CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, neither this Conference report nor the accompanying joint statement of Conferees contains any congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in such rules.

For consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JEFF MILLER of Florida,
DOUG LAMBORN,
DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee,
BILL FLORES,
DAN BENISHEK,
MIKE COFFMAN,
BRAD R. WENSTRUP,
JACKIE WALORSKI,
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD,
CORRINE BROWN of Florida,
MARK TAKANO,
JULIA BROWNLEY of California,
ANN KIRKPATRICK,
TIMOTHY J. WALZ,
Managers on the part of the House.

BERNARD SANDERS,
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
PATTY MURRAY,
SHERROD BROWN,
JON TESTER,
MARK BEGICH,
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
MAZIE K. HIRONO,
RICHARD BURR,
JOHNNY ISAKSON,
MIKE JOHANNS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 8 of rule XXII, the filing of the conference report on H.R. 3230 has vitiated the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), which was debated on July 25, 2014, and on which further proceedings were postponed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family obligations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3212. An act to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 517. An act to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 29, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6640. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Money Market Fund Reform: Amendments to Form PF [Release No.: 33-9616, IA-3879; IC-31166; FR-84; File No. S7-03-13] (RIN: 3235-AK61) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6641. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priorities. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CDFA Numbers: 84.133B-6 and 84.133B-7] [ED-2014-OSERS-0012] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6642. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CDFA Number: 84.133P-5] [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0011] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6643. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Education Acquisition Regulation [Docket ID: ED-2013-OCFO-0078] (RIN: 1890-AA18) received July 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6644. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priorities, requirements, and definitions—Charter Schools Program (CSP) Grants for National Leadership Activities [CDFA Number: 84.282N] received July 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6645. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-24, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a waiver determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6648. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on armed forces support to the security of the U.S. personnel in Libya; (H. Doc. No. 113-138); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6649. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program; Qualifying Life Event Amendments (RIN: 3206-AM57) July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6650. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2013 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6651. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Atlantic Ocean; Ocean City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0494] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6652. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Zone Buffalo [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0081] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6653. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Independence Day Celebration Fireworks, Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0473] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6654. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Charleston Zone, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0471] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6655. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Partnerships; Start-up Expenditures; Organization and Syndication Fees [TD 9681] (RIN: 1545-BL06) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6656. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Basis of Indebtedness of S Corporations to their Shareholders [TD 9682] (RIN: 1545-BG81) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6657. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Mixed Straddles; Straddle-by-Straddle Identification Under Section 1092 [TD 9678] (RIN: 1545-BK99) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6658. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Allocation and Apportionment of Interest Expense [TD 9676] (RIN: 1545-BJ59) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6659. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-43] received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6660. A letter from the Board Members, the Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2014 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 113-139); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

6661. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2014 Annual Report Of The Boards Of Trustees Of The Federal Hospital Insurance And Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 113-140); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 1771. A bill to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–560, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 676. A resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. 113–561, Pt. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3635. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 693. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4315) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species of threatened species, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–563). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 3230. A bill making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period (Rept. 113–564). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1771 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. House Resolution 676 referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5212. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil asset forfeiture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 5214. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for recommendations for the development and use of clinical data registries for the improvement of patient care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5215. A bill to provide for the restoration of Federal recognition to the Clatsop-Nehalem Confederated Tribes of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5216. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency a Columbia River Basin Restoration Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 5217. A bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5218. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Organ and Tissue Donor Registry Resource Center, to authorize grants for State organ and tissue donor registries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARCIA (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 5219. A bill to promote innovative practices for the education of English learners and to help States and local educational agencies with English learner populations build capacity to ensure that English learners receive high-quality instruction that enables them to become proficient in English, access the academic content knowledge needed to meet State challenging academic content standards, and be prepared for post-secondary education and careers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5220. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund to limit the use of funds available from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to use for maintenance; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5221. A bill to establish grant programs to improve the health of border area residents and for all hazards preparedness in the border area including bioterrorism, infectious disease, and noncommunicable emerging threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5222. A bill to increase the unit cap on the rental assistance demonstration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 5223. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting the States in operating an RDOCS program in order to provide for the increased availability of primary health care services in health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 5224. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a scholarship program to increase the availability of physicians who provide primary health care services at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5225. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to redevelop the Department of Energy Forrestal Complex in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 5226. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude therapeutic hemp and cannabidiol from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 5227. A bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. VELA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5228. A bill to amend section 240(c)(7)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the time limit on the filing of a motion to reopen a removal proceeding if the basis of the motion is fraud, negligence, misrepresentation, or extortion by, or the attempted, promised, or actual practice of law without authorization on the part of, a representative; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H. Res. 692. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding actions the President should take to secure the borders of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WALBERG:
H.R. 5212.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.
The purpose of the bill is to amend the civil asset forfeiture procedures and Section 8, Clause 9 extends to Congress the power to create inferior courts and to make rules of procedure and evidence for such courts.
By Mr. RENACCI:
H.R. 5213.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to law and collect taxes. This provision grants Congress the authority over this partiuclar piece of legislation.
By Mr. OLSON:
H.R. 5214.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Ms. BONAMICI:
H.R. 5215.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 5216.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 5217.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. CLAY:
H.R. 5218.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. GARCIA:
H.R. 5219.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution
Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:
H.R. 5220.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which states that ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . .''
By Mr. HINOJOSA:
H.R. 5221.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the constitution which states that ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''
By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 5222.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in: General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 1) Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 c1.3) Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)
By Mr. MCDERMOTT:
H.R. 5223.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. MCDERMOTT:
H.R. 5224.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 5225.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 1 of section 8 of article I clause 2 of section 3 of article IV and of the Constitution.
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 5226.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. SCHOCK:
H.R. 5227.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. VEASEY:
H.R. 5228.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Artile I, Section 8, Clause 4
The Congress shall have the Power to establish an uniform Rule of Naturaltization.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 188: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 292: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 318: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 543: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 596: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 632: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 647: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 781: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 794: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 851: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 855: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 963: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 997: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1015: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1074: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1078: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1179: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1199: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1449: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1666: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1731: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1750: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1761: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 1812: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1821: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1839: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1842: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1852: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1893: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1907: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1918: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2053: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2084: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2224: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2536: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2720: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2835: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2856: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2994: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3456: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3505: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3508: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3560: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3662: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3669: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3732: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3747: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3775: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 3958: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3963: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3969: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3987: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3992: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4060: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 4083: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 4158: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 4245: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4319: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4325: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4347: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4440: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4446: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4510: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4521: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 4577: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4626: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4682: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. AMASH, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4748: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 4808: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4814: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4815: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4827: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4837: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4897: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4930: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4960: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4964: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4970: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4978: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 4999: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 5015: Mr. COBLE and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5018: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 5026: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 5052: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 5059: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 5062: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 5063: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MICA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5074: Mr. STEWART, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5075: Mr. STEWART, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5078: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DENT, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 5095: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 5114: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 5129: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 5137: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 5138: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 5160: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5177: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 5207: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. FUDGE.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 30: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 525: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 558: Ms. SINEMA.
H. Res. 620: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 644: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Res. 668: Ms. HAHN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 679: Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 685: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 687: Mr. GOODLATTE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The amendment to be offered by myself or a designee to H.R. 4315, the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GREAT AFRICAN-AMERICAN ARTISTS SELECTED FOR NATIONAL ART SHOW

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an upcoming national art show that will showcase America's creativity and diversity. In August, great American art will be displayed on billboards and buses, as well as in airports, malls, movie theaters, and transit centers. This portfolio, known as ''Art Everywhere US,'' was selected by top museums and was guided by online public voting. This unique celebration of American art will showcase leading African-American artists, including Romare Bearden, William H. Johnson, Archibald Motley and Charles White.

Romare Bearden was born in Charlotte, NC, in 1911. At an early age, he moved to New York City as part of the Great Migration. For much of his life, Bearden worked for the New York City Department of Social Services, leaving nights and weekends available for creating art. In 1964, he was appointed the first art director of the Harlem Cultural Council. In Charlotte, the 5.4-acre Romare Bearden Park opened in 2013, in a prime location near BB&T Ballpark. Bearden's 1968 collage of three musicians performing entitled ''Soul Three'' will be part of Art Everywhere US.

Like Bearden, William H. Johnson (1901–1970) moved from the South to New York, where he became a foremost painter in the Harlem Renaissance. Johnson taught at the Harlem Community Art Center as part of the Roosevelt-era Works Progress Administration (WPA) Federal Art Project. Johnson died in obscurity in 1970, but his artwork, which numbers more than 1,000, bear witness to one of America's most important painters. Johnson's ''Blind Singer'' will be displayed via Art Everywhere US.

Archibald Motley (1891–1981) was born in New Orleans before his family journeyed to Chicago when he was two years old. Although he never lived in Harlem, Motley's depiction of urban African-American social life identified him with the Harlem Renaissance. Motley painted portraits and scenes in Chicago's Bronzeville neighborhood, home of most of the city's African-American population. Motley's 1943 ''Nightlife'' is part of Art Everywhere US, showing the motion of jazz through composition.

Charles White (1918–1953) was born in Chicago. His mother, a domestic worker, bought him his first set of oil paints for his seventh birthday. In his career, White was committed to representing the African-American experience, a goal reinforced after he journeyed to the rural South. Art Everywhere US will display White's powerful drawing ''Harvest Talk,'' which depicts two farm hands whose strong and imposing physical presence embody the dignity of their work.

Art Everywhere US spans the history of our nation, from the Revolutionary era to pop artists such as Andy Warhol, Roy Lichtenstein and James Rosenquist. Supporters and patrons of the arts tell us of the multiple benefits of art education. In August, we'll learn a bit more about great American art and artists, including outstanding art of the Twentieth Century by prominent African-American artists.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. CRAIG CONWAY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Craig Conway for his service to the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats as a Pearson Fellow.

The Pearson Fellowship was established as a way for Foreign Service officers to encounter and take part in the legislative process. This highly selective and prestigious position is reserved for those who would secure the strong and enduring relationship between the State Department and Congress. Over the past year Mr. Conway has exemplified these attributes during a particularly active period in transatlantic relations and went above and beyond in his role as a Pearson Fellow. His service to Congress will no doubt be missed by his many friends and colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Craig Conway prepares to head back to the State Department at the end of this month, it brings me great pleasure to honor him for his service, knowledge, and invaluable experience. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Mr. Conway for his work.

RESTORING THE DOCTORS OF OUR COUNTRY THROUGH SCHOLARSHIPS ACT OF 2014

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will address the gaping hole in our country's workforce of primary care physicians. Due to the retirement of a generation of physicians, the aging of our population, and the entry into the system of some 30 million newly insured thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we do not have enough primary care doctors to meet demand. One estimate projects a national shortage of approximately 45,000 primary care doctors by 2020. This problem will continue to worsen without a major initiative to produce new physicians.

Primary care doctors are the front lines of our physician workforce. Under the right conditions, they oversee and coordinate health care for their patients. They educate patients on how to prevent illness and manage chronic conditions. They are the medical generalists who establish long-lasting bonds with patients throughout their lives. Proper primary care is also one of the keys to containing health care costs. On the other hand, inadequate primary care leads to neglected and mismanaged conditions, which causes costly emergencies and illnesses downstream.

I am introducing the RDOCS Act to help solve this problem. Modeled after the successful ROTC program, RDOCS offers full scholarships to medical students in exchange for a 5-year service commitment in a medically underserved area. RDOCS will be administered by the states, which will send RDOCS scholars to their state-operated medical schools. RDOCS officers (as they are known after graduation) will then become licensed and serve as primary care doctors in their state of residence. The program is designed to ensure that at least 4,000 new scholarships are awarded each year.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we are going to get close to universal health coverage in the United States. But universal coverage will not be meaningful if we don't have enough doctors to serve our population. RDOCS is a major step in this effort, and in the future Congress must build upon this program by expanding graduate medical education and creating additional residency slots to train these new doctors. I am optimistic that Congress can demonstrate the leadership needed to restore our physician workforce for the next generation.

THE SIGHTS WE'VE SET: IN HONOR OF AN AMERICAN HERO, CHRIS KYLE

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in memory of one of Texas's most heroic sons, Navy SEAL Sniper Chris Kyle. Chris was one of the deadliest snipers in American history, with 160 confirmed kills out of 255 claimed by his SEAL brethren. He earned Two Silver Stars, and five Bronze Stars With Valor; and survived six IED attacks, two gunshot wounds, two helicopter crashes,

and more surgeries than he could remember in his distinguished career. Sadly, on February 2, 2013, while trying to help a fellow veteran suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, he was shot and killed at a shooting range. His courage, selfless service, and his dedication to his country and family make us all proud. He is survived by his wife Taya. I submit this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

THE SIGHTS WE'VE SET
(By Albert Carey Caswell)

The . . .
The sights . . .
The sights we've set!
All in our moments upon this earth as met . . .
All in our honor that we've so kept!
All in the goals that we've so met!
So reached!
To all our children we must teach!
Of uncommon valor so very deep!
As a United States Navy Seal Chris,
The Legend you now beseech!
And so surpassed,
forever onward to so last!
All in the sights Chris you've so set!
You, Star of Texas so very deep!
All in your Seal of Honor Chris,
you would not so breach!
Throughout your magnificent life so sought to seek!
Are left behind all of those moments of your life of now we speak!
About Strength In Honor so very deep!
As why for you Chris we now all so weep!
For such things can only be found,
only in the most courageous of all hearts which so beat!
When, courage comes to crest!
To but be one of The Very Best!
As a true American Hero no less!
And to march off to war,
so willing to give up all that you love and adore!
For such ones,
Heaven will so reach!
And ah all of those lives you've saved!
And all of those Mothers whose tears you so helped not to break!
Not to so weep!
And all of those children now so born,
from all of your Brothers In Arms from death you'd keep!
For only our Lord so knows this number so sweet!
And to you this day will speak!
Rest now our most heroic son!
As the eyes and the Hearts of Texas are upon you this one!
As we pray to our Lord to help your loved ones to move on!
As SEALED with a kiss we say goodbye!
As here we stand with tear in eye!
To so guide us all,
each and everyone!
All in the sights Chris,
for us you have set!
For now Chris you have but a new war so to be won!
As an Angel in The Army of our Lord our most precious son!
To so watch over us from sun to sun!
And we will hear you on the wind!
And feel your Angel's breath upon us,
as Thy Will Be Done!
As we pray up in Heaven one day we all shall so meet!
As this sight we have so set,
now so seek!
For you were once,
and will forever be . . . one of America's Best!
So Rest my Son!
As we lay your fine body so down to sleep!
And when there comes a gentle rain,
your tears shall wash down upon your loved ones to so ease their pain!
Until, up in Heaven you all so meet,
and you won't have to cry no more!
Amen!

TO CONGRATULATE NESHAMINY HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate Neshaminy High School for its tradition of academics and football and the recent gathering of the school's football community to honor James Franklin, a 1990 graduate who was recently named head football coach at Penn State University. Also, returning to Pennsylvania is Coach Franklin's teammate and fellow graduate, Mike Frederick, who will coach Neshaminy football this year. Both men represent the sportsmanship and scholarship taught by their teachers and coaches at Neshaminy High School as students and they proudly carried it forward. It is a tribute to the families, the community and the school when former students follow the path they traveled in high school on to success and dedicate their professional lives to passing on that tradition of sportsmanship, hard work and discipline. In so doing, they have set an example for their future students and players. They have our best wishes for a bright future.

HONORING DR. BARBARA L. MCANENY, CHAIR—BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AMA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a pioneer in the field of medicine, Dr. Barbara McAneny, on her election as Chair of the American Medical Association (AMA) Board of Trustees.

Since 1980, Dr. McAneny has called Albuquerque, New Mexico her home. After graduating from the University of Iowa College of Medicine in 1977 and completing her residency in 1980, Dr. McAneny began her lifelong commitment to the fight against cancer as a Hematology-Oncology Fellow at the University of New Mexico (UNM). Taking her skills to private practice, in 1983, Dr. McAneny began working for Hematology Oncology Associates in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and in 1987 cofounded New Mexico Oncology Hematology Consultants Ltd.

Dr. McAneny was also a driving force behind the creation of the New Mexico Cancer Center (NMCC), the largest physician-based cancer treatment institution in the state, where she currently serves as a Managing Partner and CEO. NMCC has continued to lead the country in comprehensive outpatient medical and radiation oncology care and imaging, which it conducts at multiple sites and in underserved rural areas.

She also serves as the Medical Director and CEO of Innovative Oncology Business Solutions. In 2012, they were awarded a $19.76 million grant to implement a community oncology medical home model in seven practices across the country. This was made possible after years of dedicated research and development by Dr. McAneny and her staff at NMCC.

Dr. McAneny has stormed the medical profession with an unparalleled commitment to results-driven health care and a passion to innovate new methods for treating patients with cancer. This is demonstrated in the numerous accolades and accomplishments throughout her career.

To name a few:

1977: Dr. McAneny received the American Medical Women's Association Award for Scholastic Achievement

1992: Dr. McAneny received the Ayerst-Wyeth Award for Medicine

1996: Dr. McAneny received the Governor's Award for Outstanding Women in New Mexico

1998: Dr. McAneny became Chair of Albuquerque Emergency Medical Services Authority

2000: Dr. McAneny became President of the New Mexico Medical Society

2001: Dr. McAneny became President of the New Mexico Medical Foundation

2001: Dr. McAneny became Chair of Chronic Disease Prevention Council

2002: Dr. McAneny was appointed by Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson to the Practicing Physicians Advisory Council

2002: Dr. McAneny became a delegate of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) to the American Medical Association (AMA)

2003: Dr. McAneny was elected to the AMA Council of Medical Service

2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009: Dr. McAneny received the Top Doc Award, Albuquerque Magazine

2009: Dr. McAneny joined the Community Oncology Alliance Board of Directors

2010: Dr. McAneny received the New Mexico Business Weekly Publication, Women of Influence Award

2010: Dr. McAneny received the ASCO Statesman Award

2010: Dr. McAneny joined the Board of Trustees for the American Medical Association

2011: Dr. McAneny became an Advisory Board Member to RainTree Oncology Services

2013: Dr. McAneny became a Board Member for the Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare/Committee on Operating Rules for Information Exchange

This year, Dr. McAneny was elected to become Chair of the AMA Board of Trustees, the nation's largest and most influential physician organization. There is no candidate more worthy of such an honor than Dr. McAneny, who has fought tirelessly on behalf of her patients.

In fact, Dr. McAneny will tell you:

I've learned a lot from my cancer patients, and every day I see their courage. There have been so many advances in the field and

now we actually cure people all the time who years ago would have been lost. And there is a silver lining to cancer—you learn what is important in life, and not to sweat the small stuff.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Dr. McAneny on her election as Chair of the AMA Board of Trustees and her lifelong dedication to cancer research and treatment. Dr. McAneny is an inspiration for future generations of health care professionals across the country, particularly in our community in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Whether that is through her work with a clinic serving the Navajo Nation, and comprehensive efforts to improve telemedicine for these rural areas, to her work to help pass New Mexico's Dee Johnson Clean Indoor Act, which prohibits smoking in indoor public places and workplaces, Dr. McAneny has selflessly fought to improve the lives of New Mexicans.

Any New Mexican will tell you that in the hardest of times, in the deepest of struggles, Dr. McAneny has always been there with words of wisdom, a helping hand, and guiding heart. Dr. McAneny truly is a remarkable woman, and I am proud to call her a dear friend. I have no doubt that Dr. McAneny will continue to blaze trails in her new role, and develop new ways to provide affordable, reliable, and accessible health care in our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL FRANK E. PETERSEN, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant General (LtGen) Frank E. Petersen, Jr., the first African-American to serve as a three-star general officer in the U.S. Marine Corps. At the time of his retirement after 38 years, LtGen Petersen was the senior ranking aviator in the U.S. Marine Corps and the U.S. Navy with the respective titles of ''Silver Hawk'' and ''Grey Eagle''. He will be honored on July 28, 2014 for his selfless acts and lifetime of dedication to the Marine Corps and his country.

A Topeka, Kansas native, LtGen Petersen enlisted in the United States Navy in 1950 as a Seaman Apprentice where he served as an Electronics Technician. One year later, he entered the Naval Aviation Cadet Program, earning his commission and the rank of Second Lieutenant with the U.S. Marine Corps upon the completion of flight school in 1952. LtGen Petersen served during the Korean War, where his first tactical assignment was with Marine Fighter Squadron 212. After flying over 64 combat missions, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross for his combat leadership and bravery on June 15, 1953. He also flew 250 combat missions during the Vietnam conflict, receiving the Purple Heart after enemy anti-aircraft fire brought down his F–4B over the demilitarized zone. In addition, the Marine Corps Aviation Association honored his Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 314 (VMFA–314) with the inaugural Robert M. Hanson Award for best fighter attack squadron during the Vietnam conflict.

LtGen Petersen was the first African-American to command a Marine Fighter Squadron, a Marine Air Group, a Marine Aircraft Wing, and a major Marine base. On February 23, 1979, he was promoted to Brigadier General, becoming the first African-American general of the Marine Corps. Prior to his retirement, he served as the Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff and Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command in Quantico, Virginia.

Upon his retirement from the Marine Corps on August 1, 1988, LtGen Petersen concluded a military career of remarkable ''firsts''. He commanded at every level of command and stood as a trailblazer for all Marines. His autobiography, ''Into the Tiger's Jaw'', is known as the story of the modern U.S. Marine Corps, providing vital insight into the history of Marine aviation as well as the racial integration of the Marine Corps. Throughout the book's narrative, LtGen Petersen reflects on key moments that defined his life's sacrifices, triumphs, and key personal moments in addition to unequivocally chronicling the racial integration of the Marine Corps.

Throughout his career, LtGen Petersen confronted racism inside and outside the Marine Corps. Nevertheless, as he reflects in his book, the Marine Corps ethos enabled Marines to ultimately triumph over racism. Indeed, his life's commands illustrate the Marine Corps' triumph. In 1970, as deteriorating race relations threatened to rend the nation asunder, LtGen Petersen became the Special Assistant for Minority Affairs to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. His guidance to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense served the Marine Corps and the country well during this challenging period.

LtGen Petersen spent his civilian years as vice president of corporate aviation for DuPont DeNemours, Inc. He was also appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Education to serve as a Board Member of the Educational Credit Management Corporation.

LtGen Petersen's personal awards and decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal; Legion of Merit with Combat ''V''; Distinguished Flying Cross; Purple Heart; Meritorious Service Medal; Air Medal; Navy Commendation Medal with Combat ''V''; Air Force Commendation Medal; Robert M. Hanson Award for the Most Outstanding Fighter Squadron while assigned in Vietnam, 1968; Man of the Year, NAACP, 1979; Honorary Doctorate, Virginia Union University, 1987; and the Gray Eagle Trophy, August 21, 1987–June 15, 1988.

LtGen Petersen has certainly accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his wife of 39 years, Alicia, and his children; Frank III, Gayle, Dana, Lindsey, and Monique.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, the United States Marine Corps, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation to Lieutenant General Frank E. Petersen, Jr., a pioneering leader who, in addition to achieving the distinction of a number of ''firsts'' for African-Americans, has the respect, admiration, and affection of his fellow Marines and leaves behind an outstanding legacy of service and leadership in the Marine Corps of the United States of America.

THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we celebrated the 24th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act, signed into law by President Bush on July 26, 1990. Twenty-four years later, the ADA remains one of the most significant and comprehensive civil rights laws of our time. Its enactment affirmed our collective belief in America's fundamental promise of equality and opportunity for all. Today, the ADA and the subsequent ADA Amendments Act—which I was proud to help pass in 2008—continue to open doors and ensure greater access, inclusion and justice for millions of people living with disabilities.

On this anniversary, we honor the civil rights pioneers who championed the ADA and express our sincere gratitude to those who continue the fight to fulfill its promise and expand opportunities for the entire disability community. As someone who has lived with the challenges of a disability since the age of 16, I know firsthand the positive impact the ADA has had on everyday activities for countless Americans. It has broken down barriers to education, employment and technology. It has made public transportation more accommodating, improved voting accessibility, and reduced the prevalence of discrimination throughout communities nationwide. I am proud future generations will live in a world that is more inclusive, more accessible, and increasingly recognizes the unique talents and abilities of individuals with disabilities.

As we celebrate progress, however, we must also acknowledge areas where we have not yet accomplished our goals. Equal employment opportunities and fully integrated community living has not been fully realized; recent data shows 31 percent of disabled individuals live below the poverty line and less than 34 percent are fully employed. It is more important than ever that we educate businesses and connect them with proper resources to create more employment opportunities. We must ensure that transportation is available and accessible to everyone so they can get to their job, the doctor, or the grocery store. We must also address changes that accompany the modern age, such as fully accessible internet services. And we must ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to reaffirm our country's longstanding role as a leader in global disability rights.

Clearly, our work is far from done. As we approach the silver anniversary of the ADA, I look forward to reaffirming our commitment to equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency for people with disabilities everywhere.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,613,901,518,929.04. We've added $6,987,024,470,015.96 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OAKDALE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the firefighters and residents of Oakdale, Minnesota on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Oakdale Fire Department.

The department was started in 1964 in the garage of local resident Mr. Dean Arnt in what was then the undeveloped community of Northdale. Beginning with a volunteer staff of twelve people, an old Jeep, and an early 1950s model Ford fire truck, what the department lacked in physical resources, it made up in generosity and hard work. Thirteen local residents used their own money to send letters to residents getting the word out about the creation of the department and to ask for donations to build a fire station. A small station was finally built by the volunteer firefighters in 1967, and the department responded to 24 calls during its first year.

The area served by the Oakdale Fire Department has doubled in size since 1964 and the department has expanded with it. Now operating out of two, much larger fire stations, the department employs 40 paid-per-call and eight full-time firefighters. Many of the staff are trained as emergency medical technicians or paramedics who provide support 24 hours. The department now responds to more than 2,000 medical, fire, and rescue calls per year.

Despite its impressive growth, the Oakdale Fire Department still retains its commitment to the community and stands as an example of the very best in public services funded by taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, the valuable efforts of the Oakdale Fire Department during the past five decades are commendable and worthy of recognition. In honor of many people who have built the success of the Oakdale Fire Department, it is a privilege to submit this statement in honor of its 50th anniversary.

HONORING JAMES RODARTE

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of the late James Rodarte, a lover of music and photography, and a passionate community leader in Southwest San Antonio. Mr. Rodarte served his community through his vocal advocacy for transportation solutions in Southwest San Antonio.

Mr. Rodarte was born August 12, 1959, to James and Anita Rodarte. He inherited his witty sense of humor from his mother and the two were often caught laughing at their own private jokes. He was adored by his sisters Debra, Diane, Denise, and Dori. Mr. Rodarte attended Ivanhoe and David Crockett Elementary Schools, Edgewood Middle School, and graduated from Kennedy High School in 1978.

Mr. Rodarte had a lifelong passion for music and photography. Every Christmas growing up he turned the family living room into a photo studio, sweetly providing a family portrait as his yearly gift. As an adult he volunteered his time taking pictures of Edgewood High School activities and received particular joy from taking photos of all athletic teams.

A talented musician, Mr. Rodarte played the trombone, drums, and bass guitar. He particularly enjoyed playing his five-string bass with conjuntos. Mr. Rodarte played with the legendary San Antonio Marching Band, and though diabetes may have prevented him from marching, he didn't let his condition stop him from participating. He would drive the ''chase vehicle'' behind the band. Whenever a musician tired, they could pull out of the ranks and get into his vehicle to rest for a while.

Mr. Rodarte combined his love of music and photography by taking pictures and videotaping Tejano performances, especially during San Antonio's yearly Fiesta celebration. He would upload performances to YouTube for the local community to enjoy.

The legacy that Mr. Rodarte will most be remembered for was his dogged campaign to provide relief for the citizens living in the Zarzamora Street and Frio City Road area from traffic delays caused by train traffic. These daily delays force the community to wait longer than 30 minutes while the trains inexplicably stop in the middle of this residential neighborhood.

Mr. Rodarte spearheaded the community's demands for a solution. He was a constant presence at City Council and Commissioners Court meetings, presenting a plan to build an overpass to provide relief to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to recognize the life of James Rodarte, a lover of music and photography, and a dedicated community leader.

HONORING JEANNINE BAXTER FOR HER 25 YEARS OF SERVICE AT THE DU QUOIN STATE FAIR

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Jeannine Baxter who is returning for her 25th year as the First Lady of the front office at the Du Quoin State Fair.

Since its beginning in 1923, the Du Quoin State Fair has brought joy and entertainment to generations of families in Southern Illinois and throughout the entire Midwest. And for a quarter of the fair's history, Jeannine Baxter has been greeting fair goers, workers and visiting dignitaries with grace and her ever present smile. Jeannine's love of the fair is infectious and her knowledge and professionalism ensure that everything runs smoothly so everyone is sure to have a good time.

While Jeannine has been at her post for a quarter of a century, the 84 year old shows no sign of slowing down. She worked for 20 years at Illinois Power Company in Du Quoin where her professionalism and enthusiasm proved as much of a joy for customers and staff of that utility company as for the fair goers and staff of the Du Quoin State Fair.

The Du Quoin State Fair opens on Friday, August 22, which has been declared Jeannine Baxter Day at the Fair and Jeannine will serve as Grand Marshal for the opening day parade.

In addition to her work at the fair, Jeannine is active in the community in other roles. She has served for many years on the Du Quoin Park Board, working to improve her home town with recreation and opportunities for young people. She has also worked as an election judge for many, many years and has been a welcoming face both on Election Day and at early voting hours for her neighbors as they participate in the electoral process.

Jeannine has been blessed with a large family, including eight children, 25 grandchildren and 16 great grandchildren. Her family is a source of great joy for Jeannine especially since they are able to get together for a family reunion every year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Jeannine Baxter well and thanking her for her quarter of a century of service at the Du Quoin State Fair.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FORRESTAL COMPLEX REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2014

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce the Department of Energy Forrestal Complex Redevelopment Act to direct the General Services Administrator (GSA) to redevelop this site using its authorities to enter into public-private partnerships in accordance with the National

Capital Planning Commission's (NCPC) Southwest (SW) Ecodistrict Plan. The Department of Energy (DOE) Forrestal Complex is located at 1000 Independence Avenue SW., and has the potential to serve as a gateway to renewed development in this section of the National Mall area in downtown Washington. For many years, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and its Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management have expressed concern about excess federal property, wasteful spending, energy efficiency, and space utilization practices. This bill, which would maximize use of valuable, centrally located land for public and private uses, responds to this concern.

GSA and DOE have been assessing the needs of the DOE and any costs and benefits associated with disposing of the assets at the complex. In the last few months, GSA released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for two of its properties in close proximity to the DOE Forrestal Complex, the Cotton Annex and the GSA Regional Office Building, which are part of the SW Ecodistrict Plan. Portions of the Forrestal Complex lie between these two parcels, and their redevelopment will aid the in the realization of the SW Ecodistrict Plan, which has been embraced by the NCPC and the District of Columbia.

Redevelopment of the Forrestal Complex will enable mixed-use development, and it would accommodate the uses agreed to in the SW Ecodistrict Plan. The plan includes a modern headquarters for DOE that combines reduced but more efficient utilization of federal government office space, more sustainable practices to preserve energy and water, and the possible location of a nationally significant museum or memorial. In addition, it would bring the SW Ecodistrict closer to fruition.

I urge my colleagues to support this timely, important legislation.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER PETER T. COURTNEY ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 24 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND TO OUR NATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Commander Peter T. Courtney, on his retirement after 24 years of Commissioned Service to the United States Navy and for his extraordinary dedication to duty and to the United States of America.

I have worked with Commander Courtney personally over the past five years—first in 2009, when he was a Defense Legislative Fellow assigned to my office, and then for three years as the Deputy Director, Appropriations Liaison in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller). I would like to share with you some highlights of his fine career.

Commander Peter Courtney graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1990 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Political Science. Following Commissioning and flight school, he was designated a Naval Flight Officer. He reported to his first sea assignment aboard USS *Theodore Roosevelt* (CVN–71) flying the F–14 Tomcat. He then transferred to Navy Fighter Weapons School for duty as a TOPGUN Instructor. He later reported to Fighter Squadron Thirty Two (VF–32) aboard USS *Enterprise* (CVN–65) and participated in Operation SOUTHERN WATCH and direct action missions during Operation DESERT FOX. After he completed his Master of Arts degree at the Naval War College he reported to USS *George Washington* (CVN–73) participating in Operations SOUTHERN WATCH and ENDURING FREEDOM.

Peter served with distinction in a variety of assignments ashore: as Aide to then Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vern Clark; Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management & Comptroller) as a Congressional Appropriations Liaison; and with Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Staff for the Naval Aviation Enterprise, including Adversary Aircraft Requirements, Acquisition Reform, and Manpower Planning and Resourcing.

After completing a Military Legislative Fellowship, Commander Courtney reported to his current assignment as Deputy Director Navy Appropriations Matters Office where he helped the Department of the Navy achieve their financial and legislative goals. For nearly four years, Commander Courtney has demonstrated exceptional leadership and foresight, engaging Members of the Appropriations Committee and its Staff to provide information essential to resourcing the Navy for its role as the world's dominant sea power. In an increasingly difficult budget environment, Commander Courtney provided essential support in shepherding three Navy budgets through the appropriations process. Peter served our Navy and nation with integrity, insight and dedication. My office, the subcommittee staff, and I have found him to be a pleasure to work with and all respect his professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in saying thank you to Commander Peter T. Courtney for his extraordinary dedication to duty and steadfast service to this country throughout his distinguished career. We wish Peter, ''Fair Winds and Following Seas,'' as he leaves the Naval Service.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN RESTORATION ACT OF 2014

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Columbia River Basin Restoration Act, a bill that would bring much needed resources to cleaning up toxic pollution in the Columbia River Basin. The Columbia River is the largest river in the Pacific Northwest. The River and its tributaries provide significant ecological and economic benefits to the Pacific Northwest and the entire United States. Historically, the Columbia and its tributaries have constituted the largest salmon-producing river system in the world, with annual returns peaking at 16 million fish.

The Columbia River was designated an Estuary of National Significance in 1995 and a Large Aquatic Ecosystem (LAE) by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2006. Yet it remains the only LAE to receive zero Congressional funding—despite a growing problem of toxic contamination throughout the River Basin.

Toxics are present throughout the Columbia River Basin, and are harmful to humans, fish, and wildlife. These contaminants make their way into fish tissues, which, when consumed, can be harmful for human health. Some of these toxics are known to cause cancer, and have been linked with neurological, developmental and reproductive problems, including birth defects and learning disabilities. This concern is particularly pressing for tribal populations, who consume local fish in large quantities.

Last year, the States of Oregon and Washington issued fish advisories warning the public to protect itself against mercury and PCB contamination by limiting consumption of resident fish species living in the 150 mile stretch of river between Bonneville and McNary Dams.

This bill would authorize the EPA to establish a voluntary, competitive Columbia River Basin grants program for projects that assist in eliminating or reducing pollution, improving water quality, monitoring, and promoting citizen engagement. Eligible entities may include States, Indian tribes, local governments, nonprofits, and private landowners. The legislation authorizes $50 million per year for five years for this effort, which are estimated to create between 700 and 1,000 family wage jobs per year in the region.

This bill is supported by a diverse group of stakeholders including the Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Pacific Northwest Waterways Association, and Salmon-Safe. Now is the time to clean up the Columbia River and improve water quality and river health for generations to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRADUATION OF JANICE JENNINGS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize Janice Jennings who is graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing from the Capstone College of Nursing at the University of Alabama.

Mrs. Jennings was born in Anniston, Alabama. She graduated from Saks High School and went on to attend Gadsden State University, where she got her degree in Nursing. In 1983, Jan married her husband Jeff and soon after in 1987, her only daughter, Jessica, was born. Jan went on to receive her Business degree from Jacksonville State University in

1989. Perhaps most notably, Jan welcomed another addition into the Jennings' household in 2010: a labradoodle named Tully.

Although she lives in North Carolina now, Jan remains a dedicated fan of the University of Alabama. This dedication to her beloved Crimson Tide has led her to pursue a degree from the University. Through hard work and dedication, she will be achieving a lifelong goal on August 2, when she walks across the stage in Coleman Coliseum to receive her degree.

Mr. Speaker, we join her family and friends in celebrating Jan's accomplishments and congratulating her with a hearty Roll Tide.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ALEKSEY BOLOTNIKOV, AND DR. RALPH JAMES OF BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brookhaven National Laboratory, located in my congressional district and recognized by R&D Magazine for developing a novel radiation detection technology.

Often referred to as the ''Oscars of Innovation,'' the annual R&D 100 Awards are given to the top 100 most technologically significant products each year from around the world. I am proud that this prestigious honor has been bestowed upon Long Island's own Brookhaven National Laboratory, which is jointly managed by Stony Brook University and Battelle for the Department of Energy (DOE).

A team of scientists led by Dr. Aleksey Bolotnikov and Dr. Ralph James at Brookhaven developed GammaScout, a compact hand-held high-resolution radiation detector, as well as the electronics and software to make it functional. This project was funded by the National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation research and development program.

The GammaScout technology will be especially useful in tracking the movement of radioactive materials and the imaging of radiopharmaceuticals in oncology and cardiology. Its application could also be used in real-time dosimeters, x-ray radiography, mineral exploration, and materials sorting and recycling. As a result, this new technology has the potential to improve our homeland and national security, protect first responders and the environment, and even make it easier to diagnose disease and save lives.

This detector technology works at room temperature, making it particularly unique and useful in the field. Previous technologies had to be cryogenically cooled for the same high-resolution radiation detection, thus confining critical work to a laboratory setting.

I am very proud to recognize Dr. Bolotnikov, Dr. James and their team of scientists, which also included colleagues from Korea University for winning one of only 32 R&D 100 Awards given to DOE laboratories. This speaks volumes about the value of these labs and the importance of their contributions to the nation, economy, and national security.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of New York's First Congressional District, I congratulate the scientists and laboratory leadership for this well-deserved award. It is a timely reminder that Brookhaven National Laboratory remains a valuable asset to Long Island, New York, and our nation.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH FROEHLICH

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Union County Sheriff Ralph Froehlich, posthumously, and the many contributions he has made as a dedicated public servant in Union County and a beloved leader in the State of New Jersey.

Sheriff Froehlich was a great man and an incredible public servant. Following his eight year service in the United States Marine Corps, he had sought a career in law enforcement. He had faithfully served as Sheriff of Union County since 1977 and was in his thirteenth term.

Sheriff Froehlich was a pioneer in law enforcement, starting many programs to protect the county, including gun safety programs for children and teens; 'Union County's Most Wanted' television program, which led to the apprehension of over 80 Union County murderers and felons; the Missing Persons Unit and Domestic Violence Unit; and a K–9 Search and Rescue Unit. In an effort to share services with other law enforcement agencies, Sheriff Froehlich implemented a Municipal Transportation Program to assist local police departments. He also vociferously spoke out in favor of more regulations on guns.

From his time in the U.S. Marines to becoming the longest-serving County Sheriff in New Jersey history, Ralph has for decades set the standard for what it means to defend and protect. He will be remembered for his commitment to keeping the people and families of Union County safe and for always working toward the betterment of the community. On behalf of the people of New Jersey and certainly the people of Union County, we are grateful.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Sheriff Froehlich's family, to the Union County Sheriff's Department, to the people of Union County, and to all the people who loved and respected Ralph. His leadership will truly be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow Members of the House of Representatives agree that Union County Sheriff Ralph Froehlich deserves to be recognized for a job well done and his many years of service to the people of the State of New Jersey. This tribute recognizes his life's work, namely a stellar career and a personal commitment to protecting our community.

RESTORING THE DOCTORS OF OUR COUNTRY THROUGH SCHOLARSHIPS VETERANS AFFAIRS ACT OF 2014

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will address the shortage of physicians at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs. As we have learned from recent events, long wait times at VA facilities are, in part, a consequence of understaffing and a doctor shortage. The lack of primary care physicians in VA facilities is particularly troubling. Recently, the VA estimated that it had about 400 unfilled vacancies for primary care doctors.

Through the Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program, the VA currently provides for loan repayment and scholarships that fund the education and training of a range of health providers. Unfortunately, Educational Assistance Program benefits are limited and, as currently designed, the program does little to encourage primary care physicians to work at the VA. Furthermore, recent proposals to reform the VA do not go far enough to emphasize training VA doctors who are committed to the practice of primary care medicine.

That is why I am introducing the RDOCS–VA Act, legislation that will strengthen the Educational Assistance Program. Modeled after the successful ROTC program, RDOCS–VA will provide scholarships and stipends covering the full cost of attending medical school, in exchange for a five-year commitment to service as primary care doctors at the VA. RDOCS–VA is designed to directly address the VA's needs by requiring the creation of a minimum of 400 RDOCS–VA scholarships, with flexibility to award even more scholarships in the future.

Once fully implemented, the RDOCS–VA program will be an important tool to ensure that our veterans have access to primary care. As part of future efforts, Congress must build upon this program by expanding graduate medical education and creating additional residency slots at VA facilities. This will allow us to train primary care doctors who are fully prepared to serve our veterans for years to come.

66 REPS, TO BE THE BEST . . . A TRIBUTE TO ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER AND THE AMERICAN DREAM ON HIS 66TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and The American Dream on his 66th birthday. This world renown Championship body builder, turned Movie Star Icon, to Governor of California is the antifascist of The American Dream. He is

a champion for physical fitness and children's causes. He is living proof that hard work and believing in yourself has no limits in America. I ask that this poem penned in honor of his 66th birthday by Albert Carey Caswell be placed in the RECORD.

66 REPS, TO BE THE BEST . . .

66 Reps!
To Be The Best!
Will we LEAD, or will we rest?
Do we BUILD on our success?
But To Be The Best!
Will we fall,
or will we CREST?
Do we follow,
or will we LEAD?
Showing our world,
what it is that she so NEEDS!
Do we make our lives FULL,
or shallow?
DO WE LIVE LARGE NOT NARROW?
DO WE WORK OUT, AND DO IT NOW?
Do we CRUSH IT?
To find VICTORY as such it!
Only by living the GOLDEN RULE,
will we so SHINE like a jewel!
While, PUMPING UP our world so full!
All to BLESS HER,
as Arnold has done oh so yes sir!
What will we give all in our time?
To this our world ALL IN OUR LIVES!
Do we TERMINATE doubt,
when that's all people talk about?
And what do we so create,
with each new rep that we so take?
And say, ''GET OUT!''
In each brand new shining day!
Do we BEEF IT?
DO WE FEEL THE BURN?
AND FOR GREATNESS SO YEARN!
And are we NOT AFRAID to fail!
Because that's the only way TO VICTORY NAIL!
And will you give ALL OF your HEART and SOUL?
For that's the only way TO TURN YOUR DREAMS INTO GOLD!
STRETCHING OURSELVES,
so beyond belief out on our life's road!
As we GROW,
and to this world convey!
Saying HASTA LA VISTA BABY,
to those who NO say!
And ''GET OUT'' of my way!
All in what our LIVES'S so have to say!
Leaving DYNAMIC GAINS all in our wake's!
So all in our HEARTS what we CREATE!
All in what WE GIVE and TAKE!
And what is The True Measure of a Man?
The ONE who before us now so stands?
For LIFE is so very short!
So then what is it that we HOPE to sport?
All in the days of our LIVES report!
And who do we LIFT UP?
When in tough times BELIEVING and NEVER GIVING UP?
To make all of our lives so BUFF!
All in our life's REP'S as such!
Do we dare to PUSH THE ENVELOPE?
TO MAKE DYNAMIC GAINS all in our approach!
Giving to all such HOPE!
All in what our HEART'S INVOKE!
For we only have so many REP'S!
For this our world to so BLESS!
All TO BE THE BEST!
For WE MUST BE BOLD,
For WE MUST BE STRONG!
For WE MUST WORK HARD, all night and day long!
If we are to WRITE our life's song!
And as the years progress!
SOME of us shall not grow old!
Men like Arnold NEVER DO SO!
Whose HEART'S never run cold!
For his is THE HEART of a CHILD yo!
Who see's the GOOD IN ALL HE BEHOLD'S!
Whose SMILE TO ALL HEART'S CALL'S SO!
Who NEVER STOP'S BELIEVING,
as new DREAMS he's CONCEIVING!
For he knows not the word DEFEAT even!
And FAILURE is not an option CONCEIVING!
All in his Austrian-American HEART which is BEATING!
Is a HEART of a CHILD,
who against all odds is COMPETING!
As he let's his DREAMS run wild!
With his greatest of all SMILES,
and CHAMPIONSHIP style!
And if you want to get TO THE MOUNTAIN TOP?
You've got to CLIMB STRAIGHT UP!
66 REP'S, but there's a lot more left!
In this American Hero be assured!
Maybe, SIXTY-SIX MORE?
WORK OUT, DO IT NOW!
66 REP'S TO BE THE BEST!
Happy 66th Birthday Arnold!

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 29, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 30

Time to be announced
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Business meeting to consider S. 1463, to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species, the nominations of Jane Toshiko Nishida, of Maryland, and Ann Elizabeth Dunkin, of California, both to be an Assistant Administrator, and Manuel H. Ehrlich, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, Corps of Engineers Study Resolution relating to San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Channels, California, and General Services Administration resolutions.
TBA

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 1049 and H.R. 2166, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 1437, to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon, S. 1554, to direct the heads of Federal public land management agencies to prepare reports on the availability of public access and egress to Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide funding for recreational public access to Federal land, S. 1605, for the relief of Michael G. Faber, S. 1640, to facilitate planning, permitting, administration, implementation, and monitoring of pinyon-juniper dominated landscape restoration projects within Lincoln County, Nevada, S. 1888 and H.R. 1241, bills to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, S. 2123, to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Minnesota, S. 2616, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, H.R. 1684, to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and H.R. 3008, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Los Padres National Forest in California.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development
To hold hearings to examine flood insurance claims process in communities after Sandy, focusing on lessons learned and potential improvements.
SD–538
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider H.R. 4007, to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, S. 1618, to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government, S. 1347, to provide transparency, accountability, and limitations of Government sponsored conferences, S. 1396, to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency

to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfire, S. 2640, to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, S. 2547, to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, S. 2323, to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service, S. 2664, Integrated Public Alert and Warning System Authorization Act of 2014, S. 2651, DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014, H.R. 4197, to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, S. 2665, Emergency Information Improvement Act of 2014, S. 1898, to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, S. 2247, to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, H.R. 606, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building'', H.R. 1671, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the ''James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office'', H.R. 2291, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the ''Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office'', H.R. 3472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the ''Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office'', H.R. 3765, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the ''Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building'', and the nominations of Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, and James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, and Victoria Reggie Kennedy, of Massachusetts, all to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the next steps for the ''Violence Against Women Act'' (VAWA), focusing on protecting women from gun violence.

SD–106

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Children and Families

To hold hearings to examine paid family leave, focusing on the benefits for businesses and working families.

SD–430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine domestic challenges and global competition in aviation manufacturing.

SR–253

2 p.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine ''The African Growth and Opportunity Act'' at 14, focusing on the road ahead; to be immediately followed by a business meeting to consider the nominations of Robert W. Holleyman II, of Louisiana, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, D. Nathan Sheets, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary, and Ramin Toloui, of Iowa, to be Deputy Under Secretary, both of the Department of the Treasury, Maria Cancian, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Family Support, and Cary Douglas Pugh, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

SD–215

2:15 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine pricing policies and competition in the contact lens industry.

SD–226

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the impact of Medicare observation status on seniors.

SR–418

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Ukraine.

SVC–217

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine wireless phone bills, focusing on a review of consumer protection practices and gaps.

SR–253

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1948, to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program, S. 2299, to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages, S. 2442, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important land into trust for the benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, S. 2465, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico, S. 2479, to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada, S. 2480, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and H.R. 4002, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine responses to natural disasters in Indian country.

SD–628

JULY 31

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine financial products for students, focusing on issues and challenges.

SD–538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carolyn Watts Colvin, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

SD–215

2 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection

To hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office report on expectations of government support for bank holding companies.

SD–538

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

S–116

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 31

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–226

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 29, 2014*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 29, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday was a monumental day in the House of Representatives as we finally had a debate on the merits of sending U.S. troops back into the conflict in Iraq.

Again, I thank the House leadership and the Foreign Affairs Committee leadership for working with Representatives MCGOVERN, LEE, and myself to bring H. Con. Res. 105 to the floor, and I thank the 370 Members who voted in favor of this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 105 states very simply:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will have other debates on the Constitution and the role of Congress in deploying our military, including a debate on repealing both the 2001 and 2002 AUMF.

There is no decision more important than a vote to commit a young man or woman to war to potentially give their life for our country. That is one reason that I am opposed to President Obama's decision to allow U.S. troops to remain in Afghanistan. While he says that we are withdrawing our troops, the fact remains that 32,800 members of the American military remain in harm's way in Afghanistan at this very moment.

We have all read and heard the reports from Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, John Sopko, which details rampant waste, fraud, and abuse of American resources.

We in Congress continue to propose cuts to domestic programs that assist our veterans, children, and senior citizens, yet there are no cuts to the money that is being funneled overseas to prop up a corrupt Afghan regime.

One would think that we would learn from history. No amount of blood or treasure will change Afghanistan. It is what it is, like it or not. It is what it is.

As I close, I want to mention three members of the Army who died on July 25 as a result of their service in Afghanistan. I also want to thank ABC News for faithfully honoring our fallen servicemembers. The names of the three fallen Army members are Staff Sergeant Benjamin Prange, PFC Keith Williams, and PFC Donnell Hamilton.

Why, you may ask, do I continue to speak against the war in Afghanistan? Because American servicemembers are still dying.

Mr. Speaker, I have a poster beside me on the floor today that probably gives a better example of war than even I do with my words. It is a little girl holding the hand of her mom as the United States Army is getting ready to start the caisson. The little girl is wondering why her father is in the casket draped by an American flag.

These are the costs of war. We must always carefully consider where we are going to send our young men and women overseas to fight and give their life.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will close by asking God to please bless our troops, God to please bless the families, and for God to continue to bless America.

SENATE TRANSPORTATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as early as this afternoon, the Senate debates transportation funding. It is not just about the money to stop the summer slowdown that is impacting projects and jobs all across America because we have not adequately funded our transportation needs. It is an opportunity to focus our response to the larger infrastructure crisis which is no longer just looming but is upon us.

America is literally falling apart. The American Society for Civil Engineers has famously rated our transportation with a D-plus, with an overall dismal scorecard for other infrastructure categories.

We can no longer afford to maintain our existing system in a state of good repair. Eleven percent of our bridges are obsolete or functionally deficient. Ongoing operations, to say nothing of strategic new investments, are increasingly difficult.

This is sad because the Federal Government used to play an essential role for infrastructure throughout our history, from Benjamin Franklin's postal roads to Abraham Lincoln's transcontinental railroad to Dwight Eisenhower's interstate highway system. The ability to even imagine such accomplishments is increasingly a thing of the past. This means we are losing our competitive edge to be able to move goods efficiently. Our families are losing mobility.

Our low level of investment is being dwarfed by competitors overseas: Europe, India, Japan, and especially China.

Shanghai has 14 subway lines, a high-speed Maglev railway, two massive modern airports, 20 expressways, and a high-speed train leaving Shanghai every 3 minutes. China has spent 8½ percent of its gross domestic product for 20 years, while American investment has shrunk to 1.7 percent recently for a system that is variously rated 12th or 27th, depending on what you are looking at.

Is it any wonder that China's economy has expanded 700 percent in 20 years while America struggles to grow at 2 percent a year?

With such an overwhelming, well-established need, it is criminal that Congress is in the process of making a decision that will probably delay any meaningful opportunity to correct this situation in transportation funding for 3 years or longer.

Yes, it is essential that a financial transfer take place to the highway trust fund to stop the summer slowdown and give Congress a chance to

work, but hopefully, only with enough money to work through this year. The Senate may well appropriate enough money, as the House did a couple of weeks ago, to slide into the next Congress with new committees, new leadership, perhaps, in the Senate. The situation will get no easier, no less complex, and no less expensive if this Congress abandons its responsibility.

This is a continuation of an unfortunate pattern since 2003, where a series of ever-shorter solutions and 21 temporary extensions have created near permanent uncertainty for communities who rely on the Federal partnership for the big picture, major repair, and new construction of roads, transit, and bridges.

The people who build, maintain, and depend on our transportation infrastructure are in the dark where they stand now, where they will be in 6 months, where they will be 2 years from now. It is absolutely unacceptable.

I will fight for this Congress to get on with its job now. If it means we have to work in October instead of campaigning, so be it. If it means we have to come back after the election and work into the holidays, we should do so. Congress should not recess for vacation, for campaigning, or adjourn for the year unless it has met its responsibilities for a long overdue, 6-year, robust transportation bill provided with enough sustainable, dedicated funding to stop this chronic uncertainty.

The Senate will be debating limiting funding for this year or sliding into next. They will even debate Senator LEE's proposal to slash the Federal partnership and turn it back to the States as an unfunded mandate, eliminating the gas tax and, with it, any thoughtful, overall Federal transportation system.

These are the choices that really need to be drug out into the light. They need to be talked about in the open to find out what the public thinks, and then we make a decision, let them know, and move on. America deserves no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision in Halbig v. Burwell held that ObamaCare ''makes tax credits available . . . to individuals who purchase health insurance through . . . exchanges . . . established by the State.''

Supporters of the law predictably decried judicial partisanship. They claimed the reasoning of the Court was spurious because it led to an absurd result which was not in line with the intended policy of the law.

Also recently, video surfaced of MIT health economist Jonathan Gruber, a prominent architect of and supporter of ObamaCare, clearly stating that States have an incentive to set up exchanges so that their citizens will have access to Federal subsidies. So much for the charge that the Court's reasoning led to an absurd result.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that someone at some point in the legislative drafting of ObamaCare thought using Federal subsidies as an incentive to get States to set up insurance exchanges was a good idea, and that was the view that was codified as law. But at a fundamental level, the issue here isn't the way the statute was written; it is the way the statute was passed. The extremely partisan nature of ObamaCare's passage has made the administration unwilling or unable to seek fixes via the normal legislative process because doing so would necessitate working across the aisle and compromising.

We all remember that ObamaCare was hastily passed after an election which cost the Democrats their supermajority in the Senate. They couldn't edit this law because the people of Massachusetts denied them that privilege. But that didn't stop Democrats from ramming this poorly drafted law through using some very questionable legislative tactics. Now they are asking the courts to let them make edits to the plain language of law without consulting Congress.

As this case moves forward on appeal, judges should ask themselves this question: Is it my role to shield the Democratic Party from the consequences of a republic form of government? I don't recall ever reading that particular clause in my copy of the Constitution.

THE LEGISLATURE'S JOB IS TO PASS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the House uses what little legislative time is left in the year to sue the President, I am reminded of what Benjamin Disraeli once said: ''How much easier it is to be critical than to be correct.'' That is the reason why the American public thinks that the lawsuit against the President of the United States is a political stunt, because it is a political stunt.

The majority argues that the President's executive actions give them no choice but to sue the President; that it is the legislative branch's job to defend against the executive branch's supposed overreaches.

But I will tell you what the job of the legislature is. The job of the legislature is to pass legislation.

For 112 Congresses before this one, the fight over the separation of powers has endured, with each Congress before us using the powers allocated to it in our Constitution to pass legislation to counter the actions of the President.

□ 1015

It is not a unique idea: You don't like the job the President is doing? Well, then let's do our job. You don't like the President's policy? Well, then let's enact some policies of our own. Rather than litigating, we should be legislating.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been so busy trying to prevent the President from doing his job, they have forgotten to do their own. For years, their number one legislative priority was making President Obama a one-term President, to discredit him, to delegitimize him. Time and time again, with every issue, from extending unemployment insurance to comprehensive immigration reform to climate change, to name a few, this Congress has punted the ball. Instead of finding the courage to tackle the tough issues the American people are begging us to take on, we have retreated.

For many issues, we even refuse to allow a simple up-or-down vote on the floor. We are afraid that if we actually allowed a vote, we might actually pass something.

This Congress makes Truman's ''do-nothing Congress'' seem downright busy. No wonder why our approval numbers are so low. It is ironic that a Congress that refuses to get anything done has the audacity to accuse the President of getting too much done.

The President isn't taking our power away from us. We have abdicated it to him.

Since George Washington, our Presidents have used executive actions to get things done, yet the majority argues that this President is the exception to the rule. President Obama may be the exception, but not in the way that they think. Out of the last 10 Presidents, President Obama has signed the least number of executive orders, on average, per year. So far, the President has even signed half as many as President Reagan did.

Yet despite this, let's remember what the President has been able to accomplish over the last 6 years. President Obama brought our economy back from the brink of depression, lowering unemployment from 10 percent in 2009 to 6.1 percent today. We have had 52 straight months of private sector job growth, with the last month being the

fifth month in a row of adding 200,000 jobs or more to the economy.

The President passed health care reform, achieving what every President since Teddy Roosevelt has tried and failed to do. Now millions of Americans who were previously barred from health insurance coverage because of preexisting conditions or because they simply could not afford it can access the care they desperately need.

And the President has taken unprecedented action to protect our environment. He has proposed the toughest fuel economy standards for passenger vehicles in U.S. history, put a plan in place to cut carbon pollution from new and existing power plants, and significantly increased production of renewable energy.

In 6 years, President Obama has accomplished more than many who have come before him, despite a do-nothing Congress whose stated mission has been obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, Malcolm X used to say that if you have no critics, you likely have no successes.

The intent of the majority's lawsuit may be to spotlight the President's critics, but I am confident that what it will actually do is prove his successes.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act reforms our broken and harmful mental health system. Here are some reasons why we need it.

For some who are experiencing the most serious mental illnesses, like bipolar disorder or schizophrenia, they don't think their hallucinations are real; they know they are real. Their illness affects their brains in such a way that they are certain, beyond all doubt, their delusions are real. It is not an attitude or denial. It is a very real brain condition.

With that understanding, we are left with a series of questions: Do these individuals have a right to be sick, or do they have a right to treatment? Do they have a right to live as victims on the streets, or do they have a right to get better? Do they have a right to be disabled and unemployed, or do they have a right to recover and get back to work? I believe these individuals and their families have the right to heal and lead healthy lives.

But they are sometimes blinded by a symptom called anosognosia, a neurological condition of the frontal lobe which renders the individual incapable of understanding that they are ill.

Every single day, millions of families struggle to help a loved one with serious mental illness who won't seek treatment. Many knew that Aaron Alexis, James Holmes, Jared Loughner, Adam Lanza, and Elliot Rodgers needed help.

Their families tried, but the individual's illness caused them to believe nothing was wrong, and they fought against the help. These families watch their brother, their son, or their parent spiral downward in a system that, by design, only responds after crisis, not before or during. The loved one is more likely to end up in prison or living on the streets, where they suffer violence and victimization, or cycle in and out of the emergency room or commit suicide.

In a recent New York Times article about Rikers Island prison, they report that over an 11-month period last year, 129 inmates suffered injuries so serious that doctors at the jail's clinics were unable to treat them; 77 percent of those inmates had been previously diagnosed with mental illness.

Rikers now has as many people with mental illness as all 24 psychiatric hospitals in New York State combined, and they make up nearly 40 percent of the jail population, up from about 20 percent 8 years ago.

Inmates with mental illnesses commit two-thirds of the infractions in the jail, and they commit an overwhelming majority of assaults on jail staff members. Yet, by law, they cannot be medicated involuntarily at the jail, and hospitals often refuse to accept them unless they harm themselves or others.

Is that humane? Shouldn't we have acted before they committed a crime to compel them to get help?

According to the article, correctional facilities now hold 95 percent of all institutionalized people with mental illness. That is wrong. Yet with all we know about mental illness and the treatments to help those experiencing it, there are still organizations, federally funded with taxpayer dollars, that believe individuals who are too sick to seek treatment will be better off left alone than in inpatient or outpatient treatment. It is insensitive. It is callous. It is misguided. It is unethical. It is immoral. And Congress should not stand by as these organizations continue their abusive malpractice against the mentally ill.

The misguided ones are more comfortable allowing the mentally ill to live under bridges or behind dumpsters than getting the emergency help that they need in a psychiatric hospital or an outpatient clinic because they cling to their fears of the old asylums, as if medical science and the understanding of the brain has not advanced over the last 60 years.

We would never deny treatment to a stroke victim or a senior with Alzheimer's disease simply because he or she is unable to ask for care. Yet, in cases of serious brain disorders, like schizophrenia, this cruel conundrum prevents us from acting even when we know we must because the laws say we can't. We must change those misguided and harmful laws.

The system is the most difficult for those who have the greatest difficulty. Why are some more comfortable with prison or homelessness or unemployment, poverty, and a 25-year shorter life span?

I tell my colleagues: Do not turn a blind eye to those that need our help. The mentally ill can and will get better if Congress takes the right action.

Tomorrow, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and I will hold a briefing at 3 p.m. on the rights of the seriously mentally ill to get treatment. I hope my colleagues will attend and understand that we have to take mental illness out of the shadows by passing the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717, because where there is no help, there is no hope.

HONORING TED RUBIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the military service and the life of Tibor—known to us as Ted—Rubin, a Korean war veteran, a Holocaust survivor, and a prisoner of war survivor.

Mr. Rubin received the Congressional Medal of Honor in 2005, and he will be the guest of honor at a ceremony in the city of Garden Grove at their post office in Orange County, California, on August 8, 2014.

Ted was born on June 18, 1929, in Hungary. He spent 14 months in a concentration camp in Austria, which was liberated by the United States Army. Inspired by the work of the United States Army who saved him, he enlisted and became a member of the U.S. Army's 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, on February 13, 1950, and he was soon deployed to Korea.

Despite facing religious discrimination from his sergeant, who sent him on the most dangerous missions in South Korea's Pusan Perimeter and who withheld his commendation, he fought valiantly. Corporal Rubin enabled the complete withdrawal of his comrades by solely defending a hill under an overwhelming assault by North Korean troops.

He inflicted a staggering number of casualties on the attacking force during his personal 24-hour battle and helped capture several hundred North Korean soldiers. During a massive nighttime assault, he manned a .30-caliber machine gun and slowed the pace of the enemy advance.

On a later assignment, Corporal Rubin was severely wounded, and he was captured. He disregarded his own

personal safety and immediately began sneaking out of the camp at night in search of food for his comrades.

Risking certain torture or death if he was caught, he provided food to the starving soldiers, and he provided desperately needed medical care for the wounded in the prisoner of war camp. He used improvised medical techniques to save his fellow soldiers and provided critical moral support. His brave, selfless efforts were directly attributed to saving the lives of as many as 40 of his fellow prisoners.

Corporal Rubin's gallant actions in close contact with the enemy and unyielding courage and bravery while a prisoner of war are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin states: ''I always wanted to become a citizen of the United States, and when I became a citizen, it was one of the happiest days in my life. I think about the United States, and I am a lucky person to live here. When I came to America, it was the first time I was free. It was one of the reasons I joined the U.S. Army, because I wanted to show my appreciation. It is the best country in the world, and I am part of it now. I do not have to worry about the gestapo knocking on my door tonight. I have shalom, peace. People die for it.''

HAS LAST CHRISTIAN LEFT IRAQI CITY OF MOSUL AFTER 2,000 YEARS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to read the following piece that was posted on nbcnews.com yesterday. The headline was: ''Has Last Christian Left Iraqi City of Mosul After 2,000 Years?''

Samer Kamil Yacub was alone when four Islamist militants carrying AK–47s arrived at his front door and ordered him to leave the city. The 70-year-old Christian had failed to comply with a decree issued by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, ISIS.

Yacub's hometown of Mosul had boasted a Christian community for almost 2,000 years. But then the al Qaeda-inspired fighters who overran the city last month gave Christians an ultimatum. They could stay and pay a tax or convert to Islam—or be killed.

Yacub, 70, was one of the few Christians remaining beyond last Saturday's noon deadline. He may have even been the last to leave alive. ''A fighter said, 'I have orders to kill you now,''' Yacub said just hours after the Sunni extremists tried to force their way into his home at 11 a.m. on Monday. ''All of the people in my neighborhood were Muslim. They came to help me—about 20 people—at the door in front of my house. They tried to convince ISIS not to kill me.''

The rebels spared Yacub but threw him out of the city where he had spent his entire life. They also took his Iraqi ID card before informing him that elderly women would be given his house.

Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of what is unfolding in Iraq right before our eyes. The end of Christianity, as we now know it, is taking place in Iraq. This is the fifth time I have come to the floor over the last week to try to raise awareness of what is happening, to talk about the genocide.

It is genocide that is taking place. Yes, genocide: the systematic extermination of a people of faith by violent extremists seizing power in a region. Churches and monasteries have been seized. Many of them have been burned down.

Last week, it was widely reported that ISIS had blown up the tomb of the prophet Jonah.

Christians, threatened with their lives if they do not leave the region, are being robbed as they leave a land they have lived on for more than 2,000 years.

With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions, and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. The patriarch Abraham lived in the city of Ur. Isaac's bride, Rebekah, came from northwest Iraq. Jacob spent 20 years in Iraq, and his sons—the 12 tribes of Israel—were born in northwest Iraq. The events of the book of Esther took place in Iraq, as did the account of Daniel in the lion's den.

Many of Iraqi's Christians still speak Aramaic, the language of Jesus. The Pope has spoken out. His Beatitude Ignatius Ephrem Joseph III Younan, the overseer of Syriac Catholics around the globe, has spoken out.

□ 1030

His Grace Bishop Angaelos, general bishop of the Coptic Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom, has spoken out. Archbishop Justin Welby, the archbishop of Canterbury and leader of the world's 80 million Anglicans, has spoken out. Russell Moore, a key leader in the Southern Baptist Convention, has spoken out.

Despite these Christian leaders speaking out about the systematic extermination of Christians in Iraq, the silence in this town, in Washington, is deafening. Does Washington even care? Where is the Obama administration? The President has failed. Where is the Congress? The Congress has failed.

Time is running out. The Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq are being targeted for extinction. They need our help. Literally, during our time, we will see the end of Christianity in the place it began.

INSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION IS UNPRECEDENTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I spent 30 years in a courtroom, one-half of those as a judge, including 2 years on the North Carolina Supreme Court. I have taken particular interest in House Resolution 676, and I have spent considerable time researching the standing of the House to initiate litigation against a President or Department heads or Federal agencies to seek ''appropriate relief for failure to act in a manner consistent with the duties of the executive branch.''

Never before, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the Congress, has there been ''institutional litigation'' between two coequal branches of government—never. There have been prior cases involving individual Members of Congress who have alleged that their vote had been nullified by Presidential action, but none of them succeeded.

This bill will clearly authorize institutional litigation between the legislative and executive branches—unprecedented, Mr. Speaker.

The Republicans have chosen to proceed with a one-Chamber resolution. The Affordable Care Act, I remind you, was a two-Chamber enactment. The House, as an institution, as a subset of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, cannot by itself enforce a legislative enactment. It must be bicameral.

This misguided and politically motivated resolution will establish a precedent that is unknown in our jurisprudence. It is an abuse of power on the part of House Republicans.

If this bill passes and this Republican-controlled House initiates a lawsuit without Senate authorization, it will threaten the separation of powers principle and the checks and balances that we have long cherished in our country.

I ask my colleagues: Do you want the judiciary to become the arbiter of disputes between the Congress and the President? Do you really want to cede to the courts the authority to resolve disputes between the branches?

If you set this precedent, then, in the future, the House or the Senate, acting alone, could simply allege a constitutional violation against the President and get its day in court.

Well, what happens if a President is unhappy with the House or with the Senate? Could she just allege a constitutional violation and have the courts settle the dispute? If this precedent is established, will the House be able to sue the Senate or the Senate sue the House? Where does this end?

I call on my Republican friends to talk to objective legal scholars and read the literature and prior court decisions, protect the integrity of our Federal system, and reject this resolution.

Finally, I ask the proponents of this legislation to tell me two things:

Tell me, what relief are you asking the court to impose? I suppose your answer would be, well, we want the court

to tell President Obama that he lacked authority to extend the employer mandate.

Why are you upset about that? I thought you didn't like the employer mandate.

Well, tell me, how do you plan to pay for this frivolous litigation? Under this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House will have unbridled discretion to pay legal costs and expert costs. I did not know that the House of Representatives has the authority to pass a bill that will require unbudgeted spending that will add to the deficit that you constantly bemoan. How much will this litigation cost the taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day in this House. I know what you are doing, and the American people know what you are doing. You are using this legislation in your constant effort to discredit President Obama and set the stage for a despicable impeachment proceeding should you hold the majority in the House and gain the majority in the Senate.

Shame on House Republicans. Shame on you for this type of politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

HOUSE PASSAGE OF ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will be advancing solutions to some significant issues that are facing this Nation.

Among those, I rise today to discuss one of those, a piece of legislation set for consideration by the House later this week, H.R. 4315, the Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act. It is a package of reform bills that will modernize and improve the Endangered Species Act.

In 1973, the Endangered Species Act was first enacted to protect and recover key domestic species that are under threat of extinction. Although the ESA was written with the best of intentions, areas of the law hinder, rather than enhance, our ability to effectively manage ecosystems and conserve species as initially intended. Today, the law is failing, failing to achieve its primary purpose of species recovery and has only a 2 percent recovery rate.

In April, the House Natural Resources Committee advanced this package of bills through committee with support from both sides of the aisle.

As a member of the House Endangered Species Act Working Group, which developed the findings and recommendations for these proposals, I encourage my colleagues to support these reforms that promote greater transparency and accountability under the Endangered Species Act, while ensuring the ecological and economic needs of our local communities are being met.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS' SHAMEFUL DIVERSION TECHNIQUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, President Obama and the Democratic Congress took office. When they took office in January of 2009, the economy was in free fall, and we were losing 800,000 jobs a month—losing 800,000 jobs a month, but the Congress went to work, and under the guidance of President Obama, we passed the American Recovery Act, we saved the American automobile industry, and within 14 months, we were gaining 250,000 jobs a month. We turned around over 1 million jobs a month, from losing 800,000 to gaining 250,000 in 14 months.

The President knew that that wasn't sufficient to continue the progress, so he proposed the American Jobs Act, and he proposed a major investment in American infrastructure. But the newly elected Republican Congress—the obstructionist Republican Congress—stopped the American Jobs Act, wouldn't pass the infrastructure bill, and stopped every job initiative the President and Democrats proposed, and we have had a slow recovery from that recession.

We are gaining about 200,000 to 250,000 jobs a month. It is up a little, and that is good, but our economy is about $2 trillion below its productive capacity, below what it should be because every proposal from the President has been stopped by the Republican Congress, which shouldn't have time for it, but they had time for other things.

We had plenty of time to take 50 votes on repealing the Affordable Care Act at a cost to the taxpayers of about $79 million to repeat that vote 50 times. We had time for the Republicans to shut down the government. That cost the economy about $24 billion.

We had time when the administration knew that the Defense of Marriage Act could not be defended in court, the House of Representatives wasted $3.5 million trying to defend the indefensible in court and lost in front of the Supreme Court. We have had, in that time, no minimum wage increase, no extended unemployment insurance, and no pay equity for women because it costs too much money. This House has passed $850 billion in unpaid-for tax loopholes for large corporations—unpaid for.

Now, they want to waste more money. The Speaker wants to waste more money on a meritless lawsuit against the President for not taking care that the law be faithfully executed.

What did he do? In implementing the Affordable Care Act—which the Republicans have tried to repeal 50 times—he postponed implementation of one provision by a year—a provision the Republicans opposed, so they now want to waste money to go into court and sue the President to say he had no power to postpone this for a year, even though no one opposed President Bush when he postponed for a year a provision of the Medicare drug act when he was President.

It is well within the discretion of Presidents, in implementing a law, to postpone parts of it in order to get it done right. That has been very clear, and it becomes another question. Let's assume the Republicans went into court and overturned the standing question that Mr. BUTTERFIELD talked about—which they will not—what is the remedy they seek?

By the time it got to court, that provision will have been implemented, so the Republicans want to waste $5 million or $6 million of taxpayers' money to go into court and say, Judge, order the President to implement what has been already implemented—totally ridiculous.

So what have we got? We have got a Congress with no highway bill, no minimum wage bill, no unemployment extension bill, no pay equity for women bill, no action on campaign finance reform, no action to reduce the burdens of student loans, no action to make sure that women continue to have access to contraceptive services—despite the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decisions—no action on all the emergencies that face the American people, but we are going to waste money on a meritless lawsuit that will go nowhere, but simply will serve the single function of diverting attention from all the real problems the House Republicans want to continue to ignore.

That is not a proper use of the taxpayers' money, more wasted money for political purposes—for shame.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF WALDWICK, NEW JERSEY, POLICE OFFICER CHRISTOPHER GOODELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Waldwick, New Jersey, Police Officer Christopher Goodell. Officer Goodell was killed in the line of duty on July 17, 2014, when a truck hit his police cruiser. He was just 32 years old.

Although Officer Goodell's life was tragically cut short, he lived a life of

purpose, serving both his community and his country as well.

Officer Goodell was raised up in Waldwick and graduated from Waldwick High School, just back in the year 2000. Shortly after September 11, Officer Goodell enlisted in the U.S. Marines. Officer Goodell served in the military for 5 years, even including a tour of duty over in Iraq.

After his military service, Officer Goodell returned back to his hometown of Waldwick, New Jersey, and joined the Waldwick Police Department. He took a special interest, if you will, in discouraging teens from drinking and driving.

He spoke about the dangers of drunk driving back at Waldwick High School, and he also ran an annual DWI prevention course.

It was on June 11 of this year that Officer Goodell was recognized in the State by the State chapters of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, doing this for all of his good service.

Thinking about it, Officer Goodell truly had a bright future ahead of him. Just last month, he had proposed to his girlfriend, and they had plans to get married in 2016, but now, he is survived by his fiancee, a loving family, and an endless number of friends.

Officer Goodell was truly a hometown hero. He lived a life of purpose, and he died serving and protecting the community where he grew up. So I come here today and I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me today in paying tribute to Officer Goodell.

We recognize, as we do this, that words alone may be of little comfort to the family and the friends of Christopher Goodell. It is my hope that they may find some solace, knowing that our thoughts and our prayers will be with them.

JOURNEYING THROUGH THE 23RD DISTRICT OF TEXAS, THE TOWN OF COTULLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to continue the journey through the vastness of the 23nd District of Texas and pass through a Texas town with an early reputation for infamy. ''Cotulla! Everybody get your guns ready,'' that is what train conductors would yell as they approached the town of Cotulla, which was established in 1881.

In spite of its infamous start, Cotulla emerged from the roughness that is common to early Texas towns and became an early indicator of the social change that was to come to America, taking on issues such as civil rights and women's education.

Life in Cotulla inspired a very young teacher, a man by the name of Lyndon B. Johnson, who went on to serve as our country's 36th President, and inspired him to lead the fight for change. President Johnson taught Mexican Americans in Cotulla's segregated public schools.

□ 1045

Early on, he understood how education could pull a family out of generations of poverty and push them into the middle class. LBJ, after his experience in Cotulla, once said:

> This Nation could never rest while the door to knowledge remained closed to any American.

Education, the key that opens the locks of success, found an early ally in Cotulla. The town itself was founded by a young entrepreneur by the name of Joseph Cotulla, who was a Polish immigrant and a veteran of the Union Army. He was willing to take the risk of establishing a town after learning that the International-Great Northern Railroad intended to expand into La Salle County. This willingness to risk is still what makes our country great today.

The town grew from an early farming and ranching community into an energy boomtown in the 1950s. That still continues today in the Eagle Ford Shale area. Today, as in the past, the folks in Cotulla work to secure America's energy future, and by 2035, our energy deficit will be reduced to 4 percent.

Today, many of the descendants of Joseph Cotulla still live in the town. The town has seen tremendous change since its founding and its infamous early reputation. In truth, we find a small reflection of America in Cotulla: a willingness to overcome adversity and take risks to find success and to achieve. Cotulla's history also points out that the fabric of American society doesn't always match our founding values, but in Cotulla, it set in place a desire to change that.

I invite anyone who is visiting south Texas to stop by Cotulla, to learn its history, and to enjoy its hospitality.

PREVENTING EXPANSION OF DACA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of a bill I introduced to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that was unlawfully created by executive memo on August 15, 2012. H.R. 5160 is the House companion to legislation introduced by Senator TED CRUZ of Texas and would freeze DACA by defunding it.

DACA promotes amnesty by using prosecutorial discretion to allow illegal immigrant children and those who came here illegally as children a deportation deferral to remain in the country for up to 2 years. The deferral period is subject to renewal.

DACA also permits illegal aliens to obtain work authorization, despite the fact that they are not in the country legally. This takes jobs away from hardworking American taxpayers and hurts our economy. According to ICE, remittances from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras are estimated to cost the U.S. taxpayer $10 billion a year.

Last month, DHS Secretary Johnson announced that DACA would be extended and that those who have been protected from deportation would have a chance to renew their applications.

Democrats say that DACA is irrelevant because it only applies to illegal immigrants who have been here since 2007, but let me tell you why DACA reform does matter.

First, the administration will expand DACA. President Obama has instructed DHS Secretary Johnson and Attorney General Holder to come up with a list of executive actions to address immigration reform. DACA is going to be on that list.

Second, DACA has given Central American children false hope that they will be able to obtain amnesty as those before them have done.

DACA began in 2012, and the numbers tell the story. In fiscal year 2013, there was a 305 percent increase in the number of unaccompanied alien children that came to the U.S. That figure is expected to increase by 1,381 percent in fiscal year 2014. Yes, you heard me right: 305 percent in 2013; 1,381 percent in 2014. Those numbers are evidence of the correlation between DACA and the influx of unaccompanied alien children coming to the U.S.

Just recently, I learned that the administration secretly placed 760 unaccompanied alien children into Tennessee. This was done despite assurances I had received from the administration that alien children were not in Tennessee. Indeed, the administration appears extremely organized and eager when it comes to resettling the illegal immigrants in this country. I wish they were as eager and organized about addressing the concerns of our veterans, some who have died while on the VA waiting list.

Sadly, the President and the Democrats have moved from the party of ''yes, we can'' to the party of ''because we can.'' DACA provides another example of how the President is using executive action to circumvent Congress.

Soon, if he continues on this path, we won't need legislators or the courts. The President will make the law, interpret the law, and then, if he chooses, enforce the law. The Obama doctrine of lawlessness is cracking the foundation of our democracy. It is shredding the Constitution and consolidating power within the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, if the President has the power to tell illegal immigrants that they can stay in the country, does he have the power to tell legal citizens to leave the country? If the President can delay part of a law, does he have the power to delay the entire law? Where does his authority begin and end?

The President's immigration policies are causing every town to be a border town, every State to be a border State. And not only is it turning America into a country without borders, it is turning it into a country without laws.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's inability to secure the southern border is also placing America's national security in a pre-9/11 posture. The Department of Homeland Security estimates that 90,166 unaccompanied children will arrive in the U.S. in 2014. If 90,000 unaccompanied children can sneak into our country, how difficult will it be for a terror cell to infiltrate America and plan an attack?

We need to be concerned about securing our borders. We must secure our border. We must end the cruelty of providing children with false hope, and we must stop the lawlessness of this President.

WHAT HAVE REPUBLICANS DONE FOR YOU LATELY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about the issue of impeachment; and in connection with that topic, I would use as my text the song some of us may remember by Janet Jackson, ''What Have You Done for Me Lately?''

That is what we should ask the House Republicans: What have you done for me lately?

Well, I will tell you what Congress has been doing. Congress has been wasting your time and your tax dollars. At a time when Congress should be working on the issues that matter most to the pockets and pocketbooks of America's citizens, instead we have, for the last 3 weeks, been wasting taxpayer time and money.

During that 3-week period, over $800 billion in tax cuts have been awarded to the rich people of this country. And guess what. The Republicans have once again violated their own rule and failed to find an offset in the budget to pay for this gift to the wealthy. This means that Republicans have just added—just like that—almost $1 trillion to the Nation's debt.

What have you done for me lately?

This session of Congress, the 113th Congress, which threatens to go down in history as the least productive Congress in the history of this great Nation, this Congress has produced a government shutdown, which cost the American people $24-plus billion. And we have spent in this House of Representatives $79-plus million shuffling paper and voting 50 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

And how much is it going to cost the American taxpayers when the Republicans embark upon this effort to impeach President Obama? How much will it cost? Well, they won't let you know that. I will tell you, shutting down the government and repealing ObamaCare did not work, so we just wasted money. The Republicans came up empty-handed.

So what are they doing now? In fact, working people should ask their Representatives during this upcoming 5-week August recess which we have worked so hard to earn, you should ask your Representative: What have you done for me lately?

Congress has spent the last 3 weeks preparing to impeach President Obama. You see, over the past 3 weeks, the Republicans in the House have been talking up and taking legislative action, at the same time mounting a FOX TV and hate-radio campaign in support of their effort to file a lawsuit against the President of the United States. Now, is this lawsuit simply an attempt to mollify and pacify those Republicans who have turned up the volume on the drumbeat towards impeachment, or, more cynically, is this lawsuit a precursor to the filing of articles of impeachment so they can remove this twice-elected President from office prior to the end of his term?

Either way, it does not look good for America if, in November, voters put Republicans in control of both Houses of Congress. Just like the government shutdown, cooler heads will not prevail. TED CRUZ and the other Tea Party Republicans who were so willing to drive America off the fiscal cliff will not hesitate to do what has never been done throughout the course of our history, and that is to pull off a coup.

So the lawsuit against President Obama should be looked upon as being synonymous with impeachment.

FAILED ENERGY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Obama told the San Francisco Chronicle editorial board in 2008, under his environmental policies ''electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.''

To be even more specific, he said:

> If somebody wants to build a coal-fired power plant, they can. It is just that it will bankrupt them. Under my plan, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

Now listen to this story from The Washington Post just last week:

> Pueblo, Colorado. Sharon Garcia is stumbling around her dining room in the dark, trying to find Post-it notes.
>
> As she has for years, Garcia wants to affix the notes, marked with dollar signs, to light switches all around her house. The message to her five kids: light is expensive.
>
> ''Why do you need to turn the lights off?'' she asks her son, Mariano.
>
> ''Because otherwise there's no money,'' he answers, dutifully.
>
> ''And when there's no money?''
>
> ''You can't feed us or take us anywhere.''
>
> Bingo, again.

□ 1100

I am still quoting from the Post story:

> It's not just the light switches, though. Ever since her power was shut off in 2010, Garcia has adopted a Depression-era obsessiveness: she doesn't use the oven in the summer, because it heats up the house, and uses only one small air-conditioner. Even the aquarium goes dark when someone's not in the room.
>
> And yet, no matter how much she rations and cuts, Garcia cannot keep ahead of the fast rise in rates. In Pueblo, the residential rate per kilowatt hour has risen 26 percent since 2010, and on a per-household basis, is now among the highest in the State.
>
> But in Pueblo, it happened in a way that has left poor consumers gasping for relief.
>
> To a wealthy community, skyrocketing electricity rates might not have much of an impact. When you have a decent-paying job, what's a few more dollars a month on your utility bill?
>
> Pueblo is not that kind of place. With a poverty rate of 18.1 percent, incomes far below the State average, and a third of the population on some sort of public assistance, those few dollars can make a big difference here.

Now, I realize that almost all environmental radicals come from wealthy or upper-income families. Perhaps they just do not realize how harmful all these environmental rules and regulations and red tape are to poor and lower income people.

As Charles Lane, The Washington Post columnist, said, climate change is ''a rich man's issue.''

Perhaps it doesn't matter to wealthy environmentalists that all this environmental overkill has sent millions of good jobs to other countries over the last 40 or 50 years.

Now we have ended up with the best-educated waiters and waitresses in the world as millions of college graduates or very intelligent non-college graduates are having to work at jobs far below the levels of their education or below the level of their skills, talents, and abilities.

Perhaps it doesn't matter to rich or upper-income environmentalists if utility bills or prices for everything go way up, but it sure does matter to millions of people like Sharon Garcia.

Perhaps it doesn't matter to wealthy environmentalists that their policies over the years have driven very small- and medium-sized companies out of business.

Perhaps they are pleased that their policies have helped give job security to bureaucrats and have helped extremely big businesses and foreign energy producers.

This administration even had a Secretary of Energy until a few months ago who said we need to be paying the same price for gas as they do in Europe—$8 or $9 a gallon.

Then, of course, all the wealthy environmentalists would have to fight a whole lot less traffic because they would be about the only ones who could afford to drive.

We have made tremendous progress over the past many years in cleaning our air and water. I have voted for many of these laws and voted many years ago for the toughest clean air law in the world.

But as Charles Krauthammer said: If we shut our whole country down, it would make almost no difference on carbon emissions because China and India together are opening coal-fired plants at rate of almost one per week, and Indonesia is the third-largest emitter.

Some environmental groups hate to admit how much progress we have made—how much cleaner our air and water are—because it would reduce their contributions. They have to keep telling people how bad everything is so their contributors will keep sending them money, especially money and contributions from foreign energy producers.

But we need to make people realize that only a prosperous country that allows free enterprise can generate the excess funds to do good things for the environment that everybody wants done.

Communist and socialist countries have been some of the biggest polluters in the world because their economies have been barely able to feed, clothe, and house their people. And certainly they have been unable to spend the kinds of money that it costs to help the environment.

We must not allow big government environmental regulators at both the Federal and State levels to cause our country to move so far to the left that it destroys our economy.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN SUBTERFUGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to denounce the unprecedented political attack House Republicans are bringing to the floor of this House. This week, this body will consider a measure to bring a lawsuit against the President of the United States for doing the job that the people of this country elected him to do.

This highly partisan lawsuit is a subterfuge. It is a subterfuge by House Republicans aimed at achieving their political goals that they were not able to achieve at the ballot box. Make no mistake about it. This is not a frivolous matter. Nothing could be more serious than House Republicans attempting to get the taxpayers of this country to finance their misuse and abuse of the legal system. The ultimate goal of this exercise is to try to discover some peg upon which they can hang an impeachment resolution.

This is very simple. Republicans could not defeat this President in back-to-back elections, and now they are looking for other means to their ends. This wasteful Republican lawsuit is their prelude to impeachment. It is a vendetta, a direct attack on the heart of our democratic form of self-government launched by House Republicans who got over a million less votes from the American people in the last national elections than their Democratic counterparts. Nothing could be more serious.

This lawsuit is a measure by House Republicans to use taxpayer money to further their partisan attempts to besmirch and destroy a President they couldn't beat in the elections. It is unfair to the American people, it is undemocratic, it is un-American.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know what is going on here. Rather than focusing on creating jobs, fixing our broken immigration system, rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, and other sensible measures that can help hardworking families struggling to make ends meet, House Republicans are obsessed with political gamesmanship on a historic scale. Nothing could be more serious.

LET'S NOT WASTE PRECIOUS TIME SUING THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, with 3 legislative days left before Congress leaves for a 5-week vacation, Democrats are working to advance the priorities of the American people: creating jobs, jump-starting the middle class, and working to reform our broken immigration system. The majority, however, seems only interested in advancing a lawsuit against the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong, very wrong. Suing the President—for what, for doing his job? This is the first time in the history of our Nation that one branch of government is bringing a lawsuit against another branch of government. What an incredible way to uphold the separation of power among branches of government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to tackle big problems and do real work on their behalf. This lawsuit is only further proof that House Republicans have lost touch with the American people.

Not only is this lawsuit a waste of time, but it is a serious waste of taxpayers' money. Just as House Republicans spent $2.3 million defending discrimination during the DOMA case, and the $3 million they are spending on the Select Committee on Benghazi, they are now poised to waste yet more money on a political stunt that is deeply unpopular with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have critical work to do. I strongly urge my colleagues to do what is right. We should stay here in Washington to deal with issues like immigration reform, veterans' health care, and the economy. Let's not waste precious time and money on political stunts like suing the President. We owe it to the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jeff Parish, First Baptist Church of Indian Rocks, Largo, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Lord, we come before You today and pray for our elected officials.

God, I pray for wisdom for them in areas that they need it and guidance to follow You, Lord, in all things.

God, we do pause today and ask You to use us as Your servants.

We realize our dependence on You and look to You for answers to the problems that face our country. I pray that the discussion and the decisions made in this Chamber today, God, will reflect Your heart and Your direction.

Lord, we pray in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARRIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JEFF PARISH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce to my colleagues and to this House our guest chaplain for the day, Pastor Jeff Parish.

Pastor Jeff serves as the senior pastor of First Baptist Church of Indian Rocks, Florida. Pastor Jeff first entered the ministry in 1986, sharing with others the message of Christian salvation and of the redeeming love and grace of the God in whom we put our trust, and counseling fellow believers along their personal faith journey.

Pastor Jeff is joined in his ministry by his wife, Martha, and by the congregation and community of believers at First Baptist Indian Rocks, a church family that, for 50 years, has shared its message of faith with the Pinellas County community but also in remote lands around the globe.

I welcome Pastor Jeff today, and I thank him personally for the ministry he leads every day that has had an impact on the life of this Member but, likewise, on many thousands of others he has touched during his career of service to our loving God.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ACA FAILURES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, over half of Americans view the President's health care law unfavorably, according to a new Rasmussen report. But this is no surprise. What started only as a failed Web site has turned into even more logistical failures: problems about applications, questions about subsidies, and lots of confusion.

But the policy behind ObamaCare is equally flawed. Premiums are rising. Americans are losing the coverage they liked. They are unable to see the doctors they were previously visiting. And they are finding that many of the services or drugs that they need are not covered. President Obama promised the opposite of this, and Americans should not be misled by their leaders.

House Republicans will continue to pursue patient-centered reforms so Americans can get the care they need and want, the care they were promised.

LAWSUIT AGAINST PRESIDENT OBAMA

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, so there are just 3 legislative days left before we go on recess, and the most pressing issue that the House Republican leadership has decided that we need to devote our legislative time to is a resolution to sue the President of the United States.

Not to bring up a jobs bill, not to deal with comprehensive immigration reform, not to extend emergency unemployment benefits for the millions of people who have lost their benefits, but to debate a dangerous and unprecedented lawsuit with the House of Representatives suing the President. What is next—the Senate suing the House? I mean, this is really ridiculous.

And after all that is done, what we are going to do is recess for 5 weeks. Instead of taking up the issues that the people have sent us here to deal with, we are going to leave for 5 weeks after taking action—presumably, the majority will vote to sue the President of the United States.

It is a waste of our time. It is a horrible waste of money. It is unconscionable. We ought to stay here and do the work of the American people that we were sent here to do.

DEFENDING THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, the President has taken the oath of office two times. Twice he has sworn to faithfully execute the laws. Twice he has sworn to protect and defend the Constitution. Yet he has unilaterally delayed the employer mandate of his own health care law twice. On topic after topic, this President has violated the law through overreaching executive action, often not even bothering to issue an executive order.

Our former constitutional law professor-turned President should know that it is Congress' job to make the laws, and it is his job to carry them out, not make them up.

That is why the House is asking the judicial branch to step in and referee this dispute. Champions of the President's choices today may regret when future Presidents are empowered to run roughshod over the people's representatives. Let's defend the Constitution and support the House lawsuit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references toward the President.

RESOLUTION TO SUE THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, 9.5 million Americans are unemployed. America's roads and rails are crumbling. College graduates are saddled with $1 trillion in debt that they can't refinance. Ukraine and the Middle East are on fire. And what does the Speaker have lined up for us in the final 3 days before his 5-week recess for August? He wants us to pass a resolution to sue the President for actions he doesn't like. Mainstream legal experts have said repeatedly this lawsuit is both ludicrous and dangerous, but what it mostly is is wasteful.

The Speaker's shutdown cost the American economy $24 billion. The 50 ACA repeal votes have cost $79 million. The DOMA lawsuit lined pockets of lawyers at $500 an hour, billable hours.

We should cancel the recess. We should go to work in terms of addressing the issues of jobs in this country. We should stop lining the pockets of politically connected lawyers. Let's stand up for the middle class. Let's fix America's infrastructure, and let's get this country moving again and skip the lawsuit.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PRIORITIZATION ACT

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, H.R. 2283, and commend my friend and colleague from New Jersey, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for introducing it.

The State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, or J/TIP, does a fantastic job of maintaining U.S. leadership and accountability in the worldwide effort to combat human trafficking.

More than 130 countries have created or strengthened their antitrafficking laws largely due to J/TIP's work. Among other provisions, this bill raises the status of the J/TIP office to that of a bureau, preventing countries and other bureaus from gaming the tier ranking system. It also achieves this without any additional bureaucracy or cost to the taxpayers.

As a member of the Congressional Human Trafficking Task Force, working with the congressional leadership,

J/TIP, and antitrafficking groups, I know it is crucial to keep this fight from being consumed in a bureaucratic shuffle.

I thank Congressman SMITH for his leadership and look forward to Senate passage of H.R. 2283.

HALTING THE GOP MARCH TOWARD IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, this week House Republicans will be considering a resolution that would authorize the Speaker of the House to sue President Obama. This lawsuit is frivolous. It is also wasteful and without merit.

We must focus on critical legislative priorities instead of political lawsuits that will do nothing but waste millions of the taxpayers' dollars. There are critical issues that need action now. How about creating some jobs, raising the minimum wage, or maybe fixing our broken immigration system before we leave here?

I can tell you that the constituents in my district could use a raise in the minimum wage. There are also people out there that are hurting, that need their unemployment benefits extended.

This lawsuit disregards the priorities of the American people. I do not support this lawsuit. It is frivolous. And I suggest that we use our time to address critical issues that will positively impact Americans.

I will be voting ''no'' on this lawsuit and urge the House leadership to use their time wisely this week—like we are taught early in elementary school—to bring up bills that will put hardworking Americans back to work.

CONGRATULATING GENERAL WILLIAM L. SHELTON ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE AIR FORCE

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize General William L. Shelton on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force.

Over the course of his career, General Shelton has served with great distinction and made countless sacrifices for our country. We commend his service and the sacrifices of his wife, Linda, and their two children, Sara and Joel, in support of his service.

General Shelton has been a vigilant advocate for national security space programs. As the commander of Air Force Space Command, he was responsible for more than 40,000 military and civilian personnel who assure space and cyberspace protection for our Nation. He established an unmatched level of success during a time of increasing challenges. His frank and informed discussions on space systems have helped leaders and citizens around the world appreciate the value of our Nation's space capabilities.

General Shelton deserves our most heartfelt gratitude and praise. Thank you, General Shelton, and best wishes to you and your family.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, while the House Republicans are busy wasting taxpayer dollars on conspiracy theories and a lawsuit to nowhere, Democrats have unveiled an agenda to put working families and the middle class first.

For millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet on the current minimum wage, times have gotten harder and harder as the cost of living rises and wages stagnate. Our plan puts families first and expands opportunity for all Americans by fighting to create good-paying jobs here at home, supporting equality for women, both in their workplaces and in their doctors' offices, and creating a sustainable future for students by helping to slow down the ballooning costs of college.

Now is the time to empower our workforce by showing them that they can make ends meet and provide for their families by working hard. Now is the time to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, to ensure that women finally receive equal pay for equal work. Now is not the time to be suing the President. Now is the time for action and dedication to making our country stronger.

□ 1215

DAY THREE, WASHINGTON UNDER SIEGE

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MASSIE. Day three, Washington under siege—3 days ago, a Federal judge struck down D.C.'s unconstitutional ban on the right to bear arms. D.C. went from having the most restrictive gun laws in the country to having virtually no restrictions on carrying a handgun in public.

Did gun-toting tourists commence to shoot-outs? Did residents cower in their homes? Did vigilante posses maraud about the city? Did politicians revert to dueling at 10 paces? No, none of these things are happening. History will show the streets are safer today as more law-abiding residents and visitors are armed.

Contrary to apocryphal warnings from D.C. leaders, no one is panicked—except for the city's leaders. Why are the city's leaders apoplectic, and why are they asking for an immediate stay from the judge's ruling? Because the emperor has no clothes and all of the lies about gun control are being exposed right here in the District of Columbia on day three.

CORRECTING THE CRISIS AT THE VA

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's obligation to our veterans should go far beyond simply thanking them for their service. We must also make sure that they are being properly cared for and supported when they return home. That is why I—like so many others—was outraged by the news that the VA health system had broken down.

I am pleased that the House and Senate leaders have come together and drafted legislation to address some of the most fundamental issues to this crisis, like access to timely medical care, upgraded facilities, and consequences for misconduct and poor performance.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that future reforms to our VA medical system will include a unified electronic health records system between the VA and the Department of Defense. In today's hyperconnected world, we ought to be doing much better than shuffling large paper files between facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to put partisanship aside and take action to correct this crisis at the VA now.

CONGRATULATING MOOSE LODGE NO. 1568 IN ANGOLA, INDIANA

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Moose Lodge No. 1568 in Angola, Indiana, for its 100th anniversary celebration.

Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1914, the Loyal Order of Moose Supreme Council officially issued a charter for the Angola Lodge, and over the past 100 years, the lodge has grown in membership and has become a recognized service and volunteer organization in the Angola community.

Importantly, the organization's robust community service program has been engaged in countless humanitarian efforts through the lodge's own work, as well as annual donations to other community groups, health support organizations, and local services, such as food banks and homeless shelters.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize, for the record, Mr. Ed Palmer, Angola Lodge's first governor.

In addition, I would like to recognize Tony Culver, Eric Henion, Ron

Nusbaum, and Richard Gens for their recent leadership of the organization, as well as the rest of the Moose Lodge's membership as they begin their next 100 years of service to the Angola community.

Congratulations and happy 100th anniversary.

REPUBLICANS IGNORE AMERICA'S PROBLEMS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days, we will go home, leaving behind a long list of unfinished business, but it is not for lack of trying on the part of Democrats.

We have introduced bills, signed discharge petitions, protested on the steps of the Capitol, and fasted on the Mall, all to try to prompt or at least shame the Republicans into some kind of action, but they are shameless.

Apparently, they just don't care. They don't care if women get paid less, as long as CEOs get record salaries. They don't care if children stack up at the border and families are divided, as long as they can sue the President. They don't care if people struggle to get by on low wages or with no unemployment insurance, as long as corporations can keep their tax loopholes, and they don't care if the environment is raped, as long as big polluters can continue to circumvent regulations that protect our air and water.

Before we go home, we need to show the American people that Congress does care about them, and we need to pass important measures that jumpstart the middle class, so we can say we did something while we were here.

OBAMACARE PREMIUM HIKES ARE HURTING FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the failing Affordable Care Act has proven not to be affordable for American families. Health care premiums have increased with confusing coverage destroying jobs.

When Stepheni from Monetta went to the doctor, she found her ''copay for each therapy session is $250. However, I can be an uninsured self-pay patient and get the same therapy for $85 per visit.''

Connie from Aiken says, ''I was more than shocked to learn what used to be an $89 prescription was now more than $300.''

America's devoted mothers know firsthand of the failure of ObamaCare. Small businesses are hiring more part-time workers than full-time workers because ObamaCare costs are too high. Longtime employees are having hours reduced, putting families at risk.

We must repeal and replace ObamaCare, so that people like Stepheni and Connie receive relief from unworkable mandates.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Best wishes for continued success for Chad Sydnor, Military Legislative Assistant of the Second District, for continued service with Senator JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

LITIGATING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, often, the American people hear the term ''Congress,'' but I think it is important to let all of my colleagues know and remind them what the Republicans will be doing over the next 48 hours.

It is important to know that there will be a resolution—a bill—on the floor of the House, H. Res. 676, and it says that they are looking for the power to intervene in one or more civil actions to file suit against the President, to seek any appropriate relief against the President, the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or employee.

Let me be very clear. The Republicans are looking to sue the secretary who didn't order enough paper clips and indicate that we need to sue the President for not doing his job, while veterans are suffering and need a whole reformation and a new bill, while people are still not getting their unemployment insurance, while we are not able to expand Medicaid to help those who need health care, and while we are not raising the minimum wage.

Democrats want to work for the American people, but Republicans want to sue the secretary, meaning the secretary who orders paper clips, because the President is not doing his job. Let's work for the American people.

LET'S UNITE TO FIX THE VA

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the Sunflower State has a long and proud history of Kansans answering a call of duty to serve their country. From pre-Civil War battles to keep Kansas a free State, to brothers joining arms to fight for democracy in wars around the globe, to today's battles fighting terrorism in remote and dangerous places, Kansans proudly step up to serve when asked, time and time again.

Kansas is now home to more than 220,000 veterans, courageous men and women who have honored our Nation by sacrificing and serving; yet, sadly, our Nation does not always honor them. I have been heartbroken to see how some of our veterans are treated when returning home from service.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time that Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, unite on legislation that would fix the problems in the VA, that would give our veterans in long waiting lines options to receive quicker and better care when needed and legislation that would ensure that adequate resources are available to care for posttraumatic stress disorder and other injuries sustained in today's battles.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans have honored and fought for us. How about we, as a Congress, honor and fight for them.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4315, 21ST CENTURY ENDANGERED SPECIES TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 693 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 693

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4315) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-55. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All

points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York by way of Kentucky, Ms. SLAUGHTER, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4315, the Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act, and makes in order four separate amendments for floor consideration.

In fact, this rule is generous in making all filed amendments which were germane and otherwise met the rules of the House in order. Only four were filed, and they are all made in order, so it is hard to see how anyone could vote against this resolution as not being fair.

The resolution also provides for 1 hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member from the House Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the time. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is actually a package of four bills—H.R. 4315, H.R. 4316, H.R. 4317, and H.R. 4318—which aim to derail the Endangered Species Act.

The four bills are a product of the House Natural Resources Committee's Endangered Species Working Group, a committee working group which had not one Democrat Member on it, so that there was no bipartisan discussion. There is always room to discuss how we can improve legislation, but the negotiations should not be limited to backroom negotiations with a select few from a single party.

It is ironic the bill is entitled ''21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act'' when the process to create the bill was anything but transparent. If the Endangered Species Act needs to be improved in order to better achieve the bill's purpose, then let's have a robust bipartisan conversation in an open forum, which is what we call the committee process.

Now, the package we are considering today, however, does not have any bipartisan support because it would create additional red tape that undermines essential protections provided for the Endangered Species Act.

The Endangered Species Act was passed over 40 years ago to protect imperiled animals and plants from extinction, and it is one of the most important tools we have to ensure our Nation's wildlife is protected for future generations.

These bills today do nothing to continue that wonderful background, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to introduce you to an individual in history by the name of John Gochnaur. John Gochnaur was the shortstop for the Cleveland Indians in 1902 and in 1903. In 1902, he played the entire year, and his batting average was .185, as he committed also 48 errors, but was still good enough to be the shortstop in 1903 as well, where he completed a second season, once again hitting .185, but this time committing a still record 98 errors as shortstop, which means one out of every five times he touched the ball, he threw it away.

□ 1230

John Gochnaur probably has the record now of being the most inept major league player we have ever had in history, never hitting above the Mendoza Line and setting the standard for errors. The worst major league player—which is still quite an achievement to be a major league player—but the worst major league player we have ever had in history hit .185. The Endangered Species Act batting average would be .010 if you round it up. They have had 1,500 species listed, only 12 have actually passed the test and been recovered, for an actual batting average of .008, or .010 if you really want to round up.

The Endangered Species Act, quite frankly, is the most ineffective and inefficient piece of legislation that we have in the history of this country. It does not work. It does not meet its goals. It never has and it never will. The sad part is, though, this act does not go into significant changes to the Endangered Species Act, which would change that batting average. Instead, Chairman HASTINGS has to be commended for getting a group of people to work together that did a study, got testimony, produced a report, and came up with the most basic of reforms that have to be necessary before anything significant can go on past that.

What these reforms are is simply saying, look, if you are going to have an Endangered Species Act, for heaven's sake, make sure that the data that is used to come up with the realization of the program you have is open to the people, it is transparent and it is public knowledge. They are paying for it. You might as well make sure that they have the opportunity to see it.

The President of the United States recognized this when he said in 2008:

> Democracy requires accountability; accountability requires transparency.

And then he quoted Justice Brandeis, who said that ''sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.'' That is the concept that is here. The data used to make these decisions should be available to the public, and presently, it is not.

One of the witnesses in the committee, when it was a full committee markup on this bill, was a long-time biologist by the name Mr. Ramey, who said:

> What are the effects of this lack of transparency on the public when data are not possible or accessible? Legitimate scientific inquiry and debate is effectively eliminated, and no independent third party can produce the results. This action puts the basis of some ESA decisions outside the realm of science.

We have the issue that if there is data making these decisions, people should know about it. It should be transparent. All of the data that they use to make these decisions should be transparent. That is not what is happening today.

In an exchange between the director of Fish and Wildlife and the ranking member, the ranking member asked:

> Okay. But again, why would a scientist wish to withhold that data? I mean, if we gave them the public funds, I guess we could require they publish the data; right? I mean, we could change. We could put that into the language.

The Fish and Wildlife official said:

> Congress could do that.

The ranking member said:

> Okay. That might be something we would want to do. I don't understand why we would go down the path of withholding the data.

That is what this bill does. There are two elements to it. The most significant part is the first of transparency. If there is data that is going to be used, we need to make sure that we have access to that particular data.

This is a bill that was passed almost four decades ago. This is a bill the last time it was addressed I was still wearing saddleback jeans and platform

shoes and my hair had color and it was parted down the middle and it covered more than just my ears. We haven't touched it since that time. They didn't have iPods back then the last time we touched it. It is a new era that requires new information and new data, and there is no reason that should be withheld from the American people, and that is what this bill tries to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), who has had to live with the realities of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this important issue. I rise in support of the rule and H.R. 4315, the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act.

My home State of Montana is called the Treasure State, where we found settlers. In fact, my great-great-grandmother came out and homesteaded in Montana. They found productive ag lands. They found riches of minerals to sustain our industries among the many species that are important to our fishing and hunting heritage.

When the Endangered Species Act became law, Congress committed to helping to sustain our unique ecosystems and our way of life. However, too often ESA decisions are not based on sound science and it is about political science, unfortunately, and the law results in encouraging habitual litigation. The result has been fewer jobs and deteriorating forest health. And, as Mr. BISHOP mentioned, the species aren't actually recovering with a batting average of .008. Frankly, the Endangered Species Act is like a 40-year-old ranch pickup: it once served a useful purpose but is in bad need of repair.

By increasing transparency—and this is about repairing the Endangered Species Act, bringing it forward to the 21st century so it actually delivers the outcomes we all desire, and that is recovering the species versus just listing them. H.R. 4315 begins an important process toward modernizing this well-intentioned but out-of-balance and out-of-date law. I urge the House and Senate to pass it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) because he also is faced with the unique situation, because this is not just a Western issue. This is an issue that affects all of us.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we come here today, one of the things that strikes me—and, of course, I support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4315, because it really strikes a balance and, as part of the working group that has been meeting under Chairman HASTINGS and others, including Mr. BISHOP, dealing with this, as my friend from Utah said, it is an issue that has not been touched in many, many years. There is nothing that really, from our perspective of government, should not be looked at every once in awhile, and especially when you get things such as the Endangered Species Act, which has grown and multiplied and just really expanded to where not only does it affect Western States, but it affects States like Georgia.

To come to the floor today to take issue with a bill that simply permits the concept—and my friend from Utah said we could have actually gone after a lot more than this. We could have taken on the Endangered Species than this. We could have taken on the Endangered Species Act and said: Let's make it better for the 21st century. Instead, we went to targeted reform, targeted aspects of it. We said: Let's look at transparency. Let's look at capping attorneys' fees. Instead of paying pockets of attorneys, it is okay to still sue. We are saying it is okay if you want to sue, but we are not going to pay unlimited amounts just so you can sue for maybe dubious data or devious wins. This is an issue of transparency.

Wouldn't we want to put that money into protecting actual endangered species? Is that not what the Endangered Species Act is about? Is it actually protecting endangered species?

The problem with the Endangered Species Act, however, is that it has expanded to where now the Endangered Species is jobs. It is people. It is the people who are affected by the Endangered Species Act, and all we are saying is let's shine a little light on it. That is a song from back when the ESA was first passed. Let's shine a light. ''This little light of mine, I'm gonna let it shine.'' Well, let's shine a little bit of light on this as we go forward.

A ''no'' vote on this legislation to me is simply a ''no'' vote, whether it is the rule or the bill. It is a ''no'' vote for the status quo. If there is anything that this country is screaming, whether it is Republican or Democrat, they are tired of the status quo, and especially in something like this, because when they hear about it, they don't understand it.

I am going to tell a little story that comes from Georgia, and it involves the Indiana bat. The Indiana bat is on the endangered species list. A few years ago—oh, oh, be quiet. A few years ago, a transmitter went off. It was a little beep. Oh, oh. You might hear it on your phone. It was a beep in southern Tennessee. It only went off one time from everything that we can gather, but that transponder hit said the Indiana bat is moving south.

Well, we expanded the net and said nothing north of Atlanta. All of a sudden we have to start checking for the Indiana bat. We checked. We have looked. I have it on my phone here. I brought one to the floor today. I have a compass. I have a map. I asked this before and nobody stepped forward, but I will take my compass. I will take my map, and if you help me, come to northeast Georgia and find the Indiana bat, there is probably a prize. I will take you to the Waffle House and buy you whatever you want, because so far it hasn't been found. In fact, the last time the Indiana bat was actually seen in Georgia was in Athens in the 1940s.

Now, Athens is home to a wonderful, fine, upstanding institution called the University of Georgia. Go Dawgs. But it was probably found or seen maybe after one of the celebrations of our great victories on Saturday on the gridiron when everyone is partying, and they may have seen the Indiana bat and said, ''There's the bat,'' but we haven't seen it since.

So I am not sure what we are looking for, but I tell you what we are doing. We are paying almost $100,000 on every road project over and above the cost for hard-earned taxpayer dollars on the Federal and State level looking for a bat that may have existed in a fraternity party in Athens 45, 50, 60 years ago because nobody knows. But it came because, listen—those in the gallery, those watching on TV, listen—the transponder may go off, and we may just block off all kinds of areas and say ''pay more'' because the transponder went off.

Now, many times our friends across the aisle say we on our side, we just want business and we don't care about endangered species, we don't care about the environment. There is no other Republican, and when you come to the Ninth District of Georgia—and I know my friend from Colorado feels that his State is beautiful, and it is. It is great. But the Ninth District of Georgia is pretty nice, too. And I want clean water and I want good roads. I want the things that matter because the environment in north Georgia is great. But what I do not want is an overreaching regulation that is not addressed when we are simply asking for transparency. We are simply asking for transparency. When you are asking for transparency, my question not only is where is the bat, but where is the problem. Where is the bat? Where is the problem?

The problem with this bill is nothing. The problem with this bill is it begins to shine light on the things that need shining light on. Disinfectant, I am not sure what we are doing here because right now there is no disinfectant. We need transparency to shine a light. ''This little light of mine, I'm gonna let it shine.'' I am going to let it shine on something that protects taxpayer dollars, that protects transparency and does the things that it is supposed to do.

And by the way, if you happen to be coming by, the problem with this is simply transparency. It protects taxpayer dollars and protects endangered species by using the latest in science and being open to the public.

□ 1245

But let me ask all who may be watching: if you are driving through the great State of Georgia, if you are in north Georgia in the Ninth District, I have got a lot of places for you to come, but when you get there bring your binoculars, bring your compass, bring a map, and if you find the bat I will see you at the Waffle House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from addressing occupants of the gallery.

Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To be clear, the goal of the Endangered Species Act doesn't exist just to get species off the list, it exists to keep species on the planet, and has a tremendous track record of success—99 percent effective at preventing the extinction of species that have been listed on the endangered species list.

There is strong precedent in passing bipartisan Endangered Species Act measures. Last Congress, I was very proud to be an original cosponsor of Mr. BISHOP's Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act, which became law in January of 2013. The Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act facilitated the recovery of four endangered species native to the Upper Colorado River Basin. The bill ensures compliance with the Endangered Species Act for over 200 projects that use water from the Colorado River and provided enough water for agricultural and municipal water use as well.

I salute Representative BISHOP's efforts to pull together a bipartisan group from Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming to work together on that successful modification to the Endangered Species Act.

What we have before us today is not an example of that same bipartisan spirit and open process of work that can build upon, rather than take a step back from, protecting species that are an important part of our ecosystem.

This bill in its current form would not only waste taxpayer dollars and Federal Government agency time by creating additional red tape and bureaucracy, but it is also a waste of our limited remaining time in session. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, with a border crisis, crises breaking out across the Middle East, and yet we are debating a particular change to the Endangered Species Act, which, regardless of its merits, is simply not one of the top two issues, five issues, 10 issues, even top 100 issues that I have heard from my constituents about over the last year.

People wonder why this legislative body is as unpopular as we are, with an approval rating of 12 percent. One need look no further than what we are working on. Rather than addressing the budget deficit or restoring fiscal stability to our country, rather than securing the border and passing comprehensive immigration reform, we are instead discussing a bill that weakens the Endangered Species Act. And regardless of whether Members want to strengthen it or weaken it or modify it—Americans care about jobs, the economy, fiscal responsibility, addressing our border crisis—having problems with the Endangered Species Act is simply not on the minds of most everyday American families. I think most American families think the Endangered Species Act is a fine thing, maybe they think it should move this way or that way or be better or stronger or weaker, but that is not the issue that they want us addressing with our limited time in session.

This is our last week in session in the month of July. In the month of August, this esteemed body won't even meet once. In September, we will come back for 2 or 3 weeks. I don't know—are we going to be discussing endangered species for those 2 or 3 weeks as well?

It kind of reminds me of the historical precedent of Emperor Nero fiddling while Rome burned. Here we are in record deficits, war and threatened wars are enveloping the Middle East with the Islamic state and ISIS occupying much of Syria and Iraq, with the uncertainty in eastern Ukraine and separatists engaged in battle, with the precarious recovery of the economy, with things getting harder and harder for middle class American families to get by and support themselves and their family, and here we are with only 3 days left in session before September discussing relatively minor changes that add another bureaucratic layer of red tape to the Endangered Species Act. It is simply not what the people in my district hired me to fight for them on, and I don't think it is what the people in this country want Congress to do at this point.

There are so many issues that the American people, the people who sent us here to represent them, agree on, where there is common ground.

One example is immigration reform. Polls have shown that 87 percent of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform. Perhaps we found that last 13 percent of people who approve of Congress, maybe it is those same people who don't want to see immigration reform. The only people left who approve of these obstructionist tactics with regard to immigration reform, the tactics which are tearing families apart, hurting our economy, bloating our deficit, and preventing us from securing our border, are an everdwindling percentage of Americans.

Now that we are dealing with this Endangered Species Act, I hope that we can get back to addressing immigration reform. Let us have a vote on comprehensive immigration reform, a vote on raising the minimum wage, a vote on a comprehensive plan to balance the budget. Let's have a real debate and exchange real ideas to move our Nation forward.

There are a number of flaws in this modification of the Endangered Species Act which prevent it from being a true piece of bipartisan legislation with wide support from this body, like I had the opportunity to work on with Mr. BISHOP last session. But I think even more importantly, Mr. Speaker, we just need to ask ourselves why, with days left before Congress adjourns for the summer, are we considering a topic that, while surely worthy of debate, hardly raises to the level of these pressing issues, like our budget deficit, the border crisis, or the Middle East, in which I hope that this body can have a substantive debate around resolving?

While we are here debating a partisan, politically charged bill that threatens to undermine the Endangered Species Act, 32 wildfires larger than 5,000 acres are burning in seven Western States. My district had several last summer, and we are worried about this summer. These fires cover a total of 1.4 million acres and are a serious threat to homes, lives, livelihoods, and health.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014. Already 196 Members have signed a discharge petition to bring this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this rule or the underlying bill.

The Republicans are committed to partisan politics over progress for our country, and this bill is yet another example of that agenda.

In the last 3 days of legislative business before a summer recess of 1½ months, House Republicans are using this valuable time in the people's Chamber to simply pass a bill that obstructs the Endangered Species Act rather than deals with any of the critical issues facing our country.

Congress should be considering legislation to secure the border or deal with the crisis of unaccompanied minors on

our southern border, to balance our budget, to reform our broken immigration system, to deal with wildfires, to raise the minimum wage, to protect workers. But instead, here we are debating partisan changes to a piece of legislation that has, frankly, served us well and our ecosystems well over the prior decades.

We do have an emergency on our southern border with regard to unaccompanied minors from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. We need to have a comprehensive strategy to deal with that and make sure that we are not overwhelmed by people from other countries.

Before we adjourn for recess, Congress could and should address immigration reform. The American people want us to pass bipartisan immigration reform. The bill passed the Senate with over two-thirds majority. That is very rare. Democrats and Republicans came together to pass a commonsense immigration reform bill that more than 80 percent of the American people support, and more than two-thirds of the Senate support it.

If we can schedule that bill for a vote this week, I am confident it would pass right here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have a bipartisan House bill, H.R. 15, that is ready to come to the floor and be voted on, and I believe it would pass.

I am honored to be a sponsor of H.R. 15, the bipartisan immigration reform bill. The bill would create jobs here, reduce our budget deficit, ensure America is more competitive in the global economy, unite families, and secure our borders. Just as importantly, it will make sure that our immigration system reflects our values as Americans, a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants.

House Republicans have refused to allow a vote on immigration reform and it failed to bring forth a single bill to help improve our broken immigration system or our dire crisis at the border. Instead, we are left with time that we could use to debate minute changes that add bureaucracy and red tape to an already encumbered Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can discuss the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014. It is so important to my home State and so many others in the West and Mountain West.

I also will oppose the rule and the underlying bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to talk about the Endangered Species Act here because we need to make sure that the purpose of the Endangered Species Act is not to make sure that the government is always funding the listing and the maintenance of these species, but to make sure that they are healthy enough so that the government doesn't have to do that, in which case, I am sorry, the batting average is still .008. The Endangered Species Act is failing in that effort.

The methods don't work. But we are not discussing the methods here today. We are discussing something that is simply a commonsense solution to how we move forward with the Endangered Species Act.

The Governors understand that as well. I received a letter from the Western Governors' Association, signed by the Governor from Nevada, as well as the Governor from my friend's home State of Colorado, urging us to have transparency in this action, transparency in the Endangered Species Act. It is important that we simply know what is or is not taking place.

The Endangered Species Act, unfortunately, has an impact on real people. It is a regulatory taking by the Federal Government. It impacts real people's ability to use their property, it impacts real people's ability to have jobs and maintain them. To say that talking about this impact on these people is not good enough, that this is not a high enough version, this is not raising to the level, we don't care enough about these people who are impacted by that act, is something we in Congress should never say. It is significant, it is important, and to make commonsense improvements to the Endangered Species Act should be the goal.

Let me explain a couple of different areas in which these reforms are going to be significant and important.

The first one is this tries to cap the amount of money we spend wasted on litigation costs that should be actually going to the enforcement of the Endangered Species Act and recovery of these species. This act tries to set a limit on what an attorney can get for engaging in a petition against the government for the Endangered Species Act. It is mind-boggling to me that in most of the agencies of the government we put caps on what can be obtained in attorney fees who sue the government, but we don't in the Endangered Species Act.

So in San Diego, the Jonas Salk Elementary School was postponed indefinitely. The firm that actually did that postponement so the kids didn't have their school charged the Federal Government six figures, and I promise you the first number in that six figures was not 1.

In the Clinton administration, they were averaging 20 petitions a year on this act. Today, we are averaging 1,200 petitions a year. So obviously, we have a problem, as no one has a total concept of what the total cost of this litigation is or how many full-time employees we are using simply for this litigation, although we do know that the Fish and Wildlife Service allotted in 2013 $21 million and 86 full-time employees just to handling the issue of litigation.

The Ag Department has told us that the litigation cost was the third-largest cost that they were running at that time. We don't have that data. We need to have that particular data, and we also need to put in caps so we are not wasting our money on litigation, we are putting the money in the program where it should be.

That is a significant commonsense element of this particular bill. But the most significant commonsense element is simply saying people should know what data is being used to reach the decisions. The bill itself says the Federal Government shall cooperate—shall cooperate—to the maximum extent practical with the States. That simply is not being done.

Let me give you a couple of examples.

First of all, the dunes sagebrush lizard—a wonderful little lizard, Mr. Speaker, in your home State of Texas—that is trying to be listed by the Federal Government, they were using data from the 1960s, determined that they were locally extinct, the lizard was locally extinct in an area where it flat-out was not extinct. Had they gone through with this listing, 47,000 jobs in this district in Texas would have been impacted by this particular listing, and the data was inaccurate.

The Governor of Idaho asked for a FOIA request dealing with the sagebrush. He got back the emails in the FOIA request, and to summarize those emails that dealt with the national technical team report, the emails basically said: This is our approach—does anyone out there have any kind of data we can use? And if there was no data, then their next step was to use the best guess of the elements of the members who were actually working in that particular department.

That is not the way you make decisions. You collect the data first, make it public, let people know about it, then you create the decisions on where you want it to go. In Colorado, Garfield County, Colorado, actually had to go to court to try to get the department to give them the data they were using for the decisions they were going to try to use on the endangered species in that county, and that simply is not an example of how you cooperate to the maximum extent possible with the States.

We have an issue with prairie dogs in southern Utah. The problem is the Federal Government only counts prairie dogs on Federal lands to determine if they are a viable species or not. Prairie dogs are very abundant on private lands and State lands, to the point that

you can actually get a permit to hunt them on private lands. Notwithstanding the fact that there is an abundance of prairie dogs, the rural electric co-op down there had to spend $150,000 to airlift transmission lines to build a transmission line so they went over Federal habitat for prairie dogs, even though other people hunting prairie dogs happened to be on the private property.

This is silly, this is unrealistic, this should not take place if we were actually having a commonsense approach to it.

The bladderpod up in Franklin County, Washington, was threatened to be listed on the endangered species. A local university came up with its own study that proved the DNA of this bladderpod was no different than another flower that was not endangered in that area.

□ 1300

Nonetheless, the Fish and Wildlife Service rejected that particular piece of data. They ignored it. They said it wasn't peer-reviewed, but the sad part is that they ultimately refused to tell us the data that they were using to reach their own decision. Even when that data was subpoenaed, they refused to comply with that particular subpoena.

We simply have a problem here, in that decisions are being made on the Endangered Species Act without having public access to the data being used to make those decisions, and that is wrong.

That is not the way you run a government. That is not the way transparency has to be. The people of the United States are paying for all this data. They have a right to see what it is. They have a right to look at it. They have a right to question it.

All this bill does is simply make the data that is being used public—so people know exactly what you are making those decisions on—and try to limit the amount that we are spending on needless litigation, so you put some kind of caps on them. That is the first step.

Does that solve all the problems of the ESA? Of course not, but it is the first and most important step. This is a commonsense approach that is rational. It is where we need to go. If we can't get this done, no other reforms of a system that is failing can possibly take place.

I urge adoption of this bill. I support the underlying bill. I urge the adoption of the rule that would do it.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate this is a fair rule, and it is appropriate to the underlying piece of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 693 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3992) to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3992.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 192, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Bucshon	Cramer
Amash	Burgess	Crawford
Amodei	Byrne	Crenshaw
Bachmann	Calvert	Culberson
Bachus	Camp	Daines
Barletta	Campbell	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Cantor	Denham
Barton	Capito	Dent
Benishek	Carter	DeSantis
Bentivolio	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Black	Coble	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Coffman	Ellmers
Boustany	Cole	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Fleischmann
Broun (GA)	Cook	Fleming
Buchanan	Cotton	Flores

Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (TX)
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Hinojosa
Issa
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Pitts
Pompeo
Ryan (OH)

□ 1331

Messrs. GRIJALVA, CONYERS, and GARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 458, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney

Meeks	Quigley	Slaughter
Meng	Rahall	Smith (WA)
Michaud	Rangel	Speier
Miller, George	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Takano
Moran	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Rush	Tierney
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Neal	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tonko
Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Nolan	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Vargas
Owens	Schiff	Veasey
Pallone	Schneider	Vela
Pascrell	Schrader	Velázquez
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Visclosky
Payne	Scott (VA)	Walz
Pelosi	Scott, David	Wasserman Schultz
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Waters
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Waxman
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Welch
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Pocan	Sinema	Yarmuth
Polis	Sires	
Price (NC)		

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Cleaver	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Hanabusa	Pitts
Cassidy	Issa	Pompeo

□ 1339

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1345

LONGSHORE AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3896) to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Clarification Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF RECREATIONAL VESSEL.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 2 of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 902) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (23); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

''(22)(A) The term 'recreational vessel' means a vessel—

''(i) being manufactured or operated primarily for pleasure; or

''(ii) leased, rented, or chartered to another for the latter's pleasure.

''(B) In applying the definition in subparagraph (A), the following rules apply:

''(i) A vessel being manufactured or built, or being repaired under warranty by its manufacturer or builder, is a recreational vessel if the vessel appears intended, based on its design and construction, to be for ultimate recreational uses. The manufacturer or builder bears the burden of establishing that a vessel is recreational under this standard.

''(ii) A vessel being repaired, dismantled for repair, or dismantled at the end of its life will be treated as recreational at the time of repair, dismantling for repair, or dismantling, provided that such vessel shares elements of design and construction of traditional recreational vessels and is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking.

''(iii) A vessel will be treated as a recreational vessel if it is a public vessel, such as a vessel owned or chartered and operated by the United States, or by a State or political subdivision thereof, at the time of repair, dismantling for repair, or dismantling, provided that such vessel shares elements of design and construction with traditional recreational vessels and is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) amend the regulations in section 701.501 of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, by deleting the text of subsections (a) and (b) of such section and replacing it with only the text of the definition of recreational vessel in section 2(22) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) make no further modification to such definition in another regulation or any administrative directive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3896.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3896, the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of 2014, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The bill before us today provides an opportunity to correct a bureaucratic mistake by the Obama administration that is creating a great deal of confusion and anxiety among certain maritime employers, including a lot of small business owners.

For more than 85 years, the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act has provided relief to maritime workers who sustain an injury or illness through work-related activity. Under current law, individuals who repair or dismantle recreational vessels, as well as those who build recreational vessels less than 65 feet long, are covered by an available State workers' compensation program, not the Federal Longshore Act.

It is a bit confusing, especially for maritime employers. In 2009, Congress tried to simplify the law by stipulating any maritime worker providing maintenance of recreational vessels is covered by a State workers' compensation program, regardless of the size of the vessel. Unfortunately, no good deed goes unpunished. The Obama administration issued regulations that further muddied the waters.

Now, employers are forced to engage in a complicated analysis to determine which employees are covered by which workers' comp program, Federal or State coverage. It is a mess that is forcing employers to spend even more time and money managing their workers' comp programs.

As the National Marine Manufacturers Association warns in a letter to Congress, the administration's regulatory approach has led to higher rates that could ''cause businesses to lay off employees or to decide to buy no insurance coverage for their employees at all.''

Members of Congress have raised concerns with the administration's implementation of the 2009 law and to no avail. So we are here once again, Mr. Speaker, clarifying what was already made clear in the hopes the Department of Labor will finally get it right.

H.R. 3896 amends the Longshore Act to define what a ''recreational vessel'' is in order to convey the true intent of the 2009 law. The bill cleans up any regulatory ambiguity and helps ensure maritime employers have access to affordable workers' compensation coverage for their employees.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3896, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, first, as the prime sponsor of this legislation, let me thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and the talented staff on the Education and the Workforce Committee for their leadership and guidance in bringing forth this bipartisan piece of legislation.

This is a project that has been bipartisan from the start, and I think it is unfortunate that my colleague, although speaking in favor of the bill, has chosen to stray from the bipartisan commentary that we should be working together on this legislation.

The bill before us, the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, would reinstate the intent of Congress to ensure that workers in the recreational marine repair industry have adequate workers' compensation coverage. That is the crux of the matter that is before us.

In 2009, Congress passed section 803 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which expanded an existing exception that allowed more recreational marine repair workers to receive workers' compensation coverage under State law, rather than under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. This was necessary because repair workers were simply not buying the more expensive policies and, thus, they were left undercovered. Businesses found that it was difficult for marine underwriters to determine what law their employees fell under. Therefore, section 803 expanded the exception for the recreational marine repair industry from the requirement to purchase higher cost workers' compensation insurance under the Longshore Act. And as part of this provision, a repair worker was required to be covered by the lower-cost State compensation insurance in order to take full advantage of the exception. As a result, more workers would be covered—a good thing.

The Recovery Act, signed into law in 2009, provided the clarity for workers to get the coverage they needed under State workers' compensation laws. And marine insurance underwriters began to write State policies because of this clarity.

Unfortunately, new regulations were issued in 2011 that adopted a definition of recreational vessel which was far more complicated and onerous than the existing law. In so doing, this new regulatory definition ran counter to what Congress intended. It contracted the exception, rather than expanding it to ensure that we could get more employees covered. It muddied the waters of when longshore coverage was required and when the new congressionally mandated exception to use State law applied. And as a consequence, these new regulations caused the underwriters to simply stop writing policies under State law, leaving many recreational workers in the same predicament that they were in before passage of section 803.

The bill that we are considering today establishes a workable definition for a recreational vessel. In doing so, it restores the intent of Congress in the original 2009 enactments to get coverage for these workers under less expensive State workers' compensation insurance. Put simply, this bill is about protecting jobs and keeping workers covered.

In Broward County, Florida, alone, there are over 90,000 jobs in the recreational marine industry. We are the yachting capital of the entire world in Broward capital, particularly in Fort Lauderdale.

These jobs allow workers to buy homes, provide for their families, and contribute significantly to local economies. And 95 percent of these marine businesses have fewer than 10 employees, Mr. Speaker. Congress intended in 1984 and in 2009 to make sure these workers and their families were covered. And this bill keeps that promise. It does so in a bipartisan way. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

At this time, I have no further requests for time. So in closing, I will, again, simply say that I appreciate Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER's support and the work of all of the Members who have significant marine industries in their congressional districts. I am really pleased that we are going to be able to finally make sure that the intent of Congress is carried out and that these marine workers, who are vital and a part of the backbone of so many economies, will have the coverage that they need, rather than forgoing that coverage, and that we will be able to make sure that the employers who employ them will be able to provide less expensive coverage. It is a win-win, and I look forward to seeing it become law.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I couldn't have said it better than my colleague from Florida. Having a district that borders the Great Lakes, having marinas and harbors in my district, having the opportunity to use the resources and to make sure that the intent of Congress is followed and that we have employees and employers who are treated fairly under workers' comp laws, that they are cared for completely at the lowest cost that we intended, with the original intent of Congress, this bill does that.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 3896 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 3896, a bill that would provide an important technical fix to the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to ensure that workers in the recreational repair industry have access to affordable workers' compensation insurance.

In 2009, Congress expanded an exception for the recreational repair industry that allowed workers in that industry to purchase less expensive state workers compensation insurance. However, in issuing regulations for this expanded exception, the Department of Labor modified the definition of a recreational vessel in a way that actually narrowed the exception's scope. The complexity of this new definition has led insurance underwriters to stop issuing workers compensation policies for repair workers, leading many workers to go without coverage entirely.

H.R. 3896 would enact a definition of recreational vessel that more accurately reflects the intent of Congress. The bill is supported by the recreational marine and marine insurance industries and has the support of both the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Education and Workforce Committee.

I want to thank Rep. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Chairman KLINE, and Chairman WALBERG for their support and work on this bill, as well as the committee staff who worked diligently to see it through the process.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3896, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFE ACT CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGE ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4626) to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''SAFE Act Confidentiality and Privilege Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION SHARED BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORS.

Section 1512(a) of the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5111(a)) is amended by inserting ''or financial services'' before ''industry''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 4626, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Safe Act Confidentiality and Privilege Enhancement Act, legislation that I introduced this year.

One of the lessons learned from the financial crisis of the last decade was there were significant gaps in communication between State regulators. Duplicitous mortgage originators were able to move from State to State, virtually undetected, perpetuating fraud on consumers. In response, Congress passed the SAFE Act, which required all mortgage loan originators to be licensed and registered through the National Mortgage Licensing System and Registry. The SAFE Act also set minimum licensing standards that States must meet.

Since its creation in 2008, this registry has allowed State regulators to efficiently search a mortgage loan originator's history and detect previous fraudulent behavior.

The success of this registry has not gone unnoticed. Since April 2012, State regulators have been working with other financial services providers to use the NMLS as a platform for the licensing and registry of other financial services providers, like money service businesses, debt collectors, pawnbrokers, and check cashers. In fact, my home State of West Virginia is now using this platform for their money service businesses.

The use of this national licensing system not only provides efficiencies for the regulated businesses, but it also strengthens consumer protections for the licensed products. The licensing of these providers and the sharing of information between State regulators helps ensure that the consumers are properly protected from fraudulent lending. These registries will allow State regulators to better track fraudulent actors, making it less likely that these fraudsters can obtain a license to do business and harm consumers.

H.R. 4626 provides a minor amendment to the SAFE Act, ensuring that information shared between the State financial services regulators is protected. My legislation simply clarifies that information that is shared with these State regulators receives the same privileged and confidential treatment that is currently afforded to State banking and mortgage regulators. Without this minor change, there will be gaps in the system that could limit information sharing.

During a hearing in the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee 2 weeks ago, West Virginia Division of Financial Institutions Commissioner Sally Cline said: ''This possible gap limits the States' ability to use NMLS as a licensing system for nonmortgage financial services providers. The change proposed by H.R. 4626 addresses this uncertainty and would provide me and West Virginia-regulated entities with certainty that confidential or privileged information shared through NMLS would continue to be protected under State and Federal law.''

□ 1400

Ensuring the confidentiality of the shared information will bolster the effectiveness of these national registries. Expanding licensing to new lines of business and tracking those that are licensed will better protect consumers in my State and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4626, introduced by Chairwoman CAPITO, aims at protecting shared information in the mortgage and financial services industry by putting safeguards on confidentiality.

The bill is very simple. It applies the same confidentiality standards to information shared with State regulators regarding nondepository financial services companies that it enjoyed prior to being entered into the national mortgage licensing system, as long as that information is shared through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System among all mortgage regulators.

In the lead-up to the financial crisis, State regulators and Congress recognized the need to oversee the mortgage industry more comprehensively and efficiently by promoting smart and efficient financial regulations to State-licensed, nonbank financial services providers.

H.R. 4626 helps develop the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System, NMLS, so that regulators retain the ability to keep track of bad actors and provide responsible mortgage providers with greater efficiency and consistency in the licensing process.

H.R. 4626 does not create any additional privilege or confidentiality rights, but the SAFE Act currently provides that information shared through the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System among mortgage industry regulators retains existing State and Federal privilege and confidentiality protections.

The bill makes it so that these privileges and confidentiality protections remain as long as the information is shared with another mortgage regulator.

Mr. Speaker, the bill addresses uncertainty of confidentiality by clarifying that confidential or privileged information shared through the NMLS would continue to be protected under State and Federal law.

This bill will increase the cooperation—and I think this is the key piece—this bill will increase the cooperation between Federal and State regulators while ensuring that the NMLS fulfills its mission to enhance consumer protection and stability in the mortgage lending industry.

This is a good bill. It should be passed by the House of Representatives. It provides for safety for the home mortgage lending system and the licensure system. It provides for cooperation between Federal regulators and State regulators while preserving confidentiality rights of folks who are part of the licensing system, so I think a number of different goals are achieved.

I thank the gentlewoman from West Virginia for introducing this bill. With that, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my friend from Colorado for his support of this and for his service on the committee. He is a great member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reiterate that ensuring confidentiality will bring about more effectiveness with the national registers. We are responding basically to what a lot of our State regulators have asked us to do, to make sure that they better protect consumers and are able to keep the information in a privileged and confidential manner.

With that, I would urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4626.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION AND SUPERVISORY PRIVILEGE PARITY ACT OF 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5062) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege is maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with Federal and State financial regulators, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5062

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. PRIVILEGE OF INFORMATION SHARED BY CERTAIN NONDEPOSITORY COVERED PERSONS.

Section 1024(b)(3) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5514(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''regulators and the State bank regulatory authorities'' and inserting ''regulators, the State bank regulatory authorities, and the State agencies that

licence, supervise, or examine the offering of consumer financial products or services''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The sharing of information with such regulators, authorities, and agencies shall not be construed as waiving, destroying, or otherwise affecting any privilege or confidentiality such person may claim with respect to such information under Federal or State law as to any person or entity other than such Bureau, agency, supervisor, or authority.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit any extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5062, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very similar to the previous bill that we just passed. I rise in support of H.R. 5062, the Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014—we always want to have a nice, long name for everything—and congratulate my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BARR, for their hard work on advancing this legislation.

This bill clarifies that the sharing of information between Federal banking regulators and State agencies that license, supervise, or examine the offering of consumer financial products or services will not be construed as waiving, destroying, or otherwise affecting any privilege or confidentiality right that a person could claim.

Americans are familiar with the concept of privilege. Under current law, legal privilege exists with respect to certain communications, so long as they are not shared with a third party. Attorney-client privilege, for example, is destroyed if the client shares what he communicated to his attorney with his colleague at work.

This legislation provides assurance for financial institutions that privileged information shared between Federal banking regulators and State regulatory agencies will be protected and remain confidential.

This will encourage a greater amount of sharing between institutions and their regulators and will allow our Nation's financial regulators to do their jobs to ensure that our financial institutions are operating lawfully while, at the same time, able to offer consumer credit products that are critical to Americans to finance their everyday purchases and start small businesses.

The Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act is a simple bipartisan bill that clarifies that this is not always the case. I, again, congratulate Mr. BARR and Mr. PERLMUTTER on their work, and I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5062, the Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act, which is difficult to say, but easy to understand. It is to provide for full cooperation, discourse, and communication among regulators while, at the same time, preserving some confidentiality and protections for those whose books and records are being reviewed. I want to thank my friend, Congressman BARR, for working with me on this legislation.

This legislation accomplishes two important things. First, it reduces regulatory burden by ensuring Federal regulators; the CFPB; State banking agencies; and, now, nonbank agencies may coordinate their respective examination schedules. Two, it provides parity to ensure privilege is not compromised when regulated entities turn over sensitive information to their regulators and when that information is subsequently shared among State and Federal agencies.

The Dodd-Frank legislation empowered the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to regulate, supervise, and examine providers of consumer credit and financial products. Among these companies, nonbank financial institutions are typically State-licensed, and their primary regulator is often the State banking commissioner.

However, in 15 States, such entities are overseen by a nonbank agency, such as the attorney general, the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, or a dedicated consumer credit commissioner.

The bill extends the same protections that apply to all consumer creditors to ensure an effective and equitable examination and investigatory process.

Under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, similar protections exist for banks which benefit from express legal protection that provides the confidence and legal certainty to turn over privileged information and documents at the request of their regulators.

This protection encourages regulated entities to comply with the examinations and mitigates their anxiety about disclosing sensitive proprietary information to regulators. Sharing of information will not waive attorney-client, work product, or other privileges recognized under Federal or State law.

Let me be clear, a firm cannot turn over any information to their regulators they choose to benefit from the extension of privilege and shield themselves from third-party lawsuits. Privilege of information only extends to the information requested by the regulators during the course of supervisory examinations per State and Federal law.

Additionally, the bill codifies the CFPB guidance bulletin and regulation that says the ''confidential treatment of information that would provide that any person's submission of information to the Bureau in the course of the Bureau's supervisory or regulatory processes will not waive any privilege such person may claim with respect to such information.''

They go on to state that the rule is intended to ''provide protections for the confidentiality of privileged information substantively identical to the statutory provisions that apply to the submission of privileged information to the prudential regulators and State and foreign bank regulators.''

However, this bill will extend protections to nonbank State regulators, such as the attorney general in Colorado and those regulated entities.

I am a strong supporter and believer in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, but I also know certain technical fixes need to be made. That is why I urge passage of this bill introduced by my friend, Mr. BARR.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the author of the bill and a great member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I appreciate her leadership as the chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee and for her support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5062, the Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act, and I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado, my friend, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for working with me in a bipartisan fashion to introduce and advance this legislation.

In central Kentucky, one of our signature industries is the auto manufacturing industry, and no place exemplifies this proud fact more than Toyota Motor Manufacturing of Kentucky and the plant that is located in my district in Georgetown, Kentucky.

With over 7,300 Toyota team members and their families dependent on these high-quality jobs in that facility, I am committed to doing everything I can to support these Kentucky workers. This legislation does that.

H.R. 5062 is, as my friend from Colorado said, a technical fix, but it is an important piece of legislation because it helps automobile finance companies like Toyota Financial Services, which

finances over two-thirds of new vehicle sales for Toyota customers.

This legislation assures these consumer lenders that when they provide confidential and privileged information to their regulators in the course of supervision, the customary privilege or confidentiality of that information is not waived when shared with the State regulatory agencies.

This is necessary because the unintended fragmented structure of current law leaves privileged and confidential status of this information in question, and that poses a significant risk to auto finance companies.

Consumer access to finance is vital for new car sales and a healthy car market, and a healthy car market is good for the 7,300 automobile manufacturing workers in central Kentucky and all around America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation which, again, simply guaranties that when the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau asks for confidential and privileged information from a captive finance company and then shares that information with a State regulator, that information shared will continue to be treated as privileged and confidential. I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to introduce into the RECORD, speaking of Toyota, a letter dated July 14, to myself and to Mr. BARR; a letter from the Financial Services Roundtable dated July 29, 2014; a letter from Honda dated July 15; a letter from the Conference of State Bank Supervisors dated July 15; and a letter from the American Financial Services Association dated July 25.

TOYOTA MOTOR NORTH AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2014.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. ANDY BARR,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN PERLMUTTER AND BARR: On behalf of the over 30,000 Toyota Team members in the U.S., thank you for introducing H.R. 5062, the Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014. We appreciate your commitment to common sense regulatory reform.

Consumer access to finance is the life blood of new car sales. To maintain competitiveness, automobile manufacturers must have a strong vehicle finance division. These ''captive finance companies'', like Toyota Financial Services, provide tailored financing options to our customers, whether they be individual consumers or franchised dealers. As a captive, Toyota Financial Services exist solely to support the auto manufacturer in selling vehicles and are designed to maintain a long-term, positive, customer relationship with the consumer.

As you know, the Dodd-Frank Act placed captive finance companies under the jurisdiction of the newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). However, in a technical oversight, the Act did not extend the traditional protections of privilege over nonpublic, proprietary information—often disclosed in the course of supervision—to either the CFPB or the state agencies that jointly oversee captive finance companies under the CFPB's jurisdiction.

A strong supervisory privilege plays an important role in supporting an effective and open examination process. Straightforward communications between regulators and the regulated entities are critical, and are made possible by the extension of privilege. Once lost, privilege cannot be restored.

H.R. 5062 corrects this oversight by simply guaranteeing that when captive finance companies produce information to the CFPB, the privileged status of that information is preserved when the CFPB shares the information with state regulation agencies.

At Toyota, we support H.R. 5062 and appreciate your taking the time to learn about this issue.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN CICCONE,
Group Vice President, Government Affairs.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ROUNDTABLE,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ANDY BARR,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PERLMUTTER AND BARR: The Financial Services Roundtable (FSR) commends your sponsorship of H.R. 5062, ''The Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014'', which seeks to ensure the protection of shared privileged information. FSR supports this legislation and urges the House to pass it at the earliest possible date.

The legislation provides assurance for financial institutions that privileged information shared between federal banking regulators and state regulatory agencies will be protected and remain confidential. While the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) has acted to protect confidential information obtained through the supervisory process, this legislation provides additional assurance that when the CFPB shares supervisory information with federal and state regulators—including any state agency that licenses, supervises or examines the offering of consumer financial products or services, that the confidential nature of the information will be protected.

We strongly support H.R. 5062 and urge its passage. Thank you for the consideration, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS CREIGHTON,
Executive Vice President, Government Affairs, Financial Services Roundtable.

HONDA NORTH AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.
Hon. GREGORY W. MEEKS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN CAPITO AND RANKING MEMBER MEEKS: Thank you and the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit for considering H.R. 5062, the Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014, introduced by Congressmen Ed Perlmutter and Andy Barr during today's hearing entitled, ''Examining Regulatory Relief Proposals for Community Financial Institutions Part II.'' Honda supports H.R. 5062 because its passage would ensure the protection of privileged supervisory information shared with and by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) for nondepository financial institutions.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the ''Act'') gave the CFPB the authority to regulate and supervise a number of institutions that provide consumer financial products or services, and to the extent the CFPB may finalize its ''larger participant'' rule for the auto finance market (expected in 2015), we anticipate these institutions will include captive vehicle finance companies like Honda. However, state agencies also regulate captive vehicle finance companies, and it is important to preserve the privilege of supervisory information that regulated entities share with the CFPB, particularly because the CFPB is expected to share such information and coordinate examinations with state regulatory agencies.

Although Congress passed H.R. 4014 in late 2012 (P.L. 112–215) to address the privilege issue, that law only protects the privilege of information in those states where state bank supervisors regulate the consumer financial product or service. However, there are 15 states where a state agency, other than a state bank supervisor, has jurisdiction over the offering of consumer financial products or services; for example, in Texas, the governing body is the Office of the Consumer Credit Commissioner (OCCC). As a result of these differences in regulatory regimes, a question remains as to whether the sharing of supervisory information with those types of agencies would result in a waiver of privilege. H.R. 5062 would clarify that such sharing between the CFPB and prudential regulators, state bank regulatory authorities, as well as other state agencies that license, supervise, or examine the offering of consumer financial products or services, would not be ''construed as waiving, destroying, or otherwise affecting any privilege'' a financial institution could claim. With the CFPB working to develop its supervisory program for ''larger participants'' in the auto lending market, it has become critical to establish parity for the protection of privileged information among all financial institutions.

We hope that the Subcommittee and the Full Committee on Financial Services can take immediate action on H.R. 5062. Thank you again for your consideration. If you need any additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

TARA HAIRSTON,
Government & Industry Relations, Honda North America, Inc.

CONFERENCE OF STATE
BANK SUPERVISORS,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

Representative ED PERLMUTTER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Representative ANDY BARR,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PERLMUTTER AND BARR: On behalf of the Conference of State Bank Supervisors (''CSBS''), I am writing to express our support of your bill, H.R. 5062,

which ensures privileged information is protected when shared with and among regulators. As state regulators responsible for overseeing a variety of depository and nondepository financial services providers, our members strongly support your effort to ensure consistent treatment across regulated entities and regulatory agencies.

Effective and efficient financial regulation requires collaboration between state and federal regulators. Information sharing is the lynchpin of this partnership. The creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (''CFPB'') with jurisdiction over an array of entities regulated at both the federal and state level makes this coordination and uniform treatment of information even more critical. By correcting current gaps in the law, this bill improves regulators' ability to coordinate and provides regulated entities with greater confidence that privileged information provided to regulators retains federal and state legal protections.

As you and your colleagues consider this bill, CSBS recommends improving the bill by adding confidentiality to the covered information protection. Not all states confer privilege upon information shared with regulators. Instead, such information is usually treated as confidential under state law. By adding ''and confidentiality'' after ''privilege'' the bill will address all intended scenarios for protection of sensitive information.

CSBS is committed to working with you to ensure that H.R. 5062 becomes law and urge you and your colleagues to pass the bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. RYAN,
President & CEO.

AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSOCIATION,
JULY 25, 2014.

Re H.R. 5062, ''Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014''

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ANDY BARR,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: On behalf of the American Financial Services Association (AFSA) and our more than 350 members, write in support of your legislation, H.R. 5062, the ''Examination and Supervisory Privilege Parity Act of 2014.'' We applaud your efforts to ensure that the nonpublic, proprietary information of nonbank consumer finance companies remains privileged, wherever applicable, throughout the course of supervision at the federal and state levels. AFSA believes this to be a key step in promoting a candid and efficient supervisory relationship between financial regulators and the entities they oversee.

BACKGROUND ON SUPERVISORY PRIVILEGE

A strong supervisory privilege plays an important role in supporting an effective and open examination process. Straightforward communications between regulators and the regulated entities are critical, and are made possible by the maintenance of privilege. There is precedent for this degree of protection in the longtime practice by bank regulators of asserting the confidentiality of records related to entities under their supervision, and resisting the efforts of third-party litigants to discover such information.

STATUS OF THE NONPUBLIC, PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OF NONBANKS

In establishing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), Congress neglected to extend bank supervisors' historical protections over privileged information to either the CFPB or the state regulators of nonbanks, with whom the Bureau is expected to share information and coordinate examinations. Therefore, the proprietary information of nonbank consumer finance companies does not enjoy the same legal protections as that of banks when disclosed during the course of supervision or other regulatory processes.

Recognizing the importance of promoting effective supervision, Congress enacted H.R. 4014 in December 2012 to protect privileged information disclosed to the CFPB by covered persons. H.R. 4014 amended the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (FDI Act) to add the CFPB to the list of federal regulators with whom no applicable privilege is waived when disclosing privileged information by or about a company under supervision. The FDI Act also permits enumerated agencies to share such privileged information with ''state bank supervisors'' without waiving the privilege. However, in the case of a nonbank institution, federal law currently provides comprehensive protection of existing privilege if and only if the company does business exclusively in states where it is regulated by state bank supervisors, per se.

CURRENT LAW PROVIDES UNEVEN PROTECTIONS FOR NONBANKS

Across the country, nonbank consumer finance companies do not always fall under the jurisdiction of state bank supervisors. In fact, there are at least 15 states where an agency other than the state bank supervisor currently has either partial or full jurisdiction over nonbanks offering consumer credit in that state. This exposes such entities to significant legal risk, given the uncertainty surrounding whether privilege will withstand the transfer of information by the CFPB to, and among, state agencies not specifically referenced in federal law. Such uncertainty will necessarily chill communications between the CFPB and the companies it supervises, undermining the agency's effectiveness.

With the CFPB conducting examinations of state-regulated nondepository financial institutions, it is imperative for Congress to extend all applicable privileges to the range of institutions subject to supervision by the Bureau. Congress should ensure that the same protections apply to all consumer creditors to ensure an effective and equitable examination and investigatory process.

AFSA URGES CONGRESS TO ENACT H.R. 5062

H.R. 5062 would amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege is maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with federal and state financial regulators. AFSA believes this bill will achieve parity in the statutory treatment of nonpublic, proprietary information disclosed by nondepository financial institutions with that of their depository peers, and will thereby promote greater candor with regulators and more efficient regulation. AFSA urges Congress to advance this legislation at the soonest possible opportunity, as covered persons face greater risk to the sanctity of their proprietary information as they disclose more documents to the CFPB with each passing day.

AFSA looks forward to working with you to address this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

BILL HIMPLER,
Executive Vice President, American Financial Services Association.

□ 1415

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Since there are no other speakers on the majority side of the aisle, I will close as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is very similar to the bill we just heard. It really is trying to do two things. One, add the cooperation among Federal and State regulators and potential companies, individuals who might be under examination by those regulators, so that the individual or company who is providing information to the regulators knows that that information maintains protections and confidentiality and privilege in those respects. So we are seeking additional cooperation and additional communication.

This bill that Congressman BARR and I have introduced I think gets to those two key goals. Again, the purpose is so that the regulators understand what it is that they are examining and have as much information as possible, and that they get full cooperation from those that are being examined. So I thank my friend for introducing this bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I again would like to thank the sponsors of the legislation, Mr. BARR and Mr. PERLMUTTER, for working together to seek a fix that will result in good things for the coordination aspect of the State regulators and Federal regulators. I encourage passage of the bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter of support of H.R. 5062.

JULY 25, 2013.

Re Supervisory Privilege for Nondepository Consumer Lenders

Hon. TIM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Ranking Member, Senate Banking Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, House Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: The American Financial Services Association (''AFSA'') and the undersigned automobile finance companies ask for your support to ensure the privilege protection for state licensed and regulated nondepository consumer lenders under the jurisdiction of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (''CFPB'' or ''Bureau'') is fully extended to all such companies and their privileged information—regardless of which state agency happens to be their regulator.

THE DODD-FRANK ACT AND PRIVILEGE

While the Dodd-Frank Act (''Act'') granted the CFPB authority to regulate and supervise a wide range of depository institutions and nondepository consumer lenders, the Act neglected to extend the historical protections over privileged information submitted to bank supervisors, during the course of supervision, to either the CFPB or certain

state agencies with whom the Bureau is expected to share information and coordinate examinations.

A FLAWED SOLUTION

The enactment of H.R. 4014 during the 112th Congress sought to resolve the problem by amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (''FDI Act'') to add the CFPB to the list of federal regulators approved to share information without waiving any applicable privilege. The FDI Act also permits enumerated agencies to share privileged information with ''state bank supervisors'' without waiving privilege. However, in the case of a nondepository consumer lender, H.R. 4014 provides comprehensive protection of privilege if and only if the company does business exclusively in states where it is regulated by state bank supervisors.

Nondepository consumer lenders, however, do not always fall under the jurisdiction of state bank supervisors. According to an informal survey conducted by AFSA, there are at least 15 states where a state agency other than the state bank supervisor currently has either partial or full jurisdiction over the financial activities of nonbanks doing business in that state. For example, in Texas, the Office of the Consumer Credit Commissioner regulates nondepository consumer lenders, and in Colorado, the state Attorney General regulates such entities. In addition, states periodically reorganize their regulatory regimes—raising the issue of whether a nondepository consumer lender currently under a state's banking agency would be protected if the state changes its regulatory regime in the future.

We ask that nondepository consumer lenders are universally afforded the customary and historical protections of privilege when the CFPB and other regulators share such privileged information with any applicable state agency with supervisory oversight over such companies. Our goal is to provide parity among financial institutions of all types, and we do not seek to advantage any class of creditor.

THE NECESSITY OF PRIVILEGE

It is important to emphasize the critical role that privilege plays in supporting a more effective and transparent supervisory process between regulators and regulated entities, as effective examinations are enhanced by the privilege. Indeed, the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit expounded as follows:

The bank examination privilege is firmly rooted in practical necessity. Bank safety and soundness supervision is an iterative process of comment by the regulators and response by the bank. The success of the supervision therefore depends vitally upon the quality of communication between the regulated banking firm and the bank regulatory agency. This relationship is both extensive and informal. It is extensive in that bank examiners concern themselves with all manner of a bank's affairs. . . Because bank supervision is relatively informal and more or less continuous, so too must be the flow of communication between the bank and the regulatory agency Bank management must be open and forthcoming in response to the inquiries of bank examiners, and the examiners must in turn be frank in expressing their concerns about the bank. These conditions simply could not be met as well if communications between the bank and its regulators were not privileged. (Emphasis added.)

We believe the same policy should apply to all consumer creditors to ensure effective and equitable examination and investigatory processes.

PARTIAL PRIVILEGE IS NO PRIVILEGE

The CFPB operates under a rather rigid document called the Enforcement Action Process, which provides that an investigation begins with a civil investigative demand (CID), ''which can easily be 20 or 30 pages long, [and] request almost every imaginable relevant piece of documentary evidence.'' Companies typically have ten days to draft an initial response, and companies like automobile finance companies that operate under all 50 state regulatory regimes could be compelled to provide information that, while privileged in some states in which the company is licensed, would not be in other states.

Once lost, privilege cannot be restored, leaving formerly privileged documents produced to the CFPB subject to discovery by third parties. Moreover, the consequences of privilege waiver can be significantly compounded if a court rules that the privilege was waived not only as to the individual document or documents actually produced to the CFPB, but as to all information relating to that subject matter. The following example illustrates the point: in responding to a CID issued by the CFPB, an automobile finance company might feel compelled to produce an otherwise privileged internal memorandum on Topic X; the CFPB shares this memorandum with non-banking regulators in States A, B and C, all of which regulate the finance company. Assume for this hypothetical that the CFPB and States A, B and C all ultimately agree with the memorandum's conclusions on Topic X, and decide to take no action against the finance company. Under the current framework, the privileged nature of that memorandum is likely lost and any private litigant can seek (and possibly obtain) production of the memorandum. This is bad enough, essentially eviscerating the privilege. Worse is the possibility that a court might conclude that not only is the privilege waived as to the memorandum, but also as to all finance company documents relating to the topic in question.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERVENTION IS PARAMOUNT

Even in an instance where the CFPB may agree to respect privilege in all states, it is unclear whether the Bureau could effectuate that protection. For example, although the CFPB promulgated a rule governing privilege, it has not addressed this particular issue regarding gaps in its statutory authority. Further, even if so inclined, it is unclear that the CFPB could assist a company attempting to defend privilege in a law suit brought by a third party attempting to discover privileged material.

We note that, while the federal banking agencies had similar rules in place, Congress—believing a statute was necessary to safeguard privilege—enacted 12 U.S.C. 1828(x) to ensure that any privileged work product or protected materials that banks disclose in the course of supervision remain privileged as to all other parties.

We respectfully request that the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking Committee act decisively and without delay to establish parity among all lenders by advancing legislation to reaffirm full privilege protection to all types of financial institutions.

Thank you for your consideration. Should you need any additional information, please contact AFSA's Executive Vice President, Bill Himpler, at (202) 466–8616 or bhimpler@afsamail.org.

Sincerely,

Katherine Adkins, General Counsel and Vice President, Legal & Compliance, Toyota Financial Services, Torrance, California;

Stephen P. Artusi, Vice President and General Counsel, World Omni Financial Corp., Deerfield Beach, Florida;

Alan Ray Hunn, General Counsel, Nissan Motor Acceptance Corporation, Franklin, Tennessee (Headquarters), Irving, Texas (Operations);

Doug Johnson, Executive Vice President, Chief Legal Officer, GM Financial, Fort Worth, Texas;

Katherine M. Kjolhede, Executive Vice President & General Counsel, Ford Motor Credit Company LLC, Dearborn, Michigan;

Kevin McDonald, Chief Compliance Officer, General Counsel & Secretary, VW Credit, Inc., Herndon, Virginia;

Catherine M. McEvilly, Compliance Officer, American Honda Finance Corporation, Torrance, California;

Carol J. Moore, Vice President and Executive General Counsel, Hyundai Capital America, Irvine, California;

RJ Seaward, Vice President, General Counsel, Harley-Davidson Financial Services, Chicago, Illinois;

Michelle Spreitzer, General Counsel, Mercedes-Benz Financial Services, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5062, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege and confidentiality are maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with Federal and State financial regulators, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4809) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act, to improve the Defense Production Act Committee, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(2) by striking ''on or after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2009''.

SEC. 2. DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT COMMITTEE IMPROVEMENTS.

Section 722 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2171) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''advise the President'' and inserting ''coordinate and plan for''; and

(B) by striking ''the authority'' and inserting ''the priorities and allocations authorities'';

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The Chairperson of the Committee shall be the head of the agency to which the President has delegated primary responsibility for government-wide coordination of the authorities in this Act.'';

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) COORDINATION OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES.—The Chairperson shall appoint one person to coordinate all of the activities of the Committee, and such person shall—

''(1) be a full-time employee of the Federal Government;

''(2) report to the Chairperson; and

''(3) carry out such activities relating to the Committee as the Chairperson may determine appropriate.''; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''Not later than'' and all that follows through ''Committee shall submit'' and inserting the following: ''The Committee shall issue a report each year by March 31'';

(B) by striking ''each member of the Committee'' and inserting ''the Chairperson'';

(C) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''a review of the authority under this Act of'' and inserting ''a description of the contingency planning by''; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''for events that might require the use of the priorities and allocations authorities'';

(D) in paragraph (2), by striking ''authority described in paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''priorities and allocations authorities in this Act'';

(E) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) recommendations for legislation actions, as appropriate, to support the effective use of the priorities and allocations authorities in this Act;'';

(F) in paragraph (4), by striking ''all aspects of'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting ''the use of the priorities and allocations authorities in this Act;''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) up-to-date copies of the rules described under section 101(d)(1); and

''(6) short attestations signed by each member of the Committee stating their concurrence in the report.''.

SEC. 3. UPDATED RULEMAKING.

Section 101(d)(1) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2071(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''not later than'' and all that follows through ''rules'' and inserting the following: ''issue, and annually review and update whenever appropriate, final rules''.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''determines'' and inserting the following: '', on a non-delegable basis, determines, with appropriate explanatory material and in writing,'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) purchases, purchase commitments, or other action pursuant to this section are the most cost effective, expedient, and practical alternative method for meeting the need.''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) LIMITATION.—If the taking of any action or actions under this section to correct an industrial resource shortfall would cause the aggregate outstanding amount of all such actions for such industrial resource shortfall to exceed $50,000,000, no such action or actions may be taken, unless such action or actions are authorized to exceed such amount by an Act of Congress.''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Section 303(a)(6)(C) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as added by subsection (a)(2), shall not apply to a project undertaken pursuant to a determination made before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 711 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161) is amended—

(1) by striking ''are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate'' and inserting '' is authorized to be appropriated $133,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter''; and

(2) by striking the second and third sentences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on H.R. 4809, as amended, the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill today, H.R. 4809, is a bill to reauthorize the Defense Production Act. Simply put, the Defense Production Act is a bill that is intended to minimize distortions to the economy when it is necessary for the government to take action to aid speedy recovery from large natural or man-made disasters or to protect our servicemen and -women during combat situations. The underlying legislation was used in the recoveries from Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy and used to get new body armor in a hurry for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan when supplies ran dangerously low.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war was when Congress first enacted the Defense Production Act, DPA, granting the President broad powers to access prompt, adequate, and uninterrupted supplies of industrial resources to satisfy national security needs. During that war, the DPA was used to establish a robust national defense infrastructure which later provided the U.S. strength in the ensuing cold war.

Since then, the DPA has been used only sparingly. In recent years, Congress expanded the Executive's use of the DPA to include the protection of critical infrastructure and needs arising from civil emergencies, such as hurricanes, in addition to its defense purposes. When it was enacted, the DPA consisted of seven titles, including some controversial wage and price controls. As the Korean war wound down, four of those titles were allowed to expire. The remainder of the law, the remaining three titles, have operated effectively and without much controversy since.

There are three remaining titles. First, title I, which grants the President authority to meet urgent defense or disaster recovery requirements. This authority essentially allows the government to move to the head of a company's production and delivery schedule and indemnifies that company against breach of contract lawsuits by nongovernment entities.

Title III authorizes the President to use loans, purchase commitments, and grants to encourage contractors to establish or expand industrial capacity and produce items that are essential to the national defense that must be domestically produced but are otherwise not economically attractive enough to have a domestic producer. These programs are usually small, typically less than $15 million, and in the history of the DPA, going back to the Korean war, only three have exceeded $50 million, each of which was specifically authorized by Congress.

Title VII authorizes the President to provide antitrust exemptions for voluntary agreements and joint activities among private entities intended to address production and distribution problems that might impair defense preparedness.

While the first two titles and the rest of title VII expire at the end of September, title VII also contains the authorization of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, which scrutinizes the foreign direct investments process, to ensure that they do not threaten national security. That authority does not sunset. It did not before, and it does not in this reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us reauthorizes the DPA for 5 years and reinstates some modest reforms, the reforms that were in place prior, adds back the guidelines for the use of title III that clarified that title III must be the most cost-effective solution to the defense industrial base shortfall, and it has a requirement for a separate congressional authorization for projects greater than $50 million. As I just described, all previous projects greater

than $50 million since the Korean war have all received congressional reauthorization, so this really is not changing what has been existing practice.

The reforms also stipulate that the use of title III may only be approved by the President and makes some changes to improve the effectiveness of an interagency coordinating committee on the uses of the DPA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill preserves the vital and important authorities of the DPA while preventing any abuse or perception of misuse. It passed the Financial Services Committee in June by voice vote. I would urge immediate passage of this bill and its commonsense reforms.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from California for working on this bill and getting it reintroduced and, hopefully, today getting it passed. I thank him, too, for working with a number of us on certain provisions.

When the Defense Production Act was initially enacted in 1950 in the aftermath of World War II and in the midst of the Korean war, it contained seven separate titles that granted broad authority to the President to control national economic policy. Following the Korean war, three of the Defense Production Act titles remain in effect and two of the act's titles need to be reauthorized.

First, there is title I of the DPA, which authorizes the priority treatment of contracts and orders to meet urgent defense or readiness requirements. It does so by allowing the government to move to the head of a company's line of production and delivery schedule while indemnifying the company against breach of contract lawsuits by nongovernment entities.

Title III is the other key provision of the law that Congress needs to reauthorize. This title empowers the President to support the private sector through the use of financial incentives, including loans, guarantees, purchase commitments, and grants to ensure that the U.S. domestic industrial base has the production capabilities that the President has determined are essential to our national security.

Congress has reauthorized the DPA on a bipartisan basis approximately 50 times since its first enactment in 1950. It has been used by all administrations since President Truman during both peace and times of conflict to support the national security programs of the United States of America.

The measure includes several reforms. First, the measure would restructure and refocus the Defense Production Act Committee, an interagency advisory body on the priorities and allocation authorities contained in title I. Agency heads are also required to issue and review rules that would establish the standards and procedures by which title I authorities can be used.

In closing on this subject, let's be very clear. The Defense Production Act is a law of great national significance. It has been reauthorized many times. It provides powerful authorities for purposes of our national defense and security. I urge the adoption of the Defense Production Act as we have modified it.

I would state, Mr. Speaker, we have other bills very similar to this that need to be acted on by the Republican majority, starting with the Export-Import Bank, which itself has been reauthorized numerous times by both parties, whoever was in the majority. Yet the Export-Import Bank is sitting there holding fire when it is a benefit—a strong benefit—to this country and to the businesses of this country so that we can be on even footing with all of the other countries competing for business around the world.

Secondly, the TRIA, which is the Terrorist Risk Insurance Act, it too is sitting there without any action having been taken by the Republican majority of this Congress. It too has been reauthorized on several occasions, and it benefits this country in many ways and needs to be acted upon. But instead, the Republican majority has chosen to bring a lawsuit against the President of the United States, which has absolutely no merit, and has given their lawyers in the proposed legislation a blank check to sue the President when we have important legislation, whether it is the Export-Import Bank, terrorist risk insurance, looking at immigration issues, comprehensive immigration reform, transportation, we have many, many items that need to be addressed. But instead, we are going to take up litigation that is unheard of in the history of the United States against the President of the United States because he has taken actions when this Congress has sat silent.

This bill, the Defense Production Act, I thank my friend from California for bringing it. It needs to be passed. I urge its passage. So many other things need to be passed and not just ignored in the face of doing something so political as suing the President of the United States.

I urge my friend from California, I urge the Speaker to dispose of what we are supposed to take up tomorrow or Thursday in this lawsuit against the President of the United States for taking steps that we here in Congress apparently are refusing, and I would say to the Republican majority, you are refusing to bring up and have heard and voted on—transportation issues should be a bipartisan matter; immigration should be bipartisan; the Export-Import Bank which benefits our companies and our businesses and has been authorized since the 1930s, makes money for the country, that should be brought up. We should be bringing up the Terrorist Risk Insurance Act so that companies across the country know in the terrible event of another attack like we had on 9/11 that there is a backstop for them and their properties and their people. But, no, we are taking up litigation, not legislation.

□ 1430

That is just wrong, Mr. Speaker. I can't object to it in any greater terms. It just makes no sense. It does not advance the ball for America. It doesn't advance the ball for middle America. People are looking for jobs and want to see that their kids go to college and want to have retirement security. It is just a political statement when we could be doing a lot more.

This Congress can do so much more. Passage of this Defense Production Act is doing something, and I thank my friend for that. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me thank the gentleman from Colorado and my friends on the other side of the aisle for their work on and support of this Defense Production Act, for which I will call the vote in just a moment.

But as to comments that my friend from Colorado made, first of all, I think he knows I agree with him on Export-Import Bank and on terrorism risk insurance, so you are not going to have any debate from me there.

Clearly later this week, the action to sue the President will come on the floor. There will be plenty of time to debate on that.

Just one comment I would like to make. You mentioned bipartisanship, and I agree with you, there is not enough around here and there needs to be. In the end, you can never move the country forward sustainably without getting something that has support on both sides. So I agree on that.

But when I first got here almost 10 years ago, George W. Bush was President, and I saw a number of your colleagues, the Democrats, had a button that said ''article I.'' I am like, what is that? They said: Well, this is to show that we, Congress, are article I in the Constitution, the executive branch is article II, and we believe that President George W. Bush is treading upon the rights enumerated in the Constitution that rightly belong to the first branch of government, Congress.

Now, we, Republicans, believe that the current President, President Obama, is doing the same thing.

Here is a place where I think maybe we can have some bipartisanship at some point. When George W. Bush was President you thought he went too far. Many of us probably did too, but didn't say so because of sort of party loyalty.

Now we believe this President is going too far. I would wager to guess that some of your side believe that too but aren't saying so because of party loyalty.

At some point, Republicans and Democrats in this institution, in this body, need to protect its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend.

The gentleman from California is absolutely right that to have sustainable movement of this country forward, it does take both sides of the aisle—Republican side of the aisle and Democratic side of the aisle.

I would suggest to my friend that Democrats did not have control of the House, did not bring legislation, or litigation, if you will, against President Bush. And I would suggest to my friend, take a look at the number of executive orders that Ronald Reagan issued, that Bill Clinton issued, that George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush issued, compared to President Obama.

I appreciate your willingness to let me speak and just get that in.

Again, I urge the passage of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I understand the point. Some individual Members, I believe, did introduce—the House didn't per se—but did introduce some charges, if you will, against President Bush.

The point I am simply trying to make is, each side of the aisle has felt that the rights under the Constitution of this institution have been trodden upon by a President of the other side of the aisle. What the right response to that is and what the right remedy to that is we can debate. I am retiring at the end of this year, so I am leaving all of this for you all. But as we grow the executive branch, as we add more departments, and we add more things, we continue to concentrate power there and take it away from here.

This place, for all its faults and foibles, and it has plenty of them, it is accountable to the people. It is accountable to the people in a way that the executive branch can't ever be. That is why we on a bipartisan basis, if it is not with this President then with the next one, we need to start clawing some of those rights and responsibilities back to article I of the Constitution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank again the cooperation and involvement of my friends on the other side of the aisle for the Defense Production Act, and I would ask for its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4809, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS AND EFFECTIVE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4709) to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION PROCESS UNDER CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FACTORS AS MAY BE RELEVANT TO AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) In this section, the phrase 'factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety' means factors that are relevant to and consistent with the findings contained in section 101.''.

(2) IMMINENT DANGER TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY .—Section 304(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 824(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(d) The Attorney General'' and inserting ''(d)(1) The Attorney General''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) In this subsection, the phrase 'imminent danger to the public health or safety' means that, in the absence of an immediate suspension order, controlled substances—

''(A) will continue to be intentionally distributed or dispensed—

''(i) outside the usual course of professional practice; or

''(ii) in a manner that poses a present or foreseeable risk of serious adverse health consequences or death; or

''(B) will continue to be intentionally diverted outside of legitimate distribution channels.''.

(b) OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN PRIOR TO REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION.—Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 824) is amended—

(1) by striking the last two sentences in such subsection;

(2) by striking ''(c) Before'' and inserting ''(c)(1) Before''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) An order to show cause under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) contain a statement of the basis for the denial, revocation, or suspension, including specific citations to any laws or regulations alleged to be violated by the applicant or registrant;

''(B) direct the applicant or registrant to appear before the Attorney General at a time and place stated in the order, but no less than thirty days after the date of receipt of the order; and

''(C) notify the applicant or registrant of the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan on or before the date of appearance.

''(3) Upon review of any corrective action plan submitted by an applicant or registrant pursuant to paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall determine whether denial, revocation or suspension proceedings should be discontinued, or deferred for the purposes of modification, amendment, or clarification to such plan.

''(4) Proceedings to deny, revoke, or suspend shall be conducted pursuant to this section in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5. Such proceedings shall be independent of, and not in lieu of, criminal prosecutions or other proceedings under this title or any other law of the United States.

''(5) The requirements of this subsection shall not apply to the issuance of an immediate suspension order under subsection (d).''.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON EFFECTS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES ON PATIENT ACCESS TO MEDICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Director of National Drug Control Policy, shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate identifying—

(1) obstacles to legitimate patient access to controlled substances;

(2) issues with diversion of controlled substances; and

(3) how collaboration between Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies and the pharmaceutical industry can benefit patients and prevent diversion and abuse of controlled substances.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The report under subsection (a) shall incorporate feedback and recommendations from the following:

(1) Patient groups.

(2) Pharmacies.

(3) Drug manufacturers.

(4) Common or contract carriers and warehousemen.

(5) Hospitals, physicians, and other health care providers.

(6) State attorneys general.

(7) Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

(8) Health insurance providers and entities that provide pharmacy benefit management

services on behalf of a health insurance provider.

(9) Wholesale drug distributors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is important and necessary legislation to bring greater clarity to the requirements for the safe and secure distribution and dispensing of controlled substances to combat the abuse of prescription drugs. H.R. 4709, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act, introduced by my colleagues, Representative TOM MARINO of Pennsylvania, MARSHA BLACKBURN of Tennessee, PETER WELCH of Vermont, and JUDY CHU of California, will facilitate greater collaboration between industry stakeholders and regulators in an effort to combat our Nation's prescription drug abuse epidemic.

Safeguarding our prescription drug supply chain is important to protect against diversion and abuse of prescription medicines. H.R. 4709 will clarify key terminology in the Controlled Substances Act to give registrants a better understanding of their responsibilities under the law.

Further, the bill will allow DEA-registered companies to submit corrective action plans to address potential violations in the absence of an imminent danger, creating a more robust and meaningful dialogue about addressing drug diversion.

That should in turn curtail unnecessary supply chain disruptions that adversely affect patient access to much-needed medications.

Additionally, the legislation requires that a report be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of HHS in consultation with the DEA and other government and industry stakeholders about how collaboration between enforcement agencies and industry can benefit patients and prevent diversion and abuse.

Equally important, H.R. 4709 will improve enforcement efforts regarding the complex and challenging problem of prescription drug diversion and abuse. It will ensure patient access to necessary medications by creating a more collaborative partnership between drug manufacturers, wholesalers, retail pharmacies, and Federal enforcement and oversight agencies such as DEA and the FDA.

After hearings last April in the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which I chair, we heard that a more feasible and practical solution to this serious problem of drug diversion and abuse is attainable, and those provisions are included in H.R. 4709. The legislation is supported by the National Community Pharmacists Association, the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, the Healthcare Distribution Management Association, as well as the Alliance to Prevent the Abuse of Medicines, among others.

I would like to acknowledge and thank my good friend, Congressman TOM MARINO, for his excellent work with this legislation. My friend from Pennsylvania is a former district attorney and former U.S. attorney. He understands the importance of law enforcement in this area. But he also understands that we will be more effective if we proceed in a collaborative, communicative, and transparent fashion. He has done excellent work here.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this legislation, we will be giving our Nation's law enforcement additional tools while protecting our patients and securing our drug supply chain in a reasonable, commonsense way.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and vote for H.R. 4709.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: On June 10, 2014, the Committee on Energy and Commerce ordered reported H.R. 4709, the ''Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014.'' As you know, the Committee on the Judiciary was given an additional referral on this measure upon introduction. As a result of your having consulted with the Judiciary Committee concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of H.R. 4709.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4709 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4709, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4709, the ''Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014.'' As you noted, the Committee on the Judiciary was given an additional referral on this measure upon introduction, and I appreciate your willingness to discharge the Committee from further consideration of H.R. 4709.

I agree that this action is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and you will have my support for any such request.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4709 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I endorse everything that the chairman just spoke about.

I am proud that the House is taking up this bipartisan action today to address an issue that impacts each of our districts, and that is prescription drug abuse.

I want to thank especially Mr. MARINO, who is using his experience to bring this legislation to the floor, and it was great working with him, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and also with Congresswoman CHU.

Vermont is facing an opiate epidemic. That is true in many States around the country. In addition to the alarming increases in heroin abuse, we have had admissions in Vermont for prescription drug abuse that have increased 361 percent from 2005 to 2013.

As we have seen in my State, we are most effective in dealing with this public health crisis when everybody who has a stake in this works together. That is the collaborative approach that Mr. PITTS mentioned. That has got to be the providers, the public health officials, law enforcement, distributors, pharmacists. They have all got to come together to tackle this problem.

If we don't have flexibility and collaboration we can do something that

might make enforcement tighter, but access to legitimate prescription drugs tougher. So the goal here is to get the balance right. We want to help folks get access to the prescription medication that they need. It alleviates suffering and it eliminates pain, but we want to make sure that the enforcement is solid so there isn't the abuse.

Today, distributors, like Burlington Drug Company in Vermont, and local pharmacies face very unpredictable enforcement from the DEA. DEA has a job, but so do the drug distributors and the doctors. That inconsistent enforcement—that unpredictable enforcement, I should say—can lead to disruptions in the supply chain, which end up limiting patient access to legitimate prescription drugs.

□ 1445

The Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act will encourage collaboration between law enforcement, members of the supply chain, and public health providers and officials, while ensuring that patients have the access to the treatment their doctor has prescribed.

So this is, as you mentioned, Mr. PITTS, common sense. It is collaboration. It is working together and having mutual respect that each entity in this process has its own job to do, but for all of us to do it together, we have got to work together and communicate.

It has been great to work with Representatives MARINO, BLACKBURN, and CHU on this bill. I thank them for their leadership. I want to also thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their leadership, and, of course, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PITTS.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4709.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and another leader on this issue.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his work on this issue and for working with Congressmen MARINO and WELCH and Congresswoman CHU as we sought to move the issue forward. We also thank Chairman UPTON for working with us as we brought the issue forward.

The gentleman from Vermont mentioned the epidemic and the widespread abuse that is taking place in prescription drugs and the need to do something about that. We all agree on this, and here are some stats that really back this up and show why it has become an epidemic.

In 2013, more people died in the U.S. from prescription drug abuse than from heroin and cocaine combined. Deaths involving prescription pills quadrupled between 1999 and 2010.

In 2012, the number one cause of death in 17 States was prescription drug abuse. In 2008, more than 36,000 people died from drug overdoses. Most of these deaths were caused by prescription drugs. That 36,000 number isn't a number to be taken lightly. It is associated with names and faces and serves as a stark reminder to every family member who has lost a loved one to an overdose.

More can and must be done to treat this growing epidemic. That is why we have all worked together on H.R. 4709, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014. Our bill seeks to facilitate greater collaboration between industry stakeholders and regulations in our Nation's effort to combat prescription drug abuse.

There are three things that we set out to accomplish in this bill. Number one is to provide clarity to the phrase ''imminent danger to the public health or safety'' to ensure the law is crystal clear for both the DEA and legitimate businesses who want to understand what the rules of the road are, so they can do the right thing. Definitions matter and have real consequences.

Number two is require the Secretary of HHS to consult with industry players in the pharmaceutical supply chain; key regulatory agencies; Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies; and public health experts to create a report to come to Congress within 1 year of enactment.

Number three is establish procedures for companies registered with the DEA to work together to develop corrective action that addresses concerns and clarifies key terminology in the Controlled Substances Act, so that everyone knows and has a better understanding of how to comply with the law.

This bill will not solve every problem that prescription drug abuse faces. It is one that is important that we take this meaningful step. It is a good step.

Congressman MARINO, who has led on this issue, is to be commended. We have appreciated the opportunity to work with him to address what is an epidemic in so many of our communities and States.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4709, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014. This bill would help prevent prescription drug abuse, establish clear and consistent enforcement standards, and ensure patients have access to needed medications by promoting collaboration between government agencies, patients, and industry stakeholders.

It will help drug distributors and others work with the Drug Enforcement Administration to keep controlled substance prescription drugs out of the hands of drug abusers. It will also help them avoid inappropriately limiting legitimate access to these same drugs by patients who need them. Achieving that balance is a difficult challenge.

H.R. 4709 would provide definitions in the Controlled Substances Act for the phrases ''consistent with the public health and safety'' and ''imminent danger.'' It also would require the DEA to provide registrants an opportunity to submit an action plan to correct any violations of law or regulation for which DEA is considering revoking or suspending their controlled substance.

It would require FDA, in consultation with DEA, to submit a report to Congress 1 year after enactment on collaborative efforts to benefit patients and prevent diversion and abuse of controlled substances.

I want to commend Energy and Commerce members MARSHA BLACKBURN and PETER WELCH, as well as Representatives TOM MARINO and JUDY CHU, for their sponsorship of this bipartisan legislation. Of course, I also thank my colleagues, Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and all other staff who have all been instrumental in bringing H.R. 4709 to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the leader on this issue.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, in early 2013, a pharmacist told me about problems he was having accessing necessary prescriptions for his customers, many of whom were older cancer patients suffering with chronic pain.

What started out as a simple conversation with a constituent soon turned into serious concerns about problems in the prescription drug supply chain, problems that we aim to address here today by passing H.R. 4709, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act.

Any legitimate business involved in distributing or dispensing prescriptions welcomes appropriate oversight and regulation. Further, we know these businesses value a collaborative working relationship with agencies like the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Manufacturers, distributors, and pharmacies alike are on the front lines every day in the fight to end the prescription drug abuse epidemic. They are making efforts to educate prescribers and patients about the safe use and disposal of prescriptions and working to implement prescription drug monitoring programs that will reduce the illegal diversion of powerful opioid pain relievers.

Despite a strong commitment to being part of the solution, distributors and pharmacists are finding that the unnecessary adversarial regulatory environment created by the DEA is putting effective enforcement outcomes in jeopardy.

As a former district attorney and United States attorney, I have fond memories of working with DEA agents to put away drug dealers. To say that I have the highest regard for the DEA and the work they do does not even begin to convey my respect for the agency and its front-line employees.

I actually went with agents and busted down drug houses. They were watching my back. I trusted them then, and I trust them now. That is why I am so passionate about this subject and why I think it is necessary to pass H.R. 4709 today.

This bill will bring much-needed clarity to critical provisions of the Controlled Substances Act. In doing so, we will ensure that the DEA's authorities are not abused and threatened by future legal challenges; foster greater collaboration, communication, and transparency between the DEA and supply chain; create more opportunities to identify bad actors at the end of the supply chain; and, most importantly, be certain that prescriptions are accessible to patients in need.

We are all in this together. We cannot enforce our way out of this epidemic. Education, treatment, and enforcement are all critical to addressing the problem, but so is collaboration.

The clarity that H.R. 4709 brings will ensure that the current regulatory culture evolves into one that rewards cooperation and brings more successful diversion control efforts in the future.

I want to thank my friend, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, for working closely with my team and me to develop the bill. I want to thank our champions on the other side of the aisle, Dr. JUDY CHU and Representative PETER WELCH, for their leadership and efforts to bring us here today.

We could not have achieved this without the efforts of Chairman PITTS and Chairman UPTON and their staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I also must thank House Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE for his forthright suggestions that made this a more effective measure worthy of consideration by this House.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4709, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

21ST CENTURY ENDANGERED SPECIES TRANSPARENCY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4315.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 693 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4315.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1457

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4315) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring before the House legislation that would help update and improve the Endangered Species Act, a law that was passed initially 40 years ago, but has not been reauthorized since 1988.

H.R. 4315 melds together four commonsense and focused bills introduced earlier this year by myself and my colleagues, Mrs. LUMMIS of Wyoming, Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. While respecting the original intent of the ESA to conserve species, this bill would help make the law more effective for both species and people.

□ 1500

Because of the more than 500 ESA-related lawsuits that have been filed against the government during this administration alone, it has become clear that costly litigation is not only driving ESA priorities but that litigation has become an impediment to species recovery.

I should also note that, regardless of what some groups are saying, this is not a comprehensive bill. It is four sections that aim to increase transparency; to enlist greater consultation by States, localities, and tribes; and to reduce taxpayer-financed attorneys' fees to help invest more funding in actual species recovery.

For example, section 2 of the bill requires data used by Federal agencies that decide which species should be added to the threatened or endangered list to be publicly available and accessible through the Internet. What a remarkable idea—transparency. The last significant update to the ESA was when the Internet was in its infancy stages. Posting data supporting key ESA decisions online will greatly enhance transparency and data quality. The American people should be able to access such data before Federal listing or delisting decisions are final.

It is troubling that hundreds of sweeping listing decisions by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service cite unpublished studies, professional opinions, and other sources that are inaccessible to the public, yet this data would be used to regulate the very people who don't have access to this information. This secrecy goes against the grain of good science and transparency. Data transparency is not only good for the American public, in that it makes our government more accountable, but it is also good for species because it allows for an open conversation about improving species science.

As biologist Rob Roy Ramey testified at a Natural Resources Committee hearing:

> When the data are not publicly accessible, legitimate scientific inquiry and debate is effectively eliminated, and no independent third party can produce the results. This action puts the basis of some ESA decisions outside the realm of science, and species recovery is no better off. Withholding data does not further the goal of species recovery.

I couldn't agree more with that statement, especially when over 700 species could potentially be listed over the next few years throughout the country. These potential listings are due to this administration's megalawsuit settlement with the Center for Biological Diversity and WildEarth Guardians, groups, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that have filed hundreds of lawsuits against the government at taxpayer expense.

One of these species could include the northern long-eared bat, and I have a map here to show. This listing could impact 39 States. As you can see, Mr. Chairman, it is nearly all of the Eastern States. Information on data when it comes to this species listing can only help and not hurt. The bill before us

today fosters the release of this information.

Section 3 of the bill would enhance State, local, and tribal involvement in ESA decisions by requiring that, before any listing decision is made, the Federal Government must disclose its data to States affected by such actions. In addition, section 3 ensures that data from local, State, and tribal entities—those are the entities that are closest to the ground, Mr. Chairman—be factored into ESA listing decisions.

Section 4 would require the administration to track and make available online the costs, in time and in resources, to the taxpayers as a result of ESA-related litigation.

Finally, section 5 would seek to reduce taxpayer-financed attorneys' fees to help ensure Federal resources are focused more on species protection and recovery than on lucrative legal fees for serial litigants. Such fees now, Mr. Chairman, are awarded as high as $600 an hour. This provision in section 5 puts in place the same reasonable hourly caps on attorneys' fees used in another Federal law—the Equal Access to Justice Act—which deals with veterans, Social Security disability, and other such claims.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4315 starts with modest, sensible updates to the ESA by promoting transparency, greater State, local, and tribal involvement, and by bringing ESA litigation fees in line with another Federal law.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today just before Congress goes on a 5-week recess for the entire month of August and the first week of September. During that time, we will celebrate Labor Day. There are a lot of reasons to celebrate Labor Day, but it has particular context to this debate today.

One hundred years ago this Labor Day, Martha died.

Now, perhaps not everybody here knows about or has heard about Martha. Martha was the last passenger pigeon. She died in the Cincinnati Zoo. None of us remember passenger pigeons, but they were in numbers so great—billions—that they would darken the sky for hours or days as they passed. Yet, within a very short period of time, they became extinct. I believe she is stuffed and on display at the Smithsonian. I think they have a special exhibit on this that I would recommend to people to remember the way things used to be.

We did then, 50 years later, pass the Endangered Species Act. So this is kind of symmetrical in that, 100 years ago, there was the last passenger pigeon, and 50 years later, we adopted a law to try and preserve species. I think the most eloquent words I have ever heard on endangered species were from Justice Douglas on the Mineral King decision. This doesn't do all of his decision justice, but here is just one sentence:

> When a species is gone, it is gone forever. Nature's genetic chain—billions of years in the making—is broken for all time. Conserve water. Conserve land. Conserve life.

Then he went on to speculate about what might be lost with any individual species, what potential it might have had. Could it cure cancer? If we lose these species, who knows?

So Congress 50 years ago—in a very different time and in a very bipartisan way—passed the Endangered Species Act.

Today, we have before us yet another missed opportunity. I am not going to look at the Endangered Species Act and say it is perfect. It isn't. I believe a 50-year-old law could use some revision. A lot has been learned. A lot of real science has changed in the interim, in particular, the individual listing of species, and particularly when they occupy the same space. It becomes very problematic, as opposed to taking more of an ecosystem-based approach. There are some who are modifying the whole idea of how we deal with critical habitat, but that is not before us today. It wasn't considered by the so-called ''working group'' of the committee or ''special group'' or whatever it was.

They concluded that the Endangered Species Act is a failure because it hasn't recovered enough species. They did leave out a little fact that 90 percent of the species that are listed are recovering at the rate specified in their Federal recovery plans. This doesn't happen instantaneously. There are years of degradation of environment, years of overharvesting or of overhunting. Those things don't get changed in a short period of time, but 90 percent are on target. They left that out probably because it didn't support their conclusion that the act just isn't working at all.

We have an estimate, actually, that without the Endangered Species Act passed by a more enlightened Congress—bipartisan—50 years ago, there would be 227 species that would have gone extinct since the law's passage. They include gray wolves—although, there are some trying to turn around that recovery effort, including some in this administration—green sea turtles, humpback whales, and, of course, the iconic bald eagle. Without the Endangered Species Act, they, in all probability, would all be extinct, a memory for our generation—gone.

As I said, it is not perfect, and I think there are changes we could make. It is truly a deliberative process in the committee, but that wouldn't be just a small group from one side of the aisle going around the country, holding so-called ''hearings'' or ''listening sessions.'' We could assure greater transparency in ways that weren't considered and won't be proposed here today. We could promote better the use of best science. We could improve cooperation and coordination with the States that are committed to species protection and recovery.

However, none of the legislation before us will do that. It will do nothing to improve species recovery. It will do nothing to improve the science underlying listing decisions. Instead, actually, contravening what the Republicans espouse to wish, these bills will, instead, increase the amount of red tape that is involved, create more reporting requirements, divert agency resources from recovery efforts, and most oddly—and, I think, perhaps, it is the oddest and most objectionable and nonsensical part of this legislation—it will deem that any data submitted by any Native American tribe, any city, county, or State, will be deemed to be the best available science.

Now, there are 16,000 counties in America. Let's say a couple of them come to a different conclusion. Suddenly, the agency is confronted with: we have the best available science from this county, and we have the best available science from this county, and we have the best available science from this county. Hmm. Wow. Haven't we created an unbelievable potential for litigation over any decisions that are made given that mandate? I think we have. Of course, that may be why they go on later in the bill to limit attorneys' fees—because they are anticipating that there will be a huge proliferation of litigation, and they want to mitigate the costs of the problem that they are going to create with this nonsensical ''this is the best available science.'' I think it is going to create a lot of tension, potentially, between States and counties—rural counties and urban counties—because they are all vying to submit the best available science.

Here we are, yet again, taking up time on the floor, and I guess we need to do that before we get to real things, like the suing of the President of the United States despite the fact that courts have definitively decided we can't do that. We have political tools, and it is a controversy, but that is not before us today—that is tomorrow—so we are trying to kill time to build up to that end just before we go off on recess. But I am going to raise another topic, and it is a bit sensitive.

About 12 years ago, I had massive fires burning in my district—the Biscuit Fire—and the committee just happened to be holding a hearing on wildfires. It devolved into the usual partisan ''you go to your corner, and I will go to mine. We need to do a forest supplemental. We need to do this.'' As sometimes I do, I expostulated a bit in the committee, and I went and used my entire 5 minutes to say how wrong I

thought this was and that I thought fires were very bipartisan in their destruction and that we should cut it out.

A few Members—oddly enough, from very different perspectives—came to me afterwards. That would have been GEORGE MILLER. It is predictable that GEORGE would side with me, but also we had Scott McInnis, we had John Shadegg, and, ultimately, we had GREG WALDEN involved. We sat down, and we hammered out something that, ultimately, didn't pass through the House, but our framework was adopted by the Senate—HFRA. Then it came back to the House and was adopted. It was an attempt to expedite fuel reduction and prevent the intensity of future fires.

I look at that as a model of how we should deal with fires. We do need to do more fuel reduction work, and we do need to do more preparation and prepositioning, but we also have to fight the fires that are burning today.

□ 1515

Now there is the rarest of rare things in Washington, D.C., even rarer than the rarest endangered species, which would be a bill which is bipartisan. I guess a lot of people don't know what that means anymore.

It means it is supported by both Democrats and Republicans, bicameral, by both Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate in substantial numbers, and is supported by the President of the United States.

Now, that is a pretty endangered thing. It has been around for quite a number of months. We have yet in the House. And it is a bill that is designed both to mitigate for future fires and to more efficiently fight fires.

The agencies that are tasked with fighting fires are about to run out of money. It happens every year. Who cares if they run out of money? Well, they have got to keep fighting the fires.

All right. Well, what do they do? They gut all their other programs—including the fuel reduction program, the forest health program, the timber program, the recreation program—things that are going to bring about more intense and more fires in the future and impact anybody who has a national forest or interior lands in their State or their area.

Now, this bill has yet to have a single hearing or any consideration, except for a mention in the Ryan budget which said he didn't support it. That is it. That is the total action by the House of Representatives on this issue. That is very sad. That is what we should be here on the floor today considering.

There are, as of this moment—I just checked it out because it is worse every day. We have, currently, nationally, 25 major fires: seven in Oregon—these are all uncontained or partially uncontained—six in California; four in Washington, including the largest in the State's history; three in Utah; two in Idaho; one in Colorado; and phenomenal lightning storms are predicted over the next 2 days, which means many, many, many more fires. Yet Congress is going to pass, I expect the House will pass, this ESA, so-called ESA bill today and leave town without dealing with the firefighting issue. I think it is very sad.

Now, some say, well, we have already done our job. We passed a bill, a couple of bills, a number of bills that could deal with forest health, future mitigation, fuel reduction. That is true. But even if they became law today, they wouldn't deal with today's problem that the agencies are going to run out of fire. And even if they became law today, it would take many years to get there.

I have got some pretty good estimates. We have somewhere around 75 million acres of land at high risk of wildfire in the West. And if we use the most conservative possible estimate, one that estimates there is a lot of commercial value there that reduces thinning cost, one that assumes that there is a lot of biomass available that is economic, you could get it down to, say, $300, $500 an acre. Well, that would be $20 billion to go out and do that work. We are about to spend the paltry budget for this year, $300 million for fuel reduction on fighting current fires. So we aren't exactly getting there.

It is a real issue, and that is what we should be dealing with here today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), who is the author of one of the provisions within this bill.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4315, the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act.

I also want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for all of the work that he has done on this issue, and I also want to thank him for inviting me to be a part of the ESA Working Group and for including my bill, H.R. 4317, the State, Tribal, and Local Species Transparency and Recovery Act, in the final version of this bill.

In the 19th District, we have been facing a lot of these issues with the Endangered Species Act. We had the lesser prairie chicken. We had the Dunes Sage Lizard and some of the areas dealing with minnows. But one of the things that this bill does in the part of the bill that I introduced is something that is very simple and straightforward and very commonsense, and that is to say we need to make sure, before we make some of these decisions, that we have the facts.

Now, that is kind of a novel idea. When we have a lawsuit, everybody gets to present the facts. And so what we are saying, and when we begin to go down the road of listing, causing millions of dollars' worth of expense and, in some cases, encumbering millions of acres of private property, we need to deal with the facts.

Now, why are we bringing this bill up? Well, it has been pointed out that this bill is like over 40 years old and over 1,500 species have been listed, and only 2 percent of those have been recovered.

Now, imagine going to a doctor and you say: Doctor, what is your outcome ratio? He says: 2 percent of the time I have good outcomes. Or imagine buying a product where you say this product works 2 percent of the time. So, basically, the ESA, Endangered Species Act, does need reform, and my bill, this bill, begins to do that.

What does it do? It just says that when the Federal Government has collected data and they are making the decision, they have to make all of the findings, all of the data that they used to reach that decision available to the States and local governments and to the stakeholders.

That seems fair to me.

The other thing it says is that the local stakeholders and the local State governments and the local county governments have the right to present their facts.

Now, one of the things that is important about that is that, I know a lot more about Lubbock, Texas, than maybe somebody that lives in the State of Oregon or the State of New Jersey. So that local knowledge of the habitat, the conditions is an important part of the data.

So when you are dealing with the facts, then I think we are going to have better outcomes. And if that is the goal of the Endangered Species Act, then why are we trying to suppress the facts? I don't get it. So that is the reason that this is an important part of that.

I notice that the gentleman mentioned that he thinks that this bill somehow dictates what is the best science. Not true. What it says, though, is that all of the data that they collect they have to present to the other stakeholders. What it also says is that the data that the stakeholders and the county and local and State governments present, they have to consider that data.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Now, if somebody has got a study about what they think the conditions in Lubbock, Texas, are, we think the people on the ground in Lubbock, Texas, or in west Texas probably have better information and ought to be a part of that consideration.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4315.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman made a point with which I would agree, which is they should consider and give due weight to local submissions and people in the area. But unfortunately, and perhaps the gentleman is unaware, this bill elevates that, and it does say all science submitted by States, tribes, and local governments is, by definition, the best scientific and commercial data. Then, if you refer back to the law, under basis for determinations on endangered species and a number of other things, the Secretary shall rely on the best scientific and commercial data.

Well, now, suddenly everybody who is submitting something has the best commercial and scientific data, and the Secretary is somehow supposed to sort out between 10 different counties, five States, 14 cities, and 18 Indian tribes who all have different disagreeing best available commercial data and science. You are creating a standard which, given the existing law which you didn't change, is going to be impossible to meet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to associate myself with my good friend from Oregon. I agree completely with everything he said, and I am going to agree with our subsequent speaker, Mr. MILLER, who played an essential role in getting the original Endangered Species Act passed. It has been wildly successful, Mr. Chairman, preventing species extinction.

More than 99 percent of listed species still exist today. Species recovered under the Endangered Species Act are also off the charts. The latest analysis found that 90 percent of listed species are recovering at the rate specified by their Federal recovery plan.

Successful species delistings are also increasing—delistings. Five years ago this month, the Fish and Wildlife Service finalized its rule to remove the bald eagle from the endangered species list. What a success story.

But for those who want to open up even more of our public lands to resource extraction, the law is a major inconvenience. So a working group, comprised entirely of Republican Members of the House of Representatives, was established by the House leadership to come up with legislative proposals to weaken the act. Today's bill is drawn directly from those recommendations.

It would deem whatever data that States, local governments, and Indian tribes submit to the Federal Government as the best available science.

It would undermine the ability of public citizens to contribute to the efficacy of the act, and it would compel the Fish and Wildlife Service to put online all data, regardless of merit, regardless of whether it contains proprietary or private information, and notwithstanding the fact that to do so will provide poachers and criminals with a road map to further endanger endangered species.

Mr. Chairman, the net effect of this bill before us today would be to force the Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, to squander its limited conservation resources on meritless requirements to become tied up in legal challenges and to diminish its ability to protect endangered species.

I guess if this body can outlaw Federal agencies from using scientific findings related to climate change in their decisionmaking process, then it is no stretch of the imagination for this body to define what constitutes best available scientific and commercial data.

This bill states that data submitted by a State, tribal, or county government is automatically deemed as the best available scientific and commercial data. The quality of the data is immaterial. What matters is who is sending it.

Let me say that again a different way. The quality of the information that State, tribal, and local governments submit is irrelevant under this bill. The bill says it shall be deemed the best available scientific and commercial data. The Fish and Wildlife Service would be required to include this data, even if it is not the best, even if it were not developed by scientists, even if it were developed for purely commercial purposes, and even if it is contrary to fact. The Service would be forced to include it and it will, thus, alter its decisions on listings, recovery plans, and other policies related to the conservation of endangered species.

It is also unclear how the Service would resolve a situation where States, tribal, or county governments submit conflicting data.

This is no hypothetical situation. During hearings on the Endangered Species Act, one of the witnesses, a Mr. Tom Jankovsky, Commissioner of Garfield County, Colorado, was very critical of State officials for the information they were providing the Bureau of Land Management on sage grouse habitat.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN. Commissioner Jankovsky found the State maps inaccurate, overstating the area of sage grouse habitat. The map he commissioned for Garfield County showed 70 percent less habitat for sage grouse.

Whose map should the Federal Government accept as the best available science, the Colorado State map or Garfield County's? This bill gives equal weight to both.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill, and no amendment can make it a good bill. It should be rejected.

Rather than addressing some of the compelling challenges that this Nation is confronting, we are wasting time on a bill that may pass the House but will go nowhere in the Senate and certainly will not become law. I urge its defeat.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), an author of another provision of this bill.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4315, and I appreciate my colleague from urban northern Virginia for his insight on the Endangered Species Act. But those of us from more rural areas actually understand that the challenges that are presented in this law as it currently stands beg for reform.

This bill contains important reforms to the act, and it has been authored by Chairman HASTINGS, Congresswoman LUMMIS, Congressman NEUGEBAUER, and myself. Within that is a provision that I had authored, which is commonsense legislation that makes the Endangered Species Act consistent with current law.

□ 1545

It reforms the ESA litigation process while enhancing wildlife preservation, improving government efficiency, and protecting taxpayer dollars. And I know that is something that my colleagues on the other side have expressed, they are concerned with wasting precious dollars that have been appropriated to the EPA.

Well, for too long, litigating attorneys have taken advantage of the Endangered Species Act, raking in millions of taxpayer-funded money. In many ESA cases, lawyers' fees climb as high as $300, $400, or even $500 an hour, with hardworking American taxpayers left to foot the bill.

In fact, I have a 2013 quote here from David Hayes, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, who was so concerned about this waste of resources, that he said this: ''My major concern is timing, resources needs, the fact this has been fish-in-the-barrel litigation for folks who, because there is a deadline and we miss these deadlines and so, we've been spending a huge amount of, in my mind, relatively unproductive time fending off lawsuits in this arena.''

And I couldn't have said it better.

But even worse, these rates can be awarded in cases where the Federal Government has settled with these groups that may not have even prevailed in the court system. This does absolutely nothing to benefit the species or the people and is not productive. My section of the bill seeks to remedy this unconscionable problem.

Currently, the Equal Access to Justice Act limits the hourly rate for prevailing attorney fees to $125 per hour for veterans, small businesses, and the Federal benefit recipients. So it is time that we apply the same cap to the ESA citizen suits as well.

So in times of tight fiscal budgets and escalating national debt, taxpayer dollars should be prioritized for the protection and recovery of species, not lining the pockets of highly priced lawyers.

With that, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4315 and for the commonsense updates that are so desperately needed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Well, tomorrow I fully expect the Republicans to prevail on the floor of the House to authorize litigation against the President of the United States for nonjusticiable controversy, all per all the previous precedents of the court.

I would note they spent $525 an hour on attorneys to defend the indefensible Defense of Marriage Act, which was ultimately found unconstitutional. And I expect they will spend well over $500 an hour for a nonjusticiable political stunt suing the President.

But beyond that, during this Congress, the requests, subpoenas, et cetera, by the committee to the Department of the Interior for purported conspiracies, which have yielded nothing, cost $2.5 million. The total award to attorneys was $1.7 million. So if we reined in the subpoenas a little bit, you could save more money than by limiting the attorneys and people's access to justice.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I thank him for his defense of the Endangered Species Act. And I thank him for how he administers his position as the ranking member of the Resources Committee.

This is an old argument. We have been around here time and again. Time and again, people who don't like the Endangered Species Act have tried to put their thumb on one side of the scale of justice whenever these arguments come forward. They have tried to empower junk science and give it the status of thoughtful, proven science to get in.

But now they are suggesting that the science would be based upon the party that submits it. If the right parties—if a local entity submits it, then it will be judged as the best science. Whether or not it is science at all won't matter. It will simply be deemed that by the Congress of the United States, and the Department will have to follow that.

That just, obviously, takes you right back to the courtroom, where they now inspire litigation. When the citizens want to sue, then the citizens will have to go back to the courtroom because they have deemed junk science as real science. And then they will try to limit the amount that the citizens can be compensated in terms of their lawyers.

And yet, as the gentleman from Oregon just pointed out, they are going to spend millions of dollars suing the President of the United States, and they are not going to pay for any of it. They are going to charge it to the deficit. They will charge it to the deficit. So how is this justice coming out of the House of Representatives?

The fact of the matter is, the Endangered Species Act has been effective. It has worked. It saves species. It has returned species off of the list. And the American people truly support it in great numbers. They truly support it in great numbers because they recognize that this is about one generation taking care of what we inherited and passing it on to another generation. People are most often pleased with the public spaces that have been preserved to protect it, to protect the various species.

Has every decision been exactly right? Of course not. And that is why people go to court on both sides of the law.

Nobody is suggesting that you limit it equally. This is a question of the science being used and who gets a leg up in that argument in the courts, which leads to more litigation. So the idea is that you are trying to get away from litigation.

But the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is that this is an act that has caused us to pause and wait and think about what we are doing, and what the impact of that is, whether that is development, whether that is forced practices, whether that is public infrastructure. Whatever it is, what is the impact beyond that project? And is that adverse and is it detrimental to these species? Is it detrimental to the health of the neighborhoods, to the health of the communities? And very often, the Endangered Species Act has resulted in better projects being designed, very often better projects being designed because of those considerations, more sustainable projects being designed because of those considerations.

But the fact of the matter is, many people just hate the Endangered Species Act. So we come here Congress after Congress with these meat-ax approaches.

I spent one of the longest negotiations on a bipartisan basis trying to arrive at a conclusion on a section of the Endangered Species Act. In the eleventh hour, my Republican partner, the chairman of the committee, walked out the door. I don't know why that happened. It wasn't communicated, but that was that. That morning, we were supposed to have a press conference to announce the agreement, but it never happened. With the hours and hours that were spent, I thought we had reached a good agreement between those areas.

But the idea of frustration builds up, and you can just swing away at the Endangered Species Act. Yes, it is very popular, and it can be very controversial.

I am more concerned about what local agencies do in the name of endangered species sometimes when they ask for mitigation that I find is very unfair, that I have complained about, that I have written the agencies about.

I think very often, it is not so much the Federal protection of endangered species. Very often, it is people who then want to use it at another level of government to extract from developers, from land use, for the purposes of mitigation that I think is hard to justify.

And I would just hope that, once again, this Congress would use its good judgment, it would support the American people, it would support the Endangered Species Act, and it would, in fact, reject this legislation.

This is really bad legislation, and you can't pretend that you care about science and at the same time say you get to deem the best science based upon the party of submission.

I have fought with agencies to get the science that people have worked on, that universities have worked on, introduced into the discussion. I have never suggested that they would have to accept it as the best science. I thought it would broaden the discussion. I thought it would bring another consideration to those debates.

So this is a bill that should be rejected, and the gentleman from Oregon is quite right. I would have been so much happier spending our time here on the floor today dealing with the issue of wildfires, and not just those wildfires that are burning in California today, but by all projections, we are already ahead of the worst wildfire seasons this year already, and we expect it to get much worse with the persistence of this drought. And as the chairman and ranking member know, in those three States, we are way out ahead here on wildfires, and I wish at some point, we would make a decision that we could deal with these in an institutional fashion so that the firefighting assets would know what is available to them. We wouldn't scramble around. We wouldn't put other agencies in jeopardy by stealing money from their accounts. But we would deal with this in an adult fashion. We would set aside money for the purposes and replenishment of that money to fight wildfires because the alternative cannot be not to try to control this wildfire and stop the damage that they do both to the natural environment and to the private environment and the local economies

that are so severely impacted by the aftermath of those fires.

But we are not going to do that. We are just going to stand up here and take another meat-ax approach to the Endangered Species Act, which is going to be unsuccessful, in the time we could have been talking about wildfires, in the time we could have prepared for the remainder of this wildfire season, giving notice to State agencies, to local agencies, to our Federal agencies on what they can do to prepare and the assets that they can have in place for those wildfires. We have missed that opportunity today in the name of this continued attack on the Endangered Species Act, which the American people have rejected over and over. And fortunately, this Congress has rejected over and over.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 18¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), another person who is the author of another section of this bill.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee for working with us on this working draft.

I also support the Endangered Species Act, and I rise in enthusiastic support of the Endangered Species Act and enthusiastic support of this bill because this bill embodies much of the ethos that the American people have embodied during the years the Endangered Species Act has been in effect.

This act was passed in 1974 with goals that were admirable and goals that the people of this country have embedded in their DNA to achieve. To conserve species, to have habitat for species so we can have rich, diverse populations of flora and fauna.

This bill will help those goals because we will know what science is being used to base these decisions upon. Right now, science that is undisclosed is being used. Right now, we have tribal governments, county governments, and State governments, through these incredibly impressive wildlife agencies, who have had this ethos embedded in them since they were little kids, trying to administer these laws, trying to save these species.

We want their knowledge shared with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We want to know what science is being used to make these decisions so it can be vetted by third parties, so people who have specialized scientific knowledge about a habitat area or a subspecies can share that knowledge with agencies so that we are not making decisions with litigants behind closed doors with no public input by the people whose dream is to have an Endangered Species Act that works, that works for the people on the land, the people who love these species, who love the habitat, who care for it every day, the people who want the Endangered Species Act administered in a way that is transparent and fair and will recover species.

I am of the opinion that an act that has less than a 2 percent recovery rate or a delisting rate is not a success. I think we can have better models to succeed to delist species or, better yet, not list species in the first place.

These small steps that are embedded in this bill—transparency of science, involving tribal, State, and local governments and their base of knowledge about what they see on the ground, is critical to having an Endangered Species Act that works, that takes advantage of the American people who care about conserving habitat and saving species.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense, rational approach to recovery that has the kind of transparency that we were promised by this administration. Let's help them achieve it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), a member of the working group.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I were to ask most Americans, why do we have the Endangered Species Act?, just about all of them would say, so we can protect endangered species and increase those population numbers. But then you ask the question of each specific species, what is the goal? And very rarely now will you hear the goal being to increase population. You will hear things like protection of habitat, expansion of the species and such, but you are not going to hear population numbers.

□ 1545

What effect does that have? Well, come to Oklahoma some time. In western Oklahoma, we deal with a beautiful little ground chicken called the lesser prairie chicken. The lesser prairie chicken in the past month and a half has been listed as a threatened species now.

So what is the result of that? Well, the first question we ask is: What is the number that we need to have to recover? I don't know. We are just going to try to recover habitat.

What that means is they are now trying to block in 8,000 to 9,000 acres at a time of grassland and say no one can do development on these 8,000 to 9,000-acre blocks of land—that is no building, that is no construction, that is no energy, and that is no wind power, blocking it off and leaving it natural, up to 70 percent of that area. Suddenly, private lands have suddenly become the ownership of public lands.

The simple question is: How many lesser prairie chickens do we need to have before these restrictions go away? We don't know.

The latest survey that just came out showed a 20 percent increase from last year to this year. Is that enough? No. Fish and Wildlife Service is not required to take in that specific study. If it came from a State and from the people that lived there and know it best, shouldn't we take that advice?

For some strange reason—I am not opposed to scientists from New York—but if scientists from New York can pop in on Oklahoma and can say, I am going to give you the best science, and when we ask for the data behind it, they can say, no, it is secret and proprietary, and we can't do a thing about it, that doesn't make common sense.

Mr. Chairman, this bill fixes that. I encourage the House to pass it and support commonsense legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague for giving me time to speak on this important legislation. The Endangered Species Act is a fundamental environmental law, one that was enacted because we, as a society, decided that we have a responsibility to our generation and to future generations to protect species that are threatened with extinction, as we did with the American bald eagle, our Nation's symbol.

Unfortunately, its implementation has had a profound impact on many human activities in many areas of the country, including my own district in the San Joaquin Valley of California. This year, people that I represent will be standing in food lines due in part to the way the ESA is being implemented in the San Joaquin Valley as it relates to water.

Let me be clear, I support targeted reform of the Endangered Species Act and the use of best science. However, the reform must strengthen the policy goals of the ESA. We need to be improving its performance, not reducing its protections.

Unfortunately, as I have said too many times on the floor of this House, this bill, unfortunately, is going nowhere. It is going nowhere because the process to develop it was not transparent and was not bipartisan. It is going nowhere because this is another example of a single-Chamber bill to score political points that has no Democratic support.

If we are going to create law that benefits the American people, bipartisanship is no longer an option. It is a requirement. I will vote for this bill in

spite of the flawed process on how it was developed and my serious reservations regarding the definition of best science.

I will vote for it because it is past time to roll up our sleeves and get to work on crafting serious proposals to reform the Endangered Species Act that ensures greater transparency, provides for more stakeholder input into the process, ensures that best science is used regarding species management, and creates a better balance between species protection and human impacts.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this bill because, for me, hope springs eternal that we can come together and become legislators that work together between the House and the Senate in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Endangered Species Act serves a great cause, to prevent the extinction of any species because of human activity, but as Eric Hoffer warned:

> Every great cause begins as a movement, becomes a business, and eventually degenerates into a racket.

Unfortunately, in the last 4 years, the ESA has become the basis for an explosion of lawsuits seeking to force hundreds of new species listings. Many of these suits are funded at taxpayers' expense, which in turn require Federal, State, and local agencies to spend even more taxpayer money to respond.

In northern California last month, this kind of litigation resulted in designating 2 million acres of the Sierra as critical habitat for three amphibians, despite overwhelming evidence that human activity is not to blame. The cause of the decline is nonnative predators and a virus affecting all amphibian species in the region.

The Natural Resources Committee has heard hours of testimony of how these decisions are based on highly questionable data from advocacy groups that include major mathematical errors, rank speculation, and selective suppression of data in order to arrive at predetermined conclusions.

This measure before us begins to address these abuses. It requires that supporting data be readily available to the general public, thus assuring greater scrutiny, and it requires that the government use the best available science and data from all sources.

It addresses the litigation crisis by requiring that legal costs be tracked and publicly reported, and it conforms those costs to the Equal Access to Justice Act that prevents extravagant claims for legal fees.

Louis Brandeis said that sunlight is the best of disinfectants. This bill places the data for implementing the ESA back into the sunlight where it can be fully scrutinized, and it places a modicum of restraint on the legal fees sought by out-of-control litigants.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4315, the Endangered Species Transparency Act.

Mr. Chairman, as a doctor and lifelong resident of northern Michigan, I have been supportive of conservation my entire life. Like many on the floor today, I understand there is more work to be done in the arena of conservation and recovery of species. However, the Endangered Species Act, as written, isn't working.

When the Endangered Species Act, or the ESA, was signed into law 40 years ago, it was meant to save species, not lawyers. Today, more money is being spent on frivolous lawsuits than recovering or conserving species that actually need saving. These lawsuits result in listings or proposed listings for very questionable species. As a result, the taxpayers, the environment, and the economy all lose.

In my district, the northern long-eared bat is currently a candidate for listing. As this decision is being considered, local and State officials, as well as businesses in northern Michigan, must be able to know how the decision will be made and what information is being used to make it.

I believe that local residents and officials know what is better for northern Michigan than bureaucrats or high-paid attorneys in Washington. That is why I am here today to support commonsense reforms to the Endangered Species Act. The bill goes a long way towards improving the Endangered Species Act by requiring good government through transparency and capping attorneys' fees.

If you truly support the environment, then you realize funds should be spent on conservation and recovery, not $500-an-hour attorneys.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation is a win-win for the taxpayer and for conservation of truly endangered species, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time, since I only have 1 minute remaining, until that side has no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 4315, a commonsense package comprised of four bills that seek to update and improve the Endangered Species Act.

These bills make commonsense changes that increase transparency, save taxpayer money, ensure local involvement in species conservation and the designation process, limit the hourly rate attorneys can charge the taxpayers for Endangered Species Act lawsuits, and require the Federal Government to make available to Congress and the public any data it uses to determine which species to list as endangered. All of these are common sense.

Mr. Chairman, for far too long, the Federal Government has been making listing decisions based on secret and pseudoscience, including studies that do not allow for peer review of the underlying data.

Even more troubling is the fact that attorneys have been making millions of dollars based on frivolous lawsuits associated with the Endangered Species Act, and the Federal Government doesn't even know how much money has been paid out.

It is time to update the Endangered Species Act that involves America, is accountable to America, and is a win-win for everybody concerned.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, this bill brings a portion of the Endangered Species Act back in to the 21st century and much-needed transparency.

Under this bill, the public will have access to data used to determine which species are listed as endangered. Backroom decisions made by regulators at the behest of nongovernment organizations with secret data is the sort of policymaking you might find in the Soviet Union or communist China, not in the United States.

Astoundingly, you will hear arguments that this data should remain secret. This is the data used to decide whether Americans can build a home on their own property, farm their own land, or simply going hiking in their national forest.

The bill includes also much county data used in ESA decisions, which is key. It is important that all economic information is available so locals get a fair shake. Had this bill been in place, my district would have had more input in an ESA listing that will hurt the economy across the Sierra Nevadas.

This measure also tracks and caps attorney fees paid in ESA lawsuits. Of the 75 Federal agencies surveyed, just 10 even tracked their payouts to lawsuit factories like the NRDC and the Center for Biological Diversity.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to think Americans deserve to know how their government makes their decisions.

Let's pass H.R. 4315 to bring transparency and fairness back to the ESA process.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), a former member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4315. New Mexico used to have 123 mills that processed timber. Today, that number is zero because of an endangered species called the spotted owl.

Now, 20 years after declaring the spotted owl to be endangered because of logging, last year, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service came out and said: oops, we made a mistake, it is not the logging at all.

We killed 123 mills in New Mexico. Eighty-five percent of the Nation's timber industry is gone because of a mistake. That sounds like the junk science that our opponents are arguing that we should be avoiding.

Mr. Chairman, last year, a lizard was going to be named as threatened or endangered in my district, and an ad hoc committee of scientists came together. They looked at the science that the Fish and Wildlife Service was going to use to list, they proved all of it to be false, and the listing did not occur—but only because of peer review.

That is what this bill is trying to do, to establish a process where others can get to see what is going on inside those hidden dark doors of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This year in New Mexico, the lesser prairie chicken was listed as threatened which, again, put people out of jobs. Ben Tuggle, the Fish and Wildlife Service director in New Mexico said they felt pressured by the lawsuits—not by the science, but by the lawsuits. This is what it looks like dealing with the Endangered Species Act in the West today.

It kills jobs, takes away the future, and takes away tax base—all for junk science that is currently being used by the department. This bill simply says let's get some transparency and let's get peer review. I urge the Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), in whose district we had a field hearing on the impact of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman. I am glad to be here today in support of H.R. 4315 and to emphasize the point that this is not just a Western thing. We certainly hear a lot about Oregon's northern spotted owl, about California's delta smelt, and we have heard about—the lesser prairie chicken has been cited, but I doubt many of you have heard about the rabbitsfoot mussel.

I have a map here that indicates the range of the rabbitsfoot mussel, and I can assure you the folks in Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Missouri have become very well familiar with the rabbitsfoot mussel.

□ 1600

What the critical habitat designation proposal could do, and certainly in States like Arkansas where 70 percent of Arkansas' rivers and streams would be impacted, it would have a direct and costly impact on farmers and ranchers and municipalities who rely on those waterways for drinking water, private landowners and local governments who are trying to build and improve roads and bridges, and small and large businesses across the State of Arkansas that use water in manufacturing the products that help keep Americans employed.

The 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act will go a long way to bringing some common sense and sanity back to the protection of vulnerable species, and that is what we should be about.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) who is also experiencing the effects of this act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee yielding me this time.

You know, it is amazing when you even mention dealing with reforming the Endangered Species Act how people all of a sudden think—and it is just a matter of putting some controls or limiting it—that you are antispecies, you are terrible on the environment. Really what we are talking about here is just basically like all of the things in life that are updated from time to time, this is something that needs to be updated. I have been pleased to work in this working group, together with the chairman and others, to bring about some sensible reforms.

The reason we do this, farmers, ranchers, folks back home, my Farm Bureau, have been hit by lawsuits. And I appreciate what the gentleman just said. It is lawsuits, not science, that seems to be pressuring some of this along. In fact, in 2011, the WildEarth Guardians and Center for Biological Diversity entered into an agreement with Fish and Wildlife that added 1,000 species. Now, the only problem with that is that no one in the ag community and others who were affected were allowed to participate. Now, I have another bill called Sue and Settle that would have taken care of that when we passed it out of this House.

It was said earlier that, when you take the ESA, you don't take a meat cleaver approach. Well, I think the problem is not a meat cleaver approach here. It is the fact that many don't want to take an approach at all. They want to just leave it alone. They don't even want to take up having reasonable caps on attorneys' fees. Instead of putting money into lawyers' pockets at a cap of just $125 an hour, they would rather go on—which, by the way, in that same 2011 case, the attorneys' fees went over $300,000 in this situation.

You see, the problem here is not wanting to deal with ESA. The problem is wanting to continue an ideological bent that says leave it alone even at the expense of jobs, even at the expense of saying that maybe we messed up, even at the expense of saying maybe we can find a different point of view, maybe we can have valid science, or maybe just addressing it.

For those of us in northeast Georgia, we want good, clean water, clean air, and protection of our wildlife. But also, we understand that taxpayer dollars spent on this needs to happen. We need to do this reform.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, I still have no takers on my bat.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4315 is simply a no-brainer. Its primary purpose is to require that ESA be available to the public. This is nothing but a commonsense reform in the application of a law that is subject to extensive bureaucratic manipulation. Some opponents wrongly assume that the American people don't need to see this data, but how can anyone argue against transparency in our Federal Government?

Let me quickly list an example in my district. We have the Utah prairie dog, a species that was listed under the ESA in 1973. U.S. Fish and Wildlife says there needs to be at least 1,500 prairie dogs before they can be considered for delisting as recovered, but the Federal Government only counts those dogs living on Federal lands, about 442 of them. In 2013, there were almost 5,000 of these prairie dogs living on private land that went uncovered.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 4256, the Endangered Species Improvement Recovery Act, something which would help in this effort as well. H.R. 4315 is a commonsense approach, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), a very active Member on this issue.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, this bill brings a lot of common sense to Washington. In my district currently today, they have basically shut down agriculture because of this tiny fish

there. We have seen food products coming in from other countries, and we see people standing in a food line.

What has caused all of this? Under the Endangered Species Act, a species was added to the Endangered Species Act list.

And do we know if that listing actually helped that fish, if turning off the pump has actually helped save that fish? We know it has put people out of work. We know it has changed where we are getting our food from. And for all we know, it hasn't even saved that little fish. That is something that needs to be looked at. What this bill does, it brings some transparency to this.

When we pass these rules and regulations on these industries that affect these people at home and put them in the food line, are we actually basing it on real science? Are we basing it on the fact that we are actually going to save this species?

This is a tragedy. What we see going on in my hometown right now, in my district is a tragedy. We have an opportunity to actually make a difference today with some common sense. Make sure that we know that the science is honest and transparent before we pass these laws.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I advise the gentleman from Oregon that I am prepared to close, so if he wants to use his time, then I will close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will close where I ended my opening remarks, 25 major fires burning in the West: seven in Oregon, six in California, four in Washington, two in Utah, two in Idaho, and one in Colorado. And by this time next week, probably twice as many, but next week Congress will be out of session.

The agencies will run out of money. They can't stop fighting the fires. So what they will do is they will pull back money that would prevent future intense wildfires from prevention programs. They will pull back money from recreation programs. They will pull back money from a host of things that Americans care about and want to have funded just to fight these fires. It is an endless cycle. We need to deal with it.

We could have dealt with it here today instead of spending multiple hours on a bill which is going nowhere, which is poorly drafted to the point where anybody, any city, county, tribe, State who writes on the back of a napkin can submit that to the agency and it must be considered the best available science and commercial data. And under the law, the Secretary has to use that to make a decision.

How the heck is that going to work? You are saying you are worried about attorneys' fees; you are creating a universe for new litigation with this misguided approach.

So I wish we would return to a bipartisan addressing of the forest fire issue because I know there is bipartisan concern on it. There is a bill pending in the House—54 Republicans, 54 Democrats. We should take that bill up today, tomorrow, or Thursday before we leave town and fund our firefighting efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a couple of points on issues that have been raised. First of all, H.R. 4315 is not a comprehensive reform to the Endangered Species Act. It is very targeted.

I might mention that several Members on the other side talked about species going extinct. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that during testimony in the House Natural Resources Committee, nobody testified that they are in favor of species going extinct.

Several Members said this bill weakens the Endangered Species Act. Mr. Chairman, how does transparency weaken a bill? I do not see how that works.

Finally, there seems to be a lot of discussion about allowing local entities and tribes to use their data in the listing of species. Several Members on the other side said the act deems that should happen. It does not at all. In fact, let me read it. It says:

> The best scientific and commercial data available includes all such data submitted by State, tribal, or county government.

Now, we will have more debate on this because there are two amendments that address this section, but I just wanted to mention that this is a targeted look at the Endangered Species Act. It is not a comprehensive reform, but it certainly will, I think, get more people involved, especially because of this megasettlement, the impact that this will have on the rest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of H.R. 4315.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair on December 28, 1973 the Endangered Species Act was signed into law, meaning we are currently commemorating the 40th anniversary of one of our nation's strongest and most successful environmental laws: the Endangered Species Act.

Passed with overwhelming bipartisan support and signed by President Richard Nixon, the Act was the first comprehensive law to address the global extinction crisis.

The Endangered Species Act took a zero-tolerance approach to achieving its goals: no new extinctions, no exceptions.

As a result, 99 percent of listed species have been saved from extinction and are on the path to recovery.

Some iconic American species, such as the bald eagle, the American alligator, and the Pacific gray whale, have recovered from the brink of extinction and are now thriving in their natural habitats.

Beyond the preservation of individual species, the Endangered Species Act helps to keep the strong interdependent web of life.

Today, conservation efforts under the Endangered Species Act are a model for preserving biodiversity around the world.

Unfortunately, here in the House today we are proceeding with reforms that would undoubtedly weaken provisions of the Act with the belief that doing so will somehow yield greater benefits for the species it was designed to protect.

As a member of the House Natural Resources Committee, I've been committed to protecting our nation's strongest and most successful environmental laws.

Let us reject the bill before us and in doing so commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the Endangered Species Act.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to today in strong opposition to H.R. 4315—the "21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act."

Mr. Chair, there is nothing reasonable about this bill.

This bill is an assault on citizen enforcement and the rule of law.

If enacted, the bill would place an unreasonable cap on the recovery of attorneys' fees in suits brought under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

By limiting fee recoveries, this bill would make it difficult for many citizens to obtain effective legal representation—and undermine the enforcement of the law.

The Endangered Species Act is one of our country's most important tools for protecting endangered fish and wildlife populations.

The fact of the matter is, the bill before us, would increase the likelihood of future extinctions.

Mr. Chair, we are here to protect not only our wildlife, but also the very foundation of our justice system—equal access to adequate representation.

I urge a no vote.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this legislation.

H.R. 4315 is an important first step in reforming the Endangered Species Act, and undertaking long overdue.

This legislation is about three things: increasing government transparency, requiring better state and local data and input, and limiting excessive payments for lawyers who sue the Federal government under ESA.

First, the bill requires the Federal Government to publish on the internet and make publicly available the data that was used to make the determination that a species should be considered for listing under the ESA.

Secondly, the legislation would require the Federal Government to include and consider data provided by state, local and tribal governments. The purpose of this is to ensure that the best "on the ground" input is taken into account when making such listing.

Finally, H.R. 4315 would limit attorneys' fees when individuals or organizations sue the government under the ESA and prevail.

In my home state of Pennsylvania, we are currently seeing firsthand why these changes need to be legislated. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service recently proposed the Northern Long-Eared bat for listing under ESA—despite significant scientific debate over its population levels.

While the species is unquestionably being impacted by White Nose Syndrome, considerably more research still is needed before sweeping federal regulations go into effect.

This species has an enormous geographical footprint and is found in 38 states. Listing this bat species would have an enormous impact, including harming a large number of economic sectors that pose no threat to this population.

During the open public comment period, the Fish & Wildlife Service received a significant number of public comments discussing this lack of adequate data, and since then, the Service has acknowledged that the economic activities most affected by the proposed listing have had little impact on population numbers or the decline of the species.

As a result, the agency has now decided to extend the comment period to further review these disparities.

H.R. 4315 is a package of commonsense reforms that will improve local control and increase government transparency and accountability.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4315, which would interfere with scientific determinations for endangered species recovery and divert resources towards unnecessary bureaucracy at the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Endangered Species Act is designed to use the best possible science to identify and protect our most vulnerable species from extinction. This bill would eliminate rational assessment of data and instead mandate that any information from any state, local, or tribal government must be named the ''best available science'' to make decisions. It includes no minimum threshold, such as peer review, for the integrity of that data. Moreover, it invites uncertainty, as there is no way to distinguish between conflicting data from two different states or localities.

The bill also creates unnecessary and cumbersome reporting requirements for the Fish and Wildlife Service, including listing potentially sensitive commercial data and species location information online. It includes no additional funding to complete these reports, diverting funds from the agency's core mission of safeguarding vulnerable species.

As the Speaker plans to recess the House at the end of this week, there are important issues that we should be addressing, including the wildfires that threaten public and private lands in the west. Instead, we are weakening fundamental protections for endangered species, creating more paperwork to distract from recovery efforts, and devising bizarre new rules to politicize science. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 4315, the so-called ''Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act,'' which is an overt assault on the Endangered Species Act designed to weaken its protections and guarantee the likelihood of extinction for wildlife, plants, and fish.

The Endangered Species Act is one of the Nation's most important environmental laws. Signed into law by President Richard Nixon over forty years ago, the Endangered Species Act continues to serves as an effective tool for protecting our wildlife, plants, and fish from the brink of extinction.

To ensure enforcement of the Endangered Species Act, Congress empowered citizens to bring enforcement actions to hold parties accountable for violating the law or to compel the government to protect endangered species. Importantly, the law does not provide for rewards of damages for the citizen bringing the suit. Rather, the Endangered Species Act allows for courts to award reasonable attorneys' fees to parties that substantially prevail on the merits.

Congress has long recognized the importance of encouraging citizens to bring meritorious claims under the Endangered Species Act that they would otherwise abandon due to the financial costs of hiring competent counsel. Many other federal statutes contain similar enforcement mechanisms that encourage citizens to act as a private attorney general.

The Supreme Court has likewise observed in numerous contexts that if private citizens are to enforce laws against ''those who violate the Nation's fundamental laws are not to proceed with impunity, then citizens must have the opportunity to recover what it costs them to vindicate these rights in court.''

Contrary to the stated goal of H.R. 4315 to ''standardize the awarding of attorneys' fees to prevailing parties against the federal government,'' this legislation is a thinly-disguised effort to prohibit litigation by citizens and public-interest groups.

By eliminating the possibility of reasonable attorneys' fees, this bill creates yet another hurdle that will make it more difficult to find competent legal representation to enforce complex environmental laws.

Reasonable attorneys' fees are particularly appropriate for complex and highly specialized adjudications involving environmental law. Environmental groups are almost uniformly nonprofit organizations. Many file lawsuits for injunctive relief to enforce laws and protect the public health. But as a result of this bill, many of these organizations will be deterred from bringing such actions if they cannot recover attorneys' fees.

For these reasons, a broad coalition of interest groups—including Alliance for Justice, Public Citizen, American Association for Justice, Sierra Club, and dozens of other environmental, civil rights, and civil liberties organizations—oppose H.R. 4315.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–55. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO PUBLISH ON THE INTERNET THE BASIS FOR LISTINGS.

Section 4(b) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The Secretary shall make publicly available on the Internet the best scientific and commercial data available that are the basis for each regulation, including each proposed regulation, promulgated under subsection (a)(1), except that, at the request of a Governor or legislature of a State, the Secretary shall not make available under this paragraph information regarding which the State has determined public disclosure is prohibited by a law of that State relating to the protection of personal information.''.

SEC. 3. DECISIONAL TRANSPARENCY AND USE OF STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIRING DECISIONAL TRANSPARENCY WITH AFFECTED STATES.—Section 6(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before the first sentence; and

(2) by striking ''Such cooperation shall include'' and inserting the following:

''(2) Such cooperation shall include—

''(A) before making a determination under section 4(a), providing to States affected by such determination all data that is the basis of the determination; and

''(B)''.

(b) ENSURING USE OF STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (21) as paragraphs (3) through (22), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) The term 'best scientific and commercial data available' includes all such data submitted by a State, tribal, or county government.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(n) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(n)) is amended by striking ''section 3(13)'' and inserting ''section 3(14)''.

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DISCLOSE.—Section 13 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 902; relating to conforming amendments which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 13. DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES.

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall—

''(1) not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report detailing Federal Government expenditures for covered suits during the preceding fiscal year (including the information described in subsection (b)); and

''(2) make publicly available through the Internet a searchable database of the information described in subsection (b).

''(b) INCLUDED INFORMATION.—The report shall include—

''(1) the case name and number of each covered suit, and a hyperlink to the record or decision for each covered suit (if available);

''(2) a description of the claims in each covered suit;

''(3) the name of each covered agency whose actions gave rise to a claim in a covered suit;

''(4) funds expended by each covered agency (disaggregated by agency account) to receive and respond to notices referred to in section 11(g)(2) or to prepare for litigation of, litigate, negotiate a settlement agreement or consent decree in, or provide material, technical, or other assistance in relation to, a covered suit;

''(5) the number of full-time equivalent employees that participated in the activities described in paragraph (4); and

''(6) attorneys fees and other expenses (disaggregated by agency account) awarded in covered suits, including any consent decrees or settlement agreements (regardless of whether a decree or settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions), including the bases for such awards.

''(c) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—The head of each covered agency shall provide to the Secretary in a timely manner all information requested by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of this section.

''(d) LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, this section shall not affect any restriction in a consent decree or settlement agreement on the disclosure of information that is not described in subsection (b).

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) COVERED AGENCY.—The term 'covered agency' means any agency of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, or the Southeastern Power Administration.

''(2) COVERED SUIT.—The term 'covered suit' means any civil action containing a claim against the Federal Government, in which the claim arises under this Act and is based on the action of a covered agency.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to such section and inserting the following:

''Sec. 13. Disclosure of expenditures.''.

(c) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—This section shall not be construed to affect the amendments made by section 13 of such Act, as in effect before the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AWARD OF LITIGATION COSTS TO PREVAILING PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING LAW.

Section 11(g)(4) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)(4)) is amended by striking ''to any'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''to any prevailing party in accordance with section 2412 of title 28, United States Code.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–563. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–563.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 13, insert '', State agency,'' after ''Governor''.

Page 1, strike line 16 and all that follows through the first period on line 17 and insert ''determined public disclosure is prohibited by a law or regulation of that State, including any law or regulation requiring the protection of personal information; and except that within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall execute an agreement with the Secretary of Defense that prevents the disclosure of classified information pertaining to Department of Defense personnel, facilities, lands, or waters.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this manager's amendment which would clarify two important items relating to section 2 and public disclosure of the Federal Government's ESA data.

First, the amendment would provide an important but technical clarification that the intent of the bill is for any Federal public disclosure of ESA data on the Internet under the bill to be completely consistent with data privacy laws of States, including those that protect personal identifiable information from disclosure.

A significant amount of the ''best available scientific and commercial data'' currently used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for ESA listing decisions is derived from States which have diverse laws protecting the privacy of their citizens and sensitive species data.

While some make completely baseless suggestions that more data disclosure on the Internet could lead to poaching of species, this amendment would allow States an added layer of confidence that the information they choose to share with the Federal Government does not compromise their own data privacy laws.

Second, the amendment clarifies that the bill would not require disclosure of classified Department of Defense information related to lands, personnel, installations, or waters within their jurisdiction.

The Endangered Species Act has a significant impact on U.S. military activities. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service Web site, more than 300 ESA-listed species are located on the more than 25 million acres spread across hundreds of Department of Defense installations across the Nation. While greater data transparency related to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service listing decisions is important, branches of the American military should not have to disclose information that would in any way compromise national security.

So my amendment would make clear that the Fish and Wildlife Service's or the National Marine Fisheries Service's disclosure of best available scientific and commercial data on the Internet can be accomplished while safeguarding classified or sensitive Defense Department information.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is similar to an amendment offered by the chairman in committee which carved out an exemption for private individuals. This would carve out another amendment for the Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, crafting legislation so it doesn't have unintended impacts is often a difficult, deliberative process. In this case, the overly broad language in this section would still require commercial data from timber and oil and gas companies. That is not covered by the exemptions in the bill. And also, it could require data containing business activity locations, operation plans, information regarding species found on their lands, and they would be published on the Internet, which would be an invitation to trespass in the case of private timber companies having to publish that sort of invitation.

So I don't think the exemption goes far enough. I think the entire provision should be stricken. But again, I will not bother to oppose this amendment, but I will oppose the underlying bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–563.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 1, strike ''The term'' and insert ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term''.

Page 3, at line 3 strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 3 insert the following:

''(B) Such term does not include any data, study, or survey that has been published solely in an internal Department of the Interior publication.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, and it was mentioned by a number of Democrats on this side, we don't think the Endangered Species Act is perfect and we could work on a bipartisan basis on modernization-type reforms to bring it into the 21st century, compliant with current science. However, that is not before us today. But I am hopeful that this amendment, because of a very unsettling precedent by the Obama administration, will get bipartisan support.

Now, the Republicans may, in this case, agree with the objectives of an agency of government which has gone rogue in this case, which is Fish and Wildlife. They have been trying for years to remove the gray wolf from the Endangered Species Act. Unfortunately, science isn't on their side. Wolves have not recovered throughout much of their range. Oregon and Washington have a few packs; California, Colorado, Utah, and New York have none. However, they have cooked up a little bit of science to justify their determination to delist.

Now, in the case of Oregon, OR–7, his mate, and pups, might be pretty safe. They are down in the corner of the State. California won't be hunting wolves because of their own Endangered Species Act. But his relatives up in the northeast corner of Oregon, should they cross the border into Idaho, they will be immediately assassinated. That is the result of what Fish and Wildlife and Congress combined have done.

They cooked up the science. Unfortunately, science has to be peer-reviewed and published in journals. No journal would publish it. Not even some of the captive industry journals or the livestock association journal. Nobody would publish it. They said this is junk.

So what did they do? Well, they came up with a zombie journal. They revived an internal journal called North American Fauna, which was an internal Fish and Wildlife little newsletter, and it hasn't been printed previously since 1991.

Now, again, I imagine most Republicans are saying: So what, if this helps us get rid of the wolf—which many on that side of the aisle would like to do—so be it, that is good.

Well, just think what is going to happen when Fish and Wildlife and this administration, or another administration, wants to make a decision contrary to what you care about? What if they want to cook up a phony science on the sage-grouse, the lesser prairie chicken, or on some of these other species that have been talked about today? They drag out the North American fauna label and they say: Hey, it has been published, and that is what we based our decision on.

This is a very disturbing trend by an administration—inexplicable that this administration would go down this particular path. And again, even if you may agree with delisting the wolf and greatly reducing the populations, which are nowhere near what they should be for a full recovery, threatening again a future, more comprehensive, listing—again, a bit shortsighted if you support that, but you may.

But just think if you let this stand. If you let these people these Federal bureaucrats, these hacks, get away with this. They cooked something up. I mean, really? You can't even get the sheep journal to publish this because they really hate the wolves, or the cattleman's journal, they really hate the wolves. No, they wouldn't publish it. They had to come up with a phony internal journal, because it was so bad that they knew they would be subject to ridicule and violating essentially their own morals and ethics by doing that.

I would hope that the Republicans can support this amendment, because even though they may agree with the ends here, they surely should disagree with the process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, as I was listening to the gentleman, I was wondering if he was talking about the amendment that he had actually offered, because actually he is making the case that I stood up to make today.

Let me tell you what this amendment would do. It would exclude scientific information published solely in the internal Interior Department publications from the definition of ''best available science,'' which would allow the Department of Interior to avoid transparency requirements in section 2 of the bill, which requires that the data used by the Federal agencies for the Endangered Species Act listing decisions to be made publicly available and accessible through the Internet.

So what the gentleman was saying is they cooked the books, they cooked the information, and he doesn't want that to be made available. So here we are making important decisions about the potential taking of people's land, spending millions of dollars in mitigation for what may be false science.

This gentleman's amendment defeats the whole purpose of transparency, the intention of this bill.

What we are trying to do is we are going to say: Let's take the facts, let's take the best available science that the Fish and Wildlife and some of these agencies say that they have, let's compare it with what is the best available science from the stakeholders and come up with the truth.

But the gentleman's amendment, which I urge Members to defeat, defeats the whole purpose of that transparency. The American people deserve that. Their tax money is being used against them in the fact that the tax money is going out and being used to determine what is the best available science. Now if we have got the best available science—in fact, as the gentleman referred to it as ''cooking the science,'' then the American people ought to have an opportunity to dispute that and it not be hidden from them in some agency memo.

With that, I encourage Members to defeat the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, well, I didn't understand that.

Look, a Federal agency revived a journal that had been extinct for 23 years. It is an internal document. They took phony science and published it in that, and then they based a delisting decision on it. If they based a listing decision on it, you guys would be going berserk over there.

What I am precluding is future Federal agencies, no matter where they come down on a listing decision, from using phony science which is only self-published. This is like whack nuts who write books about crazy things and they publish it themselves and say: Look, it was a book. Yeah, it is a book. You paid to publish it.

In this case, they used taxpayer money to publish a phony study to justify a decision they had already made, which you might happen to agree with.

But what happens when they use that same tactic to do that with a decision you disagree with, to actually list something?

This has nothing to do with transparency. It doesn't need to be transparent because they couldn't use it. It is phony science. They would not be allowed to use phony science by self-publishing it. That is simply what the amendment does, and I can't believe you guys are going to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, when I listen to my good friend from Oregon's arguments, in many respects, maybe indirectly, he is making precisely the argument that we are making with this bill. That is, whatever data is being used to list or delist should be made available to the public so they can ascertain if that data is correct.

Now, the gentleman talked about data that was made up. Okay, that is his interpretation. If it is made up, shouldn't we know that? Shouldn't we know that that is what the data is being used to make these decisions rather than just accepting it?

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this bill is all about, to have transparency on this scientific data. That is really all we are asking about.

The argument got shifted to other things, like we are destroying the Endangered Species Act and so forth. Nothing could be further from the truth.

His amendment, however, does something that I think violates the principle we are trying to do. He wants to exclude certain stuff from us being transparent with it, or for the people having transparency to that data.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge also rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–563.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike ''(a) REQUIRING DECISIONAL TRANSPARENCY WITH AFFECTED STATES.—''.

Beginning at page 2, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 3, line 7.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today has many problems, but one of the most egregious and obvious is in section 3, where the bill declares that any and all data submitted by States, tribes, or local governments shall be considered the ''best scientific data available.''

I am offering here an amendment with my friend from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), which would strike that provision and would force Federal agencies to accept as the best available science actual science.

The language in question says:

The term ''best scientific and commercial data available'' includes all such data submitted by a State, tribal, or county government.

The Endangered Species Act is one of our Nation's strongest and most successful environmental laws. One reason for that success is that the law has been based on scientific evaluation using peer-reviewed science by trained scientists, not the whims and ideological wishes of legislators.

The Endangered Species Act is not a shouting match or a fight for power and influence among interested parties; it is a look at the need to protect endangered species as determined by the best science. This language that the best scientific and commercial data available includes all such data submitted is as preposterous as it is impractical. Where is the quality control?

Now, what happens if a locality submits something that is not, in fact, true, or not, in fact, established within the scientific community? Or how about if a State or a tribe submits one thing and another State or tribe submits conflicting views? Are they both the best available evidence? What about where a county thinks its data is better than the State's data? These are all situations that not only might occur, but are likely to occur.

A witness at the committee hearing on this bill—in fact, a witness that was invited by the Republicans—testified to this very point, saying that all does not equal best, highlighting the fact that this bill creates more problems than it solves.

Agency decisionmakers must evaluate data from all sources to ensure that they are making determinations based on the best information available, and we should encourage them to do so.

Let's not have another case of congressional malpractice where Members of Congress play scientists and try to present political restrictions on the science.

The peer review process is the best tool available, and that is how we draw out the best science. Maybe scientists occasionally make mistakes, no doubt about it, and new findings can call for a revision of the science. But surely we don't think that Members of Congress are better at determining what is scientifically factual than the biological and environmental scientists.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, basically, what the gentleman's amendment would do is strike the language in the section of this bill that requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to consider all data submitted by State, tribal, or county governments as best scientific and commercial data available.

Let me dispel one of the myths. It says that all of this data has to be considered best scientific and commercial data. That is not necessarily true. The Fish and Wildlife Service still has discrimination over what data that it considers. What it does say is that it must consider the data that is submitted.

The other thing that you hear my friends on the other side of the aisle say is that I guess all of the best data and all of the smartest people in the country must be in Washington, D.C., but we have Mr. DEFAZIO, the gentleman from Oregon, stand up and say: no, sometimes they cook the books. So I wondered if that memo that the gentleman was talking about was the best commercial and available science for the wolf. Obviously, he was saying it was not.

What we are really saying about all of this is it is just about transparency. It is about recognizing that the people in the States and the local governments may actually have better information on the ground about a lot of these issues than somebody sitting in Washington, looking at some model or some report that someone has drawn up.

I will talk about my State of Texas, for example. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Service has developed over 8,000 wildlife management plans covering over 30 million acres. I would probably tell you that those people have some of the best available and commercial science on a lot of the issues facing Texas probably a little bit more than maybe somebody sitting in Washington, D.C., or some other State.

So one of the things that I am a little perplexed about is my colleagues keep fighting the transparency. This President said he was going to have one of the most transparent administrations in history, but that has been far from the truth.

I would encourage my colleagues to defeat this amendment. It defeats the whole purpose of the bill and the intention of letting the American people know the facts.

If you go to a trial, you don't get to use only your facts. You have to hear

everybody's facts. Since this is a trial that determines whether these species are in fact endangered or not endangered anymore, we should be able to deal with the facts, but we can't deal with one set of facts. We have to deal with all of the facts.

So if you want to hear all of the facts, defeat this amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair the time remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I am bemused by this.

It is simple. It says:

The term ''best scientific and commercial data available'' includes all such data submitted by a State, tribal, or county government.

That means all the data. That means if all the counties, States, and tribes don't agree, you have conflicting best available data. That is what we are saying. We want them to take all data into account, but you can't deem that theirs is the best.

In the case of nitrification in the Columbia River, Oregon and Washington disagree. They have competing science, but now, they would have to weigh it equally. I have heard tribes say to save salmon and delist them, you have to take all the dams out of the river. That becomes the best available science, if submitted by a tribe?

What are you guys thinking? We want them to listen to everybody. Everybody can submit something, but we don't then deem it to be the best available data. That is nuts.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Oregon said it well: All does not equal best.

The other side evidently is embarrassed by the language in the bill. There are many problems with this bill, but this particular section has some language that they should be embarrassed about, and so they are saying what they wish the language said or what they want it to say.

The best scientific data includes all such data. It does not say we will consider all data. It says all equals best. That cannot be true. That should be removed from the bill. That is what this amendment does.

Decisions on whether or not a particular study or data set have scientific merit with respect to an individual species listing should be made in the context of peer-reviewed science, not because one State wants one thing and one county wants another thing.

It should be based on the best scientific data. That is what this amendment would ensure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am not embarrassed by this piece of legislation. Let me walk through this and explain why this language says what it says because I think our friends on the other side of the aisle are leaving out a very important word when they are debating this issue.

The language in question is the term ''best scientific and commerce data available includes all such data submitted,'' and so forth.

They are arguing as if the word ''such'' was taken out, where it would read ''scientific and commercial data available includes all data.'' We didn't say ''all data.'' We said ''all such data.''

What does that mean? How does that relate? All such data that relates to scientific and commercial data coming from the local communities—what is wrong with that argument?

By the way, the agency still has discretion to use that data, but it should be part of it because lacking having this language in the bill means that the only data is what my friend from Oregon criticized when we were discussing the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, I think this language is pretty straightforward. It says ''all such data that relates to it, as developed by local communities and tribes.'' That should be part of the transparency.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–563.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 22, strike ''and''.

Page 5, at line 4 strike the period and insert ''; and'', and after line 4 insert the following:

''(7) any Federal funding used by a person or a governmental or non-governmental entity in bringing a claim in a covered suit.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for all of his work on this legislation.

I am from Wisconsin. I have the central to northern part of the State. In my part of the State—and for the State as a whole—we value our natural resources. We value our wildlife. We have people who love to hunt, fish, bike, ski, and hike. It is part of our culture and our community.

We have many organizations that work hard to promote conservation. We have hunting groups, sportsmen groups, conservation organizations, State and local DNR organizations. Many of them have come together to protect the gray wolf population in Wisconsin, so much so that it has become healthy, and the gray wolf has been taken off and delisted from the Endangered Species Act.

However, not all organizations come at this with a pure heart. We have some whose main purpose and priority is filing lawsuits and suing the government under the Endangered Species Act. It is these sue-and-settle tactics that don't advance the cause of preserving our environment, and they aren't good for the American taxpayer.

What is more, many of these lawsuits are funded by way of Federal tax dollars to support the litigation, so in essence, we are spending tens of millions of dollars of hardworking Americans' tax dollars to sue ourselves.

So I think it is important that we have transparency in government. If an organization is suing the Federal Government under the Endangered Species Act and they are using Federal money, let's disclose it. Let's all see it.

We might come together and say that is a good use of our Federal tax dollars, or we might say that is outrageous that we should be funding suits against ourselves.

This is a commonsense amendment. I would ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this issue to the floor. I think it adds very much to what we are trying to do with this underlying legislation, which is adding transparency to our efforts.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I just wonder if the gentleman can name one piece of litigation which was sponsored by Federal tax dollars, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of my legislation. We don't know.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman can't name one lawsuit, one organization using Federal tax dollars. I guess that is probably because he is familiar with OMB Circular A–87 that says neither a State, local government, or an Indian tribal government can use money provided by the Federal Government for legal expenses for prosecution of claims against the Federal Government.

Well, okay, that leaves a big hole. What about nonprofits? They get Federal money. That would be OMB Circular A–122, ''Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations,'' which says, ''Costs of legal, accounting, and consultant services, and related costs, incurred in connection with defense against Federal Government claims or appeals, antitrust suits, or the prosecution of claims or appeals against the Federal Government, are unallowable.''

So we are now going to have the agency chase a chimera—that is, something that has never happened and can't happen under law. They have got to go out and spend a bunch of money trying to unearth it.

If the gentleman could just name one instance, then that might change the argument, but he can't.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that money is fungible. To the point that this is going to cost a lot of money, I would disagree.

All we are asking for is that if you receive Federal money and you are suing the Federal Government, that you disclose it. You don't have to go on a witch-hunt. You don't have to go find it.

If you receive these dollars and you are suing the Federal Government, tell us. If the gentleman is correct, there won't be any disclosure, but if what I suspect is true, there will be a lot of disclosure, and the American people will see how their tax money is being used to sue themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would note in closing that good government is a government that has transparency, and we should know how our tax dollars are being used. This is not overburdensome. This is a simple request that if you use hard-earned taxpayer money to sue the Federal Government under the Endangered Species Act, the Federal taxpayers know how their money is being spent.

This makes sense. It doesn't cost any money. It is not a hardship, so let's stand together. Let's work together, and let's make sure we have full knowledge in how this money is being used.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the gentleman misstated what his amendment does. It doesn't say that individuals filing litigation under the Endangered Species Act must disclose whether or not they receive any Federal funds and are using any Federal funds in this case. It doesn't say that.

It says that Fish and Wildlife Service must determine. How is the Fish and Wildlife Service going to determine whether or not someone used Federal funds?

As he said, money is fungible. He is saying they may be violating the circular that prohibits nonprofit organizations from doing this. They may be violating the circular.

These are, of course, criminal offenses, that prohibit State, local, and Indian tribal governments from using Federal money for such litigation. He is saying that may be going on, so then Fish and Wildlife should just discover it themselves.

How is that going to work? It sends Fish and Wildlife on a mission that it is not equipped to handle. They can't say: pretty please, tell us.

If someone is violating the law, they are probably not going to volunteer it to Fish and Wildlife.

□ 1645

If you wanted to do this, you would have to write an amendment that amends the Rules of Civil Procedure or whatever—I am not a lawyer—that would require that these litigants disclose at the time of filing their litigation. Saying Fish and Wildlife should find out after it has been filed is absolutely absurd.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–563 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 227, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—188

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook

Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Brady (TX)
Cassidy
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Garcia
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Israel
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Pompeo
Ros-Lehtinen
Waxman

□ 1712

Messrs. WALDEN, MULLIN, COTTON, DUNCAN of South Carolina, DUNCAN of Tennessee, WESTMORELAND, and MATHESON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. CLARKE of New York changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 460, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–563 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 215, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—204

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—215

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)
Cassidy
Clay
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Granger
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Ros-Lehtinen
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4315) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 693, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4315 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

SEC. ___. CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 17. FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL TRUST RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO INDIAN TRIBES.

''In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall consult with affected Indian tribes to ensure that the Federal trust responsibility with respect to Indian tribes is fulfilled.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 17. Fulfillment of Federal trust responsibility with respect to Indian tribes.''.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill, nor send it back to committee. If it is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent a district that has more Native American tribes that own tribal land than any other district in the country. I have 12 tribes in my district, including the Navajo nation, where the people speak a beautiful language called Diné. So I am going to start my speech tonight in Diné.

(English translation of the statement made in Diné is as follows:)

Hello, my esteemed elders, my relatives, and my Navajo friends. It's your Congresswoman speaking, ANN KIRKPATRICK, and I work for you.

YA'ATEEH SHI' NANTAI SHI'KE SHI'DINE' ADO. AHE'HEE. NI'HI' CONGRESSWOMAN ANIH, ANN KIRKPATRICK. ADO NI'HA NASHNISH.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up on tribal land, on the White Mountain Apache where my father ran the general store, and my mother was a schoolteacher. My father spoke Apache. My first words were in Apache. And it is important that we know that the language of our Native American tribes addresses their spirituality, their culture, and their land.

What I want to talk about tonight is tribal sovereignty, because all of our tribes have their own culture, their own history, and their own language, but what they share is a deep respect for tribal sovereignty. What that means is that they are entitled, they have a right to government-to-government negotiations.

So what I want my colleagues to do tonight is do not turn your backs on our Native American people. Do not turn your backs and shut the door to our tribes. I urge you to push for the inclusion and the respect of tribal sovereignty in this legislation and that there be abundant government-to-government negotiations. Our tribes deserve that. They have that right. Let's stand with our Native Americans and make sure that we do everything possible to strengthen those government-to-government relationships, conversations, negotiations, tribal sovereignty.

I will close my remarks tonight as I began, in Diné.

(English translation of the statement made in Diné is as follows:)

Okay. Let's move forward. Thank you.

HAGONEE, AHE'HEE!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona will provide the Clerk a translation of her remarks.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, of course this body should recognize the treaties that we have made with our Native American neighbors. And I say that with the privilege of representing a central Washington district that has two Indian tribes and reservations within my district. So that goes without saying.

However, we have had on this floor I don't know how many motions to recommit. And sometimes I wonder exactly what these motions to recommit are trying to do, other than maybe just make a political point. And I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that is probably so true with this motion to recommit.

Now why do I say that? I say that because this motion to recommit implies that tribal members should be part of the discussion. Well, of course they should. But apparently my friend from Arizona did not read the bill because section 3 in the bill says very specifically that consultation should be made with locals, including tribes.

And to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, the last amendment that was offered, offered by my friend from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), would take out the section that says tribal respect ought to be in the underlying bill, and the gentlewoman from Arizona voted for it. Now she comes down to the floor and says we ought to insert into the bill something for tribal authorities that we already had in the bill.

I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, where these motions to recommit are going, but I will say this. This bill deals with transparency in the Federal Government to the citizens of the United States. That ought to be number one on our minds, and that is what this bill does.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute

votes on the passage of the bill, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4809; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 225, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—197

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX)
Cassidy
Clay
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rogers (KY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1734

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

AYES—233

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)
Cassidy
Clay
Cleaver
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Nunnelee
Pompeo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1741

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 463 on H.R. 4315, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4809) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act, to improve the Defense Production Act Committee, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 32, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—386

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—32

Amash
Bentivolio
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gowdy
Grayson
Harris
Huelskamp
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
Lummis
Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Perry
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Stockman
Stutzman
Tipton
Webster (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Amodei
Brady (TX)
Cassidy
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
DesJarlais
Graves (MO)
Hanabusa
Lowenthal
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rice (SC)
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1748

Messrs. POE of Texas and STUTZMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES 676, AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 935, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2014, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2014

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–566) on the resolution (H. Res. 694) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING M. CALDWELL BUTLER

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has lost a true public servant. Congressman Caldwell Butler, who represented the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia from 1972 to 1983, passed away last night. He will be remembered for many things, including his sharp legal mind and an integral role in the Watergate investigation and the Nixon impeachment proceedings.

A genuine family man, he treasured his wife, June, and their four sons. I am especially thankful to have served as a member of his staff many years ago and to serve the same Sixth District today. My thoughts and prayers are with the Butler family during this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me and members of the Virginia delegation in a moment of silence in honor and in the memory of M. Caldwell Butler.

SUPPORTING KURDISH ALLIES

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Kurdish allies in the Middle East.

The Kurdish people are one of America's strongest allies in the Middle East. In 2003 leading up to the Iraq war, the Kurdish people, positioned in the northern part of Iraq, opened their arms to American troops and welcomed their liberation after decades of oppression from Saddam Hussein's regime.

Recently, with the ISIS insurgency in Iraq, the Kurdish Regional Government has remained firm in protecting Iraq and have managed to maintain stability in a volatile region.

Currently, a Kurdish tanker is anchored off the coast of Texas with an estimated $100 million worth of crude oil aboard. The KRG presently maintains federal control over their region despite the objections of the Iraqi central government. Even though the ship was cleared on Sunday by the U.S. Coast Guard, a Federal judge ruled that the cargo could be seized by U.S. Marshals at the request of the Iraqi oil ministry.

The claim of misappropriation by the Iraqi oil ministry could be viewed as exclusionary. Congress and the administration need to pressure the Maliki government to be more inclusive.

The Kurdish Regional Government, at present, exports billions of dollars each year in crude oil to major allies of the United States all over the world. It should always be our mission to support our allies in the Middle East and move in the right direction in our relationship with the Kurds.

THE IRS

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, if a Cincinnatian were audited tomorrow, the IRS would expect my constituent to have the last 7 years of records to simply prove their compliance with the law. The IRS? Not so much. It is a different standard for them.

After spending years politically targeting Americans, and trampling the First Amendment to silence opposition, the IRS is hiding from the American people. Now, instead of coming clean, the IRS is essentially saying: Sorry, the dog ate my homework. They say: Our emails are missing.

It would appear that Lois Lerner knew what she was doing. In April 2013 she warned staff to be cautious about what information they put in emails.

The Federal Government cannot and should not expect to live above the rules that govern every hardworking American. The breach of trust is devastating. The American people expect a government that is answerable to the people, not one that shirks any accountability or responsibility for blatant political abuse.

A viable special prosecutor must be appointed to get answers. We can't continue to let bureaucrats hide from justice.

HELPING FLORIDA'S MARINE INDUSTRY

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, south Florida has a booming marine industry, from our huge freighters to our Sunday boaters, generating over $8.9 billion a year to our local economy. So I am very proud to join with DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Kristy Hebert, owner of Ward's Marine Electric, in trying to fix a problem.

Businesses like Kristy's have to pay upward of $200,000 a year for providing recreational boat services, the same as companies that are providing services to 100,000-ton petroleum vessels. Obviously, the risks are different, and so H.R. 3896 is going to fix this problem. Workers are still going to be protected, and at an affordable cost for the employers.

SECURING THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was down on the Texas-Mexico border this weekend. I met with Federal officials, and I met with State officials as well.

I want to commend the work that the State of Texas is doing to protect and secure the sovereignty of the United States, including the Department of Public Safety, local law enforcement, Parks and Wildlife law enforcement, the Texas Rangers, and soon to be the National Guard. It is obvious to me that they are on the border and they are protecting the sovereignty of our country for all Americans.

While meeting with the Border Patrol, I asked them where are these people coming from that are so quickly coming to the United States. They told me they are coming from 144 countries. Most recently, 2 weeks ago, there were three Ukrainians who crossed into the United States. The reason why is because the word is out to the world that if you can cross into the United States through Texas, you are going to get to stay. That is too bad. That is tragic.

It is the first duty of government to secure the national borders of any country. That is the obligation of our country, and it is the obligation of this administration. We protect the borders of other nations. It is about time we protect the border of the United States of America.

And that is just the way it is.

IN MEMORY OF MOST REVEREND ROBERT W. DONNELLY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today in Toledo, Ohio, in the 19-county diocese to which he dedicated his selfless life, the beloved most Reverend Roman Catholic Bishop Robert W. Donnelly was laid to rest. This ''priest of priests,'' gentle soul, humble leader, and compassionate shepherd passed from this life on July 21, 2014. With loving gratitude, our entire community extends its deepest appreciation for his life and deepest sympathy to his family and friends at his passing.

Bishop Donnelly's religious life spanned 57 years, and he served as parish priest for seven congregations and taught in two Catholic high schools. Everywhere, he was of the people and revered.

What a priest, what a bishop, what a shepherd was he—a gentle and holy man and a powerful religious leader. The thousands upon thousands of homilies and religious messages he shared were not bombastic but wise. He touched thousands upon thousands of people across generations with baptisms, graduations, communions, marriages, funerals, and confirmations. Bishop Donnelly was a man of peace. He was hardworking and always present when it mattered.

With his extraordinary brother priest, Father Martin Donnelly, with whom he retired, their service cannot be measured in years but, rather, in devotion to imbuing real meaning to the faith to which they devoted their lives.

May God grant him eternal rest as the joy of his spirit is released to eternity.

MOST REV. ROBERT W. ''BISHOP BOB'' DONNELLY

Most Reverend Robert William Donnelly passed on to eternal life on July 21, 2014, surrounded by his family after a short illness. Born in Toledo March 22, 1931, to Agnes (Quinn) and Leonard Donnelly, he was a son of West Toledo's Most Blessed Sacrament Parish, living close by and attending elementary school there—the tallest kid in the 8th grade. As a teen he worked summers as a day camp supervisor at Close Park. During his high school years in the Class of 1949 at Central Catholic he played football and CYO basketball and baseball, and was an avid CCHS tennis player; he captained the tennis team there. Later, at Quinn Family reunions he was the pitcher for the annual softball games. He enthusiastically donned costumes for family reunions and the Blessed Sacrament Halloween Parades. And he had golf in his blood, avidly playing the game.

Bishop Bob earned a Bachelor's degree in Philosophy at St. Meinrad College Seminary. Ordained a priest May 25, 1957, he loved his years in pastoral ministry at Sandusky St. Mary, Landeck St. John, Spencerville St. Patrick, Rossford Ss. Cyril & Methodius, Toledo St. Clement, Toledo St. Charles, and Fostoria St. Wendelin; and teaching at Delphos St. John and Oregon Cardinal Stritch high schools. In every assignment, his heart was always with the people.

He earned a Master's degree in Theology at Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota and attended graduate school programs at Mount Saint Mary Seminary, Norwood, Ohio; Xavier University, Cincinnati; and the University of Toledo. He was ordained Bishop on May 3, 1984. As Toledo Auxiliary Bishop he was appointed to several diocesan positions, serving as Vicar General for 20 years and diocesan administrator following the death of Bishop James Hoffman; he was chairman of the diocesan Ecumenical Commission, a Pro-Synodal consultant, a director of RENEW, and a member of the diocesan board of consulters. He also served on the National Council of Catholic Bishops' committees for Pastoral Practices, Evangelization, and African America Catholics as well as local boards of St. Vincent's Hospital, United Way, and Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE). He retired in May 2006.

Brother priests have known him as ''a priest of priests.'' He is remembered as a truly gentle man, a warm and loyal friend, a wonderful mentor, respectful, humble, a people person. His friends and family say that he was always open and would give his full attention to whatever they had to say, putting them at ease; he could always find something good in everyone. When he presided at Mass, people knew it wasn't ''his'' Mass; it was a prayer of, and for, and by, everyone. He gathered often with life-long friends for cards and camaraderie, loved to vacation with family, and cherished friendships with brother priests. He enjoyed cooking and was good at it, taking special care with holiday dinners of crown roast, apple dumplings, and caesar salad. He later shared and traded secret recipes with his beloved cousin, cook, housekeeper, and friend Dorothy ''Buck'' Taylor.

With subtle wit and care, Bishop Bob loved his family and friends and took delight in children. His many cousins, nieces, and nephews affectionately call him ''Uncle Father Bishop Bob.'' He had a seemingly endless line of advice seekers who he couldn't be more excited and willing to tend to. His Irish heritage inspired him to take a group of the younger generation of family members to Ireland to meet their blood kin. When asked a question, his responses were well-thought-out, detailed, and explained.

Bishop Bob was predeceased by his parents, brother Quinn Donnelly, sister Mary Hendricks, and cousins Fr. Tom Quinn and Betty Mears. He is survived by his brother, Fr. Marty Donnelly, his brother-in-law Pat Hendricks, nieces and nephews Ann (Tim) Doran, Larry (Sharon) Hendricks, Jim (Julie) Hendricks, Mike (Kaye) Hendricks, Kay (Bill) Byrne, and David (Betsy) Hendricks; 24 great nieces and nephews; and 12 great-great nieces and nephews.

Friends may visit Monday, July 28, from 2 to 8 p.m. at Our Lady Queen of the Most Holy Rosary Cathedral, 2535 Collingwood Boulevard, Toledo, where a Vigil Service will be celebrated at 7 p.m. Rosary will be prayed Tuesday, July 29, at 10 a.m., with visitation until 11:45 a.m. The Funeral Mass of Resurrection will be celebrated at noon Tuesday, followed by burial at Resurrection Cemetery. Arrangements by Blanchard-Strabler Funeral Home (419–269–1111) The family would appreciate that any memorial donations be sent to St. Martin de Porres, 1119 W. Bancroft Street, Toledo, OH 43606. Online condolences: blanchardstrabler.com.

□ 1800

SUPPORT OF ISRAEL

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my support for one of our closest allies, Israel, as they combat a surge of violence against their sovereign country from the terrorist group Hamas.

The history of the Jewish people is one of faith, honor, and most importantly, survival. This situation is no different.

Hamas claims that Israel has no right to exist and uses tactics that are beneath the dignity of the human race as they carry out these attacks.

Israel has proven time and time again it is a willing and a waiting partner in the struggle for peace in the region. It continues to endure and defend against attack after attack, however, quite often without retaliation. Yet, faced with the pure evil that Hamas represents, no one should find fault in Israel's measured response and efforts to ensure these attacks are halted and halted for good.

We must continue to show our unwavering support for our friend and ally, Israel.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–142)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the

enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2014.

Certain ongoing activities, such as continuing arms transfers to Hizballah, which include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems, undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 29, 2014.*

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO PROTECT ITSELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, we live in a very dangerous world. It seems like there is chaos and darkness all around us. As a former Air Force pilot, I have seen the results of abusive power in a very real way.

It seems like every time we turn on the television or we read the news, we get the feeling that the world is being turned upside down. The wheels have come off the train and we seem to be careening towards the cliff: Russia takes Crimea and then sends un-uniformed troops into eastern Ukraine; tens of thousands of deaths in Syria, with millions of refugees; the recent evacuation of our own Embassy in Libya; Iran working toward a nuclear weapon; ISIS in Iraq creating essentially a terrorist state; the crisis of Chinese power threatening significant parts of the Eastern world. The list of concerns is very long, indeed.

But nowhere is the strife and uncertainty more dangerous, more strategic, and more critical to U.S. interests than what we are witnessing in Israel and their military operations in Gaza.

Israel is the most important ally in the region that we have. It has the only democratically elected government in a very unstable and violent part of the world. It has a vibrant, free capitalistic society that respects human rights, that respects women's rights, that respects minority rights, even the religious minorities.

Let me say this as clearly and as unambiguously as I can: Israel is our friend and our ally. So tonight we stand with Israel and state without equivocation that Israel has a right to defend itself.

Let me set the stage for the crisis that is happening right now, very quickly.

September 2005: Israel withdraws from Gaza Strip, home to some 1.8 million people. Thousands of Israelis are uprooted and missile fire from Gaza into Israel increases dramatically.

A few short months later, in January 2006, Hamas deposes Fatah, wins elections, and becomes the ruling party of Gaza. The United States, Britain, and all the European Union consider Hamas a terrorist organization.

June 2007: Hamas seizes power in Gaza with Mahmoud Abbas and the Palestinian Authority.

Skipping ahead now to May 2014: rocket attacks from Gaza to Israel increase.

June 12, 2014: Three Israeli teenagers are kidnapped and killed on the West Bank. The PA aids Israel Defense Forces in clamping down on Hamas in the West Bank and tension increases significantly. As a result of that, Hamas unleashes hundreds of rockets in Israel.

Finally, July 7, 2014: the Israel Defense Forces launch Operation Protective Edge. Its goal is to stop the insistent rocket attacks in Israel. Within a week, they expand to an offensive ground war. Its purpose is to destroy Hamas tunnels built for military use against Israel. Now, we will talk more about these tunnels, but let me mention just briefly that, to date, Israel has uncovered more than 66 access shafts to 30 tunnels. Palestinian militants have fired, to date, more than 2,000 rockets since the fighting began on July 8.

Let me put that in perspective before I turn the time over to some of my colleagues.

Imagine, if you will, that al Qaeda or ISIS in Iraq has pledged the destruction of the U.S., something which is not hard to imagine. Now imagine they placed a military frigate off our eastern shore. Now, they claim that it is a supply ship, they say that it has no military purpose, that it only has civilian and peaceful purposes. But then imagine they start lobbing not a few and not dozens, but hundreds of rockets and missiles along our eastern shore, specifically targeting cities where millions of innocent families live.

What would we do? What should we do. Would you expect your government, your President, to protect you? Of course, we would. We would defend ourselves. We would seek the elimination of the threat. We would protect our own people, our values, our way of life. Any Nation would, and every Nation should be able to do that.

That is all the State of Israel is asking: the right to defend itself. That is why we are here tonight, to defend a friend and ally against not only missiles and rockets, but against an onslaught of deception in the world of public opinion. We want our friends in Israel to know that they do not stand alone.

I have invited some of my friends and colleagues to share the floor with me this evening as we stand firm and united in the defense of Israel and their right to protect themselves.

I would like to begin with my colleague Dr. WENSTRUP from Ohio. He is a fellow veteran, he has served in the Army Reserves since 1989, and served a tour in Iraq. He sits on the House Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I yield to Dr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you. I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from Utah, for putting this together tonight to allow us to share our message in support of Israel.

The fear that has engulfed innocent civilians in this conflict is really unthinkable. In southern Ohio and across America, could you imagine rockets raining down indiscriminately on Cincinnati or Chillicothe or Portsmouth? Ohioans know the fear that they feel when they hear tornado sirens blare and the impending threat of possible destruction. Imagine that fear amplified and extended continuously over weeks by an enemy that seeks to eliminate your country and your countrymen.

The continued success of the Iron Dome has protected countless innocents and weakened the perpetual threat posed by the terrorist organizations that surround them. I am proud to say that America has been a strong partner in pioneering this technology.

While Israel continues to protect their people with the Iron Dome, Hamas urges Palestinians to become human shields to protect their Hamas rockets.

We all hope for a peaceful resolution to the current conflict. Unfortunately, Hamas continually rejects cease-fire deals. Hamas refuses to recognize Israel's right to exist and is dedicated to destroying the State of Israel.

Just yesterday, Hamas used tunnels to burrow into Israel and ambush Israeli soldiers, killing many. Can you imagine a terrorist group with tunnels built to infiltrate your town, your village, your city?

The construction materials used to build these terrorist tunnels were intended to construct schools and hospitals, but Hamas would rather continue its perpetual aggression with Israel than better the lives of the Palestinian people. Hamas would rather

fire rockets from playgrounds and homes than work towards peace.

The American public stands with Israel on a foundation of shared democratic values and a commitment to a free society, especially in the face of rising anti-Semitism across the globe.

Israel cannot draw down while Hamas continues to dig tunnels, giving them unfettered access to towns.

Every Nation has the right and responsibility to defend itself, and Israel is no different.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Dr. WENSTRUP.

Next, I would like to yield to Mr. STEVE KING, a colleague and gentleman from Iowa. Mr. KING sits on the Agriculture, Small Business, and Judiciary Committees, and he has always been a strong defender of Israel.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for leading on this Special Order to have this discussion about the sovereignty and the safety and the protection of Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, the place where there is a rule of law, where there are property rights, where they are available to everyone that is an Israel citizen, whether they happen to be of Arabic descent, whether they happen to be of Jewish descent, or any other descent.

The allies that Israel have been deserve on our side that similar kind of support, in fact, a stronger support. There have been so many messages that have been sent from this administration to the contrary, we need to be standing on the floor of the House of Representatives sending a message to Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, and the leaders that are there, the members of the Israel Defense Forces: We stand with you, Israel. Any Nation that is surrounded by enemies, that is infiltrated by tunnels that are dug through to be able to infiltrate and kill innocent people on the streets of Israel, kidnap them, celebrate that, any government that is formed for the purposes of eradicating Israel from the face of the Earth—and, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this new government that was formed among the Palestinian Authority, the Palestinian unity government, includes Hamas terrorist leaders in the cabinet.

Finally, the political arm of Hamas, which always was the Palestinian Authority, has openly now embraced Hamas itself. This Congress and the administration itself and the American people need to understand that there is a Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 which prohibits the U.S. from sending foreign aid to the Palestinian Authority government. That includes Hamas terrorists. It says that we are not going to fund any terrorist organizations, and Hamas has been declared a terrorist organization.

We are watching now as the operations that were so utterly necessary, the Israel Defense Forces going into Gaza, losing Israeli soldiers, and, yes, they have to defend them since thousands of rockets have been fired into Israel. Living under that threat of a people that outside your borders would raise their children to carry suicide vests, to kill themselves to try to kill Israelis, to teach the things that they teach to the young people in that culture and in that climate, that hatred is on one side of that border of Gaza, it is not on both sides. It is on the Gaza side, it is in the West Bank, and it is all around Israel, it is not from within Israel out.

I am amazed at how forgiving they are, how patient they are, how tolerant they are, how they have suffered the way they have, and they waited until it absolutely had to be before the order was given to go in and eradicate the tunnels and to try to take out some of the rocket locations. These rockets are in schools around children. They are using human shields of the children. They are hoping—I guess I can't quite say hoping—but willing to accept the casualties of children, because that is a media message to the world.

This is an appalling set of neighbors that Israel has. They want to live in peace. They have a right to live in peace. We stand with Israel. Israel stands to defend itself. We need to make sure that they have the resources to do so and the moral support from the United States.

I would point out also the statement that was made by Ari Shavit in the newspaper in Israel. He said of Secretary Kerry's latest attempt for a cease-fire over the weekend that ''very senior officials in Jerusalem described the proposal that Kerry put on the table as a strategic terrorist attack.''

□ 1815

That is not a very strong message, I would say, Mr. Speaker. It is not a very strong message representing the policy of the United States coming from our Secretary of State. Our policy is we stand with the Israeli people. We stand for their self-defense.

I thank the gentleman for setting up this Special Order tonight.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING mentioned the tunnels. I would like to illustrate this, if I could, and just interject very quickly. This is a photograph of the tunnels. These aren't dark 2-foot holes dug into the ground.

These are sophisticated, expensive, complicated contraptions that have been put together—30 tunnels, not including the more than two dozen that were discovered prior to Operation Protective Edge. They run for miles.

They are dug more than 60 feet beneath the ground, so that they avoid seismic detection. Some of them are large enough that you can drive a vehicle through them.

You think: What is their purpose? Is it to smuggle men, weapons, or material? It is to in some cases, unfortunately, smuggle and hide those who have been captured and are being kidnapped. Hamas operatives have been intercepted emerging from the tunnels with tranquilizers and handcuffs—obviously, to kidnap Israeli soldiers.

Once again, how much better would the situation have been for the citizens of Gaza if these resources and this money had been diverted? Instead of building tunnels, build infrastructure and schools and hospitals and other things that the citizens there could use.

Thank you, Mr. KING, for your comments.

I would like now to yield to my good friend, Mr. DAINES from Montana. He is a successful businessman who sits on the Homeland Security, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittees.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah for putting together this Special Order. I also want to thank you, Congressman STEWART, for your service to our country. As a B–1 bomber pilot, you in fact hold the record for the fastest nonstop flight around the world. Thank you for your service to our country, Chris.

As our closest ally, Israel's security is critical not only for the future of Israeli people, but also for the security of the United States. Both of our nations were founded by those seeking political and religious freedom.

Israel is the beacon of democracy in the Middle East. Our continued support for Israel is crucial to bringing peace, stability, and security to this most important region of the world.

Daily rocket fire from Gaza is one of the many threats facing the Israeli people. I was in Israel last year. As I stood at the border with Syria, I could hear mortar and rocket fire in the distance.

Since its founding in 1948, Israel has faced a number of existential threats from all sides, including invasion by its neighbors and terrorism from radical groups operating within Israel, Gaza, and the West Bank.

This past March, representatives from Montana's Crow Tribe presented a formal resolution to Israeli Ambassador Ron Dermer in my office here in Washington. The resolution from the Crow Legislature to the Israeli people affirmed their support of Israel's right to exist and recognized their shared challenges of maintaining political and territorial independence and a deep connection to their ancestral homelands.

During this meeting in my office with Crow Tribal leaders and Israeli Ambassador Dermer, his cell phone went off. It wasn't a call. It wasn't a text message. It wasn't an email.

It was an app he had on his phone that many Israelis have to warn them

of impending rocket attacks. It was a sober realization that each time his phone made that noise, fearful Israeli families had seconds to scramble for their lives.

As the Israeli people remain steadfast in confronting these threats, they deserve our unyielding support now and in the future. America's commitment to Israel must never waver. We must stand with Israel.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. DAINES, I agree that we must stand with Israel. All of us here tonight agree that we must stand with Israel.

I now yield to my colleague and good friend, Mrs. HARTZLER from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman from Utah. I appreciate you leading this critical Special Order tonight.

It has been a dangerous few weeks in Israel. We have been watching the developments between Israel and Hamas in Gaza, as Israel shows restraint while still protecting its citizens.

Quite simply, Israel is under siege by a radical faction that displays blatant disregard for its citizens. Hamas is using its citizens as human shields, building bombs in the basements of schools and homes, and prohibiting families from evacuating areas where rockets are being launched.

Israel has shown tremendous restraint and has every right to defend itself against these unwarranted attacks. Over 2,000 rockets have been launched into Israel, reaching even Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Over 80 percent of the country's citizens have had to huddle in bomb shelters for parts of 3 weeks now.

Over 6 million men, women, and children are endangered, yet Israel has agreed to cease-fire after cease-fire. Unfortunately, Hamas has not abided by these calls, firing dozen of rockets into Israel, even when Israel was ceasing its efforts to protect its citizens, so that humanitarian assistance could arrive to the people in the Gaza Strip.

Israel has gone above and beyond for years now to help the people of Gaza and give them an opportunity for a better life. Nine years ago, Israel moved totally out of Gaza, giving the land and farms and greenhouses to people of Gaza. 10,000 Israeli lives were disrupted as they moved to Israel.

Generous people all over the world raised money to buy the tractors and farm equipment for the people of Gaza. The area could have become the jewel of the Mediterranean and a peaceful neighbor to Israel—a model of a two-state solution. Instead, they tore down the greenhouses. Instead of building roads and homes, they built tunnels with the intent to attack and kill Israelis. They voted Hamas in power and turned the area into a terrorist military outpost.

So here we are today, while Hamas is bent on killing innocent Israelis, Israel is intent on preserving their lives. As they seek to stop the rocket fire in the Gaza Strip, Israel goes to great lengths to save innocent lives. It drops leaflets into the neighborhoods, warning of an impending military attack to take out the rocket launchers, which are often strategically placed by Hamas in the neighborhoods.

It then calls the residents of the house to warn them, then sends text messages to the home, then ''knocks'' on the house by dropping a small non-penetrating bomb on the roof to let people know they are serious. Unfortunately, Hamas has responded by stopping people from fleeing and even forcing them onto the rooftops as human shields.

Thankfully, the Iron Dome missile defense system has stopped rockets from reaching their targets in Israel. As Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said:

> Israel uses its missile defense system to save human lives. Hamas uses its people to save its missiles.

We need to be standing strong for the only democracy and our greatest ally in the Middle East. We need to let other nations know we will never abandon Israel, and they need to join us in speaking out against the affront to national sovereignty and to human decency. We need to be offering assistance to stop these attacks and help Israel stay safe.

It is time for Hamas to agree to a total cease-fire. Any loss of life is tragic, and Hamas needs to end their blatant disregard for their citizens and agree to end the attacks.

Please join me in praying for the peace of Jerusalem.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you. We have so many people who want to join in this conversation tonight. We are grateful for many of those who participated.

It is my honor to yield to Mr. ENGEL, who represents New York, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Sir, we are glad to have you with us.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to thank all my colleagues for their excellent remarks. I agree with every word that has been said.

I think perhaps I will start off with a bit of good news because everyone can see this tonight. At a time when the pundits say that the two parties can't agree on anything, that nothing gets done, and that there is too much fighting, there is one thing on which we can agree, and that is that the support for Israel in this Congress is strong and it is bipartisan, and that is the way it should be.

It is bipartisan for a number of reasons. First of all, Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. We share common values with Israel, and we understand that the people of Israel, right now, are besieged.

Hamas is a terrorist group. It is not a fight between Israelis and Palestinians. It is a fight between Israel and a terrorist group. As someone who was in New York on that fateful day of September 11, 2001, Israel has endured many September 11, 2001s.

My colleague said it right before. The difference between the Hamas terrorists and Israelis is that Israel uses its missiles to protect its citizens and Hamas uses its citizens to protect its missiles.

It is terrible when any civilians die, and my heart breaks for casualties on both sides, but Hamas uses their citizens as human shields. They build their bomb factories, and they build their missile factories in mosques and schoolyards. Missiles were even found in United Nation schools. They do this deliberately because they apparently don't value human life at all.

Let's just imagine if we, in the United States, had a terrorist group over the border in Canada firing rockets, hurting people in New York or Michigan. Wouldn't we respond?

If there were terrorists in Mexico that were firing into Arizona, Texas, or California, would we just simply let our people be targets? Wouldn't we respond? Wouldn't we go over the border and try to root out the terrorists, root out their missiles, root out their tunnels if there were? That is precisely what Israel is trying to do.

I am introducing the emergency Iron Dome replacement act. The Iron Dome, which has been Israeli-created and American-funded, has saved countless numbers of Israeli lives, and by the way, Hamas has the nerve to talk about civilian casualties when it has targeted, day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, Israeli civilians. That is what they do.

Israel targets the missiles—and there are some civilian casualties because of the way the Palestinians put their missiles right in the densely-populated areas—but Hamas has deliberately been trying to kill innocent Israeli civilians.

So we hope we will continue funding the Iron Dome, and I know there will be strong bipartisan support on both sides.

Any cease-fire should contain the total disarming of Hamas. Any cease-fire should contain the destruction of the tunnels which, as my colleague very adeptly pointed out, were made for terrible purposes.

With the concrete that was coming into Gaza, they could have built schools and mosques and skyscrapers; but what did they do? They built terror tunnels, so they can try to kill Israelis.

And the media? Shame on some of the coverage we have seen in the media. There is no moral equivalency between a terrorist group and a nation that values its citizens and wants to

protect its citizens. There is no moral equivalency whatsoever.

Israel is trying to protect its citizens. Hamas only wants to kill. Read their charter. Read what they say about Jews. Read about Israel. They want to destroy every last person in Israel. So I think the media ought to be a little more evenhanded and not the way it has been portraying things up until now.

So let me conclude by saying this: the bond between Israel and the United States is unbreakable, unshakeable. It has always been and will always be. The United States will always stand by the people of Israel, particularly in their fight to exist and in their fight against terrorism.

I thank my friend.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. ENGEL. Thank you for your service on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

You bring up such a great point. This is a bipartisan issue. There is agreement on both sides of the aisle. We have got servicemembers, military members, school teachers, and businessmen. We have got people from all backgrounds who want to speak on this tonight. Frankly, we have got more people who want to join in this Special Order than we have time for.

I would like to now yield to Mr. COLLINS from Georgia. He has a unique perspective as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee as well. He served as a chaplain in the Air Force since 2002 and a combat tour in Iraq in 2008.

Mr. COLLINS, thank you for your service.

□ 1830

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you as well for yours, and thanks for doing this tonight.

Mr. Speaker, this is an easy one for me. I stand with the State of Israel as well as her right to defend herself. It is amazing to me at times that that is even called into question, because Israel has proven time and time again that it is very capable of defending herself, and it is amazing to me that the world doesn't want to acknowledge that.

This commitment that I have to Israel is here now and will continue to be unwavering even in the midst of this conflict between Israel and Hamas that is taking place mainly in Gaza. I am in firm support of Israel's decision to launch a ground operation, and I hope this conflict will be resolved quickly and negotiations for a permanent cease-fire will occur soon for this area.

Currently, Israel's strategic objective is to eradicate Hamas' ability to terrorize Israel. Prime Minister Netanyahu gave the go-ahead to send ground troops into Gaza after a 10-day air operation failed to diminish Hamas' rocket barrage.

Think if the U.S. were being targeted. Do you think we would wait a day to execute a ground incursion, let alone 10 days? Absolutely not.

In fact, Israel and Egypt tried to negotiate a cease-fire with Hamas, but Hamas was unwilling to accept it. We see the true stripes of Hamas when they will not come to the table and when they, instead, want to basically put their own citizens up as human shields.

I have received a lot of feedback from folks in the Ninth District who feel very strongly about the United States' support for Israel from the beginning, when the three young Israeli teens were kidnapped. Georgians empathized with the pain of the nation and with the hope that the three teenagers would be returned to Israel, unharmed. Unfortunately, their bodies were discovered in a Palestinian-controlled area. They had been brutally murdered at the hands of Hamas.

I think my constituents would agree when I say a peaceful solution to end this conflict between Israel and the residents of the Gaza Strip is preferred. Hamas, on more than one occasion, however, has rejected the cease-fires that Israel was more than willing to agree to. We as Americans understand fighting terrorism is a constant fight, and this is yet another reason we must continue to work towards combating terrorism, not just on American soil, but by supporting our allies in their fights against terrorism.

Our support is shown in many ways, but the biggest is in the Iron Dome defense system. Hundreds of Hamas' rockets have been intercepted by the Iron Dome, and it has protected those in Israel who are being terrorized by Hamas. Hamas is hiding behind Palestinians—their own people—to protect their rockets while Israel is protecting their people with the Iron Dome. These are the things that must be reported, and these are the things that must be looked after. A peaceful solution needs to be found soon.

The administration needs to get its priorities correct. Israelis understand this, and that is why they need to continue to protect themselves. The resources going to Gaza should be used to build schools and hospitals and infrastructure instead of the things that the Palestinians are not getting. This is why the United States must continue to support Israel. We must continue to support their fight against terrorism, and we must continue to maximize our efforts towards a peace that will last in Israel in this area.

Mr. STEWART. I thank you for your comments and for your support, Mr. COLLINS.

I now am happy to introduce the newest Member of Congress, Mr. CLAWSON from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Thank you very much for this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a time of significant crisis at home and worldwide.

We have a humanitarian and a national security crisis on our own border, and all Americans are deeply concerned and are looking for solutions. Simultaneously, we see a border crisis in the Middle East that makes our own border crisis pale by comparison. We see our friend and ally Israel attacked physically but also, sadly enough, attacked in the media. It is our solemn duty, I believe, to address this crisis as well as our own crisis on our own border.

Israel's borders have been attacked by over 2,000 rockets, launched by Hamas, with a total disregard for innocent lives. Within Gaza, Hamas sets up their rocket launchers in the midst of apartment buildings, mosques, and U.N.-sponsored schools—using civilians as human shields. Hamas is not seeking to minimize collateral damage but, rather, to maximize it. Meanwhile, elements of the media fuel anti-Israeli propaganda with scenes of innocent dead and wounded Palestinians, adding to Israel's dilemma—falsely asserting that the Israel Defense Forces are committing war crimes.

The fact is that Israel is responding with careful precision, taking extraordinary steps that few nations would take to protect lives on both sides of this fight. Israel's Iron Dome is shooting down rockets that would otherwise kill Israelis. Israel is warning civilians in Gaza in advance of attacking terrorist infrastructure there. Israel takes extraordinary steps to minimize collateral damage. Israel wants peace. Hamas seeks the destruction of Israel. This cannot happen.

The United States must stand firmly with Israel and against Hamas and take a leadership role in convincing the world to do likewise.

We must remember the threats extend beyond Gaza and Hamas. Hezbollah, the Islamist militant group and Iranian surrogate based in Lebanon, possesses thousands of rockets on another part of Israel's border. ISIS—evolved from al Qaeda in Iraq—has declared an Islamic caliphate in major areas of Syria and Iraq, threatening the entire region, but especially Israel. Iran, the world's exporter of terrorism—committed to the destruction of Israel—continues to hold nuclear ambitions, raising security issues not only for Israel but for the entire world.

We cannot waver in leading the international community towards a long-term, verifiable solution. The Middle East is arguably a more dangerous place than at any time in history, with Israel threatened on several fronts by well-armed and well-funded terrorists who are distressingly close to possessing weapons of mass destruction. This cannot happen.

This is not a time for partisan bickering between Democrats and Republicans or between the Congress and the administration. It is a time for a national discourse to educate the public

about the dangers out there, with the goal of national unity and resolve to stand behind Israel—the only democratic state in the world's most dangerous neighborhood.

Speaking as a freshman Congressman—the newest Congressman—I pledge to work with my colleagues to seek better ways of working together in support of the State of Israel and its right to exist.

In these times of peril, I believe it is our duty to work as a team and to stand with Israel. Together, we can seek a path to lasting solutions in the Middle East. The alternative cannot happen. America must come together to support Israel.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. CLAWSON. We look forward to serving with you in the future, and we, once again, welcome you.

It is now my honor to introduce my good friend and someone I have come to respect and admire, Mrs. WALORSKI from Indiana. She is the daughter of an Air Force veteran and serves on the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as with past conflicts in the Middle East, much of the media focus in this current conflict between Israel and Hamas has been on the death tolls on both sides, but what this reporting neglects to mention is Hamas' destruction of its own people. Legitimate governments understand that one of the most important duties of any nation is the protection of its people and the protection of innocent civilians.

Israel goes to great lengths to avoid targeting civilians, from its use of precision-guided weapons to sending out phone and text warnings to evacuate buildings before it carries out a strike. Yet Hamas' leaders are willing to sacrifice their own people in an attempt to score political points. Hamas continues to force civilians, including women and children, to stand in harm's way and literally act as human shields for the terrorist leaders and properties, causing Israeli strikes on legitimate military targets to result in the loss of innocent lives.

As General Conway, the 34th Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, recently wrote in The Wall Street Journal, there is a clear and obvious ''moral chasm,'' he says, between Hamas and Israel. Hamas has always targeted civilians, and they continue to target civilians. It is their standard operating procedure, and it is one of the reasons it makes them a terrorist organization.

Sadly, though, what we are seeing in this conflict is nothing new. This is the third time in less than 6 years that fighting has broken out between Israel and Hamas.

In order to secure peace and stability in the Middle East, America, our allies, and anyone else truly concerned about the safety of civilians on both sides of the border should focus on keeping weapons out of the hands of Hamas' leaders. We must condemn anyone—perhaps, most importantly, Iran—who is supporting and arming Hamas. Iran supplies Hamas with rockets and training. Just yesterday, Iran's supreme leader declared on Iranian national TV:

> Everyone, whoever has the means—especially in the Islamic world—should do what they can to arm the Palestinian nation . . . The Zionist regime deeply regrets starting this war, but it has no way out.

We must stand strongly with Israel as it exercises its legitimate right to self-defense. We must call on the international community to join us in condemning Hamas for their human rights violations.

Everyone wants the current conflict in Gaza to end, but how it ends is critically important. The conflict can only be truly over when there are no rockets, when there are no tunnels, and when Hamas has been completely disarmed and defeated militarily and politically.

Mr. STEWART. We thank you, Mrs. WALORSKI. Beautifully said.

I now would like to introduce someone I have come to have tremendous respect for. He brings not only a unique perspective but great experience to this question as chairman of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee. He is also a U.S. Army Vietnam veteran; although, he appears to be far too young for that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Israel.

There are certain principles that govern the conduct of nations that are so basic—so fundamental—that the world should never have to be reminded of them. The most fundamental of these is simple and straightforward: a nation has the right and the obligation to defend its people and its territory from attack. Unfortunately, however, this fundamental principle does not bear repeating tonight because too many around the world seem to have forgotten it or too many seem to think it only applies to every nation but one—the State of Israel.

Make no mistake. It applies to Israel just as it applies to every nation on the face of the Earth.

Every nation—every one—has the right and the obligation to defend its people and its territory. The thousands of rockets launched against Israel by the terrorist group Hamas are a deliberate attack on the State of Israel and the Israeli people.

I stand with Israel's right to exist in peace and to protect itself. I stand with Israel in terms of its efforts to defend itself, and I support the very important Iron Dome, Arrow program, and David's Sling program, which keep the Israeli people safe. I stand with Israel in its effort to destroy the ability of Hamas' to attack Israel's people and its territory.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Israel.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, for your comments and for your leadership.

It is now my honor to introduce Mr. LANCE from New Jersey. He served for many years in the New Jersey State Legislature and now serves on the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us in the United States who value Israel, its people and its value—symbolic and real—these are heartbreaking times. Our world's most sacred lands are again brutalized by terror as evil tries to extinguish the Jewish state. Though we may be far in distance, our spirit, support, and resources are needed. The United States stands in solidarity with Israel and its fundamental right to defend itself.

The ongoing crisis in Israel may feel a world away to some, but the significance cannot be understated: a free people and democratic ally of our Nation faces continued war by elements of hate and intolerance similar to those who have claimed the lives of millions, forever scarred the face of the Earth, and brought this battle to our shores 13 years ago.

To know terror, look at their tactics. While Israel uses weapons to shield women and children, Hamas uses women and children to shield weapons.

□ 1845

When Israel offers a cease-fire, Hamas orders more rocket launches. When Israel offers compromise, Hamas calls for more bloodshed. Israel needs and deserves the support of the world community, not a lecture from media commentators. If the United States were under daily rocket assault, assuredly, the press would not question our right to keep Americans safe.

Many of us in Congress have worked together in a bipartisan fashion to support Israel. Look no further than the Iron Dome capability at the center of Israel's current defense apparatus. The Iron Dome has been the guardian of a people under siege, and it was constructed with the help of American ingenuity, American technology, and American funds.

Countless other measures have sought to assist Israel, including legislation recently passed here in the House, to disrupt to the greatest extent possible international financing capabilities of terror networks.

How can Israel negotiate with entities on a mission for its destruction? The answer is moral authority. Israel stands for peace, democracy, the rule of law, human rights, liberty, an eventual two-state solution, and peace through strength.

In this time of great moral crisis, now is not the time for neutrality. Nearly 800 people proudly stood in solidarity with Israel earlier this month at the New Jersey headquarters of the Jewish Federation of Greater MetroWest as we rallied for Israel. Tonight, that same energy is here in Washington, where I join many other lawmakers in further conversation as how best the United States can assist our friend in need.

Israel must never lose its resolve, its mission, its purpose, or forget its proud history, and the United States must support our great ally as it fights to preserve its very existence.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. LANCE.

As the manager of this Special Order, I have to be prepared to fill the time if we need to, to fill any gaps in the conversation, and very clearly that has not been necessary tonight. We have so many eloquent Members who are anxious and are stating this case so powerfully.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), who also serves on the Armed Services Committee and Judiciary Committee and is also chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman MICHELE BACHMANN and I recently introduced H. Res. 622 to defund the Palestinian Authority. We have now 27 bipartisan cosponsors in the House of Representatives, and just today we received nearly 28,000 signatures supporting this policy.

Mr. Speaker, may we all remember that Yasser Arafat, the founder of the Palestinian Authority, proclaimed early on: ''We plan to eliminate the State of Israel and establish a purely Palestinian state. We will make life unbearable for the Jews by psychological warfare and population explosion. We Palestinians will take over everything, including all of Jerusalem.''

Mr. Speaker, Mahmoud Abbas, the current head of the Palestinian Authority, has taken this mantra to its insidious end by publicly uniting with the terrorist group Hamas, which is really the Muslim Brotherhood.

Let me make this very clear, Mr. Speaker. The Hamas and Palestinian Authority have now become one and the same. Yet, even as Hamas has continued to launch cowardly attacks from neighborhoods in Gaza, hiding behind innocent women and children and making civilian casualties a deliberate strategy, this President has responded by heralding President Mahmoud Abbas as a man of peace.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the President's astonishing failure to do so, Congress must continue its steadfast commitment of supporting Israel to protect against Hamas' thirst for death, and the first step in doing that is to defund the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy now to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a good friend of mine, someone, once again, that I have come to respect greatly. For one thing, he is a colonel in the Army National Guard. I was only a major when I separated from the Air Force, so, of course, I salute him every time I see him. He sits on the Homeland Security and also Foreign Affairs Committees.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the great gentleman from Utah who is, indeed, a friend, and I thank him for his service.

We have heard much tonight about Israel and the rockets and everything that is happening in that part of the world, but one thing we haven't talked about much is the United Nations Human Rights Council, which really can't be taken seriously as a human rights organization, and I will tell you why.

Let's talk about some of the members on that: Cuba, Russia, Congo, Ivory Coast, Venezuela, and China.

When you think about Cuba and Venezuela, they outlaw political demonstrations in their country, but yet they are on the Human Rights Council judging Israel. When you think about Ivory Coast or Congo, they allow genital mutilation in their country, yet they are judging Israel.

Now, this commission established a commission to probe alleged war crimes in violation of international law by Israel for defending its citizens against rocket attacks and terror tunnels. I mean, really? A competition to probe the war crimes from Israel.

Now, what they should be doing, instead, is focusing on Hamas, which uses its citizens as human shields while its commanders flee to bunkers. If Hamas uses human shields to protect its rockets, I mean, is that Israel's fault for defending itself? But somehow, as Americans, we are told that that is what we should believe.

Everybody—everybody—in this Chamber, every American is saddened by the tragic loss of innocent life on both sides of the conflict. However, let's be clear. It is Hamas, a designated terrorist organization, that has refused to deescalate this conflict.

Recently, I heard a reporter and some other folks saying: Well, in Gaza, where should the Palestinians go? It is small. There is nowhere to go to avoid the rockets from Israel. Where should they go?

They should stay right there and quit firing on Israel, quit digging tunnels into Israel. That is what they should do, and then this problem would relieve itself. I mean, who dug these tunnels? Who has fired over 2,000 rockets into Israel? They don't have to go anywhere. They just need to quit attacking Israel.

No U.S. funds should go towards the Palestinian Authority or its institution so long as Hamas is part of a unity Palestinian Government.

Secretary Kerry's recent actions have actually hampered a cease-fire. This administration continues to befriend our enemies and make enemies of our friends, and it must stop, Mr. Speaker. It is critical for the U.S. to reiterate our support for our ally, our only ally there, which is Israel, including its right of its people to live in peace and to defend itself.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. PERRY.

Once again, I have the honor of yielding to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO), a Member with a unique background, who, while stationed in Iraq with the Michigan Army National Guard, he, himself, experienced rocket attacks. This happened on a regular basis, so I think he speaks with some authority on the subject tonight.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART). He is a true friend of Israel and a friend of mine as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Israel and its right to self-defense as it faces the ongoing threat of terrorist rockets from Gaza.

Picture the scene. You are walking down the streets of Tel Aviv. You look around you. You see men, women, and children of all ages. To your right is an elderly man with a walker. A few paces ahead is a mother with her stroller. It is peaceful. It is calm. It is the embodiment of urban normality. And suddenly you hear it. Everyone instinctively knows what it is and, in a split second, everything changes. It is the red alert siren. A rocket is racing toward the city at breakneck speed. Only seconds remain to find refuge in a bomb shelter. And the rocket could land anywhere: on a preschool, on a hospital, on a random family home, or perhaps on the mother and her stroller up ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this is the threat that Israel faces from Hamas and other terrorist groups in Gaza, which deliberately target Israeli civilians, which indiscriminately kill, maim, and terrorize, and whose sole purpose is to destroy the State of Israel.

When faced with such a complete absence of basic moral inhibition by a brutal enemy, it is Israel's right—nay, its duty—to forcefully respond in order to eliminate the threat. It is not disproportionate. It is self-defense, pure and simple, and it is precisely why the State of Israel deserves our unwavering support at this time.

It is also why no government that claims to be interested in peace can credibly partner with a group like Hamas. It is past time for the Palestinian Authority's president to dissolve his unity governing arrangement with this appalling terrorist group.

We can't have it both ways. We can choose to make peace with Hamas or with Israel.

As for me, I have made my choice. I am proud to support the Jewish State, and I stand with Israel because Israel embodies all the values I embrace—peace, democracy, tolerance—while the values of Hamas—hate, extremism, violence—violate everything I believe.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He has stated it, once again, like many others, very powerfully.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion tonight, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who, once again, as a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has great experience and is unquestionably like many of us, a strong supporter of Israel.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend from Utah. I thank him for his service to our country and for, again, bringing us all together this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the President of the United States to give Israel the robust and vigorous support it deserves.

Since the latest round of unprovoked rocket barrages were launched on July 6 by Hamas, Israeli citizens have lived under a relentless rocket attack, mortar fire, even attack from Hamas drone aircraft and a foiled sea raid.

Israel itself has lived under a media attack, a calculated campaign to isolate Israel for defending itself. Major articles in international newspapers around the world take a grossly anti-Israeli slant.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. A major purpose of Hamas' rocket attacks is to provoke counterattacks, thereby to use the inevitable civilian deaths to set up an international media campaign against Israel. Hamas is guilty of sacrificing Palestinian lives and is guilty of using women and children as human shields in a brutally cynical attempt to manipulate world public opinion and isolate Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the facts on the ground of Hamas attacks were clear from the start and follow long-established patterns. It is time our government sent a much more powerful and unambiguous message that the U.S. fully supports Israel's right to defend itself.

The administration should emphasize that Israel's actions in its own defense are legal, that they are right, and that the U.S. stands with Israel without any ifs, ands, or buts, or so longs or any other qualifiers.

As of yesterday, since the start of Israel's Operation Protective Edge, 2,500 rockets have been fired at Israel from Gaza. 1,875 of these have landed in Israel; 495 have been shot down by Iron Dome. Also, as of yesterday, the IDF has uncovered in Gaza 32 tunnels, with more than 60 access shafts, some of which were in mosques and houses.

Anyone who has read today's feature in The New York Times, ''Tunnels Lead Right to the Heart of Israeli Fear,'' understand what these tunnels mean. The tunnels are about 50 feet underground, mostly undetectable like this one to my left, and underground equipment cannot even discover their whereabouts.

The story quotes Eyal Brandeis, who lives in Kibbutz Sufa, and he says:

> It is a very pastoral environment. I live in the quiet of the green grass, the trees. It is not pleasant, though, that you sit one day on the patio drinking coffee with your wife and a bunch of terrorists will rise from the ground.

That is exactly what happened a mile from his kibbutz at dawn on July 17.

Many Israelis are more concerned about the tunnels than the rockets. Perhaps that gives us some insight into the dimension of the Hamas terrorist.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that despite these rocket attacks by Hamas and tunnels, Israel continues to permit the transfer to the Gaza of humanitarian supplies and goods. Israel's humanity while under terrorist fire, its continued effort to do everything it can to separate terrorist militants from Palestinian civilians, only underscores the evil nature of Hamas.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, Hamas was designated a foreign terrorist organization in 1997, and it has adopted its charter, the famous Covenant of the Islamic Resistance. That charter remains its ideological program.

Only yesterday, Khaled Meshaal, the leader of Hamas, spoke on the Charlie Rose show in response to a question, ''Do you want to coexist with the State of Israel?'' He said, ''No.'' He said, ''No.'' Hamas doesn't want peace or reconciliation or coexistence. It wants to utterly destroy the State of Israel.

I have further comments I will be saying later on this evening about the charter. Please read the charter. It couldn't be clearer. Hamas wants to destroy Israel.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, that was powerfully said.

In conclusion, as we wind down our time tonight, let me just finalize with these thoughts.

There is a great line from a speech that would have been given by John F. Kennedy in November 1963 if he had been allowed to give that speech before he was assassinated. And he said: ''This people, this generation, not by choice, but by destiny, are set to be the watchmen on the wall of world freedom.''

We may not like the fact that we have to lead in the world. We may not like the responsibility. We may not like the cost. We may not like the hassle or the criticism or sometimes the hatred that is directed toward us. But it doesn't matter. We have to lead. If we don't do it, who will? If we don't lead, we give power to our enemies, and we weaken our friends.

We have a chance here tonight to make a statement to the world. To the people of Israel, we stand by your side. To the peace-loving people of Gaza, we stand with you as well. But to the terrorists who seek for the destruction of Israel and to the leaders of Hamas who seek only for death and destruction, we, the American people, will always stand in your way.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCALLISTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, we gather this evening to discuss anti-Semitism. It is a plague that has ravaged the world for thousands of years, yet in the last few weeks, it has reared its ugly head globally in a way we have not seen in a long time.

It is truly shocking. From Berlin to New York, we are hearing chants of ''Gas the Jews.'' And this is not hyperbole. We are actually hearing chants of ''Gas the Jews'' around the world.

And these are not isolated incidents. We are seeing hundreds and thousands of people rallying and sometimes attacking synagogues in Europe. It is one thing to protest against events going on in the Middle East, but there is simply no justification and no reason for doing it right outside any Jewish place of worship. These are brazen acts of anti-Semitism.

Now, I cannot possibly understand anti-Semitism to the same extent as my Jewish friends. But I think it is crucial that non-Jews speak out forcefully against this disease because to effectively combat anti-Semitism, we need non-Jews to step up and also lead on this issue.

I would like to focus my remarks today on two related issues, the international and domestic dimensions of anti-Semitism.

With regard to anti-Semitism beyond our borders, I would like to focus on one case, that of France. I am focusing on France because I think it is really the front line right now in the war against global anti-Semitism, and I think it is an instructive case for how policy leaders here can face this issue.

In France right now, there is a war. On the one hand, we see some of the most widespread and atrocious acts of anti-Semitism, but on the other hand, we see a government—most particularly, Prime Minister Valls—acting forcefully against anti-Semitism. The words and actions of the French Government, most particularly Mr. Valls' recent assertions that anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism, are unprecedented and should be acknowledged as such.

So what we have here are two sides: virulent anti-Semites on one side, and on the other, a democratically elected government that appears resolved to take them on. Rather than throw our hands in the air and say that France is a horribly anti-Semitic place and that all the Jews should leave, we ought to get in this fight.

Anti-Semitism is a complicated issue, not a black-and-white issue. Yes, France has a deep history of anti-Semitism, but it is also a country that has had a Jewish President and one that nearly elected another a couple of years ago. It has the third-largest Jewish population in the world, and there is a reason for that. It is also a country that historically has proven itself capable of changing. We need to recognize this history and work with France's leadership and civil society to fight this battle and remain hopeful. What happens here will, I believe, affect the future of the Jewish people.

This brings me to the domestic dimension of our problem. We obviously have anti-Semitism in this country as well, although not to the degree we see it in Europe. It is essential that Jews and non-Jews speak about this problem to their own communities, and we have to continue to encourage that here in Congress.

In New York, Mr. JEFFRIES and I are leading a program whereby Jewish, Asian, and African American college students are gathering to discuss foreign policies and the perspectives of the respective communities in relation to key foreign policy issues.

We must speak regularly about Israel, BDS, and other issues of importance to our Jewish friends and neighbors, not just when there is a major international incident. The reason I say this is because it is also far easier to hate someone you don't know than to hate someone that you do know.

Mr. Speaker, as we head into the August recess, I urge my colleagues of all stripes to discuss the dangers of anti-Semitism with their communities and to build bridges between communities so that we may reduce hatred and bigotry.

I also urge my colleagues as statesmen and -women to engage the international community in a positive way on this issue and believe in and fight for a Europe and world of lesser anti-Semitism.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, the first Jewish woman from Florida elected to Congress, a tireless advocate and one of the great Jewish leaders of our time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentlewoman from New York, particularly for her leadership in stepping up and bringing to the floor of the United States House of Representatives the incredibly important topic of anti-Semitism, not just nationally but globally, because much of the conflict that exists worldwide today, unfortunately, stems from poisonous anti-Semitism.

The gentlewoman from New York represents the district that my parents grew up in and neighborhoods and communities with a proud Jewish immigrant tradition. And she also represents the Asian American community that has come and joined that crowd and vibrant ethnic community of immigrants who have contributed so much to the United States' rich tapestry of diversity. And it is diversity that we celebrate. But, unfortunately, it is not a difference that everyone celebrates, as we have seen with the precipitous and poisonous rise in anti-Semitism.

So from the bottom of my heart, as a Jew, and as the representative of a significant Jewish population myself, thank you so much for your leadership and bringing this important issue to the floor of the House of Representatives, because it is only through shining a light on anti-Semitism that we are going to be able to help educate people and fight back.

And I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to condemn the alarming increase of anti-Semitism that we have witnessed over the last few weeks. The Anti-Defamation League released a terrifying report just last month about anti-Semitism growing throughout the world.

Tragically, my own constituents have personally experienced terrifying and heinous crimes against them just this past week. On Monday morning, congregants and neighbors were horrified to find that swastikas had been spray painted on the walls of Torah V'Emunah synagogue in Miami-Dade County. In Miami Beach over the weekend, a Jewish couple found their car had been egged and the words ''Hamas'' and ''Jew'' had been smeared on their cars.

These deplorable acts are atrocious and despicable. For all of us who care about the rights of minority populations in this country, who celebrate the rich diversity that makes up our great Nation, we cannot and we must not be silent.

It is amazing to many of us that these actions are occurring in 2014, not in 1930s Nazi Germany. But, unfortunately, we are also witnessing what Anti-Defamation League director and holocaust survivor Abe Foxman recently called the worst anti-Semitism since World War II.

As the gentlewoman from New York detailed, in France, in an episode that is chillingly reminiscent of Kristallnacht, we witnessed angry rioters throw firebombs at synagogues and ransack and destroy Jewish-owned businesses. In Belgium, a cafe actually publicly displayed a sign saying dogs were allowed in the cafe, but Jews were not.

Thankfully, we have seen the leaders of European countries, including Germany, France, and Italy, condemn this kind of behavior. There are countless voices across Europe speaking up in the face of this barbarism.

But this anti-Semitism is real. This hatred is real, and the violence is real.

Many not close to this issue may ask why. To us, it is very clear. This recent surge of anti-Semitism is born out of knee-jerk vitriolic reaction to the conflict raging in Israel and Gaza. But this conflation of anti-Semitism with the recent actions of Israel in defense of her people is completely misplaced. Israel's actions are a direct response against rocket attacks from a terrorist organization whose stated mission is Israel's destruction and that thrives on a continuing narrative of anti-Semitism and hatred.

Unfortunately, we only see a few lone voices around the world protesting against a Hamas government that knowingly and willingly puts its citizens, its children, in harm's way, placing them in jeopardy and sacrificing their lives to engender sympathy for their evil cause.

We hear little from much of the world against a terrorist organization that chose to invest in rockets and building tunnels for plotting murderous attacks against innocent civilians instead of investing in homes and schools and hospitals for its citizens.

Instead of condemning these cowardly practices by Hamas, we have, however, seen people rage equally against Israel, Israelis, and Jews anywhere. The words and phrases that these protesters are using cannot be spoken on this House floor. They have been dug up from the worst episodes of human history.

That is why I am proud to stand with my colleagues tonight, to stand with President Obama and Secretary Kerry, and send a clear message that these actions will not be tolerated. We must stand by the commitments we made as a community and as a world to never again stand silent in the face of this kind of horror, this kind of bigotry, this kind of injustice.

We will not stand idly by as vitriolic speech turns into violence against innocent people. Never again.

Ms. MENG. With that, I would like to yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, a mentor on many of

those issues, a good friend, fellow Wolverine, tireless fighter, and defender of Israel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from New York (Ms. MENG). I appreciate very much your dedicating this hour to this important topic. I appreciate your leadership. I am proud to be here with you. I am proud to be here with my friend and my neighbor from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a powerful and eloquent spokeswoman on these issues that means so much not just to the Jewish community but to all of America.

And I am glad to be here with you to condemn the increase of anti-Semitism around the world.

Anti-Semitism isn't a new issue faced by Jews. For centuries, Jews have been targeted, persecuted, sometimes by their governments, sometimes by their neighbors, used as scapegoats for economic downturns and disasters, and commonly accused of being disloyal to their home country.

But this hatred, unfortunately, is far from gone. It continues in a range of manifestations, from Holocaust denial to suspicion of Jewish influence over international affairs and, tragically, even in the shooting of innocent Jews.

In recent days, we have seen a new face on this age-old bigotry. We are seeing demonstrations around the world that claim to be protesting Israel's actions against Hamas but too easily and far too often, political opposition to Israel's policies and actual hatred toward Jews are conflated and are indistinguishable.

□ 1915

It is clear, unfortunately, that many people are using the current conflict, a facade of anti-Zionism, or anti-Israel sentiment, as a thin veil to cover up a much more deep-seated hatred toward Jews.

Let me be clear. It moves far beyond a political statement when your intention is to incite—incite violence and to incite violence against Jewish targets especially.

Since the military operation began on July 8, over 100 anti-Semitic incidents have been reported in the United Kingdom alone. On July 18, four teenagers assaulted a rabbi in Gateshead, and separately, in Belfast, a synagogue was damaged when bricks were thrown through the windows.

France has also experienced a significant number of incidents across the country. In Sarcelles, a kosher store was the target of a Molotov cocktail, and last month, two Jews were sprayed with teargas.

In Paris, two synagogues were attacked on July 13 while the mob chanted ''death to the Jews.'' In Toulouse, Molotov cocktails were thrown at a Jewish community center, but thankfully, the attacker missed the target. Particularly in Toulouse, these incidents evoke memories of the awful shooting that happened 2 years ago when three Jewish children and a teacher were shot and killed at a Jewish day school.

In Germany, long touted—appropriately so—for its extensive protective policies against anti-Semitism, Jews are witnessing anti-Semitic slogans and chants that now seem so out of date and out of place.

Only a few days ago, a Jewish man wearing a yarmulke was assaulted on the streets in Berlin and hit in the face. In Essen, a group of anti-Israel protesters, reportedly on their way to attack a synagogue, were arrested for conspiracy to commit a crime—and the statements, the screaming, in Frankfurt, ''You Jews are beasts;'' in Paris, ''Death to the Jews;'' Gelsenkirchen, Germany, chants of ''Hamas, Hamas, Jews to the gas.''

All over the world, not just statements, but the vitriol found on social media as well is not only abhorrent, it is chilling, but these incidents, as my colleagues have described, are not taking place only abroad.

Just this past weekend, as my friend from Florida related, a synagogue in her district was vandalized with the words ''Hamas'' and swastikas spray-painted on the front column. Nearby, a Jewish family woke up to find one of their cars completely covered in eggs, and on another car was written ''Jew'' and ''Hamas.''

Yesterday, outside my own office in Boca Raton, Florida, during a rally, a few angry individuals screamed, ''Throw the Jews into the sea.''

A former employee of mine recently posted a story of an occurrence that happened to him last weekend. He said:

> Today, I was walking home alone from synagogue, minding my own business. When I got to the crosswalk, I waited for the light to turn, so I could cross safely. While waiting, a car pulled up in front of me where a young man rolled down the window and yelled, ''Jew, Hitler was right,'' and then drove off.
>
> I remind you this was not at a rally. I was wearing a yarmulke and was walking from synagogue, and I was enjoying Shabbat.

There are many more examples domestically, including a Jewish summer camp in California where graffiti was found that read, ''Jews equal killers,'' and ''Jews are children killers.'' It is unacceptable that radical groups have used the conflict between Israel and Hamas as pretext for their own anti-Semitism.

Last month, I proudly joined my colleagues in a letter to Secretary Kerry, urging the State Department's continued focus on combating anti-Semitism worldwide. I applaud the statements of condemnation by European leaders, including those in France, in Germany, and Italy, and their stated commitment to ensuring the safety of their own communities is to be admired, but there is more that needs to be done to rid societies of this baseless hatred toward Jews.

A number of Jewish leaders in the U.S., Europe, and Israel have expressed serious concern about the rise in the number of incidents in hate speech and violence, and many believe that this animosity has risen to the worst level seen since the Holocaust.

We must continue to speak out on these issues, which is why I am so grateful to have this opportunity tonight. We have to use this opportunity to educate and to combat anti-Semitism in all of its forms.

When we combat anti-Semitism, we stand not just against hatred for the Jews, we stand against hatred, and it affects not just the Jews, but when we stand against anti-Semitism and we speak out against hatred, ultimately, every minority group that is the target of hatred—every one of those groups benefits from our willingness to speak out.

I am glad to have that opportunity to do that here on the floor tonight, and, with that, I, again, would like to thank my friend, Ms. MENG, for bringing us together today.

Ms. MENG. In conclusion, we stand today united as a Congress to condemn acts of anti-Semitism through the world and right here in our communities. Hate is never the answer. We must always speak up.

I would like to end by reciting a well-known poem by Martin Niemoller:

> First, they came for the socialists—and I did not speak out because I was not a socialist. Then they came for the trade unionists—and I did not speak out because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Jews—and I did not speak out because I was not a Jew. Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HAMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my good friend for yielding and thank him for his leadership and his very eloquent remarks just a few moments ago on Hamas terrorism and the fact that we need to do much more than we have, to try to mitigate, end, and disarm this organization that is committed to the demise of the State of Israel.

Hamas, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, is a terrorist organization, and as Netanyahu put it so well, it is like al Qaeda, and it is just like Boko Haram. They kill people, they murder, they rape, they abduct, and they do all

kinds of terrible terrorist activities in order to promote their ends.

Yesterday, Khaled Mashal, leader of Hamas, spoke to Charlie Rose, who asked: Do you want to coexist with the State of Israel? The Hamas leader said in a completely matter-of-fact manner, ''No.''

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that Hamas doesn't want peace, reconciliation, or coexistence. Hamas seeks only the total demise of Israel.

I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, briefly from the Hamas Charter, and I encourage Members of this body, Americans, and people around the world to read the Hamas Charter.

Article 13 says:

Initiatives and so-called peaceful solutions and international conferences are in contradiction to the principles of the Islamic Resistance Movement. There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad. Initiatives, proposals, and international conferences are all a waste of time and vain endeavors.

It gets even worse, Mr. Speaker. Article 20 obscenely compares Israeli society with Nazism. Article 28 charges so-called Zionism with massive conspiracy which ''aims at undermining societies, destroying values, corrupting consciences, deteriorating character, and annihilating Islam.''

Article 32 charges that the plan of the so-called Zionist is embodied in one of the greatest libels of all human history, the ''Protocols of the Elders of Zion.''

All of this, Mr. Speaker, recalls Natan Sharansky's ''3–D test of anti-Semitism,'' which he called demonization, double standards, and delegitimization.

Sharansky twice testified in hearings that I chaired on combating anti-Semitism and proposed what he called the simple test to help us distinguish legitimate criticism of Israel from anti-Semitism.

As he put it, the three Ds are, again, demonization—he said:

When Israel's actions are blown out of all sensible proportion; when comparisons are made between Israelis and Nazis, this is anti-Semitism, not legitimate criticism of Israel.

Second, the double standard:

When criticism of Israel is applied selectively, when Israel is singled out by the United Nations for human rights abuses while the behavior of known and major abusers, such as China, Iran, Cuba, and Syria is ignored, this is anti-Semitism.

The third D, delegitimization, as he puts it:

When Israel's fundamental right to exist is denied—alone among all peoples in the world—this, too, is anti-Semitism.

This, too, is exactly what Hamas is engaged in. From its origins to the present day, the Hamas movement has been poisoned by anti-Semitism, and the murderous nature of this evil has not diminished. It has got worse. Jews today continue to die because of it.

Five IDF soldiers were killed yesterday, 48 have died since July 8, and of course, we are deeply saddened by these deaths, as well as all who have died in the conflict, and we must not forget that it is anti-Semitic hatred that is driving this conflict and causing all of these deaths.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I call on President Obama to give Israel our government's full support and to make unmistakably clear our government's position that Israel, in response to Hamas' unprovoked attacks, is fully in the right to defend itself, including to search out and destroy Hamas terror tunnels and those who launch rockets at Israel.

Again, I thank my good friend, Mr. FRANKS, for his leadership and, again, for his strong and eloquent statement earlier on, during the Special Order on Hamas.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just would suggest to you that, in the time that I have been in Congress—nearly 12 years now, about 12 years—I do not know of a greater defender of humanity and truth and just the kind of principle that made America what we are than one Congressman CHRIS SMITH, and I just consider it a privilege for the time that I have been able to serve with him.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, Soviet Marshal Ogarkov announced that Flight 007 of Korean Airlines had been terminated, that the Soviets had shot down a civilian airliner killing all 269 passengers aboard.

President Reagan immediately addressed the entire Nation about the tragedy and resolutely called for justice and for action. He then proceeded to accelerate work on America's missile defense system. He worked with Congress on the Reagan defense buildup, he built relationships with European allies and enforced strong sanctions that ultimately bankrupt and brought down the once-unshakeable Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, last week, another civilian airliner, flight MH17, with 298 innocent people aboard, was also shot down and this time by Russian-backed separatists.

On that same day in which the conflict in Israel also escalated to new heights, The New York Times reported President Obama's schedule as, ''a cheeseburger with fries at the Charcoal Pit in Delaware, a speech about infrastructure, and two splashy fundraisers in New York City.''

Mr. Speaker, where would America be today if we had elected Barack Obama in 1980? Where will this President's leadership take us tomorrow?

With that question, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

CHRISTIAN PERSECUTION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, as I have said several times in recent weeks, I want to bring attention to the plight of Christians in the Middle East. Any person watching the news for the last several months will have seen an increasingly violent, chaotic, and unpredictable environment. The Middle East, and Iraq in particular, are not stable. This creates an enormous problem for Christians in the region.

Chaldean Christians in Michigan and in my district have repeatedly raised the issue of ongoing persecution of Christians in Iraq. Just recently, the last remaining Christians were forced to flee. ISIS has taken the city. For the first time in well over a thousand years, Sunday mass is no longer being said.

My colleague, friend, and mentor, Representative FRANK WOLF, has characterized the situation facing Christians in Iraq as genocide. That analysis is about as accurate as it can get. Christians have been targeted and killed for their faith. What we are seeing is genocide, the eradication of a specific group of people, namely, Christians.

ISIS is trying to wipe the face of Christianity from Iraq. Not only have they killed and pushed Christians out of territory that they control, they are also destroying the physical traces of Christianity. Churches, monasteries, and religious sites are being destroyed and desecrated. Even Jonah's tomb has been destroyed. And the shrine of the Prophet Seth has been blown up. As a Christian, it is an incredibly heartbreaking series of events that I have watched unfold.

I have been an advocate for human rights and religious freedom since I took office, and what really bothers me is the fact that neither the President nor the State Department have addressed the challenges facing Christians in Iraq. Chaldean Christians in my district have been asking me what can be done for Iraqi Christians. But, as I have said many times before, there is only so much that can be done when the President has not taken action.

The government and military of Iraq are weak, ineffectual, and unable to defend the people of their country. The U.S. withdrawal from Iraq has left a power vacuum that has allowed a group like ISIS to take control and force their radical beliefs on an increasingly large portion of the population. I am worried that what we have seen is only the beginning. Christians are being targeted now, but I suspect that they will eventually begin to target Muslims who don't share their beliefs as well.

Radical Islamists are trying to shape and form an Iraq that adheres to their

beliefs. They are destroying Iraq's cultural and religious heritage, its history. If they succeed, there will be nothing left of it.

Chaldeans and Iraqi Christians don't want to leave Iraq, and many in my district wish that they never had to. However, it has become too dangerous to stay. When faced with forced conversions, death, and other forms of violence, most Christians have chosen to flee. Genocide is indeed a brutal thing.

As I discussed in a previous speech on the House floor, there is a severe problem in U.S. foreign policy that needs to be examined. The U.S. began the Iraq war with the goal of ridding the region of a tyrannical government that didn't protect its people. However, a decade later, at the conclusion of the U.S. military mission in Iraq, the people are perhaps worse off than they were before the U.S. invasion.

What did we miss? If the U.S. is leaving Iraq in a considerably worse state than when we arrived, there is something that went wrong. That is the question that needs to be asked and what needs to be considered. It is not that we can afford to make these kinds of mistakes; it is that people who live there absolutely can't afford the consequences.

We need to put pressure on the Kurdish government to continue protecting the Iraqi Christians. We need to analyze where our foreign aid is going and whom it is going to. I have heard from many of my constituents, Chaldean Christians and others from Iraq, that the aid we are sending to Iraq is not making it to the Christian communities.

If we are going to be giving foreign aid, humanitarian or otherwise, to a country or government in order to protect its people, then they better do it. If we are propping up a government or nation that doesn't protect its people from radical threats, religious and ethnic persecution, and genocide, then it is time to reevaluate that relationship and figure out a better path forward.

I have said before and firmly believe, if countries in the Middle East are unable to provide security and stability for all of their people, then they will never be stable. They will continue to be at risk. We have to encourage stable societies, respect for religious freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. We can't just build strong governments and militaries or the U.S. will always face the problems we are seeing in Iraq.

If Iraq's Christians are forced out entirely, I don't think there will be much hope left for the country. I would like to see Chaldean Christians and other Iraqis one day be able to return home. At the moment, I am not sure when that will be possible. That depends on Iraq's resilience and ability to manage radical threats. I will remain hopeful, and I ask that others also pray for those still there facing a dire situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my friend for yielding, and I am very grateful for his strong stance on the issue of Israel and just wanted to add an exclamation point to the gentleman's comments.

There has been a lot of discussion about Israel tonight and about what is being done against the interests of Israel, but, Mr. Speaker, I think it bears pointing out that this administration could do much to help our friend Israel. And that when anyone in this administration says to the world and, in particular, the people in the Middle East, including the terrorists in the Middle East, that we see Israel, a country whose leaders are elected, and Hamas, whose leaders are sworn to the destruction of Israel and the death of Jews, then the world gets the wrong impression. They get the impression that we see terrorism and love of life in Israel—terrorism by Hamas, love of life in Israel—as equals. That is a despicable thing to show the world from the United States, from any administration official.

It is important that we let the world know that when a nation that is such a dear friend as Israel is attacked repeatedly by rockets intended to kill innocent children, women, others around the country, then they have the right of self-defense to go in and clean up those who would destroy them. That means, when they go in to shut down the tunnels by which terrorists are allowed to enter their country and kill people, that we don't have some do-gooder from the United States rush in and say: Hold on. Hold on. We realize you are destroying the tunnels that are allowing Israelis to be killed. We realize you are shutting down the rocket missile sites from which rockets are being launched to kill Israelis, but we want to give Hamas a breather so these terrorists, bent on killing Israelis, can regather their forces and get a better run at death to Israelis.

That is a disastrous foreign policy. You don't put as equals terrorists and a country that loves life, and it loves life so much that, unlike any military operation I am aware of, it notifies the people they are about to bomb before they bomb so people can clear out. That is extraordinary.

The burden of proof on Israel that is placed there by some in this administration and by others who love the terrorists and hate those who simply want to live in peace is unbearable. It is time the United States showed itself to be a friend of Israel.

The good news is, in this body, in this House, and even at the other end in the Senate, though we disagree profoundly on so many issues, when Israel comes up, we are more unified on our friendship with Israel than we are about any other issue I am aware of. And that is how it should be.

When the leader of Israel, Prime Minister Netanyahu, came and spoke a few years ago right here at this podium, both sides of the aisle stood and applauded repeatedly. That is as it should be. As he pointed out right here, if Israel lays down its weapons, there is no Israel. If the Palestinians lay down their weapons, there is no war. The war ends. That is all they are asking for.

I used to wonder why in the world did the Israelis try to give away land, try to buy peace, when every time they give away land they are attacked from that piece of land. After spending time in Israel, I began to understand. When you see the coffee shops, the different places where people would gather that would have someone loaded up with a suicide bomb, walk in and blow up as many innocent people as they could, or see an area and they would say that is where the terrorist bomber came walking up on the school ground, then you realize they are willing to even give away their precious land that God gave to them over 3,000 years ago if they can just buy a little peace. But the lesson should come back loudly: there has never been a time in Israel's history when it has given away land trying to buy peace when that land was not ultimately used as a staging area from which to attack it.

I think it was pretty clear this administration showed its cards when, as a method of thumping, figuratively speaking, Israel, the FAA suspended flights into Tel Aviv. They were not at risk any more than other flights from American airlines around the world, especially in countries where there are terrorists. But it was a message to Israel that, hey, you better do what we tell you or we are going to hurt you economically. That message was clear and it wasn't missed by the Israelis. And then to have that followed by the Secretary of State putting a terrorist organization and a country that is one of our dearest friends together on equal standing was further insult to the injury, literal injury that this country had caused Israel.

It is time that we recognize what my dear friend Mr. BENTIVOLIO has said clearly. It is time we stand with Israel. It is time to make clear to Israel's enemies: You take on Israel, you take us on. You may not get that from this administration. They may still be playing patty-cake with terrorists, but in this Congress, from both sides of the aisle, we stand with Israel. I thank my friend so much for helping make that clear.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his wisdom on this and so many other important issues facing us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 653. An Act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1104. An Act to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 29, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3212. To ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 30, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Bart Fischer	6/20	6/25	Switzerland		1,339.78		1,137.05		895.00		3,371.83
Committee total					1,339.70		1,137.05		895.00		3,371.83

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, Chairman, July 17, 2014.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Cheri Bustos	5/9	5/14	Afghanistan				11,734.60				11,734.60
Hon. Sean Maloney	5/24	5/28	Afghanistan				11,348.70				11,348.70
Hon. Markwayne Mullin	5/24	5/28	Afghanistan				11,348.70				11,348.70
Committee total							34,432.00				34,432.00

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, July 16, 2014.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, July 18, 2014.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6662. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pistachios Grown in California, Arizona, and New Mexico; Modification of Aflatoxin Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0068; FV13-983-1 FR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6663. A letter from the Chairman, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, transmitting interim report June 2014, pursuant to Public Law 112-239, section 374(f)(6) (126 Stat. 1793); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6664. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Current Good Manufacturing Practices, Quality Control Procedures, Quality Factors, Notification Requirements, and Records and Reports, for Infant Formula; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-1995-N-0063 (formerly 95N-0309)] (RIN: 0910-AF27) received July 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6665. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (RIN: 3084-AB29) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6666. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6667. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-376, ''Fiscal Year 2014 Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6668. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-378, ''Residential Real Property Equity and Transparency Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6669. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 113-141); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6670. A letter from the Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the U.S. Breeding Population of the Wood Stork From Endangered to Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0020; FXES11130900000C2-134-FF09E32000] (RIN: 1018-AX60) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6671. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XD200) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6672. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened and Endangered Status for Distinct Population Segments of Scalloped Hammerhead Sharks [Docket No.: 111025652-4523-03] (RIN: 0648-XA798) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6673. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Ruling: Stock Rights Exempt from Section 457A (Rev. Rul. 2014-18) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6674. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities [TD 9677] (RIN: 1545-BL60) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6675. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Research Expenditures [TD 9680] (RIN: 1545-BE64) received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6676. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidelines for the Streamlined Process of Applying for Recognition of Section 501(c)(3) Status [TD 9674] (RIN: 1545-BM07) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing (Rept. 113–565 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 694. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014. (Rept. 113–566). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4299. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than September 19, 2014.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5229. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5230. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 5231. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 5232. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5233. A bill to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 5234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against

tax for manufacturing job training expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 5235. A bill to authorize further assistance to Israel for the Iron Dome anti-missile defense system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5236. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to add certain tax-related crimes to the definition of aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5237. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to allow aliens having status as an E-2 nonimmigrant by reason of a change of nonimmigrant classification made in the United States to re-enter the United States after a trip abroad without obtaining a new visa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5238. A bill to preserve the access of victims of trafficking to information about their eligibility to receive SNAP benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 5239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 5240. A bill to reform classification and security clearance processes throughout the Federal Government and, within the Department of Homeland Security, to establish an effective and transparent process for the designation, investigation, adjudication, denial, suspension, and revocation of security clearances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 5241. A bill to prohibit United States Government recognition of Russia's annexation of Crimea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5242. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5243. A bill to eliminate the payroll tax for individuals who have attained retirement age, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5244. A bill to establish the Council on Healthy Housing and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5245. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 314 Lennon Drive in Wilmington, North Carolina, as the ''Meadowlark Lemon Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 5246. A bill to require the United States attorney to bring the matter of an individual's contempt of Congress before a grand jury not later than 30 days after receiving a certification from the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President of the Senate that the individual is in contempt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5247. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the consumptive demand exception to prohibition on importation of goods made with convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5248. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 5249. A bill to re-impose sanctions on Russian arms exporter Rosoboronexport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5250. A bill to use Federal purchasing power to create good jobs, rebuild the middle class, address income inequality, stimulate the economy, and to achieve other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt foreign pensions from dispositions of investment in United States real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 5252. A bill to ensure that methods of collecting taxes and fees by private citizens on behalf of States are fair and effective and do not discriminate against interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 5253. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require consultation with States before awarding grants or contracts for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5254. A bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 121. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate political campaign contributions and expenditures, including independent expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

290. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 1086 urging the Congress and the President to review the Case of Loren Duke Abdalla's actions during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

291. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

292. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 61 urging the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to release forthwith the TBI report known as ''MLK Document 200472''; to the Committee on House Administration.

293. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 22 urging the Department of the Interior National Park Service to pursue one of the following options in regard to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

294. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, relative to a resolution calling the President to support the increased importation of oil from Canadian oil sands; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States:''

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 5233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; and, Article I, Section 8, clause 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries'' and Article III.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 5234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the authority delineated in Article I Section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 4, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 5240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 5241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the authority delineated in Article I section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 5243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 5244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfard of the United States;

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 5246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 5249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 3

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 5254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution: ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 140: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 303: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 333: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 351: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 411: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 543: Mr. ROTHFUS and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 647: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 769: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1015: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1070: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1129: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1141: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1331: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1563: Mr. COHEN and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1579: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1620: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1666: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1725: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1733: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1761: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1770: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1812: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1827: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1830: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1852: Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HALL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 1975: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2028: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2084: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2224: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2366: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2398: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2426: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ENYART, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2450: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2638: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2673: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2737: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2750: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2835: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2847: Mr. POCAN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2994: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 3121: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3276: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 3279: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3303: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3322: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 3331: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3367: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3374: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3384: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3426: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 3485: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3516: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3556: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3712: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3723: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3742: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3775: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3776: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3850: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3852: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3877: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3929: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3978: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3997: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4012: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 4016: Mr. DELANEY and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4026: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4067: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4106: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4143: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4158: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4172: Mr. LANCE, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4187: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4188: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4190: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4227: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4351: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 4437: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4446: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4574: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4577: Mr. OWENS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4590: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4646: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 4680: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4682: Mr. COOPER and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4701: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 4714: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 4717: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4726: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4739: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4740: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4748: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4756: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4762: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4775: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 4777: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4792: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4793: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JONES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4815: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4818: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4837: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. REED.
H.R. 4857: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4885: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4960: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FLORES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4969: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 4971: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4978: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4981: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 4989: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 5000: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5014: Mr. MESSER, Mr. HALL, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 5026: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 5033: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 5038: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5052: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MCALLISTER, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 5054: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5059: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5065: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5069: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5071: Mr. COLE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LONG, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 5078: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5083: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5087: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 5088: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 5098: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 5101: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5122: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5130: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5131: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5159: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5160: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5179: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5182: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5195: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5203: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. SALMON.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 72: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 281: Mr. BARR, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 422: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 456: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. BONAMICI.
H. Res. 476: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H. Res. 522: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 536: Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. ROKITA.
H. Res. 543: Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 587: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 620: Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 633: Ms. SINEMA.
H. Res. 644: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CRAMER.
H. Res. 679: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 687: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LONG, and Mr. JORDAN.
H. Res. 689: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 690: Mr. ENYART and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 692: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 5230, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30,

2014, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

93. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Governor of Arkansas, relative to a letter regarding the State Trade and Export Promotion (STEP); which was referred to the Committee on Small Business.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 29, 2014*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O mighty God, our gracious Father, thank You for the gift of this day. Lord, You are the one clear manifestation of love in the midst of lesser powers. Today, use our lawmakers to bring more of Your love to our world so that Your kingdom may come and Your will be done on Earth as it is in heaven.

May our Senators discover the stillness of soul needed to begin to comprehend what is the height, length, breadth, and depth of Your great love. Use them as Your instruments of righteousness and justice in our world. Lord, open their minds to think Your thoughts and give them the courage to do Your will.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, the emergency supplemental appropriations act dealing with the border crisis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

At 12 noon, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider Robert Alan McDonald to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for weekly caucus meetings.

At 2:45 p.m. there will be a rollcall vote for confirmation of the McDonald nomination, followed by several voice votes to confirm the Andre, Hoza, and Polaschik nominations.

Upon disposition of the Polaschik nomination, the Senate will consider the Highway and Transportation Funding Act. Senators should expect five rollcall votes this evening in relation to Wyden-Hatch, Carper-Corker-Boxer, Lee, and Toomey amendments and on passage of H.R. 5021, as amended, if amended. Senators will be notified when those votes are scheduled.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2673 AND H.R. 3393

Mr. REID. There are two bills at the desk due for second readings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2673) to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

A bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings of these two matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar.

VETERANS' CARE

Mr. REID. Almost 2 years ago, within a few days 2 years ago, we were in Las Vegas to dedicate this beautiful new veterans facility. Taxpayers' money spent on it was about $700 million. It is beautiful. It is the second one we have been able to do in southern Nevada. We built a nice little hospital with a joint venture between the Veterans Administration and the Air Force.

But with the wars in Iraq, and Afghanistan, we ran out of room to accommodate the influx of veterans.

It became very difficult for veterans. We have a huge veterans population in southern Nevada. We have all kinds of military bases there that they are stationed in. They come, and they decide they want to live in southern Nevada.

So the veterans in southern Nevada found themselves in a difficult situation. When this new hospital was dedicated—it took 7 years of work to get this done. I worked hard, as did others, to obtain this money. It was a state-of-the-art facility, 100 inpatient beds, a nursing home unit, and an ambulatory care center. It was a state-of-the-art facility. It was unquestionably, probably without exaggerating, the finest veterans hospital in the country. It was brand new. But, more importantly, it was a precious resource to veterans throughout the State of Nevada.

We have a facility in northern Nevada. It has been there for many decades. To the credit of Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, she came and visited it a number of years ago and said: This is wrong. In that facility we couldn't get the modern equipment down the halls and into the bedrooms. We had to renovate, so it is in good shape. So the veterans in northern Nevada had a facility long before southern Nevada.

But in spite of all this happy talk about what a wonderful facility this is, veterans depending on VA care have been stunned. Why? Because they are waiting 50 days. If you are a new patient, you call and they say: Well, we will see you in a couple of months. Come on in. About 2,000 patients have been waiting 90 days in order to even get an appointment. This is unacceptable.

It is not a problem only in Las Vegas, it is all over the country: a nationwide, systemic problem where these combat veterans and other veterans have been languishing on some nonexistent waiting list.

When I learned that BERNIE SANDERS from Vermont and Congressman MILLER had worked out something, I was stunned. I was so happy. I got a call from Senator SANDERS on Saturday telling me: I think we have got it done. That is wonderful. That is truly remarkable, what they have done.

I don't need to go through the bill, what it does, but it provides billions of dollars for emergency funding to hire new doctors and nurses. It will authorize 27 new medical facilities around the country, allowing the VA to grow as it needs to grow.

That is wonderful news. That is the way we should be legislating. We

couldn't find two more politically different people than BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont and Chairman MILLER. They are very different people; they have very different views. But they know we have sent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people to Iraq and Afghanistan, when these veterans come home, they need help. We took care of the war efforts, and rightfully so. The military needed every penny they have to fight these wars, but we haven't been as generous in taking care of these people when they come home from these wars.

The main point I want to make is that Chairman MILLER and Senator SANDERS understand we owe America's veterans.

It is good we are talking about this, rather than an impeachment of the President or suing the President. Look in the papers today. The American people are totally opposed. We shouldn't be off on these tracks of impeachment, suing the President. We should be legislating. An exemplary standard of that is what I hope will be completed this week when the conference report comes to us from the House to complete this legislation. It is truly a good day for the American veterans and the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. America makes a promise to every man and woman who puts on the uniform. In exchange for their service, our country pledges they will be well trained, well equipped, and treated with the dignity and respect they deserve.

It is the least we can offer to the brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who put everything on the line so we can live in freedom. It is a solemn pact, and that is why the American people were so shocked to read some of the headlines we have seen over the past few months, headlines such as: ''Veterans languish and die on a VA hospital's secret list.'' Then, as the Obama administration tried to cover its tracks, a headline such as: ''Veterans Affairs spies, stonewalls on people investigating it.''

It is a national disgrace, ailing veterans being put off for months by a hospital system that should be rushing to their aid, and veterans dying while waiting for care.

According to the government's own report on these failures, we also know these problems were so systemic that they spread to more than three-quarters of the VA facilities surveyed, literally to every corner of the country, including Kentucky.

Kentuckians heard shocking news stories such as the one about a Harrodsburg veteran who was being treated at the VA facility in Lexington. The staff there declared him dead. Yet when the veteran's wife came to say her final good-byes, she found her husband breathing—with a pulse.

I was glad to hear this veteran is now back home with his family and recovering. But no veteran and no spouse should ever have to go through such a horrific ordeal. Yet I continue to receive letters from Kentucky veterans who have been denied the care they deserve, such as this one from a disabled veteran in Gradyville. This is what he had to say:

> I have had some of the most frustrating of times trying to receive the quality of health care that anyone deserves.
>
> Not only has it taken me months to be seen, but I have been told by a primary care physician that ''He did not need to see me until my 6 month checkup''. . . . I simply no longer have the time and money to invest in the run around I receive in trying to make an appeal. . . . I gave up 4 years of my life and proper use of my right arm in this nation's defense. I would have given my life without question to protect a country that I love. It breaks my heart to no longer be a part of an institution I so lovingly became a member [of]. Our nation's veterans deserve so much more.

Well, he is certainly right. Thousands of Kentuckians have had to wait for more than a month at VA facilities in Louisville and Lexington.

So the Obama administration needs to use every tool available to address the systemic failures of the VA, and it needs to work with Congress on reforms that can help address these challenges too.

Initially, the Obama administration was slow to respond to the crisis. The White House tried to treat it as some PR predicament to get beyond rather than the true tragedy that it was—a tragedy that required bipartisan action to investigate and address.

Ultimately, pressure from Republicans and revulsion from the American people forced the White House to take this crisis seriously. Audits were conducted. Management changes were undertaken. And the necessity of serious reform was accepted—eventually.

I was proud to support bipartisan VA reform legislation that passed the Senate last month, and I am encouraged by the progress of the conference committee toward completing a final compromise that can pass Congress and be signed into law. The compromise legislation would introduce some much-needed accountability into the VA system and help increase patient choice. In fact, the compromise appears to include two initiatives I specifically pressed with the President's nominee to head the Veterans Affairs Department when I recently met with him.

One, I said we need to make it easier to fire VA bureaucrats who fail our veterans; and, two, I said we need to allow veterans to seek care outside the VA if they face long wait times or if they do not live near a VA facility.

The conference report, fortunately, appears to include both. I thank Senators BURR, MCCAIN, and COBURN for steadfastly fighting for the veterans choice part of the conference agreement that will allow our deserving veterans the option of accessing care in hospitals when VA facilities are not available.

As for the President's nominee to run the VA, Bob McDonald, we all know he has a tough job ahead of him after his confirmation. I made clear my expectations for dramatic change when I met him. But if Mr. McDonald is willing to work in a collaborative and open manner with Congress—and I expect he will—he will find a constructive partner on this side of the aisle.

Look, we know there is much we can and should do to address this crisis together. So I am hopeful because when veterans are denied care, it is a priority deserving of bipartisan attention, and the government needs to start living up again to the promises it made to our veterans. We certainly owe them no less.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. President, Israel's military campaign against the terrorist organization Hamas has a clear-cut objective: to restore Israel's security by eliminating rockets, shut down these infiltration tunnels from which Hamas is launching its attacks against Israel, and, indeed, to demilitarize Gaza. That is Israel's objective.

This is clearly justified in the face of more than 2,300 rocket attacks into Israel from Gaza since early July. I strongly support Israel's recent efforts through Operation Protective Edge to defend itself and to end the threat of additional rocket and infiltration attacks by Hamas. Operation Protective Edge also serves a larger purpose, and its resolution has broader implications for the future of the Palestinian people.

If Hamas declares victory by keeping its weapons stockpile, by continuing to undermine Israel's security, and by turning away from Egypt's efforts to forge a reasonable cease-fire, the net result will be a relative weakening of the Palestinian Authority and of those in the West Bank who have worked toward a peaceful resolution of the overall conflict.

So I support any effort which brings this campaign to an end in a manner that increases Israel's security. That means specifically that Hamas cannot be left with a large stockpile of missiles and rockets and cannot be left with infiltration tunnels. They must be destroyed. Hamas cannot be allowed to aggressively rest, refit, and build up a weapons stockpile. That weakens Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

Here is what I oppose. I oppose any efforts—any efforts by the international community, especially the United Nations—to impose a cease-fire on Israel that does not meet these military objectives and that therefore risks

actually rewarding Hamas for a campaign of terror and that seeks to make additional concessions to Hamas such as easing security along the borders of Gaza.

An unfavorable settlement, especially one that left the terrorist group Hamas with a stockpile of weaponry, would create incentives for Hamas to continue smuggling arms from Iran and, of course, to return to violence. An unfavorable settlement would also undermine the leadership of the Palestinian Authority, which has attempted to negotiate with Israel through peaceful means.

So let's be clear. The terror tactics employed by Hamas show contempt for human life, whether Israeli or Palestinian. By employing rockets and mortars as weapons of terror against Israel's civilian population or by using its own schools within Gaza as weapon depots, Hamas has shown a gross disregard for civilians.

The Prime Minister of Israel put it very well when he said: ''[Israel] uses missiles to protect our people. They (Hamas) use their people to protect their missiles.''

There is no moral equivalency—none whatsoever. These tactics should be loudly and widely condemned, and Israel's right to defend itself should be affirmed.

As I noted last week, Secretary Hagel wrote to the majority leader seeking urgent funding for components of the Iron Dome missile defense system. I and others support this request, as Iron Dome has afforded Israel some real protection from these indiscriminate rockets.

This morning some of my colleagues will further explain the importance of Iron Dome and the need for the Israeli Defense Forces to press on and finish the job in destroying the infiltration tunnels and weapons stockpiles. Republicans are united in our support of Israel's defense, and this morning my colleagues will explain our opposition to any effort to force a cease-fire on Israel that does not further its security objectives.

In a situation such as this, Israel only has one dependable friend. The United States should not be trying to pressure Israel to make a bad deal that leaves Hamas in a position to continue these attacks against Israeli civilians.

No one has been more active on this issue than my colleague from South Carolina. I see him on the floor now. Therefore, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from South Carolina.

ISRAEL

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I return the compliment to Senator MCCONNELL from Kentucky, the Republican leader.

I have been here now since 2002. There is no better friend of the State of Israel than MITCH MCCONNELL. He is the former chairman and ranking member of the foreign ops subcommittee on appropriations that deals with aid to the world—particularly Israel—and it was his idea to come to the floor today and have voices speak in support of Israel at a time when they need friends.

Friends are great to have. They are wonderful in good times. They are a necessity in bad times. Israel is going through some pretty bad times and so are the Palestinian people.

I wish to clearly make myself known. I have nothing against the legitimate hopes and aspirations of the Palestinian people to have their own country, to live in peace and prosperity by Israel. But they have to want it more than I do.

The Palestinian people are suffering. Children are being killed, and the most innocent people on the planet are children. It breaks all of our hearts to see them as a casualty of war.

But now is the time to be clear-eyed and focused as to what the problem really is. The problem is very simple in many ways. Hamas is a terrorist organization in the eyes of the U.S. Government. Hamas should be a terrorist organization in the eyes of any decent person in the world.

What did they do? They have as their goal not a two-state solution but a one-state solution—the complete and utter destruction of the State of Israel. If you don't believe me, just check out their own charter. They have as their tactics using their own people and children as human shields to win a propaganda war.

When Israeli children are killed, it breaks Israel's heart. When Palestinian children are killed, it breaks the heart of all decent Palestinians, but Hamas sees it as a victory. They literally try to put women and children in harm's way to marginalize the ability of Israel to defend itself against two things.

The tunnels are something new in this fight. Forty-one tunnels have been discovered that go from the Gaza Strip—some into Israel itself—and yesterday five Israeli soldiers were killed by an attack that came from Hamas fighters that penetrated Israel through the tunnels.

So Senator MCCONNELL is not only speaking for Republicans when he says the Senate stands firmly behind Israel's right to destroy the terrorist tunnels, but I think that is the body's view and Democrats' as well.

There is a resolution that is bipartisan in nature before the body, and I hope we can pass it before Thursday. In the resolved clause, it says the Senate opposes any efforts to impose a cease-fire that does not allow the Government of Israel to protect its citizens from threats posed by Hamas rockets and tunnels. That, I believe, is the view of the Senate in a bipartisan fashion.

Today, Republicans take the floor to clearly state where we stand in this conflict. We stand with Israel's right to defend itself against a terrorist organization called Hamas. We stand with the Palestinian people's legitimate aspirations to have a better life. But until that day comes, we are going to be firmly in the Israeli camp to defend themselves, because what would we do as a nation if a neighboring nation dug tunnels under our border for the express purpose of kidnapping and killing our citizens. What would America do if one rocket coming from a neighboring nation fired indiscriminately to kill American citizens? We would respond in the most aggressive fashion, and we would have every right to do so.

As the minority leader stated, there is no moral equivalency. Israel tells you they are going to attack. Israel calls before the attack. Israel gives notice about an impending attack. Hamas secretly fires rockets, caring less where they land. Their hope is that it hits a kindergarten. That is their desire. And the only reason they have not been successful is because of the Iron Dome program that has been a collaboration between the United States and Israel for many years.

There has been discussion about appropriating additional dollars for Iron Dome. That discussion needs to turn into a reality. We don't need to marry it with controversial topics. Israel is under siege. We are the best friend of the State of Israel. They need this assistance. Every Republican stands ready to work with every Democrat to pass—in the next 5 minutes—additional money for the Iron Dome program.

In tough times, what is the smart thing and right thing for America to do? The smart thing for America to do is pursue a lasting peace, a peace with meaning, and not repeat the mistakes of the past. Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. Israel is beyond that moment. America needs to stand by Israel's legitimate right to get to the heart of the problem and not face this threat 6 months or 1 year from now.

The one thing I can tell you that is not a smart thing to do is to give

Hamas a bunch of concrete. They are not going to build schools with it; they build tunnels. All the aid the international community has been providing to the Gaza Strip, through the hands of Hamas, has not gone into building hospitals, schools, and the economic improvement of the lives of Palestinians but to create tunnels of war. The tunnels are weapons of war. The thousands and thousands of tons of concrete and iron that have been misappropriated to build these tunnels came from people with a good heart.

How long does it take the international community to wake up to the fact that Hamas has a bad heart—an evil, wicked heart. They could care less about their own people. They want to destroy Israel.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We all remember that 10 or 12 years ago Israel—which had previously occupied Gaza for the purpose of preventing these types of devastating attacks—left. They said: We are through. They made a solid statement and said: We are uncomfortable occupying, and all we ask in return for the removal of our occupation is a peaceful border.

The Senator from South Carolina has just outlined that periodically this is what they have gotten in return for basically leaving Gaza alone and giving it a chance—if it chose to—to have a normal, peaceful existence. Yet they choose to continue the conflict, as the Senator from South Carolina indicated, because they are not in favor of a two-state solution; they are in favor of a one-state solution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Senator MCCONNELL is dead on point—land for peace. Give the Palestinians land and in return Israel gets peace. They gave the Gaza Strip to the Palestinians, and what have they gotten in return? They got 2,500 rockets in the last 3 weeks and terrorist tunnels.

The idea that leaving an area will lead to peace in the Middle East with the Palestinians has not borne fruit. What to do? No. 1, pass more appropriations for Iron Dome because it is the right and smart thing to do.

No. 2, pass a resolution saying we oppose any cease-fire that does not allow Israel to get to the heart of the problem when it comes to terrorist tunnels and dealing with the rocket threat against their country.

No. 3, push back against the United Nations that has lost its moral way. The Human Rights Commission—which is a subcommittee, for lack of a better term, of the United Nations—passed a resolution 27 to 1 about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Gaza, and I will read the first paragraph:

Deploring the massive Israeli military operations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, since 13 June 2014 that have involved disproportionate and indiscriminate attacks and resulted in grave violations of the human rights of the Palestinian civilian population, including through the most recent Israeli military assault on the occupied Gaza Strip, the latest in a series of military aggressions by Israel, and through actions of mass closures, mass arrests and the killing of civilians in the occupied West Bank.

This resolution is 1,600-and-something words, and it has a half sentence about rockets against Israel and nothing about the tunnels and never mentions Hamas.

The third thing I would like this body to do, through a letter of resolution, is let the United Nations know we condemn this one-sided view of the conflict and that we find the Human Rights Commission report objectionable and, quite frankly, immoral.

The vote was 27 to 1, and we were the only nation that objected to this resolution, which I think should make every decent person in the world feel the shame of the United Nations.

I thank our leader on the Republican side for creating this opportunity and allowing us to speak on this issue, and I thank him for his longstanding support for the State of Israel.

I close with this thought: In times of trouble, try to do the right thing and the smart thing, and they both come together on this issue. The right thing to do is to stand by your friends in Israel; the smart thing to do is to stand by your friends in Israel. The right thing and the smart thing to do is to oppose Hamas, which has a wicked heart, and allow Israel, once and for all, to fix this problem by demilitarizing Gaza and dealing with the tunnels and the rockets.

As Senator MCCONNELL said, Israel has tried cease-fires time and time again without dealing with the military threat they face. Not this time. When Israel says never again, they are referring to the Holocaust. America needs to stand with Israel and Israel should say to Hamas: Never again will we allow a cease-fire that allows you to dig tunnels under our borders to kidnap and kill our citizens, and never again will we allow you to rearm and rain holy terror on our people through thousands of rockets being fired at innocent civilians.

Now is the time for the Senate to say with Israel, never again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, briefly before Senator AYOTTE takes the floor, I wish to commend Senator GRAHAM for his suggestions. All three of those suggestions should be carried out this week. Time is of the essence.

In listening to the litany of actions by the Palestinians that he recounted—and we all remember, going back almost to the founding of the State of Israel—I am reminded of what one of Israel's early Foreign Ministers once said about the Palestinians. He said the Palestinians never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM. Sad but true.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Sad but true. I recall when Prime Minister Barak was in office at the end of the Clinton years. The administration brokered a deal that Israel at that time was willing to offer and Palestine said no. It was a deal they probably could not get today.

We have seen a litany of opportunities wasted over the years, and the people who suffered as a result of it have obviously been the Palestinian people.

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely. With that, I will turn over the debate to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, who has been one of the leaders on our side on foreign policy and is a steadfast ally of our friends in Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleagues, the Senator from South Carolina for his leadership and our leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for the incredible work he has done in supporting our great friend Israel and also leading this body in terms of the issues he has brought forward, not only in supporting important protections, such as the Iron Dome program, but also by ensuring America remains safe and strong. I thank Senator MCCONNELL very much for his leadership.

I rise because I had the privilege in March of traveling to Israel. I went there not only to meet with the leadership in Israel but I had the opportunity to meet with some of the Palestinian leadership as well.

I went to Sderot, which is a town in Israel. I was very much struck by what the Israelis are facing every day and the threat they face from Hamas, a terrorist organization. Go to a town such as Sderot and everyone in their household has a bomb shelter. I met with mothers there whose children feel traumatized because they never know when the next potential rocket may be coming toward their town, and it has very much affected their children. It has affected them so much so that when one goes to the playground where the children play, the playground itself contains a bomb shelter. There is a caterpillar which looks like something your kids would play in, but it is actually a bomb shelter because this town in Israel has been facing rockets from Hamas. That is what we need to understand in this conflict: Hamas, a terrorist organization, has not only used its own civilians, the Palestinians, as human shields but they have also continued to threaten the children of Israel so much so that their playgrounds have bomb shelters.

What is happening right now in this conflict is that Israel is trying to defend itself against the threat of rockets from Hamas which threaten their children and the Palestinian children, who

unfortunately have been put in harm's way by this terrorist organization, Hamas.

They are facing a new threat. Can you imagine if we were faced with a threat where terrorists could pop up through a tunnel and suddenly terrorize the people in this country? Can you imagine what we would do under the same circumstance? That is the threat the Israelis are facing right now. They need to eliminate these tunnels to ensure that their people can be protected from this threat.

How did they build these tunnels? They actually built some of these tunnels by using concrete the Israelis let the Palestinians have for building places such as schools, and instead Hamas has taken this concrete and used it to build terror tunnels to allow them to either kidnap or kill Israeli citizens.

We stand with the people of Israel and their right to defend themselves against this terrorist organization Hamas and the terror it has brought upon not only the country of Israel but also the terror it has brought to the Palestinian people and how Hamas stands in the way of peace in the region overall.

We also stand against the hypocrisy we have seen on many levels, and that hypocrisy and double standard has been most apparent in the U.N. Human Rights Council and the recent resolution passed by that council. I have to wonder why that council exists in the United Nations because they have countries such as China, Cuba, Russia, and Venezuela issuing a resolution condemning Israel for what is happening in this conflict but in no way even mentioning Hamas or what Hamas is doing to use civilians as shields and basically as targets so they can try to get support from the international community.

The opposite is happening in terms of what Israel is doing. There is such a contrast. Israel is taking steps to notify civilians if there is going to be a missile launched in their area. They have warned civilians to leave areas. They have taken extraordinary steps to protect civilian lives in contrast to what Hamas is doing; they are using civilians as shields.

We condemn in this body very clearly what the Human Rights Council has done. The notion that we are going to follow what China, Cuba, Venezuela, and Russia tell the world, which is their view on human rights—and they don't even mention the actions of a terrorist organization that is at the root of the conflict we see right now in Gaza—talk about the situation where the fox is watching the henhouse. That is what has happened with this human rights council. Frankly, this council, in my view, should be eliminated because it is the opposite of standing for human rights; it is for standing for terrorist organizations such as Hamas.

I stand with the recommendations of my colleague from South Carolina and our leader that we need to absolutely condemn the human rights council. We need to reaffirm in this body this week before we leave our support for Israel's right to defend itself and to eliminate the threat these tunnels present to the Israeli people, and, frankly, also to the Palestinian people as well, and to allow them to finally address this threat from this terrorist organization Hamas.

Until this threat is eliminated, there can be no peace in this region. There cannot be peace for the Israeli people and there cannot be peace for the Palestinian people. So it is my hope that we will take this up this week and make sure we clearly send a message to Israel; that we stand with Israel, that we clearly send a message to the U.N. that we are not going to accept the hypocrisy of the human rights council; that we clearly send a message to Hamas: We know who you are. You are a terrorist organization. Stop using civilians to try to accomplish your purpose and we stand with you.

I yield the floor for my colleague.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may before Senator AYOTTE leaves the floor, I commend her on her contribution to this discussion and particularly with her stories with regard to Israel, and I would also add that I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire agrees with me that the last thing the American Government needs to do right now is try to pressure Israel into a bad cease-fire that doesn't allow this terror to be stopped.

At times it appears to me that the American administration is trying to push the Israelis into stopping before they have finished the job. We all know, based on past history, that unless this operation is completed, these challenges will continue.

I wanted to see if the Senator from New Hampshire shared my view.

Ms. AYOTTE. I would fully share the Senator's view. In order to end this threat we need to support Israel and its right to eliminate the tunnels, to address the missiles and eliminate missiles and the stash that Hamas has that they are targeting Israel with—which, by the way, would have had many more civilian casualties but for the Iron Dome system that we have supported and worked with Israel on.

Finally, we need to get to a point where Gaza is demilitarized and they are put in a position where this threat cannot continue. That is what we need to get to thinking about. But we need to allow Israel to deal with the threat of these tunnels and the missiles so the children in Sderot will not continue to be targeted, so children—not only Israeli children but also Palestinian children—can live in peace in the region. That cannot happen when Hamas continues to be a terrorist organization that threatens all children in the region.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to end on what my colleagues, the Senator from Kentucky and the leader, Senator MCCONNELL, say. Senator GRAHAM, Senator AYOTTE, and I appreciate Senator MCCONNELL's leadership in making very clear what is at stake here, pushing hard to make sure that the Senate is doing its job in support of Israel, making sure they are able to defend themselves and the funding for the Iron Dome which has been so effective as a defense mechanism against these rocket attacks is done in a way that allows them to continue to use it in that capability.

As you look at the situation in Gaza, I want to start by taking a step back and looking at this conflict in both the historic and regional context. In Israel we have the only functioning democracy in the Middle East. Israel is a nation that emphasizes human rights and tolerance. Its population includes religious, ethnic, and cultural diversity. In Jerusalem you can hear the Muslim call to prayer, the bells from Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches, and the prayers of the Jews at the Wailing Wall all at the same time. There is no other place like this on Earth.

This democracy, however, is situated in a region of intense brutality and extremism. Historically that has meant seemingly endless conflicts with Israel's neighbors, intentionally targeting civilians in order to maximize casualties. One need only look across the border into Syria to get a glimpse of this brutality. When Syrians made the first attempt at striving for democracy, the Assad regime began systematically slaughtering opponents, including gassing civilians with chemical weapons. As that violence spread into Iraq, radical terrorist organizations such as ISIS began killing not only Shia opponents but also other Sunni clerics who would not swear allegiance to ISIS. Communities with ancient traditions such as the Christians in Mosul, who just 10 years ago numbered 60,000, have been forced to flee for their lives. Mosul has been completely emptied of Christians for the first time in 1600 years.

It is in this context the people of Israel have built their nation. It is in this context that we now view the conflict in Gaza. The current conflict in Gaza is one that Israel did not start. It started with Hamas firing over 2300 rockets from Gaza into Israel, specifically targeting civilian populated areas to maximize potential casualties. In response, Israel has conducted a methodical and enforceable response, as you would expect any nation to do. First Israel locates the source of the rocket. Then an attempt is made to call the

residents by phone to tell them to evacuate. In many cases a flare is sent onto the roof as a warning that the location is about to be hit, before that location is ultimately destroyed.

In a region where neighboring leaders indiscriminately drop barrel bombs on residential areas for the sole purpose of slaughtering civilians, Israel goes out of its way to save lives. These are not just civilian lives Israel is saving, because they know that by their efforts they are giving the aggressors a chance to escape as well.

After Hamas continued to launch rockets into Israel, even when Israel agreed on multiple occasions to cease fire, tunnels were used to insert combatants near Israeli settlements. Israel responded with a ground assault to destroy the tunnels and eliminate Hamas's stockpiles of weapons. As the attacks and rocket launches continue, it is understandable that Israel would want to seek out and destroy stockpiles of weapons to keep the cycle from being repeated a few months from now.

Like all of my colleagues on the floor today, I want to see peace in the Middle East. Specifically I want to see peace in the Gaza and West Bank. I want to see peace in such a way that the Palestinian people can live with the prospect of a better life. But as we have seen, peace is not possible when a terrorist organization continues to pursue its cause of annihilating Israel. Peace cannot be achieved while Hamas rejects cease-fire agreements and continues to fire rockets. As violent as the current conflict in the Gaza strip is, it would be far worse—it would be far worse—if Israel did not have the Iron Dome. In any conflict, civilian casualties are a tragedy and if Israel did not have the sophisticated, purely defensive weapons system that allows it to shoot these rockets out of the sky, the number of civilian casualties would be far greater.

Hamas does not drop leaflets telling civilians to evacuate. Hamas does not send flares to warn residents to get out of harm's way. If not for Israel's Iron Dome, civilian casualties in Israel would be staggering. The United States must continue to support Israel by ensuring that Iron Dome missile defense systems remain an effective deterrent to even greater civilian casualties. For as long as Israeli men, women, and children need to run to bomb shelters ahead of Hamas rocket attacks we must support Israel's ability to defend itself.

The United Nations Council on Human Rights and other countries around the world continue to do things that are consistently at odds with the facts and with reality. Here in the United States we need to do as my colleague from South Carolina said, the right thing and the smart thing, and in this case, the right thing and the smart thing are one and the same. So I hope my colleagues in the Senate will make a priority providing the necessary funding for Iron Dome and in standing united—united—behind our ally and our friend Israel as they defend themselves from these attacks.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Texas is on the floor, and I would simply ask him what role he sees the United States playing in both supporting Israel and providing support for the Iron Dome.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am pleased and saddened to stand here in support of my colleagues as we stand united in support of the Nation of Israel.

In the last several weeks over 2500 rockets rained down over the Nation of Israel. Eighty percent of the population had to flee what they were doing and run to bomb shelters to hide—moms, dads, children. When the alarm goes off they have sometimes 10, 15 seconds to get to a bomb shelter.

I want you to imagine if the same situation were happening in America. Imagine if 80 percent of this country in the last several weeks had run to a bomb shelter. Imagine if 240 million Americans in the last several weeks had been sitting at work or in the doctor's office or having breakfast and had to grab their children and run in panic toward a bomb shelter. Imagine what our country would be doing in response.

In recent weeks we have discovered that Hamas has opened a new chapter in the annals of terrorism. It is not just raining rockets down from on high, but it is now attacking from below. Some 32 full-scale terror tunnels have been discovered dug under the ground under the border and coming up in kibbutzes inside Israel along Gaza. Some of the tunnels come up inside kindergartens. We have discovered in recent weeks a terrifying plot that was underway for Hamas terrorists on Rosh Hashanah to come through those tunnels—hundreds of them—to emerge in kindergartens to kidnap and murder vast numbers of young Jewish children.

Imagine right now if enemies of this country had dug tunnels into this country and were coming up into our schools. Imagine if Iran or China or some other hostile foreign nation had tunnels from which your children and my children were at risk of being kidnapped or murdered. Today in Gaza we see massive civilian casualties that are the direct consequence of the violence of Hamas.

You see, the human casualties are not an unintended side effect of the conflicts. They are the objective that Hamas seeks—dead Palestinian children and women and men. We know this because Hamas is engaging in a war crime right now, not that the United Nations Human Rights Council would ever say anything about it. But Hamas is engaging in a war crime of using human shields—deliberately using human shields. Where do they place their rockets with which they are raining down death and destruction upon Israel? They place them in schools. They place them in private homes. They place them in mosques. Deliberately they surround their rockets and their terror tunnels with innocent civilians.

Israel right now is engaged in something unprecedented in the annals of modern warfare. It is undertaking more humanitarian effort to spare civilian deaths than any military has in recorded history. Before attacking, Israel sends out texts. When they discover a rocket battery they need to take out because it is firing rockets targeting innocent civilians, they send texts saying: Clear out of the area. They try to save the Palestinian civilians. They drop from the sky pamphlets on an area that is about to be bombed to take out the rockets that are coming from that area. The pamphlets say to the civilians: Get out. Get out because we are going to take out the rockets and you are in harm's way. Not only that, they have a practice of sending an initial knock bomb. What does that mean? It means the first bomb lands on the roof and makes a knock. It doesn't explode; it just makes a loud knock. They do that for a reason: So the people inside the building can look up, can hear the knock, and can flee the building so the second missile can take down the building and the rockets that are housed inside and being used to try to murder innocent civilians.

A few weeks ago Prime Minister Netanyahu summed it up very powerfully when he said: Israel uses missile defense to defend our citizens. Hamas uses its citizens to defend its missiles.

Israel has tried to warn Palestinian civilians: Don't be located where the missiles are because we are going to respond as any sovereign nation will to protect our citizens.

What does Hamas say? Hamas tells the Palestinians: Stay there.

Picture that for a second. Israel is warning civilians to clear the area because they are going to take out the rockets and they are going to take out the tunnels. The response from Hamas is: No. Stay there.

Why? Because what they want to see is Palestinian children, Palestinian women killed so they can put the pictures on the Sunday night news because they know the world—many at the United Nations, many in the media—will behave like useful idiots. They will point to the civilian casualties that are Hamas's fault. When you put rockets on top of children, when you tell the children ''do not leave,''

when you know the rockets are going to be taken out—it is Hamas, the terrorists who are responsible for those children's deaths. Yet the international community puts the pictures on the evening news and blames the nation of Israel.

I am proud this week to have joined my colleague, Senator GILLIBRAND from New York, in filing a bipartisan resolution in this body condemning Hamas's use of human shields, condemning it as a war crime, condemning it as an outrage, condemning it as the direct reason we are seeing so many civilian deaths.

I have to note that one of the reasons civilian deaths have been mitigated in Israel is because of the incredible success of the Iron Dome missile defense system. Ronald Reagan's ''Star Wars'' is today's Iron Dome.

We see unfolding in recent weeks in Israel the product of President Reagan's vision when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, on March 23, 1983. Critics at the time dismissed it as ''Star Wars.'' The Presiding Officer will recall—we were both teenagers at the time, and we recall learned experts, so to speak, going on television saying SDI was a fool's errand; it was a dream. The analogy that was given was you cannot hit a bullet with a bullet; it can't work. Well, run the clock forward three decades, and we see an Iron Dome, the strategic vision of President Reagan, playing out in real-time.

There is a wonderful video on YouTube that I encourage anyone who is interested to Google and watch. It is a video called ''Iron Dome Wedding.'' If people Google it, they will discover a video from a wedding in southern Israel. It is an ordinary wedding video, just like I suspect the Presiding Officer and I both had from our weddings. But in the midst of it, rockets begin coming through the night sky. We see rockets come across the sky, and then we see Iron Dome interceptors come up and explode the rockets. One after the other is hit and explodes, and the whole thing looks like fireworks. In the background we hear the wedding music and the sound of celebrating, and we think, were it not for these Iron Dome interceptors, those missiles might be landing on that wedding and causing carnage and death and destruction. But because of the potential, the power, the actuality of missile defense, instead they are intercepted.

There are indisputable differences between the intercontinental ballistic missiles that SDI was designed to target and the low-tech missiles Hamas is firing over Israel that Iron Dome is intercepting. That is why Iron Dome is one part of a three-tiered system that includes David's Sling and the Arrow 2 and 3 systems, which are designed to guard against more sophisticated weapons, such as the longer range missiles being provided to Hamas by Syria and Iran, and they would also defend against nuclear ballistic missiles of the sort being developed in Iran.

It is worth underscoring, even as the fighting in Gaza grabs the headlines, that we have to keep our eye on the far more serious danger of a nuclear Iran. The threat of a nuclear-armed Iran would make Hamas and their rockets seem like child's play. And our support for Iron Dome should be understood in the context of support for the continued development of these systems, which not only protect our friend and ally Israel, but they protect us. There is a reason why Hamas and Iran refer to Israel as the ''Little Satan'' and the United States as the ''Great Satan,'' because their intention with both is the same terror, the same murder, the same death and destruction.

Israel is currently working to carry out the grinding work to eradicate these terror tunnels that have been built under schools and kindergartens designed to kidnap and murder young children. I would note that it is an enormously difficult task, one that might prove impossible were it not for the success of Iron Dome limiting the effectiveness of those rockets.

I encourage this body to stand together, united as one, Republicans and Democrats. There may be issues on which we disagree—there may be a great many issues—but we ought to be able to stand together as one and speak in unison that we support the nation of Israel and that we will work with the nation of Israel immediately to replenish their Iron Dome supply so they can protect the citizens there and so they can do what is necessary to eradicate the Hamas rockets and terror tunnels being used to commit war crimes. There should be a unified, bipartisan voice in this body, and it is my hope that by the end of this week that is exactly what it will be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

Ms. MIKULSKI. May I proceed or does the other party wish to—how much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 3 minutes remaining, the majority has 47 minutes remaining.

Ms. MIKULSKI. With the concurrence of the minority party, I wish to proceed. I know they haven't yielded back their time. If that is agreeable, and hearing no objection, I will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today as the chair of the Appropriations Committee to talk about several challenges facing our country.

First, I wish to respond to the comments made by many of the Senators this morning on the compelling need to pass supplemental appropriations to help Israel replenish the rockets it has used in its Iron Dome missile defense system. I am an unabashed, unrelenting supporter of that effort.

For many years, as a U.S. Senator on the Appropriations Committee, on the Defense Subcommittee, as well as as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I know how important the Israeli missile defense system is, including Iron Dome, David's Sling, and others that are absolutely crucial. I worked hands-on with Senator Inouye—the late great Senator, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner—to make sure we funded the missile defense system for Israel and to work on a bipartisan basis with Senator Stevens and Senator COCHRAN. We worked together, and thank God it worked. We also implemented an agreement signed by President Bush with the Government of Israel that we would always help Israel maintain its qualitative edge. We have done it, and I am proud of it.

Now more than ever an antimissile defense system that has worked needs to continue operation. We know the technology works, but they need to make sure they have the tools to make the technology work—these additional rockets.

We know Israel is under attack. It has always been under attack since its very founding. This is not an existential threat; this is not an abstract threat; it is a daily threat. We know Israel is trying to defend itself against the grim, unrelenting attacks by Hamas—a self-avowed terrorist organization that has sworn in its documents not to allow Israel to continue. They absolutely oppose an independent Israeli State.

This month we are commemorating the Warsaw uprising. The Presiding Officer is a member of a group we affectionately call the Polish Caucus—those of us who have a relationship with the Polish Government, one of our greatest supporters in the NATO alliance. We recall that 70 years ago people were willing to fight back against the Nazis, rising out of the sewers of the Warsaw ghetto to be able to fight them off with sticks and stones and out-of-date weapons, working to liberate Poland from Nazis oppression.

Miles away, in places such as Dachau, Auschwitz, and others, there were the death camps. We are 1 year away from commemorating the liberation of the death camps. We know that as those people marched out of those death camps, they made their way into Palestine, which became the State of Israel.

We were the first Nation to recognize the necessary and rightful place for

Israel to exist as an independent government and forever and a day the homeland for the Jewish people so they would be safe from terrorism and what occurred.

I am for this whole Iron Dome supplemental, and we need to do it, but it cannot be the only thing we put in this supplemental. We have neighbors right now hurting in our own country—our Western States with wildfires raging over hundreds of thousands of acres, land being depleted, local resources for first responders being exhausted, local funds being worn down. We have to—we have to—be able to respond to the Western border.

Then there is the crisis at our border, and the crisis is at our border because of the crisis in Central America.

So when we move on the supplemental, let's look out for the great State of Israel, let's look out for our neighbors who are facing wildfires, and let's look out for what is going on at our border.

But, Mr. President, I came to the floor, first of all, to compliment Senator SANDERS for the outstanding job he did working on a bipartisan basis to pass the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014. What a great job they did, out of a scandal—a terrible scandal—affecting our Nation's veterans, where they had to stand in line simply to see a doctor in the very country they fought to defend.

Now they have found they have had to defend themselves against VA bureaucracy and in some places duplicitous action.

Well, the Sanders bill goes a long way, again, working on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the dome. Gosh, when we do this, this is why I wanted to be a Senator. I know this is why many others wanted to be a Senator: coming here, working on concrete problems, shoulder to shoulder, on a bipartisan basis, hands across the aisle, hands across the dome. And they did it. When this bill is passed, we will reduce the long wait times for veterans, we will increase doctors and nurses and specialty providers. It will allow veterans to see local providers if they have been on a wait list for an extended period of time or have to drive 40 miles to be able to get to a VA clinic.

Boy, do I know that when I look at some of the rural areas.

We are going to pay for it with $10 billion in mandatory emergency funds. Mandatory emergency funds, that is the way to do it.

The Sanders bill will go a long way in increasing personnel and also in expanding a number of clinics—27 new clinics. So I think it is great.

But as important as that bill is—and it is an important step—it cannot be the only step we take this week. I am so excited that shoulder to shoulder, again, if we work together, we can do a trifecta for our veterans. We can pass the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act—new opportunities for health care, where veterans do not have to stand in line. Also, we are going to vote today on Robert McDonald to give the VA a new Secretary, a new CEO, new leadership, hopefully new energy, new vitality, and new ways of doing business, bringing the practical know-how of the private sector to meeting our mission. But as important as those two are, I also come as the chair of the Appropriations Committee to say, why don't we take a third step that really will do the job? Let's pass the VA MILCON appropriations bill so we can actually put next year's funding in the Federal checkbook rather than just putting VA on autopilot? We can actually make a big difference with the new accountability, expansion of care bill, but that will take days, weeks, months to put in operation. Right this minute we could pass the VA MILCON bill as well as giving new leadership.

I come here because I really do want to move the VA MILCON bill.

The Appropriations Committee works through its subcommittees. And, wow, I have two great leaders on the VA MILCON Subcommittee, the chairman and ranking member, two outstanding Senators: Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota and Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. They have worked so assiduously on coming up with a bill for funding our veterans for fiscal year 2015. It is an outstanding bill. But right now we are out there in the wilderness. We have moved it through the subcommittee. We have moved it through the full committee. It passed unanimously. We are out in the ethers waiting to come to the floor. JOHNSON and KIRK, MIKULSKI and SHELBY, we are like people with our noses pressed against the glass. We see it within our grasp but we cannot get through. All we want to do is help to complete the job we are trying to undertake today.

As much as the bill will be that Senator SANDERS worked on, without the VA MILCON appropriations bill, the veterans will lack key tools to expand care, important support personnel that allows the doctors and nurses to do their job, important technology to run contemporary institutions. By the way, the bill we are going to be working on, the Sanders bill, is focused on health care, but we on the Appropriations Committee dealt not only with aspects of that but also the terrible backlog on veterans disability.

Mr. President, veterans disability—not only do you have to stand in line to get health care, but you are standing days, weeks, months to get your disability claim. You have lost an arm or a leg or you cannot breathe or you have PTSD and we cannot get your disability processed. This is unacceptable. What we do in the VA bill is come up with the funds to really modernize the VA.

First of all, just in terms of health care, to complement the Sanders bill, we have money in there to develop state-of-the-art technology so the doctors can provide medical health care, to make sure we have the modern equipment and the modern IT systems.

Right now, we need to be able to have DOD talking to the VA because veterans come from DOD. But we have an interoperable system. We work to fix this. We also deal with this backlog. You have no idea, Mr. President. My State of Maryland and my office in Baltimore have not had a good track record. I vowed to my veterans that I would try to break that backlog. And you know what. Working together we have been able to do this.

In the fiscal year 2015 bill, we fund an appeals process, we train additional claims processors, we require the management at the Veterans Benefit Administration to deal with the backlog, working with the new Administrator. We have not only great ideas, but we actually put the money in the Federal checkbook. JOHNSON-KIRK did it. Do you know how they did it? Yes, talking to the VA, reviewing tons of GAO and inspector general reports, and guess what else they did. They talked to the veterans. They talked to these wonderful volunteer service organizations.

So I am going to propose something later on today or later on this week. I do not want to be the chair of a committee who has her face pressed up against the glass looking longingly at the Senate floor with a bill I know will help the Veterans' Administration with the heavy lifting to deal with the health care and disability backlog. Because I believe in no surprises and no stunts, later on today or later on this week, I will ask unanimous consent to bring up the VA MILCON on third reading to be able to compliment what we are doing here today. I want to be able to do that and I hope no Senator will object to it.

Now, just again, in the spirit of full disclosure—because I truly have pledged to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I would never be a surprise chair and I would never be one to pull gimmicks or stunts—I am going to ask that consent. I want people to know about it so they can discuss it, chew on it, talk at their respective luncheons.

When I ask unanimous consent, I am going to ask that it be brought up on third reading. Why am I doing that? Because under the rules of the Senate, if you bring up a bill on third reading, there are no amendments. So the question would be: Senator MIKULSKI, are you trying to stiff-arm again? No. I am trying to get the job done. I am not trying to stiff-arm the opportunity to offer amendments. But we have 72 hours left before we take this really

long break—really long, long, long, very long—did I say ''long''—break. I do not think, when you need health care for veterans, when you need to modernize technology, when you need to crack the backlog—while we are kind of basking in the Sun somewhere—I do not want them in line.

So either this afternoon or sometime tomorrow, I will ask unanimous consent. I will turn to my 99 colleagues, and in the spirit of really meeting compelling needs of our veterans, I will ask that bill come up so that as we move through the other two aspects that we are going to do to help veterans, we can do the VA MILCON bill.

So I wanted to come to the floor today to talk about how we support a treasured ally, how we look out for our neighbors in the West fighting our wildfires, and how we deal with the crisis in Central America, where children are being victimized and brutalized every day so they are making the long march across that terrain and territory to come to the United States of America.

So I hope in the short time the Senate is going to be in session this week and this month and even this year we could use this week to meet the needs that are confronting us, but, most of all, I would hope we do not just do part of the job for our veterans; we do this trifecta that I am recommending: passing the Veterans Accountability Act, the health care act; give us a new CEO; and have a chance to pass the VA MILCON bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, my chairwoman, Senator MIKULSKI.

I would add perhaps one particular point; that is, this Senator will be basking in the Sun in Illinois during the recess, and I invite the Senator from Maryland to come join us any time she would like to. But it will not be in ordinary vacation climes; it will be in my home State. I am sure the Senator is going to be spending a lot of time in hers as well.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I could respond to the Senator from Illinois, yes, I am staying in Maryland because I had hoped we would even be working on conference reports and so on. But while the Senator is in Illinois and I am in Maryland, most of all, we do not want our veterans standing in line for their health care or their disability benefits. So shoulder to shoulder, forward together.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank Senator MIKULSKI.

Mr. President, this supplemental appropriations bill is important. It is timely. One of the provisions in it is an additional $225 million for the Iron Dome defense. The Iron Dome defense is a joint effort by the United States and Israel to protect Israel from rocket attacks. Imagine you are living in your hometown and a neighboring State or neighboring town just fired 2,000 rockets into your hometown. These are not Fourth of July rockets; these are deadly rockets that kill. You want some protection. The Iron Dome provides protection for Israel.

This joint effort by the United States and Israel has been successful. Despite 2,000 rocket attacks, the casualties on the Israeli side have been minimal, relatively minimal, and it is because of the Iron Dome defense.

What attacks does Israel face today? Well, they face Hamas attacks from Gaza. Hamas is an organization which the United States characterized as a terrorist organization almost 20 years ago. We know Hamas. We know their tactics. What they are doing is putting rocket launchers in civilian neighborhoods near hospitals and apartments and homes, and they are launching these missile attacks on Israel and daring them to fire back into civilian populations.

Iron Dome protects the Israeli population from the missiles being shot by Hamas in Gaza. Now the Israelis have invaded Gaza to go to the source to stop these rocket attacks.

Sadly, during the course of this effort in Gaza, there have been casualties—some on the Israeli side, of course; but hundreds, maybe a thousand on the side of the civilian population in Gaza. This is because the strategy of Hamas is to put their armaments smack-dab in the middle of civilian populations. As has been said, in Israel, they use weapons to protect civilians; and in Gaza, they are using civilians to protect weapons. That has to come to an end. We have to have an end to the hostilities between Gaza and Israel. No nation—no nation on Earth—would sit still for 2,000 rocket attacks into their population. That is what Israel has faced over the past several weeks. But the people of Gaza also need much better than they are receiving when it comes to Hamas.

Hamas, sadly, is engaging in tactics using human shields at the expense of the civilian population. When they are told about the civilians that are dying in Gaza, leaders in Hamas say: Well, they are martyrs for the cause. I will have to tell you, it would be very difficult for me to understand and explain to a family that has lost a child they love that their child has just become a martyr.

This has to come to an end. The hostilities between Gaza and Israel have to end, I hope, in some negotiation and peaceful resolution. Maybe it is wishful thinking, but I do believe we need to make the effort. I commend Secretary of State Kerry for his effort at trying to engage Egypt and others in this conversation.

The supplemental bill before us today provides more money for interceptor missiles for Iron Dome—to protect Israel—money requested by our Secretary of Defense, money which I support. As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we added some $350 million for Iron Dome defenses in the next fiscal year which begins October 1. This money is needed now because of the hostilities between these two countries. I certainly support it.

A second part, the major part of this supplemental appropriation, deals with the humanitarian refugee crisis we have on our border. It is not often the United States faces a refugee crisis. Think back in history. The only refugees who come to our shores are usually from nearby countries: Haiti, Cuba. Occasionally, we have refugees coming such as after the Vietnam War, the Hmong people who were our allies in that war.

But we are not like most countries in the Middle East, for example, that have a steady stream of refugees. The United States does not engage in refugee crisis alleviation because of our location and geography and our history. Seldom have we been challenged. But today we are challenged. We are challenged because in the first 6 months of the year 57,000 unaccompanied children—children—presented themselves at the border with Mexico. They were not trying to sneak in. They literally walked across the border and presented themselves to the first person in uniform.

They were told to do that by their families. Why did they make the trip to the border as kids—by themselves—to present themselves? Because in three countries in Central America there is a state of lawlessness: Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. Eighty percent of the children who have come to the border came from those three countries. They are not just coming to the United States, incidentally. There has been a 700-percent increase in refugees to adjoining Central American countries from those three countries.

This has been going on for some time. But for the past 2 or 3 years, it has gone from bad to dramatically worse. We met last week with the Ambassadors from these three countries, and we talked about what created this. A lot of it has to do with the drug gangs—drug gangs that are transporting drugs through those countries for sale largely in the United States. These drug gangs have become powerful and rich, well armed and notorious for their barbaric tactics.

They recruit young people into their drug gangs at the point of a gun. They mutilate those who even hesitate to join the drug gangs. God forbid it is your daughter, because they have a reputation for raping young girls. If they are not satisfied with their response, they kill them on the spot and

leave them in plastic bags by the highway. That is why many families are sending their kids away from this deadly violence.

Two weeks ago I went to a shelter in Chicago. This was a transitional shelter where 70 children from the border are being held until they can be placed with their families in the United States or with some trusting family that takes up foster care. I saw these kids firsthand. Your image of them may be different than what you actually see.

My wife said to me: Well, why do they not show pictures of these kids? Well, they try to protect their identity and confidentiality by not showing photos. But if you could see them, you would see children of all ages. There were five women who walked into the dining hall at this transitional shelter.

They did not seem to me to be 14 years of age. Each one was carrying a baby. They were the victims of rape in Honduras. They were carrying these newborn infants in their arms, as they had done during the 8-day bus journey to get to the border. I asked some of the staff at this transitional shelter—I had been told that many of the families, before they send their young girls on this dangerous and sometimes deadly journey, give the girls birth control pills because they anticipate they will be attacked during the course of this journey. They said: It is true.

What desperation would you have to reach before you turned your daughter loose under those circumstances? These families are literally trying to escape a burning home and sending their kids to the only safe and secure place they can think of.

What do we need to do? First, we need to get to these countries and tell them: Stop. Stop these deadly journeys, these journeys which, sadly, lead to harm and even death for some of these children. Do not let this happen any more. We have to work with the governments of those countries to make it clear this is the wrong thing to do. It is wrong because once these kids get into America, they are not entitled to stay. They are not entitled to be citizens, unless, perhaps, they qualify for asylum. They are going to be sent back.

After they are sent back to these countries, if they ever try to reenter the United States they can be found guilty of a felony. This is serious. So the notion that they can just come to America and stay here if they wish is not true. That is the first thing we need to do.

The second thing we need to do is to stop the smuggling and the coyotes that are bringing these kids into the United States. They are charging these poor families in Central America thousands of dollars they do not have to bring these kids to the border. We have to work with Mexico to hold these coyotes and smugglers accountable.

Third, I want to tell you, I think this really is key to our discussion. This is a test of who we are as a country. How many times in our history has the United States rallied for families and children around the world?

Do you remember just a month or two ago in Nigeria when 300 girls were kidnapped by Islamic extremists? Members of the Senate from both parties came to the floor to protest outrage that 300 young teenage girls would be kidnapped by these extremists. We engaged at every level to let the world know America cared. It was not the first time. There is a long history of it. We have stood for families and children around the world for humanitarian purposes throughout our history. Look back to the refuseniks, the Russian Jews who were being discriminated against in the Soviet Union. The United States was one of the leading nations in the world to stand behind those families and those children, bringing them to the United States so that they could escape antisemitism and Communism.

When you look at the victims of the Haitian earthquake, the United States was providing foreign aid to those families and children because we are, in fact, a caring nation. That is who we are. Throughout our history we have shown it. We need to show it again with these children. Some extreme American politicians have said: It is not our problem. Put them on a bus. Put them on a plane and dump them back wherever they came from—not our problem.

God forbid that is the verdict of history, that the United States, when it saw vulnerable, helpless children, did not care. I think more highly of this country. I think we have proven over and over that we do care. There have been some extraordinary statements made about this crisis by many people. The one that caught my eye was from a friend who happens to be the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Deval Patrick was born in Chicago. Maybe that is why I am partial to him. But Deval Patrick spoke about Massachusetts and its feelings toward these children.

He recalled moments of history. Here is what he said: My inclination is to remember what happened when a ship full of Jewish children tried to come to the United States in 1939 and the United States turned them away. Many of them went back to their deaths in Nazi concentration camps.

He went on to say:

I think we are a bigger hearted people than that as Americans.

I agree with Governor Patrick. President Obama has asked for resources to care for these children, to place them, to give them the right of seeking asylum if they can make that established legal claim and, if not, to return them, humanely, to the countries they came from. Two of the three Ambassadors we met with, incidentally, said they could not guarantee the safety of those children in Honduras or El Salvador, if they came back. Let's do the right thing and pass this supplemental appropriation. Let's provide the resources so these children are treated humanely, ultimately given their hearing, ultimately returned, in most cases, to the country they came from.

How will history judge us? How will we be judged if, when these refugee children came to our border, they were turned away and sent back to harm, violence or even death?

We do not want that to happen. That is not who we are as Americans. We care. We show it. Our government should show it as well. The Senate will get an opportunity to do that very soon—we hope maybe this day or this week—as we wind down the session.

The last point I want to make is a tribute to two of my colleagues who have done an extraordinary job when it comes to the Veterans' Administration. I am referring to JOHN MCCAIN, my friend who came to Congress with me many years ago, the former Republican candidate for President and a conservative from Arizona. He teamed up with—of all people—BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont, self-styled independent socialist Democrat. How about that? SANDERS and MCCAIN sat down to solve the challenge facing the VA. God bless them. They did it. They are reporting a bill to us which is a dramatic improvement over the current VA system.

We are now overwhelmed with the Veterans' Administration disability claims. Forty-five percent of the veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan have filed a claim. We have tens of thousands of these claims pending, many of them for post-traumatic stress disorder.

We have said, incidentally, that we are going to help all veterans. Some 400,000 veterans from other wars are making PTSD claims. In addition, we have those who served in Vietnam, exposed to Agent Orange and with nine different diseases being treated. We have those who were victims of Gulf War Syndrome being treated. We have homeless veterans who are now being brought in and counseled so they can get their lives back on track. It is an overwhelming responsibility which the VA has today.

The Sanders-McCain veterans bill is going to address them by providing more resources for our veterans and more medical professionals, which we need. Remember—we all should every single day—that we said to the men and women who enlisted in our military and who volunteered: If you will raise your hand, swear allegiance to this country and risk your life, we will stand by you when you come home.

We are going to keep our word. We promised. We are going to keep our

word. This bill—this veterans bill that is going to come before us this week—does exactly that. SANDERS and MCCAIN met with the House conferees and worked out an agreement—an agreement which is going to benefit the Hines VA in Chicago with an additional facility which they need. There is an amendment which is going to help facilities all across this country serving our veterans—an amendment which says: If you happen to live too far away from a veterans hospital, we are going to find a way to make sure you get timely care that is near your home. I think it is the least we can do. We owe it to our vets.

I tip my hat to my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, who put this together. I am looking forward to voting for it this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois. I think Senator SANDERS and Senator MCCAIN showed that things can get done around here. I think of the tremendous work the Senator from Illinois did last year and helped us get an immigration bill through this body. We had a large majority of the Senate vote for it—Republicans and Democrats alike.

How I wish the leadership in the House had allowed them to vote on it. I think we would be in a far better position to deal with these problems with the DREAMers and with those seeking to come into our country. I applaud the Senator from Illinois for never giving up.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from Vermont would yield for just one moment. I want to thank him personally. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he has made a point of making sure the DREAM Act, a bill which I introduced 13 years ago, has had a fair hearing before the committee on more than one occasion and has been reported by the committee. It was part of that comprehensive immigration bill. I thank him for bringing it up.

I just want to say for the record that one Republican Senator has said he wants to deport all of the DREAMers. He is in for a fight because these young men and women are proving over and over they can make a valuable contribution to this country. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2658 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FRANKEN. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROBERT ALAN MCDONALD TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Alan McDonald, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise today in strong support of the nomination of Robert McDonald to serve as Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

I also thank Majority Leader REID for moving this important nomination forward as quickly as he has, and I very much hope that later this afternoon, with a very strong vote, the Senate will vote to confirm Robert McDonald as Secretary of the VA.

Before I talk about Mr. McDonald's qualifications, I wish to take a moment to express my sincere thanks to GEN Eric Shinseki for his dedicated service to our Nation, first as a soldier and then as head of the VA, working tirelessly to provide for those injured during war and the families of those who perished on the battlefield. He set very ambitious goals, and under his leadership VA made significant strides in reducing veteran homelessness and transforming a paper-based claims system to one fit for the 21st century. I thank him and his family very much for his service.

It is my strong belief that Robert McDonald will bring two very important qualities to the position of Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

First, he is familiar with the military as well as the needs of veterans and their families. Mr. McDonald and his family have a history of service to our Nation. Mr. McDonald began his service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy at West Point. He graduated in 1975 in the top 2 percent of his class with a degree in engineering and went on to serve as an infantry officer in the Army's 82nd Airborne, earning Airborne and Ranger qualifications during his military service. His father served in the Army Air Corps after World War II. Additionally, his wife's father was held as a POW after being shot down over Europe. Her uncle served in Vietnam and still receives care at the VA. Also, Mr. McDonald's nephew is currently serving and deployed with the U.S. Air Force. In other words, Mr. McDonald and his family have a deep understanding and service with the U.S. military.

Upon hearing Mr. McDonald at the hearing we held in our committee for the confirmation process, I was convinced that he has a deep passion to do everything he can to protect our veterans.

The other quality Mr. McDonald brings to this job is that he has been the CEO of one of America's leading corporations, a company which has tens of thousands of employees. His more than 33 years with Procter & Gamble gives him the tools to create a well-run and accountable VA. In other words, he will bring the tools of a CEO and a private corporation to the VA—a huge bureaucracy that needs a significant improvement in accountability and in management.

As we begin debate on Mr. McDonald's nomination, I believe it is important that my colleagues understand the realities he will face in leading the VA.

The VA operates the largest integrated health care system in the United States, with over 1,700 points of care which include 150 hospitals, 820 community-based outreach clinics, and 300 vet centers. In fiscal year 2013 the VA provided 89.7 million outpatient visits each day—today, tomorrow, yesterday. The VA conducts approximately 236,000 health care appointments. In other words, it is a huge system.

VA's problems, which Mr. McDonald will have to address immediately, have been widely reported in recent months. In my view, Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson has done an excellent job in taking a number of critical steps to address the problems confronting the VA, but clearly there is much more to be done.

We now know, among other issues, there is a significant shortage of doctors, nurses, and mental health providers within VA, as well as the physical space necessary to provide timely access to quality care. This is a major problem because at the end of the day, no matter how well run the VA is or any health care system is, we are not going to be able to provide quality, timely care unless there are the doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel available to do that work. As a result of the shortages, we know that we have tens of thousands of veterans today in many parts of this country on lists that are much too long in order to gain access to the VA. We also know that hundreds of thousands of veterans who have appointments scheduled are waiting too long to be seen and receive care.

I think it is important that everybody recognize that as a result of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, in the last 5 years 2 million more veterans have come into the VA. This is on top of an aging population of VA patients

who served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam—patients who often need a whole lot of care as they age. So combine new people coming into the VA, often with very serious problems—including some 500,000 veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan with PTSD and TBI—and an aging population with difficult problems, and that is where we are, and those are some of the issues the VA is going to have to address.

While I am on the subject, let me say that most people understand—and that includes many of the veterans I talk to every day in Vermont, veterans across the country, and the national veterans organizations that represent millions of veterans—that once people get into the VA system, in general the quality of care is good. That is not just what veterans and their organizations say; that is what a number of independent studies show. Our problem right now is how to figure out a way that when people apply for VA health care, they get into the system quickly and that once they are in the system, they get the appointments they need in a timely manner. That is our job. It is not going to be an easy job, but that is the job we face.

My hope is that tomorrow or Thursday the House and the Senate will be voting on a comprehensive piece of legislation authored by Congressman JEFF MILLER, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and me. I think it is terribly important that we pass that bipartisan legislation with a strong vote in both Houses because that legislation will give the new Secretary the tools he needs to go forward aggressively in addressing many of the problems facing the VA.

I hope every Member of the House and Senate understands it is unacceptable that veterans in this country are on terribly long waiting lines and cannot get the health care they need in a timely manner.

This legislation, which I hope will be passed this week by the House and the Senate, provides $10 billion for emergency health care so that if a veteran can't get into the VA, that veteran will be able to go to a private physician, a community-based health center, a military base, or whatever but will be able to get timely care.

In addition, the legislation puts $5 billion into the VA so that they will be able to hire the doctors, the mental health counselors, nurses, and other medical personnel they need so that as soon as possible, when veterans apply for VA health care, they will get not only quality care but timely care.

In addition, this legislation addresses an issue many veterans around the country, especially in rural areas, are worried about—that if they live long distances away from the VA, they will not have to travel 100 miles to get the health care they need; that if they live 40 miles or more away from the VA facility, they will be able to go to a doctor of their choice in that community. This is an important step forward.

This legislation will also do some terribly important work in making sure that widows—women who lost their husbands in battle—will be able to get the education they should be entitled to under the post-9/11 GI bill.

This legislation deals with an issue passed by the House; that is, instate tuition for veterans who today may not be able to take advantage of the post-9/11 GI bill.

This legislation also addresses a very serious crisis within the military today; that is, the issue of sexual abuse and providing women and men who have been abused sexually in the military with care at the VA.

We are at a very important moment in terms of the Veterans' Administration. We will have new leadership at the VA after Mr. McDonald is confirmed. We have a significant piece of legislation that I hope and expect will be passed this week to give the new leadership the tools it needs to start addressing the problems facing our veterans.

It seems to me that if this Nation stands for anything, it must protect and defend those who have protected and defended us. When people put their lives on the line and they come back wounded from war—either in body or in spirit—it seems absolutely immoral if we turn our backs on those men and women.

The legislation we will pass this week begins to address those concerns, and I hope we will do so under the new leadership Mr. McDonald will provide.

Madam President, I yield my remaining time to Senator BROWN to hear his comments on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I applaud Senator SANDERS for his work on the veterans conference report.

I spoke at a breakfast today. I was with the Presiding Officer from North Dakota at the Air Force Caucus. As important as the Air Force is in North Dakota, it is equally important at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, OH—outside of Dayton.

One of the things I talked about at this breakfast is how proud I am, when it looks as if the Senate does not get as much done as we would like, that Senator SANDERS and Senator MCCAIN—with a supporting cast but principally the two of them—were able to negotiate with a sometimes reluctant, sometimes erratic House of Representatives on some of these issues. They were able to negotiate a very good veterans bill that will primarily do three things: first, make those accountable at the VA actually accountable; second, take care of those veterans who have had to wait longer than 30 days for their care in the VA, veterans who have earned this care; and third, will scale up the VA—the most important parts—so there will be enough doctors and nurses, mental health therapists and occupational therapists, and enough beds and enough capacity at the VA centers and at the community-based outpatient clinics. If you are in the system, you get good care. It is just that too many haven't been able to get into the system, partly because when we went to war a decade-plus ago, the people running the administration in those days and the Congress said: This war will be short. We don't need to bother with scaling up the VA.

That was shameful. They were dead wrong. Unfortunately, far too many veterans have paid the price. That is why this legislation is so important. The timing is perfect to get this reform at the same time that we have an opportunity this week to confirm Robert McDonald, a fellow Ohioan from Cincinnati who ran a company that had more than 100,000 employees, one of the world's biggest, most prestigious consumer companies.

He went to West Point. He served veterans before. He understands veterans' issues. I talked with him a number of times, as has Chairman SANDERS, and Mr. McDonald, as the soon-to-be—I hope the new Secretary. I ask my colleagues to support him—new Secretary will have these new tools because of this conference report which I am hopeful we pass this week

Mr. McDonald understands the importance of VA health care. He knows—he said this to me in my office and a couple of other times—that the Veterans' Administration has a hospital system unlike any other in the country. It knows how to treat unique illnesses and unique injuries—unique mostly to veterans—various kinds of brain trauma, various kinds of physical injuries, other kinds of treatment. That is why it makes sense for Mr. McDonald to be the new Secretary of the VA. That is why this veterans conference report is very important.

Mr. BROWN. I yield for my distinguished friend from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I want to commend Chairman SANDERS for his leadership. Last night at 9:30 p.m., I came back to the Capitol and executed a conference agreement that he has worked very hard on, and ranking member Senator BURR worked very hard on, and pulled together disparate factions to address the needs of our veterans in a bill that is going to be a toolkit for Robert McDonald, who I hope will be unanimously approved as

the next Secretary of the VA in the President's Cabinet.

I rise to talk about Mr. McDonald, but before I do, I want to talk about that conference report.

Our veterans have been abused in the last 10 to 12 years because of a veterans' medical service that has not performed the services they need to perform for our veterans in America. One of the reasons they did this is, Admiral Shinseki, who was the former Secretary, was actually insulated from a lot of the information that was going on in his own Department by the senior leadership at the VA who had become comfortable and passive and not active in terms of the operation of VA medical services.

The bill we signed last night that the Senate will vote on in the next few days is the bill that gives Mr. McDonald and the next Secretary to come the tools they need to enhance the VA and to make it a responsive organization to the 22 million veterans, 6.5 million of whom use veteran medical services, and to the 774,000 veterans in my home State of Georgia who deserve and demand, if you will, the services they were promised when they went into the U.S. military.

Bob McDonald is an outstanding American. He was president, CEO, and chairman of the board of one of the most respected companies in America, Procter & Gamble.

He is the father of two, grandfather of two additional children. He is an outstanding American and his wife Diane is an outstanding lady in support of him and his job at Procter & Gamble. He is going to need that support now as he heads to the VA.

He was a captain in the U.S. military. He graduated from West Point, was trained in airborne warfare, desert warfare, and subtemperature warfare, and he is going to need those talents at the VA in each and every case because it is a mess.

The conference committee report we have passed gives him two tools that are essential. It gives him the authority to hire and fire title 38 and title 5 employees. Title 5 employs the senior leadership and title 38 the next step in leadership down, which is what the VA needs. The VA is an organization of 340,000 people which in the last 3 years has averaged 3,000 disciplinary actions a year. Each of those disciplinary actions meant people were moved from one job to another within the VA and did not lose pay. There is no accountability in the VA and there really has not been. That is why the systemic problems on appointments and veterans services and everything else going on in the VA has not happened. By giving him the opportunity to hire and fire, he will have the respect and attention of those who work in the VA to understand full well they are going to have to carry out the game plan of this leader.

He understands metrics. He understands accountability. He understands leadership. He has taken a job he didn't have to accept, a job he didn't need to have to do at this time in his life, but a job he wants to do to give back to the country he loves and the country he served in the military.

I am confident Bob McDonald will be an outstanding Secretary of the Veterans' Administration, and I commend him to my fellow Senators with my highest recommendation in the hopes that he will be approved unanimously.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

I stand today also with high hopes that the new leadership at the VA will bring much needed changes to a department that is clearly, quite frankly, in a shambles, failing our Nation's veterans. During his committee hearing, the nominee Robert McDonald promised to bring a high level of accountability and transparency to the VA, two characteristics that are sorely needed. This is extremely important in an agency where under the leadership of the previous Secretary it would often take months to get answers to routine questions—or in many cases you would never get answers at all.

By the end of this week I am also hopeful that besides confirming the new Secretary, we will send to the President the Veterans Access Choice and Accountability Act. This important legislation includes many needed reforms to the VA, including bringing that accountability to the Department and actually providing our Nation's veterans with choices about where they can receive care.

The bill also, perhaps most importantly for Louisiana, finally authorizes much needed community-based clinics around the country, including two which have been long delayed in Louisiana by pure ineptitude and bureaucratic screw-ups at the VA—clinics and expanded clinics in Lafayette and Lake Charles. For 4 years I have been fighting the Washington bureaucracy tooth and nail to get these new expanded outpatient clinics. They are vitally important to Louisiana veterans who now sometimes have to drive up to 4 hours to receive services that have been promised to them much closer to their community.

The current clinics in Acadiana are overcrowded and don't offer the full range of services that these new clinics will. As I said, VA ineptitude delayed the clinics in the first place. If it weren't for their mistakes, these clinics would actually already be built. When they were finally teed up and ready to go, then the Congressional Budget Office made a ridiculous decision that again threw these clinics into limbo because of a scoring issue out of the blue. Finally in December, the House was able to pass a bill that dealt with these CBO concerns that passed 346 to 1.

Normally when a bill passes with that sort of margin the Senate will quickly pass it by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, that didn't happen.

First we needed to attach an amendment to address some marginal concerns. Then even after we had done that—even after that received full agreement in the Senate, unfortunately Senate Democrats, led by the Chair of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, held up the legislation basically as a hostage to try to get a broader VA package. Actually I had to come down and ask unanimous consent for the House clinics legislation six times on the floor. Unfortunately, six times Senator SANDERS denied that unanimous consent. It was only after the VA scandal broke that momentum shifted and, thankfully, it looks as though we will finally pass this into law, the clinics legislation, along with this important reform bill.

When the authorization occurs, I strongly urge Mr. McDonald and the VA to streamline the process to get these two clinics built as soon as possible, given the long and arduous history of VA delays and screw-ups. The veterans of Louisiana have waited patiently, literally for years. These clinics are overdue. Let's get on with it. Louisiana veterans have had to wait for numerous delays caused by VA mistakes. The least the Department can do is to make sure these clinics are now built with the utmost haste and efficiency.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for approximately 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MCDONALD NOMINATION

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I have been a Member of Congress in both the House and in the Senate, and in my entire time as a Member of Congress I have served on either the House or Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. Over that time I have worked with nine Secretaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Today I am here to add my support and ask for the confirmation of someone who I believe will be the next Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Bob McDonald.

I had believed—I do believe—that a change at the Department of Veterans Affairs was necessary. I made clear that we needed to change the leadership at the top, and I believe this change is a good thing for the Department—the management of the Department, but, most importantly, for the veterans whom the Department is to serve.

I also know a change in the leadership of the Department of Veterans Affairs in and of itself is insufficient to solve the problems our veterans are facing in access to health care and in the long time our veterans are required to wait to receive their benefits.

I have met with Mr. McDonald in my office. I also, as a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, had the opportunity to listen to him testify and to ask him questions in the confirmation process, and I was completely impressed by his candor, his sincerity, and certainly his commitment to serving our Nation's veterans. He is a leader in the tradition of the 82nd Airborne Paratroopers who are well regarded as the first to be called when there is a military emergency. As they say, when the President calls, the 82nd Airborne will answer. In my view, that is exactly what we have in Mr. McDonald. When the President called, he answered that call. He answered the opportunity to serve the veterans of this country.

When the President needed help, he found someone, in my view, who will dutifully fulfill the responsibilities of being a Cabinet Secretary and work on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

It seems to me there is no certainty in this world in which we know people for brief amounts of time, but it certainly seems clear to me that Mr. McDonald is the right person to lead the VA. He is willing and capable of restoring hope in veterans so they can trust the agency and the Department that was created for their benefit.

I asked the President—I don't know that he ever saw my request or certainly never probably listened to my request, but the plea was please nominate someone from outside the Department of Veterans Affairs. This gentleman, Mr. McDonald, while having military experience, has a significant background of being the CEO of Proctor & Gamble, and in that position he was well-known for his value-based leadership, believing that ''the best companies and leaders operate with a clear purpose and consistent set of principles or values.''

What the VA must do right now is to dismantle the bureaucracy, break down the culture of indifference, and review its commitment to the core values of the Department. There is no higher calling than to take care of the men and women who served our country.

Mr. McDonald shares that dedication to making certain our veterans have access to quality care—the best our Nation can offer—and he is focused and ready to take on the challenges that lie ahead. At least he convinced me that is the case.

There is now, fortunately, compromise legislation poised to pass both the House and Senate this week that will soon offer veterans more access to the quality care they deserve. Although this legislation is significant, it is impossible for Congress to mandate a change in attitude. Leaders can change attitudes at the Department. Congress does not have the power to control or develop a workforce that treats veterans like patriots, deserving care from a grateful nation, rather than to make them feel as though they are a burden.

Leadership throughout the institution, starting with Bob McDonald at the top, must command the VA to head down a new path of redemption and hope. We must create an agency that is more cost-effective, more compassionate, and more caring toward the veterans it serves. The VA must become an agency that is worthy of the service and sacrifice of our Nation's veterans.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF ROBERT ALAN McDONALD TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:45 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, before I begin I do want to take a moment to commend the chairmen of the Veterans' Affairs Committees in both the House and the Senate for their commitment to reaching a deal that puts our veterans first and gives the VA the tools they need to address immediate challenges.

More importantly, I really applaud their work to build and strengthen the VA system in order to continue to deliver the best care for our Nation's heroes over the long term.

The deal they announced yesterday is a very important step toward addressing a lot of issues that we know exist within the VA system, but it cannot be the final step. As transparency and accountability increase at the VA, so will the investigations and reports of additional concerns, requiring even more action from the VA, from the administration, and from this Congress.

However, as Chairman MILLER said yesterday, we cannot legislate good character here in Congress. It is going to be up to the leadership at the Department of Veterans Affairs to truly enact those reforms.

So I have come to the floor today in support of the nomination of Robert McDonald, someone I believe has the skills necessary to make these necessary changes as the next VA Secretary.

As I told Mr. McDonald last week, he is faced with a truly monumental task. Even as we pass comprehensive legislation to bring significant reforms at the VA to reduce wait times, to improve accountability, there are still many serious challenges the VA must address.

Twenty-two veterans still take their own lives each day. Thousands of veterans are alone, coping with sexual assaults. And while the Department has made commendable progress, it will be an uphill battle as we work to eliminate veterans homelessness and the claims backlog. Mr. McDonald will have to grapple with these and many more issues—all on day one.

When I met with Mr. McDonald in my office a few weeks ago, he told me he was one of the veterans who was lost in the system during his transition from military life to civilian life. So I trust—I trust—he understands what a critical moment this is for the VA and why we must finally fix many of these systemic and cultural challenges.

We have all made a promise to those who have signed up to serve. So I encourage my colleagues to support this nomination. I am hopeful the steps we are taking here this week on behalf of our Nation's heroes will finally ignite the much-delayed reforms our veterans have been demanding and they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I stand today not to rehash with my colleagues the crisis that exists at the Veterans' Administration or to share it with the American people. They know the story, and especially our Nation's veterans, who have been given the runaround.

I am here to highlight a success in the Senate. See, my colleagues, on July 7, 2014—not even a month ago—we received the nomination for the new VA Secretary from the President.

On July 22 of this month, we had a confirmation hearing on that nomination. On July 23—the next day—Robert McDonald was passed unanimously out of the committee. Today—before the end of July—we are on the Senate floor to confirm Robert McDonald as the next VA Secretary.

I rise to urge my colleagues to support this nomination. The VA needs a confirmed Secretary in place to begin a long, arduous process of reform and cultural change.

By now, our colleagues probably know that Bob McDonald is a veteran

himself. He is a graduate of West Point. He served 5 years in active duty, and served most of that time at Fort Bragg, NC. So I consider him one of ours.

He spent more than 30 years working for Procter & Gamble—I think the most competitive manufacturing company in the world. His work led him across the globe. But he also had prominent roles at a number of other organizations—Xerox, United States Steel Corporation, and the Business Roundtable.

Mr. McDonald has frequently lectured to groups on leadership skills, and his leadership philosophy was highlighted in the book ''The Leader's Compass.'' He is the type of leader we need at the VA at this very crucial time.

Bob McDonald clearly has the experience to run an organization as large and as diverse as the Department of Veterans Affairs. Perhaps more importantly, he has selflessly agreed to take the challenge of leading the VA at its most critical time—something many people might have passed on.

I hope this week, in addition to this nomination, we will pass legislation to help the VA and its next leader address the systemic problems with access to VA health care and a corrosive culture that led to this crisis. But that legislation would be just one step. An enormous amount of work must be done from within the VA to rebuild its reputation and to turn it into an agency that will live up to the expectations of our veterans and a nation grateful to them for their service. We need a strong leader to do that, and I am glad Robert McDonald has agreed to serve his country once again in this important role.

The nomination received the unanimous support of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I urge my colleagues: Confirm Robert McDonald as the next Secretary of the VA, and let's get on with the important work of reform at that agency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, my colleague from North Carolina has just spoken on behalf of the nomination of Robert McDonald to be the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and I will do likewise. He has also spoken of his background as a graduate of West Point, as an Army officer, and as the CEO of one of the largest companies in the world.

I had the occasion to meet with Mr. McDonald, and he could be the man of the hour. I hope he will be. He looks that way now.

With that in mind, I rise today in support of Robert McDonald's nomination for Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is my hope that Robert McDonald will bring a renewed commitment, energy, and acumen to address the Department's systemic problems that we all know exist.

The allegations against the Department of Veterans Affairs are incredibly serious. Therefore, I rise in defense of our Nation's veterans. Our veterans have put themselves in harm' way to defend us, and I think it is only right that we do everything in our power to defend them and their interests when they return home.

Allegations that veterans were not only denied timely access to care but that scheduling delays, secret waiting lists, and lost records may have led to veterans' deaths are totally unacceptable. These allegations of mismanagement and cover-up at the Veterans' Administration are beyond disturbing; they are sickening, they need to be corrected, and they need to be corrected immediately.

Our veterans deserve better. Our veterans have earned these benefits through their dedicated service and sacrifice to our Nation, and the VA must correct these problems, not just study them. It is my hope that Robert McDonald will actively work to address these tremendous challenges.

But according to the VA's recent nationwide audit, new patients using the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System waited an average of over 74 days to see a primary care doctor. That is totally unacceptable. That is nearly three times greater than the national average of 27 days for new patient wait times. I look forward to working with the new VA Secretary to review the Department's plan to initiate corrective action, both in Alabama and across the Nation.

While the VA's wait time statistics are certainly disturbing to all of us, the problem does not end there. Allegations that VA employees may have submitted false records to justify their own receipt of performance bonuses suggest the possibility that the deceit and mistreatment I have described may also have been compounded by a lot of fraud.

In May, Appropriations Committee Chairwoman BARBARA MIKULSKI and I wrote a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder and called on the Department of Justice to begin appropriate criminal and civil investigations into allegations of misconduct at the Veterans' Administration. We have also recommended that the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill—and we serve as the chair and ranking member of that committee—provide the resources for these investigations. The Veterans Affairs and Military Construction appropriations bill provides an additional $5 million to investigate VA scheduling practices. And legislation introduced this week requests an additional $17 billion to improve the VA over the next 3 years.

While I commend these efforts to initiate corrective action, I believe it is only a starting point. A lack of funding is not the mainspring of the VA's troubled past. I look forward to working with the Presiding Officer and others—with the new VA Secretary—to ensure these problems at the VA are rectified as soon as possible before any more veterans are adversely affected.

Solving the issues at the VA has never been more imperative than it is today, as American service members continue to risk their lives every day for our Nation. Support for our Armed Forces must never waiver, and it must be just as strong when they return home. Who will fight our wars in the future if we do not prove that we respect our veterans today?

Veterans have risked their lives for the freedoms we all enjoy and thus should receive the care they most assuredly deserve and have earned. Defending veterans' access to timely medical care today is the very least, I believe, we can do because they defended us first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ISRAEL

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, a part of the appropriations supplemental bill we will consider tomorrow is approximately $245 million—I think I have that figure right—for the additional assistance to the Israeli Government for the Iron Dome system.

The United States has been assisting Israel in order to be able to buy this system. To the credit of the scientists and the military planners in Israel, they developed this system, and it is a very sophisticated system. As a matter of fact, when you watch the rockets go off, you will see an incoming round coming, in this case from Gaza, often without any precision guidance.

That is an interesting thing, that they are shooting at urbanized areas where the general civilian population is, and they have incoming rounds that no one knows where they are going; thus, the need for a sophisticated radar that can track it and distinguish first if it is going to fall in an area where there is nobody, where there is nothing in the way of equipment that would be harmed and, therefore, save the ordnance that otherwise would be shot. But the radar is so sophisticated that within seconds and fractions of seconds it can determine that, and then shoot off the round that will intercept the incoming round.

It is a sight to behold to see this Iron Dome rocket go upward and then change its trajectory, almost at a 90-degree angle, to home in on the incoming warhead, and they have a 90-percent success rate.

When this system was first produced, it was so successful that the Israeli people, who had been bombed from outside their territory and had been accustomed to running to bunkers, to shelters, to places where they could be

safe, with the institution of Iron Dome, often would come outside and see this aerial fireworks display because it had such a tremendous success rate.

Now things have changed because in the latest conflict with Hamas—and this is just in the course of the last 3 or so weeks—over 2,300 rockets have been fired into Israel. Hamas continues to fire more rockets.

Each night, if you turn on your television news shows, you see another display of all of this going on over on that side of the planet. Thus the need to supply more of the Iron Dome system and the ordnance that goes with it. And thus there will be this item that will be part of the supplemental appropriations request. I commend it to our colleagues to vote for it. It is a system that consistently the U.S. has helped to fund. It has saved a lot of lives.

Remember, the ordnance that is being shot into Israel is usually not a guided system. That is part of the terror that is being aimed at Israel, because it is to inflict casualties upon a civilian population. Yet, with this sophisticated system, 90-percent effective, it is saving a lot of lives. That is what I wanted to share with the Senate.

I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be charged against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today filled with anguish and heartbreak that is shared by so many Americans who have been watching over the past week as countless innocent children and innocent civilians have been killed and live in states of great fear or even terror. Millions are running for bomb shelters time and time again. We are seeing people in Gaza killed or maimed and seeing people in Israel live under the terror in the sky and terror coming from below.

I want to stand resolute and clear about the true cause of this crisis. That lies squarely with Hamas, a terrorist organization whose ends do not start and finish with the well-being of the Palestinian people. Their primary focus and their clear agenda is not peace for their people. Written into their very charter is the firm determination to eliminate the State of Israel. They have proven this evil determination to do everything necessary to achieve their goal. They are willing to kill Israelis. They are willing to kill Americans. They have killed them both. Even worse, they are willing to put innocent Palestinians in harm's way, causing death and destruction within their own communities, to their own children, to their hospitals and to their schools.

They are in the interests of wracking up casualties to add what they consider, in a warped way, moral force for their terrorist aim. I believe clearly in the evidence that this terrorist organization is willing to stop at no end in order to build their tunnels and to advocate and advance their independence.

They are willing to deny their people food. They are willing to deny their people construction materials that could be building schools and building infrastructure. They are willing to deny medical supplies. They are willing to deny a higher standard of living in order to support clearly terrorist activities.

This is unacceptable. This is unacceptable. This is unacceptable. We as Americans cannot advocate for or in any way accept a false peace that will allow Hamas, a terrorist organization, to continue their effort to destroy the State of Israel. Hamas is not seeking peace. Hamas is not seeking the peaceful coexistence between two states. What they are simply doing is they are willing to cause death and destruction to destroy Israel. Hamas is not a democratically elected organization. They are a terrorist organization. They do not speak for the Palestinian people. Hamas speaks for Hamas.

Their history of killing Americans and Israelis and putting countless of their own people in harm's way, causing their destruction and their denial of the basics, must be stopped. For the sake of the Palestinian people and for the sake of the Israeli people, we as a Nation cannot support any measure or any agenda that gives this terrorist organization harbor or support, that gives this terrorist organization any advantage in trying to achieve their end.

We cannot in this Nation advocate for that kind of false peace that allows Hamas to go back to tunneling, to firing rockets, to hiding missiles in schools and in hospitals, and putting more innocent children in harm's way. We as Americans must advocate for a true peace where two sides clearly recognize the right for peaceful coexistence and where both sides pledge to a true cessation of aggression, not a peace that allows one side to go back to its evil end, to tunneling, to plotting, to preparing just for the next attack. We have seen this before in recent history. We cannot allow it again. Right now we are in a state of crisis. America's voice must be resolute.

We stand with our allies. We stand with the democratic State of Israel. We stand against terrorism.

This is why today I come before you in support of the $225 million in additional funding requested by the Department of Defense to ensure that the Iron Dome in Israel remains equipped to protect civilians from Hamas-fired rockets.

Hamas has fired over 2,500 rockets at Israel over the past 3 weeks, while putting innocent Palestinians at risk to protect their stockpiles and their evil ends. Yesterday alone 51 rockets and mortar shells were fired at Israel.

In this time of crisis, America must stand for a true peace for the Palestinian people and for the Israeli people. Now, as a terrorist organization has evil ends to destroy the State of Israel, we must stand with our ally. We must stand with the State of Israel. We must stand for peace. Therefore, I support this expenditure and continue a resolute, unwavering, and unequivocal support of the continuance of the State of Israel.

McDONALD NOMINATION

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, my office continues to receive an inordinate number of complaints about persistent problems with the delivery of health care services and other benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs to those who have served in our Armed Forces. This is very troubling to me.

Evidence of serious and systemic mismanagement and negligence within the Department led to the resignation of a former Secretary of the Department and a call for a thorough assessment of how to better serve our veterans. We should take very seriously our responsibility to those who have served in our military. Robert McDonald, the next Secretary of Veterans Affairs, will face many challenges to improve the VA system. He will have the support of many of us in Congress as he assumes this important position.

I have recommended on several occasions continued, vigorous oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs during the implementation of a corrective action plan at the G.V. ''Sonny'' Montgomery VA Medical Center in Jackson, MS. Reports from VA patients, their families and VA hospital officials in Mississippi have served to guide corrections and improvements at the facility.

I support measures to correct the VA's problems and improve the quality of, and access to, care for veterans. I am hopeful that the pending VA reform legislation and the confirmation of a new Secretary of Veterans Affairs will be reassuring steps toward enhancing the delivery of health care services to our veterans.

We can and should do better for those who have devoted themselves to serving our country.●

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I am pleased that the Senate is taking action this week on two extremely important measures for our Nation's veterans. First, Congress is poised to pass

the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act. This compromise, bipartisan legislation will, for the first time, provide our Nation's veterans who cannot easily get into a Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, health care facility, the ability that most Americans already have: to choose their own doctor. I am also extremely pleased that the legislation allows senior managers of the VA to be fired if they fail to do their jobs.

The Senate is also set to approve the nomination of Mr. Robert McDonald to head the VA. As important as our legislation is for fixing the VA, we cannot legislate a change in culture. Only the head of an agency can reform a toxic culture that allowed veterans to die on wait lists while senior officials lied in order to collect their bonuses.

I have met with Mr. McDonald and we see eye to eye on the massive problems that need to be fixed and the challenges that lie ahead. I am confident he is the right person with the right experience to lead the VA during this challenging time. He is a veteran himself but also has decades of private sector management experience that will serve him well in implementing the Veterans Choice Card and repairing the culture of the VA to focus on the veteran and restore honesty and accountability to that workforce. I thank him for accepting this challenge to serve the Nation again and look forward to working with him in the days ahead.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as we have learned over the past several months, there has been a clear and inexcusable lack of well-earned quality care and timely service provided to many veterans who depend on it from the Department of Veterans Affairs. I hope that the confirmation of Robert McDonald as VA Secretary will be the next step forward in ensuring that our veterans and their families receive the benefits, compensation, and support services they rightfully deserve. While I continue to recognize the hard work and commitment of the many men and women working in the VA system, the broader organizational culture has failed to harness and strengthen individual efforts in order to fulfill our promises to men and women that serve and their families.

When he assumes his new post Robert McDonald will have his work cut out for him at the VA, and he must lead the Department's deep soul-searching. It is my hope that his management experience at Procter & Gamble, including his experience addressing inefficiencies in a corporate entity, will make him the right man for the job. The replacement of a Cabinet Secretary alone does not increase accountability, nor does it reform the underlying problems that enabled the environment we now find ourselves in. These foundational reforms must take place throughout the management of the VA system, and they must address long-term, as well as short-term, challenges.

I was also pleased to hear that after many rounds of negotiations, Senator SANDERS and his counterpart in the House have finally reached a compromise that addresses many of these needed reforms. I commend them both, and I hope this legislation will be swiftly brought to the Senate and House floors and then signed by President Obama, so we can get back on track in serving our veterans as they so honorably have served our Nation. I look forward to working with the future Secretary McDonald to ensure that timely access to quality care for our veterans and their families is the ultimate priority of the VA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert Alan McDonald, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Ayotte	Enzi	Levin
Baldwin	Feinstein	Manchin
Barrasso	Fischer	Markey
Begich	Flake	McCain
Bennet	Franken	McCaskill
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	McConnell
Blunt	Graham	Menendez
Booker	Grassley	Merkley
Boozman	Hagan	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moran
Brown	Hatch	Murkowski
Burr	Heinrich	Murphy
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Murray
Cardin	Heller	Nelson
Carper	Hirono	Paul
Casey	Hoeven	Portman
Chambliss	Inhofe	Pryor
Coats	Isakson	Reed
Coburn	Johanns	Reid
Cochran	Johnson (SD)	Risch
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Rockefeller
Coons	Kaine	Rubio
Corker	King	Sanders
Cornyn	Kirk	Schumer
Crapo	Klobuchar	Scott
Cruz	Landrieu	Sessions
Donnelly	Leahy	Shaheen
Durbin	Lee	Shelby
Stabenow	Udall (NM)	Whitehouse
Tester	Vitter	Wicker
Thune	Walsh	Wyden
Toomey	Warner	
Udall (CO)	Warren	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF LARRY EDWARD ANDRE, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF MAURITANIA

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL STEPHEN HOZA TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON

NOMINATION OF JOAN A. POLASCHIK TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania; Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon; Joan A. Polaschik, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.

VOTE ON ANDRE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Andre nomination.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of

America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HOZA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the Hoza nomination.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON POLASCHIK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Polaschik nomination.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joan A. Polaschik, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5021, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3582

(Purpose: To Modify the Provisions Relating to Revenue)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment 3582 from the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 3582.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment that has just been offered is an amendment the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, and I have worked on for many weeks. It is a bipartisan agreement on emergency transportation funding that the Senate Finance Committee reported virtually unanimously 2 weeks ago.

I urge our colleagues to support this amendment as a replacement for title II of the House legislation. I will briefly describe why.

As the Senate debates transportation funding, it is abundantly clear that all sides agree on the need for a long-term plan to rebuild the Nation's infrastructure. A number of our colleagues, led by Chair BOXER, a number of Republicans, Senator CORKER, and Senator CARPER have made that point repeatedly, and it is one I share.

We cannot have a big-league economy with little-league transportation, and the chair of the Environment and Public Works committee, Senator BOXER, has consistently been on target, calling for a long-term plan to rebuild the Nation's infrastructure. The reality is that every Member of this body has constituents who are driving on highways full of potholes and ruts, and our citizens end up having to write a big check for car repairs because of it.

The best way to fix America's transportation system is with a long-term plan. The reality, however, is that to get to the long-term plan, what is needed first is a short-term path so we do not have the transportation equivalent of a government shutdown where we don't have the contracts being let and thousands of our people are put out of work, and a big set of economic dominos starts to fall. We need a short-term solution to prevent that from happening. That is what the Senate has before us today under a proposal from the Senate Finance Committee which Senator HATCH and I developed in a bipartisan fashion, working under the regular order. This bill is before the Senate under regular order and it includes with Democratic proposals and Republican proposals. Senator HATCH and I worked with every member of the committee to draft our bill.

The House has offered its own plan, and Senator HATCH and I agreed to incorporate to the greatest extent possible House ideas in drafting our alternative, including adopting a measure of customs user fees and some pension smoothing as revenue sources.

I would like to take a moment early on to highlight three major differences between what the Senate has done and what the House has done because I think they are at the heart of the bipartisan case for passing this amendment.

First, I think the other body simply overuses pension smoothing. I was struck in conversations with Senator HATCH and conversations with colleagues—one of our colleagues said: What is really striking about what the House is talking about today is that instead of having one problem, we would have two. We already know we have a huge challenge in paying for transportation long-term, as Senator BOXER has noted, but if you go with the House approach, it overuses pension smoothing. You are going to have two challenges—one, to pay for transportation, and second, what are you going to do with the hopes and aspirations of all those workers who are depending on their pensions?

The second is the House ignores the whole concept of tax compliance—something else that has had a strong bipartisan tradition here in the Congress. Tax compliance is not increasing taxes. It is not tax hikes. It is not somebody jacking up people's taxes in the dead of night. This is about collecting taxes owed under current law. Let me emphasize that. It is taxes owed under current law. Grover Norquist—somebody who is not exactly soft on taxes, and I probably wouldn't quote him on everything—makes that point as well, agreeing that what is in the Senate finance bill involves collecting taxes that are owed.

Finally, the House bill again ignores some of the important bipartisan legislation that Senator HATCH and I have included on matters that are of great interest to many Senators, including the distinguished President of the Senate.

Our bill promotes natural gas vehicles—natural gas, 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. Senator BENNET and Senator BURR came together with some very good ideas on that. Senator ISAKSON and Senator NELSON also came up with an approach to strengthen pensions and how they are accounted for. And I was very pleased that Senator CRAPO was very involved with Senator BENNET in improving water transportation—something hugely important for the West, particularly right now when it is so dry back home and in all of the Western States.

So these are major differences between the House and the Senate efforts, and, again, each of those ideas I describe is a sensible, bipartisan approach that comes about because we used our regular order. For example, the Bennet-Burr amendment adjusts

tax laws to treat liquid natural gas and diesel fuel on an energy-equivalent basis. That is going to reduce the tax on liquefied natural gas. That is going to help us encourage more use.

What Senator ISAKSON and Senator NELSON did clarifies pension rules and ensures that workers receive their earned benefits. Many of these individuals took their jobs in their teens and put in three decades of work by their late forties. When I look at what the House did in terms of pension smoothing, this raises real questions in my mind about whether the Congress, without really thinking through an alternative set of pay-fors, is going to cause those young workers additional problems.

Finally, as I have touched on, Senator CRAPO and Senator BENNET have done very good work. As we all know—particularly the chairman of the Environmental Public Works Committee—it is dry, dry, dry in the West, and what Senator CRAPO and Senator BENNET did was come up with a bipartisan proposal that Senator HATCH and I have included that is going to help deliver water to farmers across the West.

With those bipartisan initiatives, we were able to pick up support from such important groups as America's Natural Gas Alliance, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the Western Agriculture and Conservation Association. They know that the only way to advance these important ideas is by adopting the amendment the distinguished Senator from Utah and I have offered.

We have had some talk about how there is just not enough time to send a Senate amendment back to the House. I heard that statement made earlier today. I have made it clear to all concerned and I will state it again: This work is going to be done this week. This is non-negotiable. The Congress is going to get this resolved this week, and in no way, shape, or form are we going to have the transportation equivalent of a government shutdown. But the idea that the other body says, ''Hey, it is our way or no highway,'' I don't think is a way to advance the kind of bipartisan, bicameral approach that is going to help us deal with the big challenges.

I have already indicated, as Senator BOXER, the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, has said so eloquently, we are going to have to deal with the long term. There are a lot of good ideas for the long term. I think Senator PAUL from Kentucky deserves to have his ideas on repatriation addressed. We have a number of colleagues who are interested in the innovative approach used in Virginia. So we are going to have a variety of ideas to look at transportation funding for the long term, but we have to get the short-term patch resolved in order to get to the long term.

That is why I think for the House to just say, Our way or no highway—I think for us to accept it today would simply be to abdicate our responsibilities. I don't think we are sent here to just wring our hands and say, Oh, my goodness, we can't do anything. There is no time.

We are going to get this done this week. I believe the approach we have built in the Finance Committee is a more responsible approach. There certainly is time to compromise. The reality is our staff—and Senator HATCH and I have had a number of conversations with Chairman CAMP on this, as I indicated earlier—Senator HATCH and I have agreed to adopt many of the House proposals. There is no reason this body can't quickly come to agreement with the House. The Congress has addressed much bigger pieces of legislation and differences between the Senate and the House on tight timeframes in the past. The reality is the Senate has to act first or we are sending a message—and I will close with this because my colleague from Utah has been very patient and the distinguished chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee has been very patient. If we simply say all we are going to do today is accept this House approach, this ''our way or no highway'' kind of approach, we are going to advance a bill that overuses pension smoothing, and we are going to move away from an approach both political parties have felt very strongly about, which is that tax compliance should be an ongoing part of our work. It should be a part of our work today and it should be part of the bipartisan efforts for tax reform that Senator HATCH and I are pursuing. It is not in the House bill. It is in the Senate bill. We would be walking away from that provision by accepting the House approach, and we also would, as I have indicated, be walking away from bipartisan efforts that are going to promote cleaner natural gas vehicles, bipartisan efforts that will promote water use, and the good work done by Senator ISAKSON and Senator NELSON on pensions at a time when we are very concerned about their future. We shouldn't do that today.

I am going to yield to my colleagues who have been doing very good work on this issue. I think our plan is now Senator HATCH will make remarks on behalf of the bipartisan efforts in the Finance Committee. Senator BOXER, the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, will speak after Senator HATCH. It is my intention to stay here throughout the afternoon. I think both sides would like to get this done expeditiously, and I hope we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I would be happy to allow Senator BOXER to go first.

Mrs. BOXER. No, not at all. Please proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Today the Senate will vote on a short-term extension of funding for the highway trust fund.

While it remains to be seen what shape that extension will take, Congress appears to be poised to pass legislation that will ensure that the trust fund will not face a shortfall and that States will be able to continue to plan and implement their transportation projects. This is important. As many have noted, passing this extension will preserve thousands of jobs and prevent disruption of a number of different highway projects that are currently in existence.

It has taken a lot of work to get to this point. It has required the collective good will of Members of both parties and it has meant compromise on both sides.

In the Senate Finance Committee, both Chairman WYDEN and I worked together for weeks on a bipartisan Federal highway funding extension. At the outset of these negotiations, I stated that I hoped any agreement to extend the solvency of the highway trust fund would contain spending cuts and reforms to go along with any revenues. I fought hard on that point, but in the end that particular goal of mine, with one exception, had to be set aside in order for an agreement to be reached. Of course that is how we pass legislation. If everyone got everything they wanted out of a deal, it would not be a compromise. While I maintain that a deal to extend funding for the highway bill should include reductions in spending, I am willing to continue that particular fight on another day.

After weeks of negotiations—some of which were very hard fought—we were able to come to an agreement on a funding bill that I believe both parties can support. That, in my view, is more important than any individual demand I may have had going into the discussions.

I wish to take a few minutes to speak about the specifics of our proposal. Overall, our bill would provide nearly $11 billion in funding for the highway trust fund, which is enough to extend its life until the middle of next year. Of that total, $2.7 billion would be provided by pension smoothing. I do have to say I am not a fan of using pension smoothing as a pay-for on the highway bill or in any other context for that matter. We stated as much on the record numerous times. However, we do face a funding emergency with regard to the highway trust fund. That being the case, I was willing to compromise on that point.

Next, the bill provides an additional $2.9 billion by extending Customs user fees. Once again, in other contexts, I have been skeptical of using this tactic

as a pay-for, mostly because it diverts necessary funding away from national trade priorities. However, we drafted the bill to ensure that enough money was left in future extensions to pay for things such as the Generalized System of Preferences, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and the miscellaneous tariff bill, all of which are important to our Nation's trade agenda.

Our compromise bill also transfers $1 billion from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund—called LUST—to the highway trust fund. The remaining funds would be raised through a variety of tax compliance measures, all designed not to raise taxes but to realize revenues already owed to the Treasury.

The Finance Committee bill does include a provision designed to claw back orphan earmarks. The provision deals with earmarks included in previous highway bills. I wish to thank Senator COBURN for the idea that was the basis of this provision, though in the end we didn't go as far as he or I would have liked.

As I said, all told, our bill will provide nearly $11 billion in funding for the highway trust fund and prevent the funding crisis that is on the horizon if Congress does not act. Once again, this legislation represents a bipartisan agreement between Chairman WYDEN and myself. It was reported out of the Finance Committee by a voice vote, so it is an agreement by both sides.

I wish to thank Chairman WYDEN for his willingness to reach across the aisle in this effort. He has been a particularly good partner with whom to work. The Finance Committee has a long tradition of working on a bipartisan basis to provide funding for the highway trust fund, and I am glad we have been able to continue that tradition with this legislation.

My only regret is that we were not able to reach an agreement with Chairman CAMP of the House Ways and Means Committee, whom both the chairman and I highly respect. He has a tough job over there, and we have nothing but great respect for him.

The two committees met over the July 4 recess, and I believe both Chairman CAMP and Chairman WYDEN acted in good faith to try to reach an agreement, but in the end, it did not end up happening. In my view, this is unfortunate. Had we been able to reach a bipartisan, bicameral solution on this issue at the outset, it would have helped to speed this process along. Still, if we take a look at the bill the House passed earlier this month, we will find it is similar in many respects to the legislation Chairman WYDEN and I have put together. They provide virtually the same level of funding, so there is not a substantive difference in the amount of time they would extend the trust fund. The major funding pieces—pension smoothing, Customs user fees, and the LUST transfer—are all the same. The primary difference is that the House bill does not include the tax compliance provisions.

Neither the House bill nor our bill is perfect, in my opinion, but they both accomplish the same goal and they do so in a way that under the circumstances I think both Democrats and Republicans can and should support.

So while some would say we failed to reach an agreement on the highway bill, I think it is pretty clear there is a lot of agreement on these matters and that one way or another we are going to get a solution soon.

In the end Chairman CAMP produced what I think is a good bill. I think Chairman WYDEN and I have done the same. I would vote for either approach because, as I said, they aren't all that different from one another. I reiterate that the funding levels in the House bill and the Finance Committee bill—and therefore the length of the two extensions—are virtually the same. That point is important, as there is an effort, as evidenced by another amendment we will be voting on today, to put an artificial deadline on the extension. I gather from the statements made by proponents of this approach that they hope this amendment will somehow force Congress to reach an agreement on a long-term extension before the end of this year. This effort is, in my view, misguided, and I would hope, given the fact that both the House of Representatives and the Senate Finance Committee have reached virtually the same conclusion on the length of the extension, Senators will think twice before voting to shorten it.

Ultimately, we all want to get to a long-term deal when it comes to the highway trust fund. That desire is shared across both Chambers and both parties. I think we can get there. I don't think we need to impose an artificial timeline or deadline—one that would create a similar crisis to the one we are facing now just a few months down the road—in order to do it.

There are other efforts out there that would seriously alter the trajectory of this bill. I wish to stress that what we are working on is a short-term extension. Once the highway trust fund has been funded by this bill, we will need to start working on a long-term bill that will give the transportation community stability and predictability, and I believe both the chairman of the committee and myself truly mean we will do so. We will need to be thoughtful in our approach and must consider every option to ensure that our Nation's infrastructure will be safe, efficient, and reliable well into the future. But before we discuss any fundamental changes to the structure of the highway trust fund, we need to get this step out of the way first.

As I conclude, I wish to take a moment to once again commend our chairman, Chairman WYDEN, for his efforts on this legislation. From the outset he was willing to reach across the aisle on this bill and as a result the Finance Committee produced a viable, bipartisan product. His leadership in getting us to this point has been essential.

We are very close to solving this problem and avoiding a crisis. We just need to get a bill over the finish line, and I hope we can do that in short order. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to take my time off the general debate time; is that appropriate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair. I am so pleased to be on the floor because the Senate has to be heard on this issue of the highway trust fund and our whole transportation system for that matter. I do wish to praise Senators WYDEN and HATCH for coming together across party lines and making some real improvements in the pay-fors that are associated with this extension. I am very much in favor of the way they handled this bill, and I am also very much in favor of the way the pension smoothing was handled in the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment because that does away with it altogether, because we shorten the timeframe so we don't need any pension smoothing in there.

Before I speak specifically about the wisdom of what the Finance Committee did and my hope that we can get it over the finish line today, I want to give kind of an overview of where we are in general.

For 2 years we have known that our Transportation bill expired September 30. We have known this for 2 years. Yet, and still, here we are at the 11th hour with an extension.

This is probably, I think, the 12th extension in a few years. I think that is so unfair to the people of this great country who rely on their bridges and their highways and their transportation systems. It is so unfair to the thousands of businesses that work to rebuild our infrastructure, and it is very unfair to the millions of workers who work in construction.

We still have 700,000 unemployed construction workers. When we do a piecemeal bill like this, of course, it is better than doing nothing—there is no doubt about that; I would not argue that—but it still sends a message of indecision and, frankly, I think of incompetence on our part, and I step to the plate on that.

But I am very proud to say that my committee—100 percent bipartisan; we did not have a dissenting vote—passed the 6-year transportation bill. When we did that, I went to my colleagues and said: I know you have the hard job. You have to figure out the long-term funding. I want to help you. I came forward

and I said: Why don't we look at several proposals. One is what they are doing in Virginia. This was a Republican idea. It is to do away with the gas tax completely and replace it with a fee at the refinery level. That would be a more broad-based tax. We would do away with the gas tax. No more Federal gas tax at the pump. That would solve our problems. You set it at a rate where it floats, and we would have 100 percent certainty. Senator WYDEN was quite open to it. He took a look at it. I know he floated it. Clearly, we did not have the type of support we would need.

Then the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO said: Do you know what. We have not raised the gas tax in 21 years. Mr. President, we have not raised the gas tax in 21 years. I did a little reading and found out the first President to initiate the gas tax—and I say to Senator HATCH, he might be interested in this—the first President to formulate a gas tax—and it came in at a penny—was Herbert Hoover. The next President who raised it was President Eisenhower, who had that great vision to then put it into a trust fund for highways, and he raised it a couple of cents. So it was about 3 cents. The next President to raise it was President Reagan. And the next President to raise it was George Herbert Walker Bush. They were all Republican Presidents. Then President Clinton raised it.

Clearly the Congress supported it each and every time because it is a user fee. So that is an alternative. There are many other ideas. I know Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH have a number of ideas, and I know Senator HATCH prefers a user fee. It makes sense. But because of the time crunch—because of, because of, because of—we did not get it done.

I am proud. Senator VITTER is proud. We got it out of our committee, a 6-year bill. It is not a great, massive bill. It just takes the current program, adds inflation, and extends it for 6 years. I can tell you, if Senator VITTER and I can agree, if Senator CARPER and Senator BARRASSO can agree, if Senator CARDIN can agree with Senator SESSIONS, and Senator SANDERS with Senator FISCHER—I could go on. Our committee goes from left to right, and everybody agreed we should have the 6-year bill.

So as I stand here today, I am distressed that we do not have that before us, but I am still grateful to my friends for doing what they could politically do. But I feel it is a sad day for us, and I know and I hope we pass this Wyden-Hatch substitute. It is a much-improved way to pay for the extension. But we are extending all the way to May, right up against the next construction season. Now, if you are a State—whether it is Utah or California or West Virginia or Maryland or Oregon; it does not matter—you are not going to enter into any agreement. No businessperson is going to take this on where you do not know what the future holds.

So we are putting it off again, and it is sad we are doing it, and we have 60, 70, 80 groups out there, which I will list later, that are supporting our shortening the timeframe.

Now, my friend says artificial deadlines are bad. But let's face it. Their bill raises—I think it is $11 billion. Am I right on that? So we know it takes it to May 31. That is their deadline. Our bill, in the Carper-Corker-Boxer rewrite, takes it to December. We cut it back. We totally eliminate pension smoothing—totally eliminate it—and we take it back to $8 billion, and that forces us to do the job in December.

Look, this Congress has to do its work. The trust fund expires during this Congress. Now we are kicking it down the road to the next Congress.

Whatever the Senate wishes, I will go along with it. If the Senate says, no, we are going to go with that longer term extension, so be it. I will fight just as hard to move forward with a 6-year bill, I say to my colleagues, when we get back or in a lameduck.

I want to close by talking a little bit about pension smoothing for just a minute because I so agree with Senator HATCH when he says this is not his favorite thing. It is not my favorite thing either, and we come from different sides of the aisle.

So just to be clear, what we are saying to companies is, you can set aside less money for your pension requirements to your employees. Now, I have to admit in the light of day, I voted for that the last time when Senator Baucus brought that forward. I did. But it also was a company buy, an increase in the amount of money companies had to pay into the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. If a company goes broke and they cannot pay their pensions because they have not set aside enough—and with our help they are not having to set aside enough—what happens then? The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp kicks in, and that is funded by the companies. But if that does not have enough—and my information is it is short $34 billion, as we speak—the taxpayers will have to bail it out. So this pension smoothing is really, really dangerous. It is an offset that is not a good one.

Now, the Wyden-Hatch proposal is much, much better than the House proposal because it cuts it basically in half. The Carper-Corker bill cuts it out completely. So we just have to step to the plate. I think Senator WYDEN is right. Here we are bailing out—if I could use those terms—the highway trust fund until May, while we set up another potential weakness in our pension system. It is not smart. It should not be done. We had 2 years to figure this out.

But no question—no question—the Wyden-Hatch proposal is a far better proposal. Just making sure people pay their taxes, that is something we should all believe in, and, for the first time, the two Senators brought that issue forward to a successful conclusion. I am very, very grateful to them for that. So I very strongly support this.

I hope we will see a lot of support for the amendment that Senators CARPER, CORKER, and I brought forward because we do away with pension smoothing. So if you do not like pension smoothing, vote for that one; and we cut back the money so we can take this whole thing up in December and give some certainty to all the groups out there, whether it is the Chamber of Commerce or the general contractors or the cement people or the gravel people or the AFL–CIO or the laborers. All these folks want to make sure we are not just doing a little cut and paste and get us up against the next thing.

I keep saying ''in closing,'' but I really mean it now. What you are dealing with here, if you want to use an analogy, is: You find a house you really like, so you go to the bank, and the bank looks at you and says: Well, you are a good risk. Yes, we will definitely give you a mortgage, but it is only for 9 months. Nobody is going to take that mortgage. Our States are not going to enter into 3-year contracts when they know they only are going to get the funding for 9 months. We have an amendment by Senator LEE which would cut the Federal Government's ability to help the States and wind up with an 80-percent cut in funding. So it is very risky moving out with all these things hanging over our head.

But I am still pleased with what the Finance Committee did. I thank Senators REID and MCCONNELL for allowing us to have this time on the floor and all of my colleagues for agreeing, because this is a debate that has to start somewhere. So it is starting today. We know whatever happens, we are just doing a patch, and we are going to have to sit down together with good will and good ideas and solve this problem for the good of our country.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Carper, Corker and Boxer amendment to the highway trust fund extension Bill before us today. This amendment will provide certainty and a guaranteed funding stream that our State departments of transportation and the construction industry desperately need. It provides a short-term extension through December 19, 2014, which will allow Congress to complete its work on a multi-year bill this year. The underlying bill only prolongs uncertainty by extending the solvency of the trust fund to May of 2015.

In the last transportation authorization bill, I fought for a Federal formula that gives the State of Maryland approximately $780 million annually from

the highway trust fund: $580 million for highway funding and $200 million for transit funding. The Maryland Department of Transportation's, MDOT, average weekly expenditure of these Federal funds is $10 to $12 million. Right now during construction season, MDOT is submitting reimbursements to the U.S. Department of Transportation for $20 million a week.

Without this extension, the Federal highway trust fund will go bankrupt in a matter of weeks. What does this mean for my home State of Maryland? I am advised that MDOT will not meet its commitments. The Department would be unable to begin new projects. It would be forced to focus on safety and system preservation instead of putting shovels into the ground. Existing projects will slow down or stop. The State of Maryland would have to find bond or State revenues to pay existing contracts. Most importantly, over 9,000 construction jobs will be in jeopardy.

This is why MDOT, other State departments of transportation, and the construction industry support a multi-year bill. Enacting a long-term bill this year will provide certainty with a guaranteed funding stream, allow MDOT to plan for the future, and provide stability to the construction industry. Projects take time and thoughtful planning averaging approximately 10 years to complete through construction.

In addition, a multi-year bill will strengthen our transportation networks improving safety and reducing congestion. It also will create 3 million jobs and support our economy.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for the Carper, Corker and Boxer amendment. I also ask unanimous consent that the op-ed Senator CARDIN and I wrote in the Baltimore Sun be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO END THE GRIDLOCK THAT TAKES ITS TOLL ON MARYLAND'S HIGHWAYS

(By U.S. Senators Barbara A. Mikulski and Ben Cardin (Both D–Md))

It is now peak construction season and without congressional action the federal highway trust fund will go bankrupt (expenditures will exceed receipts) in August—next month. As the Senators for Maryland, we are fighting for a multi-year transportation bill to provide planning and funding certainty to our state.

Federal gas and diesel taxes paid at the pump are the primary revenue streams for the highway trust fund, which provides formula funding to states for both highway and transit projects.

We fought for a formula that provides Governor Martin O'Malley and Maryland Transportation Secretary Jim Smith approximately $780 million annually to spend across the state: $580 million in highway formula funding and $200 million in transit formula funding.

The cause of the Highway Trust Fund's insolvency is threefold: big improvements in vehicle fuel efficiency; reduced driving; and inflation. The last time Congress increased the gas tax was in 1993 from 14.1 cents per gallon to 18.4 cents per gallon. These three factors have resulted in lower gas tax revenues, reduced purchasing power, and trust fund receipts not keeping up with demand.

A bankrupt Highway Trust Fund means the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) would stop receiving $80 million a month in reimbursements from the U.S. Department of Transportation. As a result, MDOT will have to use state money obligated for other project to cover its federal expenditures. In other words, MDOT will be forced to rob Peter to pay Paul. New projects will not be initiated and existing projects will slow down or stop. The Department also will be forced to focus solely on system preservation instead of new construction needed to improve safety and modernize our transportation network.

Maryland needs a multi-year bill that ensures the solvency of the federal highway trust fund. A multi-year transportation bill is estimated to create two million jobs nationwide and transportation loans and grants create another million. Doing nothing is utterly unacceptable, and short-term extensions do not provide the planning and funding certainty states need to put those three million workers on the jobs necessary to maintain and improve our nation's essential transportation assets. In an uncertain economic climate, investments in transportation infrastructure creates jobs in construction, engineering, and manufacturing right here in the United States.

A multi-year transportation bill will help businesses succeed by making sure goods and products get to where they need to go. U.S. trade is expected to double in the next thirteen years and our national transportation assets must serve the growing economic demands for U.S. goods and services. We must modernize and maintain our infrastructure or we risk diminished profits and falling behind our international competitors in the global marketplace.

It also creates certainty for commuters and families. Traffic congestion wastes over 2.9 billion gallons of fuel each year. Maryland commuters have the longest commutes in America.

Unfortunately, the gridlock in Congress only leads to more gridlock on our nation's roads. When it comes to funding our nation's infrastructure, we've suffered from roadblocks and standstills. Despite our calls for more funding our roads, highways, bridges and railways are in dire need of repair.

That's why we work hard as Maryland's one-two punch for transportation funding Senator Cardin serving on the Environment and Public Works, and Finance Committee creates the policy and authorizes the programs that guide infrastructure investments for Maryland and the nation. Senator Mikulski as Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee puts the funds in the federal checkbook to keep Marylanders moving.

We know strong transportation infrastructure is a key ingredient to economic growth. It protects the safety and reliability of travel and transportation. It also supports our economy with investments in the highways, public transit, airports, passenger rail and ports. This money creates engineering and construction jobs today and prepares us for jobs tomorrow bringing growth to our economy. The $13.1 billion Maryland spent in transportation over the last five years has generated $29.3 billion in business output, including $12.9 billion in wages and nearly 35,000 jobs per year.

We also know that infrastructure projects don't just happen but they require smart planning. It's why we are united with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials in fighting for a multi-year transportation this year.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, our tight knit communities in Vermont are part and parcel of my State's culture of neighbors helping neighbors. Our neighbors are not just next door; they are often in the most rural parts of the State, which can be difficult to reach. Our roads and our bridges connect us in a most basic way, and Hurricane Irene was a stark reminder that our infrastructure connects us not only in commercial ways, but in practical social ways that are integral to the spirit of Vermont communities. After Irene, with some of our roads and bridges completely destroyed, we saw, felt and lived what it truly meant to be cut off and isolated from our surrounding communities.

As Congress faces a deadline in the Highway Trust Fund, we are facing yet another artificial, made-in-Congress crisis for our States, their people, and for the Nation. Congress is senselessly imposing these strains and lost opportunities on this country. There are those in Congress in recent years whose approach to governing is ''my way, or the highway.'' This time, even the highway is not safe from their obstructionism. This is a crisis we can avert if we would only work together to agree on a long-term funding plan for the Nation's transportation programs. I commend the Committee on Environment & Public Works for their hard work on legislation to reauthorize the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, MAP–21, and I commend the Committee on Finance for its hard work in trying to solve the funding issues we face in developing and improving our country's infrastructure.

However, I had hoped the Senate would have responsibly agreed to a long-term plan to give State and local governments the certainty and stability they need to plan. Unfortunately, that was not the case. And while a short term fix avoids a transportation catastrophe this summer, it will also increase costs of transportation projects, limit the ability of State and local governments to plan infrastructure improvement, and ultimately result in the degradation of our country's infrastructure. Start-and-stop highway construction is even more wasteful than start-and-stop driving is on our roads. It is wasteful, it hurts our communities and our economy, and it is needless.

The Highway Trust Fund is a critical asset for Vermont, as it is for every State. It provides millions of dollars to repair our roads and bridges and creates jobs for thousands of Vermonters.

According to the State of Vermont, every $1 million of transportation funding supports about 35 jobs in Vermont, directly and through the maintenance of the State's transportation infrastructure. Construction companies, sign-makers, State employees, and every citizen will suffer the consequence of the inability to make progress on this vital issue.

While this short-term fix has become necessary, we must acknowledge what long-term funding for infrastructure represents: opportunity. Large, long-term investments in infrastructure have paid off in the past. President Eisenhower's ''grand plan'' for the Interstate Highway System was an ambitious project that many questioned at the time. Today, it is indisputable that the vision of President Eisenhower and the foresight of the legislators in Congress who authorized the Interstate Highway System have strengthened our economy in every corner of the Nation, providing the opportunity for the American people and their families and businesses to grow, travel, and invest in the future. There are many Vermonters, and citizens all across the Nation, who are counting on us to provide a comprehensive, long-term solution to this problem. By coming together, we have an incredible opportunity to invest in the wellbeing of future Americans, and of our country. Let us not continue this latest made-in-Congress crisis. Let us pass the reauthorization of MAP–21 before the new December deadline.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 3585

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment No. 3585, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOOMEY] proposes an amendment numbered 3585.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ease Federal burdens on State and local governments recovering from catastrophic events)

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10___. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, railway, bridge, or transit facility that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, let me start by complimenting my colleagues, the chairman and the ranking member of this committee, for a genuine, sincere effort at a bipartisan solution to a difficult problem. There are provisions I like in this legislation. There are provisions I do not like. But I do like the fact that at least with respect to this legislation at the moment the Senate is functioning. The committee was functioning and had a vigorous debate and discussion and came up with a reasonable approach. I thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member HATCH for their cooperative effort to do this.

But I want to address this particular amendment, amendment No. 3585. I thank my cosponsor on this amendment, Senator MCCONNELL. What this amendment does, in short, is it allows communities that are recovering from a natural disaster to rebuild damaged infrastructure without having to acquire—or maybe I should say reacquire—Federal environmental permits.

Now, there is no question we all agree it is vitally important we protect our environment. I should point out there is nothing in my amendment that would change Federal environmental permitting requirements for any new construction—nothing at all. We should also recognize that States have their own very substantial standards in place to protect their environments, including during the construction of transportation infrastructure projects. There is nothing in my amendment that would weaken in any way or change in any way any State environmental laws or regulations.

The fact is our Federal environmental permitting process for infrastructure is broken. It is too cumbersome. It takes too long. It is too costly. It is a huge problem. I think the most damming statistic I can think of—that I am aware of anyway—is from the Federal Highway Administration itself, which in fiscal year 2011 estimated that on average transportation projects required 79 months to complete the National Environmental Policy Act review process, the NEPA review process—79 months. That is 6½ years to get permission from the Federal Government to build a road or a bridge or to rebuild an existing road or bridge that has been damaged—6½ years. That is often longer—sometimes a lot longer—than it takes to actually do the construction, and that is a problem. It is a problem because it just drives the costs up dramatically and unnecessarily.

Two weeks ago, constituents of mine in Northampton County, PA, reported to my office that just one environmental survey for a small bridge repair—we are not talking about some massive, new ''Golden Gate Bridge'' here; we are talking about a little bridge that is just going to be repaired—just one of the environmental surveys was $21,000 alone.

Senator ROB PORTMAN reports that in Ohio Federal environmental permitting alone increases project costs on average by 20 percent.

The reason these delays are so expensive is all of these delays, all of these permitting requirements, require consultants to carry it out, and there are all kinds of engineering and consulting fees that get paid, often on retainer over time; it also means that while waiting for a road or a bridge to be rebuilt or restored, there are longer commutes, there is a big detour, there is more consumption of gas. That is all a waste of time and money. The bottom line is that projects cost more the longer they take. That is the reality. The fact is, recovering communities do not need to have to incur this extra cost.

I will give you an example, again in Pennsylvania. Since 2010, Federal environmental permitting has delayed nine projects by over a year. The Cherry Creek Bridge in Monroe County, PA—this is an area that is flood prone; it was struck by Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene in 2011—the reconstruction for the damaged transportation infrastructure should have started pretty much right away, but Fish and Wildlife review delays alone cost us 2 years before construction could even begin. Senator Ben Nelson recognized this problem—a Democrat from Nebraska who served in this body—and offered a bipartisan amendment to the last highway bill, MAP–21.

What his amendment would have done would have been to exempt roads and bridge repair projects from Federal environmental permitting if the roads and bridges were destroyed by a declared emergency, such as Superstorm

Sandy, for instance, and provided that the reconstruction would occur entirely within the footprint of the existing structure, the original footprint.

Unfortunately, Senator Nelson never got his vote. He was denied a vote. Instead, he got a watered-down provision put into the final bill that allows the Department of Transportation, under certain circumstances, to exclude certain repair projects from this whole process. But they cannot make that exclusion if the project is deemed to be ''controversial.'' Undefined. I do not know what that means. The exclusions do not apply to the Army Corps of Engineers or the Fish and Wildlife Service, the reviews of which constituents tell me are the most time consuming, cumbersome, and costly to comply with.

The result is that recovering communities today, after they have been hit hard by a natural disaster, after they have incurred damage to their roads, their bridges, their infrastructure, do not know what environmental standards are going to apply to them, except that some certainly will, and others may or may not be exempted.

It still leaves them subject to a lengthy, costly, and unnecessary procedure. Because, once again, let me emphasize, we are talking about roads and bridges that are already there. We are not talking about new infrastructure, new capacity. We are talking about rebuilding what was there already and what was damaged.

This amendment I am offering is almost identical to the Nelson amendment. The difference is, at the request of SPTA, which is the Southeast Pennsylvania Transit Authority, it has been expanded to include not just roads and bridge but also rail and transit facility repair projects. That is it. So it simply says: These existing transportation infrastructure facilities, if they are damaged or destroyed by a declared natural disaster, the rebuilding, the identical rebuilding in that very same footprint should not be subject to going through the whole environmental permitting process all over again. That is all it says.

I am glad to have the endorsement of a number of organizations and groups: Associated General Contractors, National Association of Counties, Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste.

I argue this is just common sense. This is a modest, narrow amendment. As I say, it does not in any way, shape, form, or fashion change any regulations or permitting requirements for any new construction. It says nothing whatsoever about the extensive State requirements. It is silent about all of that. It simply says: With respect to Federal environmental permitting, if you are rebuilding an existing road or bridge because it has been damaged in this way, you do not have to go through this costly, lengthy process that is costing us time, money, jobs, and infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his comments and the manner in which we are proceeding.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania, and for many reasons.

First, let me compliment Senator BOXER and the leadership on the Environment and Public Works Committee. Because when we approved MAP–21, we took up this issue. We dealt with it. It was not without controversy. We had strong views on both sides of this issue. Because what the Senator from Pennsylvania is doing is removing completely replacement facilities from any—not just the NEPA procedures, but also from the Endangered Species Act, from the Clean Water Act—basically putting a dome over the process so anything goes, basically. Anything.

We debated that issue in the Environment and Public Works Committee. There were different views. Quite frankly, Senator BOXER was extremely accommodating to the legitimate concerns the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised. That is why there is an expedited procedure already in law, passed in MAP–21, that deals with this issue. The Senator talks about using the proper legislative process. We did that. The committee of jurisdiction debated it. We had difficult compromises, but we reached these compromises.

Let the process work, because the process is working. Let me point out, I was one of those who was not excited about giving up any of our environmental protections on replacement facilities, because I pointed out the fact that when we had a bridge collapse in Minnesota, that bridge was replaced within a matter of a very short period of time, before we did our compromise, which now expedites the process. My point is, in emergencies we seem to work things out. But in order to deal with the concerns the Senator has raised, we put into the law this expedited procedure for replacement facilities. It is in MAP–21. It is the law.

This amendment would open it to significant abuse. It is very conceivable that when you give this type of an exemption, you basically are exempting a geographical spot so that anything goes. It could be a total ending of the protections that we have in the Federal Clean Water Act. It could be eliminated.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It is unnecessary. It certainly opens it to tremendous abuse. We have a process in place. It was negotiated. I would urge my colleagues to accept it.

Before I yield the floor, I want to thank Senator WYDEN. I want to thank Senator BOXER and Senator HATCH—I see them on the floor—and Senator CARPER for their incredible work on this bill. I agree with Senators Boxer and WYDEN. It is very important that we pass a bill before we leave this week so that there is no delay in making sure the Federal Government pays its bills to our State and local governments on transportation projects.

I strongly support Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH's effort in our committee to get a better funding flow for the patch so we deal with collecting the taxes that should be paid, rather than causing a disruption in some of the revenue sources that are in the House bill. I strongly support Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH's efforts in our committee.

I certainly support Senator CARPER's amendment that would say it is our responsibility to act in this Congress.

Let me point out, we have 5 months left before this Congress goes out of business. It would be wrong for us to pass just a patch and not to do the 6-year reauthorization. The Environment and Public Works Committee, by unanimous vote, recognized that we could get a 6-year bill done. We have already talked about from where revenues can come. There are bills we could take up dealing with supplemental ways to fund infrastructure, infrastructure banks, using the Tax Code. I am sure we can get bipartisan agreement on some of these issues.

The Carper amendment says we are going to get our job done in this Congress and we are not going to subject our States to the uncertainty of just a patch. In my State of Maryland, we have many long-term commitments that we are trying to get funded. A short-term patch will put us in a hole. We are okay to the end of the year, but let's make sure we enact a 6-year bill before this Congress leaves.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARDIN. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend. I wanted to ask him a question. Because I think the way the Senator responded to the Toomey amendment was exactly right on point. It was almost a deja vu as I listened to my friend from Pennsylvania, because he is not on the committee of jurisdiction. But we had this debate, as my friend pointed out. As a matter of fact, I started to get a little stressed as he related what we went through to get to the point where we have an expedited procedure that takes care of the problems my friend from Pennsylvania talks about.

But we do not throw out every landmark environmental law. That would

be a disaster. I can give you an example and ask my friend if he agrees with this example.

I also want to point out the American Public Health Association strongly opposes Senator TOOMEY's amendment, because they know the health of the people is at stake.

But let's say you had a situation where you brought in a contractor to clean up after there was a disaster, collapse, let's say, of a highway. There was a body of water nearby. The contractor came in. Instead of having a good clean operation, he started dumping his fuel and chemicals and everything else into this waterway. Mind you, under our law he has already got an expedited permit, he is ready to roll. But he or she, they have to be good citizens and not make matters worse.

Does my friend not agree that these landmark laws, such as the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, should be respected, and the Toomey amendment throws them out the window, and we can endanger the health of the people?

Mr. CARDIN. I say to Senator BOXER, through the Chair, she is absolutely right. It is even worse than that, because the contractor could be using a subcontractor whose principal work may not even be directly related to the replacement. It would be virtually impossible to detect what they are doing on the replacement site as to what they are doing on other sites. So it could be absolutely used as a shield in order to avoid the laws that we have to protect public health, protect our clean waters, our drinking water, et cetera. It opens a huge potential abuse. It is throwing out the laws, rather than making the laws work. That is exactly what our committee did after a very lengthy debate and which, quite frankly, we did certain things that make it a lot easier for a replacement facility to be done in an expedited process.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to address another issue connected to this debate. Before I do so, I would yield a moment of my time to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah. Let me respond to my colleagues from Maryland and California briefly.

First of all, I am perfectly glad that the committee of jurisdiction addressed this. One of the great things about the Senate is when it is actually functioning, Members who are not on a particular committee still have the opportunity to weigh in on an issue and have that debate on the Senate floor. That is exactly what we are doing today. I am glad we are doing that.

I would also observe that my colleagues seem to have very little faith in the ability and willingness of States to protect their own environment. They should spend some more time in Pennsylvania. We care a lot about our environment in Pennsylvania. We have a Department of Environmental Protection that takes that responsibility very seriously.

Finally, I would point out that the so-called fix in MAP–21 is extremely incomplete. It is incomplete because, first, it occurs at the discretion of the Department of Transportation. They can simply choose not to have an expedited process. If they deem the project to be ''controversial''—undefined. Who knows what that means.

Secondly, the Department of Transportation is not permitted to exclude from this process compliance with the Army Corps of Engineers or the Fish and Wildlife Service reviews, which altogether are extremely time consuming and expensive and costly. Again, we are just talking about repairing existing infrastructure. We are not talking about waiving these requirements for new capacity, for new infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I thank the Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 3584

(Purpose: To empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs)

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I can call up my amendment No. 3584, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 3584.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 23, 2014, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we are here today because our Federal highway policy status quo is not working, and it hasn't been working for a long time. This is the sixth time American taxpayers have been asked to bail out the highway trust fund since 2008—the sixth time since 2008.

None of those patches, $52 billion worth of bailouts in 7 years, fixed the problem, and neither will the $10.8 billion authorized by the bill that is before us today. It will buy us only a few months before we are right back in the same place once again, the same place where we are now.

Indeed, this debate is itself the dysfunction of Washington, DC, in miniature. Here—as in health care, higher education, assistance for the poor, energy, and so many other areas—the Federal Government has created a permanent structural problem, and it responds with duct tape. Worse, this bill solves only Washington problems, only the problems of Washington, DC, not those of the American people.

Under the broken status quo this bill not only protects but also extends, in 6 months—and in 6 years—our roads will still remain congested. Too many single moms will still live on a knife's edge trying to make it to their second jobs all the way across town. Too many dads will still have to leave for work before breakfast just to make it to their job and then do the same thing again as they try to make it home for dinner. Children will still look in vain into the empty seats at their piano recitals and at their Little League games. Commuters will still squeeze onto overcrowded subway cars, hold their breath, and hope they don't break down again. Young families will still be unfairly priced out of neighborhoods near the best jobs and the best schools, and diverse communities will still be subject to the monotonous inefficiency of an outmoded Federal bureaucracy.

But it doesn't have to be this way. There is a better way. The Interstate Highway System is one of the greatest achievements not only in the history of the Federal Government but in all of American history. It unified a sprawling continental nation by investing in our common destiny. It simultaneously met the economic, social, cultural, and security needs of an emerging superpower. It was and it remains a wonder of American innovation and self-government.

More than that, the Interstate Highway System was the daring, audacious work of a young nation literally on the move, bristling with confidence in its future and in its people. With the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Congress threw off the yoke of the status quo and it met the emerging needs of a new generation.

Yet today, some 58 years later, in a new century with new needs, new technologies, and a new economy, Congress anxiously clings to that exact same policy like some kind of a tattered security blanket.

Six decades ago, Federal highway policy represented a triumph of imagination. Today, our refusal to modernize that same policy represents a failure of imagination. So we are here with the duct tape and WD–40 trying to keep this 20th century bureaucracy in place, rather than embracing the worthy challenge of building a new mobility policy, one that is well suited for the 21st century. That is exactly what my amendment, the Transportation Empowerment Act, would do.

In 1956, it made sense for the Federal Government to collect the majority of

gas taxes from around the country and then coordinate the construction of a national system. We needed it. But with the interstate system now largely complete and most transportation issues that we see today existing at the local level, there is no longer the same need for Washington to serve as the central coordinator. We have become an intrusive middleman. We need to refocus the Federal Government solely on interstate priorities and to empower a diverse, flexible, open-source transportation network controlled by the States.

My amendment would empower States and communities to customize their own infrastructure according to their own needs, their own values, and their own imagination.

It would, over 5 years, gradually transfer funding and spending authority over local transportation infrastructure projects to the States.

Today the Federal gasoline tax stands at 18.4 cents per gallon. My amendment would lower it by 2019 to 3.7 cents per gallon.

In the interim, we would gradually send States more of their allotment without strings to prepare them for the eventual transfer of this differential. After this gradual transition, Congress would retain enough revenue to continue to maintain the Interstate Highway System, which rightfully, properly remains a Federal priority and a core competence of our government at a national level, but States and communities would be newly empowered to launch a new era of local investment and local innovation.

The idea behind this plan is not only that there is a better way to improve America's infrastructure, there are 50 better ways and even thousands of better ways. In our increasingly decentralized world, there are as many ideal transportation policies as there are communities across this great country.

Washington is standing in the way, imposing obsolete conformity on a vibrant, diverse society. For if we truly love local transportation infrastructure—and who doesn't—we should set it free.

Under the Transportation Empowerment Act, Americans could finally enjoy the local infrastructure they want. More environmentally conscious States and towns could finally have the flexibility to invest in more green transit projects and bike lanes. Regions reaping the benefits of America's recent energy renaissance could accelerate their own infrastructure and their own buildouts to keep up with their explosive growth. Dense cities could invest in more sustainable public transit networks. Meanwhile, surrounding counties could reopen the frontiers of the suburbs to a new generation of far more livable communities. State and local governments will also be free to experiment with innovative funding mechanisms not necessarily tied to the unreliable, unpredictable, gasoline tax. By cutting out the Washington middlemen, all of those States, communities, and taxpayers will be able to get more for less.

My amendment would not reduce America's investment in infrastructure any more than Uber reduces America's investment in car services. In the real world, value is not a cost. Rather, my plan would empower a nation hungry for greater mobility to spend its infrastructure dollars on steel and on concrete instead of on bureaucracy and special interests.

Some of my colleagues oppose this plan. Some will offer Washington's eternal promise. The status quo will work, it just needs more money. That is all it needs, and it will work. The Federal gasoline tax has not changed since 1994, they will say. We are starving the trust fund, they will add.

But it is not true—at least it is an inaccurate and incomplete picture. For in the 12 years prior to 1994, the gasoline tax skyrocketed by an alarming 460 percent from 4 cents per gallon to 18.4 cents per gallon.

Put another way, since 1982, the Federal gasoline tax has grown by an equivalent of 6.1 percent per year. Chasing ever more money will not solve this problem. That is what we have been doing, and the bill before us today is incontrovertible proof that it hasn't worked.

Others argue that reducing Washington's role in local transportation would invite economic and infrastructural catastrophe. This makes two very peculiar assumptions.

First, it assumes that Washington is uniquely competent in the area of local transportation, even as a long train of abusive boondoggles and bridges to nowhere tell us exactly the opposite.

Even more bizarrely, this argument assumes that the 50 States of our exceptional Republic, many of which would rank among the wealthiest nations in the world on their own, are unstable banana republics nursing the development of primitive hunter-gatherer societies whose only transportation services involve the clearing of woodland paths for their pig-drawn carts.

State and local governments already pay for 75 percent of all surface transportation infrastructure projects in this country.

In my home State of Utah, one of the best run in the country, only 20 percent of our transportation money comes from Washington. The other 80 percent we raise ourselves. Of course, we raise most of that 20 percent too. It is just that under the broken status quo, Washington middlemen take their cut before sending that back to us.

Why not just leave that extra 25 percent to the States and communities who need and use it in the first place?

The States already own and maintain the highways and local transit projects that are inherently local. So why not let the Federal Government focus on interstates and let Oregonians plan, finance, and build their bike paths; San Franciscans their green energy transit experiments; and Texans their eight-lane expressways, in their own way, tailored to their local needs and their own local values? All we add to the process in Washington, DC, is unnecessary overhead and self-congratulating press releases, trying to take credit for it all.

Finally, many who admit that the status quo is unsustainable nonetheless support it because they believe their particular State benefits by receiving more money back from the highway trust fund than it puts in. Washington perpetuates the myth that transportation money is free, especially for these so-called net donee States. But as in every other middleman arrangement, the status quo policy ensures that States actually get less value back than they should.

Federal regulatory strings not only make infrastructure projects unnecessarily expensive, they specifically divert resources away from actual infrastructure and waste it on special interests and bureaucratic redtape.

The Federal Davis-Bacon Act, for instance, costs States an additional 10 cents for every single dollar they spend on infrastructure construction projects.

Numerous regulations under the National Environmental Policy Act—or NEPA, as it is frequently called—collectively cost State governments an additional 9 cents on the dollar. No wonder the trust fund needs to be bailed out every year. Washington is charging taxpayers a 20-percent processing fee off the top.

I encourage my colleagues to work out the math for their own States.

But for Utah, that means that of the $335 million we receive annually from the highway trust fund, nearly $64 million goes to political overhead instead of steel and concrete.

Everything in our economy and our society today is moving away from rigid, centralized, bureaucratic control and toward flexible, open-sourced community and individual empowerment. This is a simple question of old versus new, of bold versus unimaginative.

The Interstate Highway System met a crucial need in its time and represented a wonder of innovation, but so did Borders bookstores at one time, so did Blockbuster Video at one time, so did record stores, and so did rotary telephones.

America still needs books, movies, music, and communication, and it still gets those things. Today those goods are just delivered more efficiently, more affordably, through flexible models customized to the needs of individual customers. In the very same

way Americans still need highways, bridges, subways, and bike paths. Indeed, we need them now more than ever, but Federal policy hasn't kept up with the times. That is why, even without my amendment, more than 30 States have begun or are considering their own transportation modernization programs.

This is just one more piece of evidence that the transportation renaissance America needs is one that our centralized bureaucratic status quo cannot deliver—not with another $10.8 billion or 10 times as much.

After six decades and historic successes, the time has come for a new Federal transportation policy—one that taps the creativity of our diverse Nation. Today, Americans are unnecessarily stuck in traffic, stuck in overcrowded subway cars, missing their kids' games and recitals, priced out of neighborhoods close to their jobs, and they spend almost a full 40-hour workweek per year stuck in gridlock. They deserve better than what Washington is offering—which is just the status quo, plus a little more money. A new era demands a new approach.

The Interstate Highway System is a success, and the people who created it deserve our great admiration and gratitude. But the way to honor their legacy is to stop imitating them and start emulating them by investing in an innovative transportation network for our own era, just as they did for theirs. Just as it was in 1956, the status quo is once again no longer good enough. We need to transcend it.

The future of America's mobility is not a rigid, monolithic, centralized bureaucracy frozen in amber; it is a flexible, organic, open-sourced network of empowered individuals and communities as diverse as the Nation itself.

My amendment would empower Americans to start to build that future together, and I respectfully ask my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is really almost hard to know where to start in my opposition to this amendment, but let me say that some people call it devolution, meaning you devolve all responsibility for the highways and transits to the States. I call it not devolution but complete and utter destruction of a system that has been in place that the States have grown to count on. That is why the States that my friend speaks from, the States' point of view—they oppose this amendment strongly. AASHTO—they represent not one State but every single State.

There are so many things my friend said that we can't refute—that a State should have the right to spend whatever they want. Sure, they can. They can spend anything they want right now. But they count on the basic bread and butter of these grants.

If we look at history, it has been Republican Presidents who have stepped to the plate on this all through history. That is why I think this is so radical. It is shocking to me. It is shocking to me because some of the biggest proponents of the Interstate Highway System and aid to the States have been Republican Presidents.

Let's be clear. If, God forbid, this were to become the law, immediately the States would see a cut in their transportation funding of 80 percent. That is my friend's answer to gridlock—cut the funding to the States by 80 percent.

The last time I heard and listened, we were one nation under God, indivisible. That is why the visionary Dwight Eisenhower saw this. He knew we had to be able to move equipment. He knew logistics because he was a general. He knew we were one Nation, sea to shining sea. And my friend would have us lose that.

I really wish my colleague Senator INHOFE would come to the floor because I think he has a voting record that is as conservative as any, and he feels transportation is a basic function, along with defense.

I think it is important to note that counties and cities and States depend on this program, and they have for years. Again, this is a national interest, to have this one Nation.

If we really want to see Republicans and Democrats united around the country, look at who is opposing the Lee amendment: the American Trucking Association, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Highway Users Alliance, the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association, the general contractors, the Associated Equipment Distributors, and the Association of Equipment Manufacturers. And if they agreed with Senator LEE—set us free; set us free; we are going to build so much—I don't know what he is talking about, set us free. Set us free with 80 percent less money? That is really great. What are we going to build? Nothing. We are going to have to raise taxes. I was a county supervisor. That doesn't work.

Proponents of this amendment weakly claim that with the completion of the interstate system, we don't need a Federal role in transportation. Well, guess what. We have to maintain our Federal highways even though they have been built. We have to maintain our bridges even though they have been built.

I said on a TV show the other day: I know I have gotten a little older. I need more maintenance. That is just the way it is. I am not happy about it.

Stop laughing. But that is a fact of life.

So don't tell me ''we are free at last; do away with this'' and then think the States are going to be happy when the very States my friend says he speaks for are totally against his amendment. We would be massively cutting transportation infrastructure spending.

Let's talk about the impact on thousands of businesses and millions of workers. I don't know if we have the picture of the stadium. I wish to show my friend—when he comes here and makes an ideological speech, I like to talk about the real world. Here is the real world. This is a Super Bowl game. This is a stadium that holds 100,000 people. We have seven stadiums full of unemployed construction workers. He wants to cut the Federal involvement by 80 percent. Just don't see some of these workers. It started out that we filled 20 of these stadiums in the height of the recession. Now we have got it down to seven, and we still don't have enough work.

And this isn't make work. This is work our American businesspeople want. This is work our American workers want. This is work that can't be outsourced. This is work that pays a good wage. What a time to cut back our investment by 80 percent and sock it to the workers.

The same people who vote for this amendment won't raise the minimum wage—support this pension smoothing that is taking away dollars from our employees' pensions.

So I am at my wit's end to understand. My friend is a nice man, and I know he believes this. But don't come on the floor and say let's forget about Eisenhower's vision and have a new vision, which is that there is no more Federal role.

Some will get up and say: Maybe it is better to do this than to do nothing. Maybe this is better.

No. We have to do our job around here, and that is a multiyear bill. We are faced with a short-term extension because we haven't done our work.

Senators CARPER and CORKER and I are going to put forward an amendment that is going to force us to do our work in December if we are lucky enough to have it passed. We hope it will pass because if we vote for that amendment, we are cutting back the short-term money we have to pay, and we are cutting back the time. And that is good. But we are not walking away from the responsibility we have as a nation, one nation under God, indivisible, from sea to shining sea, a vision of America that my friend's amendment would destroy. It is not devolution, it is destruction, and I hope we will vote no.

I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I strongly, respectfully disagree with the characterization my distinguished colleague from California has made suggesting

that this somehow represents an 80-percent cut in the transportation funding. That simply is not true. The idea here is to transfer both the revenue collection authority and the spending authority back to where most of it belongs, which is at the State and the local level.

There isn't a State in the Union that wants to do away with transportation infrastructure spending. Quite to the contrary, our States and localities and those who assist the contractors, who provide the services, provide the gravel and other materials that go into these roads and bridges and transit projects—they want to get to work, but they want to put this money into steel and concrete in the ground rather than spending so much of it on lobbying, rather than spending so much of it on things that have nothing to do with steel and concrete in the ground.

I also wish to refer to something my colleague said with regard to the fact that it costs money to maintain the Interstate Highway System. I absolutely agree—I could not agree more—which is exactly why I wrote this amendment so as to retain a 3.7-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax that would be collected and spent better to make sure we would maintain the Interstate Highway System. That is exactly what we do.

A reference was made to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, expressing remorse over the fact that he is not here with us at this moment to have a discussion and wondering what he would say about it. To respond to my colleague's point, Senator INHOFE has voted for this provision in the past. In fact, in the past Senator INHOFE himself has introduced a version of this very piece of legislation.

My colleague also referred to groups that happen to oppose this legislation. I would encourage those groups to learn more about it and also point out that there are lots of groups that support my legislation, including Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Heritage Action, Club for Growth, National Taxpayers Freedom, Freedom Works, and the list goes on and on.

It is also important to remember that our Federal gasoline tax did increase substantially between 1992 and 1994, increased from just 4 cents per gallon to 18.4 cents per gallon. During that time period we were told that if the gasoline tax was increased at the Federal level, we would be backing up the highway trust fund, that we would make sure it was secure.

Did that happen? No. What happened instead was the Federal Government overreached. The Federal Government started getting more and more involved in surface streets and things that have nothing to do with our Interstate Highway System. That is why we are here today.

I therefore yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I know my colleagues want to present the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment. I will just say that we just did the math. The Senator cuts the gas tax to such a degree that the States would get an 80-percent cut. The Senator can do the math himself, but I am happy to work with the Senator on it.

It is not convenient—it is not right to speak about another Member when they are not here, but my understanding is Senator INHOFE does not currently support this. I could be wrong. We will find out in a couple hours. One of us can apologize. But I will apologize if I misstated his objection to this.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3583

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that our amendment, the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment 3583, be made pending and that it be reported by number at this time.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 3583.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, July 23, 2014, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I will make some comments to lead off and then will yield to Senator CORKER and back to Senator BOXER, and we have others who would like to speak on behalf of this amendment.

I wish to start off by saying to the Senator from Tennessee who is here with us, the lead Republican on the amendment, how grateful I am to have this opportunity to work with you on an important issue. Thank you for your courage. One of the definitions of leadership is the courage to stay out of step when everyone else is marching to the wrong tune. In this case, not everyone else is marching to the wrong tune, but a few people are. I thank you for showing that courage and standing up to do what we believe is the right thing to do.

I would like to give a big shout-out to Senator BOXER. She chairs the Environment and Public Works Committee on which I serve as the subcommittee chair for transportation and infrastructure. She and Senator VITTER and Senator BARRASSO and I worked to fashion a 6-year transportation plan for our country that is a very well thought out, excellent roadmap for the future of transportation in America, and what we now need to do is to fund it. It is great to have a plan. How about some money to make it happen? That is what this is all about.

This is the question: At the end of the day, how do we best ensure that we actually fund the 6-year plan Senator BOXER and others helped us develop?

I thank not just Senators CORKER and BOXER for their great support and for their leadership, I also thank the Democrats and Republicans and even an Independent or two for their support of our amendment.

I will yield the time now to Senator CORKER and Senator BOXER, and I will take some time out. Senator KING is welcome to speak as well.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to H.R. 5021 be modified to allow for 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form between the votes and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from California for going ahead with this amendment. I thank Senator CARPER for this leadership not just on this issue but other issues. I know we are working with other long-term issues that need to be resolved, and I thank him for the way he is going about doing that.

If I could just lay out what is happening today, a House bill is coming over here today that is a short-term extension. Mr. President, I don't know if you know this, but this will be the 11th short-term extension since 2008. Let me say that one more time. This will be the 11th short-term extension that has occurred since 2008.

This is the fifth time we have taken money out of the general fund—taken money out of the general fund—to fund the highway trust fund, which is supposed to be funded through user fees. So what I would like to say to my friends on this side of the aisle is that this is the fifth time for the highway trust fund, which builds highways and bridges around our country, that we are engaging in generational theft—generational theft—where we take money out of the general fund. Everyone knows it is not paid for. We use gimmicks to pay for something that the Constitution says we are actually supposed to deal with.

The House sent over a bill, and there has been a lot of consternation on the floor about that. They used $6.4 billion worth of pension smoothing. Everyone in this body knows it is not a real pay-for. All it does is move revenues up a decade. And because it uses $6.4 billion worth of pension smoothing, it has a $5 billion budget point of order against it. Let me say that one more time—a $5 billion budget point of order against

the House bill that is coming over. So there has been some consternation.

People say: Well, if you don't take up the House bill, the road program is going to fall apart, and we are going to go home for the August recess and everybody is going to be blamed.

Well, fortunately—fortunately—today Speaker BOEHNER said: No. If the Senate sends something over, we are going to send something right back.

So everybody ought to be relieved. So it doesn't matter today that many of our Finance Committee members who serve with Chairman WYDEN—they have made commitments to him that we are going to get on the Senate Finance Committee, and they should all know it is not a problem now. The House today said they are going to send something right back.

So the first vote that is going to take place today is a vote to strip out the House bill, which has $6.4 billion worth of pension smoothing—a total gimmick. Everyone knows it is not a pay-for. It loses money—loses money. And the Senate Finance Committee bill is going to—the first vote is to replace the House bill with the Senate Finance Committee bill—by the way, which was done under regular order, done the way bills are supposed to be done. Unfortunately, it also is a short-term fix. I have never voted for a short-term fix for the highway trust fund because it is so simple for us to resolve. The only issue is we haven't been willing to address it. There are no new ideas that I am aware of.

I am going to have to vote against a short-term extension. But we have an amendment to improve it, and what that amendment does is it takes out all of the pension smoothing that unfortunately is in the Finance Committee bill. I thank them for doing their work, but it has $2.9 billion worth of pension smoothing, which, again, is a gimmick. In other words, it moves up revenues. It weakens, by the way, the pension system in our country. You ought to know that. It weakens our pension system. It moves money into this decade, but from then on it loses even more money. It is absolute—no offense to those who put it in place—generational theft. So what this amendment does is it takes pension smoothing out of the Senate finance bill and leaves everything else in place.

The secondary benefit is that it means the highway trust fund will not have funding except to make it through this year. What that means is that this body in 2014 will have the opportunity to actually deal with this issue.

I have to tell you, seriously, I am embarrassed. I have been here in the Senate 7½ years—7½ years—and we have yet to deal with one of our long-term issues. I cannot remember a single issue this body has come together on to deal with one of our long-term structural issues. It is an embarrassment. They really aren't new ideas around here; there has just been a lack of willingness to deal with it.

I thank the Senator from California, the Senator from Delaware, and others who will join in this amendment. And all we are doing is one thing: We are taking a gimmick out of the Senate finance bill and forcing this body to act responsibly before year-end. That is all.

I would urge my colleagues to come to the floor and say: Look, it has been a long time, 11 short-term reauthorizations.

By the way, think about the economic issues that come with this. We do these reauthorizations, and departments of transportation around the country have no idea whether there is going to be funding in place. What do the contractors do? They don't hire people long-term. They don't buy equipment. Yet we come and do this 11 times since 2008. Five times, again, transferring money out of our general fund—the greatest generational theft that can occur—taking money out of the general fund and spending it over a 6-month period, paying for it over 10 years.

To my Republican friends who railed against the President over the health care bill because he was using 6 years' worth of costs—by the way, I was one of those railers—6 years' worth of costs, 10 years' worth of revenues—we couldn't get off of it because it was so irresponsible. Yet in this bill we are going to spend the money over 6 or 7 months and pay for it over 10 years. It is an order of magnitude worse.

I know that a lot of people have worked and they have said: No, there is no way we can come up with a solution by year-end.

You have got to be kidding me. How could we not come up with a solution to such a simple issue—a trust fund that has been funded by user fees. How could we not figure out some way in 5 days? The Senate Finance Committee has some of the smartest people in the Senate on it. They know there are no new real options. The chairman has floated some ideas as to how to get there, and I applaud him for it.

By the way, I know that the Senate Finance Committee is only doing its job today. In other words, you have to come up with a short-term solution. I got it. I cannot support it. I cannot support it. I cannot support another kicking of the can down the road on one of the simplest issues we have to deal with in the Senate because elections are coming. Let's face it. Every time it is the election. We can't deal with this issue, so what we said is: OK. We got it. We realize that during elections people don't really want to show their cards, apparently. So we are saying, hey, let's strip the gimmick that is in this bill—the pension smoothing that we all know is not a pay-for. It is a gimmick. Let's strip that and let's force the Congress before the end of this year to actually deal with an issue that is very important to our Nation.

I hope people will support it. I have heard people say: Well, I just don't see how we can figure out a solution.

You have got to be kidding me. I mean, how many new ideas are there relative to this?

So, look, I thank my colleagues for joining in this amendment. I hope we will have support. Again, this amendment lessens the kicking of the can down the road. It takes out a gimmick. It forces us to deal with a long-term solution, which we should have done a long time ago.

I thank all of those Senators who support this amendment. I hope others will consider it before they come down to the floor. I hope this Senate will have the opportunity—and the House—before year-end to actually deal with this issue.

Again, let me say this: The kick-the-can down-the-road that is occurring takes us into next May and June. Think about it. So we are going to have a Presidential race underway. So then people are going to say: Oh, we can't deal with this issue. We don't want our nominees to have to deal with this issue.

Remember, the primaries this year are early. So our Republicans will say: Well, we don't want to deal with this issue in May or June because a Presidential race is coming up. And the Democrats will say the same thing: We don't want our candidate to have to talk about this issue. So again and again we will kick the can down the road. We will engage in generational theft. We will weaken our economy. We won't do the things we should be doing with our infrastructure. It is the wrong thing to do.

Please support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator CORKER for his remarks because I have been here a while, and I haven't heard a more honest speech in my life on the Senate floor. I haven't heard a more passionate speech, a speech in which the Senator just spoke from his heart and with his brain, which is quite competent. I thank the Senator for it because there are some times when you do feel like shouting. I guess that was a movie, ''I Can't Take It Anymore.''

It is ridiculous that we are where we are. We knew for 2 years—2 years—that the highway trust fund was going to run out of money. We knew it for 2 years. That is why in May Senator VITTER and I, Senator CARPER, Senator BARRASSO, and others on both sides of the aisle passed a 6-year bill. We knew it was coming. We wanted to wake up

our colleagues. And we did wake them up but, sadly, to a short-term fix instead of a long-term fix, a multiyear bill.

I so agree with my friend. It is the political will that is lacking. There is always an excuse followed by an excuse. The next thing we know they will say: The dog ate my homework. We have heard every excuse. And the Senator is so right. We will be in Presidential races, and then we will start with more Senate races and more congressional races, and people won't want to take a tough vote again.

This is the greatest Nation on Earth, but we have to reflect the greatness in our work here, and we are not.

The one thing I disagree with my friend on—he said we are only doing one thing in this amendment. We are actually doing two things in this amendment. One is we are getting rid of that gimmick called pension smoothing. I have kind of studied it over the last few weeks to really understand what we are doing, which is when you use this pension smoothing, you are saying to companies: Don't put any money into your pension obligations. And through some smoke and mirrors—because then it means they get to pay a little more income taxes—by the way, some don't pay more income taxes—it comes out a plus. The fact is, it is in essence telling companies they don't have to set aside money for their workers' pensions. That is not something that is good, especially since the pension guaranty corporation is short $34 billion.

I don't know if my friend knows this. The last time we used pension smoothing for a short-term fix, at least we had in the committee a comparable measure that ensured that companies gave more to the pension guaranty corp. So although they had a chance not to put the money into the pensions, they did have to pay more to the pension guaranty corp. If the pension guaranty corp. isn't there—the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp. is broke—the taxpayers have to pick up the tab. I am looking at my friend in the Presiding Officer's chair, the Senator from Massachusetts, Ms. WARREN, who knows what happens when everybody is broke and the Federal Government says: Oh my God. That is too big to fail.

So this attack that you make on smoothing as a gimmick—it is worse than a gimmick because it has real-life impacts, and those real-life impacts are that the companies aren't putting aside enough money. So let's think about what we are saying. We are saying the highway trust fund is going broke, so to fix it we are going to endanger another fund, the pension funds of our workers. That is terrible.

That is why I love the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment, and I thank my friends for their leadership on the pay-for. It does two things, this good amendment. It says we are not going to use the smoothing; we are going to protect our pensions. Secondly, we are going to attack the long-term issues of the highway trust fund in December, in the lameduck, after the elections, and everybody knows that is the best time to do it.

So I stand proudly with my friends. I hope we pass this. I don't know what happens or what the House will do, but my dad used to say you can only control what you can control. We can't control them, but we can control us.

So I hope anyone listening to this debate—I am going to support the Wyden amendment because it does strip some of the pension smoothing. I am going to oppose the Toomey amendment and the Lee amendment because I think they are dangerous, and I am going to strongly support the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment.

I thank my colleagues. I know there is some very important business about to come to the floor, so I will yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN.). The Senator from Maryland.

MILCON—VA APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we have just listened to a very lively debate on the highway trust fund, which is certainly a great issue confronting our Nation because our infrastructure is crumbling.

But we also know another great infrastructure has really been crumbling, and that is our VA infrastructure, including the ability to deliver health care to our veterans as promised, as well as to meet their claims when they file for their benefits, particularly those poignant, compelling claims around disability benefits.

I come to the floor today to see if we can't do a trifecta this week by passing the serious reform bill advocated by Senators SANDERS and MCCAIN——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will take their conversations out of the Chamber.

Ms. MIKULSKI. These are excellent Senators whose voices are heard and heard and heard, as is mine.

In addition to the Sanders-McCain bill that comes as a result of the conference, really what that bill does is focus primarily on the health care issues facing us. What concerns me is also the fact that we need to eliminate the VA disability claims backlog for which there is also a compelling need.

Now, what I am advocating is that we do a trifecta this week; that is, we pass the conference report that has been advocated by Senator SANDERS and Senator MCCAIN that will deal with the important reforms, including adding new personnel. We have given the VA a new chief executive officer to bring about the reforms with the know-how of business. I also wish to bring to the floor the VA-MILCON appropriations bill.

This is a fantastic bill that moves from the subcommittee, led by my very able subcommittee chairman, Senator TIM JOHNSON, with the help of the ranking member, Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. They have done such incredible diligence on how we can use the taxpayers' dollars wisely to really provide the services we promised the veterans—yes, health care, but also that veterans shouldn't stand in line for health care and veterans also shouldn't stand in line and wait in line and then hope the line gets smaller for disability benefits.

What the VA-MILCON bill does this year, under the very able leadership of Senator JOHNSON, with the cooperation of Senator KIRK, is to implement these very important reforms, and the committee responded. I wish the Presiding Officer could have been in the full committee that day. We passed it on a bipartisan basis of 30 to 0.

Now I want to be able to bring this bill to the floor so this week we could do all three of these and make sure that the Sanders-McCain conference report bill is not on a weak foundation. We need to modernize our VA infrastructure.

There is over $10 billion of backlog in crumbling physical infrastructure at the VA. Its technology is dated. We want them to have great technology. Most of all, we finally want to crack this veterans backlog.

So I am going to propound shortly a unanimous consent request. I talked about it earlier. But before I make this request—I have spoken about this bill—I would like to yield to my colleague and my very able subcommittee chairman, Senator TIM JOHNSON, who has spent more than a decade working on these issues, and now, on a bipartisan basis, we have such a splendid bill—so wise, so prudent, so effective—that I wish we could do it.

I yield the floor for Senator JOHNSON and then I will reclaim the floor for my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I thank the chairwoman for her strong leadership on the Appropriations Committee and her unfailing dedication to our Nation's vets. She is absolutely right in pointing out that passage of the fiscal year 2015 MILCON-VA bill is crucial to implementing the Sanders bill. The Sanders bill provides funding and expanded access for medical care for vets, but the MILCON-VA bill provides a far broader range of funding and oversight that covers every aspect of VA operations.

By a unanimous vote, we just confirmed Robert McDonald to be Secretary of the VA. He is assuming the leadership of an agency in crisis, and he will need every resource available to him if he is to succeed in turning the VA around.

The Senate has given him the job, and the Senate should now give him

the resources to accomplish that job. This is no time to delay or shortchange VA funding.

For the sake of the Nation's vets, we must keep our focus on the full scope of VA operations, including but not limited to access to medical care. The disability claims backlog is a perfect example. In the past year, with the resources and oversight provided in the fiscal year 2014 MILCON-VA bill, VA has made great progress in reducing the backlog. The fiscal year 2015 bill provides additional resources for claims processing to sustain this momentum. The move to paperless claims was key to streamlining and expediting claims processing, and it was made possible by improvements to VA Information Technology systems—improvements which were funded in the MILCON-VA bill.

IT is the backbone of virtually every program the VA administers. An antiquated and cumbersome electronic scheduling system was a key factor in the patient scheduling scandal. The VA is in the midst of an entire overhaul of its electronic health record system to make it more accessible to patients and to exchange information with DOD. This effort is crucial to the VA's ability to deliver timely care and benefits to vets.

The MILCON-VA bill also provides the funding to implement a wide array of programs that are crucial to the health and well-being of vets. Many of these aren't the kinds of programs or initiatives that make splashy headlines, but they are essential in delivering timely care and benefits. For example, the fiscal year 2015 MILCON-VA bill contains $7.8 million for a centralized mail system at the VA. The VA estimates that once the centralized program is implemented, it will take as many as 10 to 15 days off the time it takes to process a disability claim. The bill also provides increased funding to expand the Access Received Closer to Home program for vets in rural areas. These are just a few of many examples I could cite.

The Sanders bill and the MILCON-VA bill are separate components of a single requirement and they should move forward at the same time. I hope we can pass these bipartisan bills before we adjourn for recess.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4486

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am really eager to bring at least one appropriations bill to the floor. There are only 72 hours left before we break for August.

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 400, H.R. 4486, the Military Construction-VA appropriations bill; that the Committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that there be no other amendments, points of order or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 1 hour for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on the passage of the bill, as amended; that if the bill, as amended, is passed, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. Reserving the right to object, our side is eager to schedule floor consideration of appropriations bills with a full and open amendment process, and the MILCON-VA bill would be at the top of our list.

Would the Senator from Maryland agree to modify this consent request as follows: that following disposition of the highway bill this evening, the motion to proceed to S. 2648, the Senate border supplemental bill, be withdrawn and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4486, the MILCON-VA bill; I further ask that the first amendment in order be offered by the Republican leader or his designee, and that the two sides then offer amendments in alternating fashion; that following the disposition of all amendments, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland so modify her request?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The answer is no, I will not modify my request. But my response should not be interpreted as a pugnacious rejection.

I appreciate the civil and courteous way the Senator from Alabama has responded. But in a nutshell, what the Senator from Alabama is requesting is that we not pick up the supplemental, we bring up the VA-MILCON instead. I would like to bring up both bills, which is why I am asking that there be no amendments on VA-MILCON. They are practically identical between the House and the Senate. There were no amendments except a few perfecting ones in the Senate. We could get this done in an hour. So, therefore, I will not modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I object to my distinguished chair's motion to consider and pass the MILCON-VA appropriations bill. This is not because I oppose the underlying bill, as I have said. This a bill that has wide bipartisan support. Its support is predicated upon the premise that we will engage in what we call ''regular order'' here. Regular order, by its very nature, includes the ability to offer, consider, and to vote on amendments.

If we were to agree to this unanimous consent request by the Senator from Maryland, we would be trading away every Member's prerogative on both sides of the aisle to offer and to vote upon amendments. I would, therefore, encourage the chair and the majority leader to revise their unanimous consent request to allow for an open amendment process. Until then, we will be compelled to object.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I know my friends Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY are doing everything they can to work the will of the Senate. I know how they both want to get something done on this appropriations bill.

I simply want to say that I looked at the modification of my Republican friend—and he is my friend—that he offered, and I think for the good of America, who could be watching, I want to make a couple of points that will take me 30 seconds.

First of all, there is no limit on the number of amendments. We do not know if it will be 5, 10, 20 or 1,000 or 2,000 or 1 million. We have no idea. They would not even have to be related to the bill at hand, and they will not tell us what this list of amendments is.

I have looked back at some recent requests, and I want to be very honest with my friend. The recent requests I have seen before have been attacks on the Clean Air Act, attacks on the Clean Water Act, attacks on the Safe Drinking Water Act, attacks on women's health care. Frankly, that is not something I can agree to.

So I just want to say I am so saddened that we cannot seem to take up the most popular bill. I know how hard everybody has worked on MILCON-VA, and my friend, Senator SHELBY, said: Our side is eager to schedule floor consideration of appropriations bills. Well, if they are really eager, they should work together with Senator MIKULSKI. You could not find anyone more fair. Get a finite list of amendments. If they are controversial, we have the 60-vote threshold. We know how to do our work around here.

So I am sorry it has come to this, and I appreciate the leadership of both Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, first of all, I thank all of those advocating the highway bill for their courtesy in letting us bring this to the floor. Senator JOHNSON and I are deeply appreciative.

I think we have just had a very good discussion. We have stated what we would like to do to move VA-MILCON in the most time-efficient way possible—with the least controversial bill. I am not going to have anything more to say about this tonight, but now that we have kind of put a lot of ideas out there, we have heard what the expression is of the vice chairman of Appropriations, I would hope that over the next 36 hours perhaps we could find a way forward to do the trifecta I am hoping for to serve America's veterans: pass the conference report that helps improve veterans health care—we have done one part of that now by approving Mr. McDonald—and all we would have to do before Thursday night is to finish VA-MILCON.

So I intend to reach out across the aisle, and I appreciate the effort and courtesy and the cooperation of the highway Senators, who are moving this bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I know we have a number of colleagues who still want to speak, and we want to get to votes tonight, so I want to be very brief speaking in opposition to the Lee amendment and in support of the amendment of my friends Senator CARPER, Senator BOXER, and Senator CORKER.

Madam President, I want to quickly tell you about the Norwalk River Bridge, which is a bridge in the State of Connecticut, which is pretty important to the transit of people and goods throughout the Northeast because it spans the Norwalk River and allows for trains—Amtrak trains, Metro-North trains—to be able to transit millions of people over millions of trips up and down the Northeast Corridor. Without the Norwalk River Bridge, you cannot get from New Haven to New York, but you also cannot get from Washington, DC, to Boston.

That bridge is 118 years old, and it is a miracle that it opens at all. It needs to open in order to allow maritime traffic to go up and down the Norwalk River. It is a miracle that it opens at all. But, in fact, on 16 of its 271 openings last year, it did not open and it interrupted Metro-North service 175 times.

The result for not just Connecticut but the entire region is hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost productivity. Our inability to pass a long-term transportation bill means that big projects like the replacement of the Norwalk River Bridge cannot get done. Why? Because when you only budget for 12 months or 24 months at a time—or in this instance only 6 months or 4 months at a time—there is no way for a State to be able to plan to do that kind of massive work.

So I am here on the floor to beg my colleagues to support the amendment from Senator BOXER and Senator CARPER because it is time we started to get some political courage and admit that the emperor has no clothes when it comes to Federal transportation policy. Yes, it is politically difficult to make the choices necessary to come up with the funding to fill that gap.

Senator CORKER and I have one particular idea, but we would love to hear others. But it is time for us to sit down and have that honest conversation because you cannot do projects like this if you do not.

But to Senator LEE's amendment, this is exactly why you need a Federal commitment to transportation funding. The idea that you are just going to devolve all of these projects down to the local level is preposterous. Why? Because this is a regional asset. The Norwalk River happens to be located in the State of Connecticut. But if all transportation funding came from the States, and Connecticut, for one reason or another, decided not to spend money on replacing the Norwalk River Bridge, it is not just Connecticut that is affected by that; transit stops in Massachusetts, in New York, in New Jersey, in Delaware, all the way down to Washington, DC.

So the reason we have made a robust commitment to Federal funding for both highways and mass transit is because the benefits accrue to all of us.

Senator LEE said that this is just an innovation in the way we fund transportation, like, as he said, the innovation in the way in which people buy books. That analogy speaks to our imperative for Federal funding because the way that books have been sold is different. It used to be that you just used the local roads to drive down and buy your book from the local bookstore. Today, you buy at amazon.com, and it is the Interstate Highway System, the interstate rail system that is used to get your book from a warehouse somewhere out in the Midwest to you after you ordered it online in Connecticut. If you want to talk about the great innovations of the last 20 to 30 years, they all buttress the idea that we live in an interconnected, interstate world in which we need a Federal commitment to highway funding—one that does not just parse out funding one month at a time.

My State is particularly dependent on this kind of funding. Connecticut only survives if we are able to unlock the congested highways and byways and rail lines that connect my State to New York and to Boston in particular. But this Nation as a whole will not succeed, will not survive economically if we do not grapple with the fact that as China spends 12 percent of its GDP on infrastructure, Europe spends 6 percent of its GDP on infrastructure, even if we just held the line, we would still only be spending 3 percent of our GDP on the most important asset to the future of America's economy.

So I hope we reject the Lee amendment. I hope we pass the Carper-Boxer-Corker amendment. I am glad to join them in support of it this evening.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, just for purposes of making a unanimous consent request, I ask unanimous consent that the only remaining time be 5 minutes each for the following Senators and the Senate then proceed to vote on the amendments and the bill as provided under the previous order: Senator CARPER, Senator FLAKE, Senator WYDEN, and Senator KING. The unanimous consent request is for 5 minutes each, and then the votes.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, will we still have 2 minutes before each amendment then? It will be in between?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we will.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I understand in the unanimous consent agreement I have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. CARPER. I yield 1 minute of that to Senator KING. Oh, great, he has 5 minutes. I would like to have 4 of his minutes.

I will start by saying my thanks to Senator WYDEN for his leadership as well. I am pleased to be able to support his amendment. I am grateful he is supporting ours.

I say to some of our Republican colleagues, I have talked to most of you in the last several weeks about this approach that Senator BOXER and Senator CORKER and I are proposing; that is, to lower from $11 billion to $8 billion the amount of money that would go into the transportation trust fund. That would force us to come back and make a decision by the end of this calendar year. That would force us to do something real, do our job during the lameduck session.

One of the reasons Republicans have said to me is: We can't do that because then that would force the bill to go back to the House from which it has emanated. Well, let me just say the bill is going back to the House. The Wyden amendment is going to pass. So get over it. The bill is going to go back to the House. It is not going to die there. They will do something with it. They may send it back to us in that same form or some different form. But for Republicans who have said: I understand the importance of doing something in a lameduck session, and we know we need to be compelled to do

that but I just can't do it, well, you can.

For the folks, our Republican friends who say: I don't like that pension smoothing at all, the idea of mucking with people's pensions in order to fund something entirely unrelated—and that is building roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems—well, you do not have to do that. You can use an honest pay-for, an honest set-aside, and feel good about doing that.

We are going to be here, maybe, Friday night, December 19, and if we have provided $11 billion to carry us to fund programs through the end of next May, I promise you, if we have not worked out a 6-year transportation funding plan by December 19, that Friday night, we are going to be gathered right here and people will say: What are we doing here? It is almost Christmas. I want to go home or go somewhere to be with my family. We have money to run these programs until the end of May, so let's just kick the can down the road and come back a little bit before May and we will do it then.

One problem with that: We did something like that 5 years ago, and we did it again and again and again and again—11 times. This will be the 12th time we do it.

Why am I concerned we will do it again?

I say to Senator DURBIN, let me ask, what did Albert Einstein say about the definition of ''insanity''? He said: It is the notion that we are going to do things the same way we have always done them and we get a better result or a different result. We will not. We will do it again.

All over this country, State and local governments, mayors, Governors, people who build roads, people who run contracting companies, the truckers, all kinds of people are saying to us one message: Do your job. Our job is to provide transportation infrastructure. Do it in a time-responsible way so that States and local governments that have these programs, that have them on the drawing boards can build them or the ones that are underway, they want to complete them.

We can help them do that. We can do that by voting for the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment.

Let me close with another great quote from another great guy who used to criticize this place, Mark Twain. He was always saying bad things about the Congress, even then when he was around. But one of the things he said is relevant today. Here is what he said: When in doubt, do what is right. You will confound your enemies and amaze your friends.

I will just say to my Republican colleagues, especially: We love you. We want you to join us in doing what is right, and you will confound your enemies and you will amaze your friends, and not only that, you will do the right thing for our country, strengthen our economic recovery, do what we are supposed to do, providing strong transportation infrastructure for this Nation.

The people of this country are counting on us. Let's not let them down.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, in just a short time we are going to have some votes—five—and we have been very lackadaisical. We have waited for people to come here to vote for up to 25, sometimes 30 minutes. We are not going to do it. We have first a 15-minute vote, and then we have four 10-minute votes, and we are going to cut off the time. We will have the 5-minute period we always have at the end of these votes, but, everyone, there is no excuse. It is not fair to everybody to wait around here while you are doing whatever you are doing. It is impolite, and it is not courteous, and we need to move things along. People have things to do tonight. So when we finish the speeches, we are going to move to the voting, and we are going to stick to the times. So, everybody, there are no excuses. Everybody should understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I will be brief in support of the amendment by the Senator from Utah to devolve highway trust fund spending to the States. I want to correct something that was said earlier. It was said that all money would be devolved to the States and it would be up to the States to maintain the Interstate Highway System. That is not the case.

This amendment is similar to many that have been submitted over the years, myself included. I have submitted some in the House to do this very thing.

I think we can all agree that the highway trust fund is in need of a major overall. Since 2008, we have taken, I think, $53 billion from the general fund to replenish the highway trust fund because cars have better gas mileage, and when we have recessions, less driving is done and less money goes into the trust fund, and we are trying to make that up now.

In the future, it simply is not going to meet the need out there. So we have got to do something to make sure we get more bang for the buck for highway spending. One way to do that is to allow States greater flexibility to use these moneys and give the States those responsibilities as well. When you do that, you can increase the bang for the buck. When you look at what a lot of the money is now spent on—the Federal money—instead of putting it toward highways, it is diverted to mass transit, bike paths, ferry boats, streetscaping, and countless other projects that are, at best, very local in nature and, at worst, very wasteful.

The States generally have a better idea of what their needs are and are better stewards of taxpayer money in that respect. I have been told that if you build two bridges—if a State has two bridges to be built, they are next to each other across the same river and about the same location, if you build one with Federal funds and one with State funds, the one with Federal funds will cost you about 20 percent more, when you take into account the Davis-Bacon requirements and other mandates and lengthy approval processes. So States simply get a lot more bang for the buck. If we want highway dollars to go farther, we ought to do this.

In an issue brief by Common Good, it states, ''The environmental review process has grown onerous and expensive, adding years to the length of infrastructure projects without improving environmental outcomes.'' That is another thing that Federal laws require oftentimes is lengthy environmental reviews.

We can correct a lot of this by devolving some of these responsibilities to the States. I think the Lee amendment goes a long way toward doing that.

I want to say that I appreciate some of the amendments that are being brought forward today. Some of them are a lot less gimmicky than we are used to dealing with on the highway trust fund. But the Lee amendment is one that actually deals with the highway trust fund long term and offers a long-term solution to the problem of not enough money in the fund and misplaced priorities with some of the spending.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to address the highway funding issue we are discussing today. Four or five years ago, Tom Brokaw wrote a book called ''The Greatest Generation.'' He was talking about the generation that sacrificed—I repeat sacrificed—on our behalf. They struggled through the Depression, they fought World War II. Then when it was over, they paid the debt from World War II and built the Interstate Highway System. I hate to think what Tom Brokaw would call the book written about our generation, which has, in effect, rebuilt the World War II debt, which we are passing on to our children. We cannot even keep the Interstate Highway System fixed. This is shameful.

I am here to support the Carper-Boxer-Corker amendment, because it forces us to deal with it in this Congress. It is not going to be any easier to deal with next May. Let's get it done. We have the answers. We know what we have to do. The highway system is a pay-as-you-go system. The problem

is, now we are going more than we are paying. The gasoline tax has not been raised since 1993, 21 years ago. But the cost of maintaining the highways, of course, has been raised precipitously.

Not fixing infrastructure is debt. A lot of people around here talk about debt, and we are worried about the debt we are passing on to our children. I am worried about it too, but I want to make the point that if you do not fix a bridge or do not fix a highway or do not fix an airport, that is debt too because our children are going to have fix them. When they get around to it, they are going to have to pay more for it.

Senator CORKER used the term ''generational theft.'' That is what it is. Our generation is giving ourselves tax cuts borrowing the money to pay for those tax cuts, and our kids are going to have to pay it. That is not a tax cut, that is a shift of a tax from us to our children and our grandchildren. It is wrong.

To think that generation went through the Depression, fought World War II, paid for World War II, and then built the Interstate Highway System in the 1950s and 1960s, and then we cannot even keep it paved, and we have rebuilt the debt from World War II with nothing much to show for it, is unconscionable.

There are a lot of problems we deal with here that are hard and complicated. I deal with, on Armed Services and Intelligence, some very complicated problems that are troubling and difficult to figure the right thing to do. This one is simple: Pay your bills. It could not be more straightforward. Pay your bills. If you want to drive on the highways, have the potholes filled, we have to pay for it. To delay this into next May is just that much easier, and then we are going to start talking about Presidential campaigns and other campaigns and 2016 is going to be coming up. There are always reasons not to do it.

This is the 11th time we have punted on this issue. This is what the American public is sick and tired of. They are sick and tired of us not doing our basic job. There could not be a more basic job than fixing and paying for and maintaining your infrastructure. So I hope we can pass this amendment.

Yes, it is going to go back to the House. The House has said: Well, we are not going to accept it. But let's see. Let's put something good over there, shorten the time, get to it this year, in December, November or December, and let's solve it. It is not going to be any easier to solve in May. I would argue it would probably be harder.

I think it is time for us to start talking straight to the American people and say: We have to pay our bills. That is what this amendment and that is what this bill is all about. I want that book to talk about another greatest generation, not the worst generation that just passed all the bills on to our kids.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this debate has shown the urgency of moving on both a short-term patch for funding transportation and a long-term solution. Senator HATCH and I, with the first amendment, offer a bipartisan path forward. We take ideas from the other Chamber. We take ideas from both parties. We take ideas that both sides can build on for the long term, as Chairwoman BOXER has recommended.

There are important differences between the other body and the Senate. The other Chamber overuses pension smoothing. That creates two problems rather than solving one: They ignore the issue of tax compliance. That has always been bipartisan—paying taxes on taxes owed. Not tax hikes, not increases, not jacking revenues through the stratosphere, paying taxes on what is owed.

The other body abandons important bipartisan initiatives, initiatives from Senator BURR and Senator BENNET to promote natural gas vehicles; from Senator ISAKSON and Senator NELSON to protect earned pension rights; and Senators BENNET and CRAPO to make sure we can deliver water to farmers across the Nation. The American Farm Bureau has endorsed this amendment.

The other body is saying: It is our way or no highway. I would ask colleagues, is that what we are sent here to the Senate to do, that we accept every dotted I and every crossed T from the other body and say that is just fine?

Colleagues, we talk about regular order. How is it regular order to be a rubberstamp for the other body?

This is going to be done this week. That is nonnegotiable. This bill will be finished this week. What should be negotiable is that the Senate and the other body should have a chance to work out differences. Working that out is as much a part of regular order as voting on amendments. So let's vote to be the Senate, and not have the other body dictate that it is either their way or no highway.

I urge my colleagues strongly to support the first amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment from Senator HATCH and me. It passed with virtual unanimity in the finance committee.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mrs. BOXER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Have the votes been set for a certain time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired except for the 2 minutes before the vote on the Wyden amendment.

Who yields time?

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, if Senator WYDEN would like this time, I think that would be really appropriate to sum it up in the 1 minute we have. If there is an opposition person, they can speak. I think the Senator should sum it up in 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as Senator HATCH and I—very briefly—offer a bipartisan amendment, it is a bipartisan amendment based on the ideas from both bodies. It reflects the fact that we have tried to come up with an approach we can finish this week that does not overuse pension smoothing, that ensures we comply with our tax laws, and includes bipartisan initiatives that promote natural gas vehicles, help our farmers, and ensure that earned pension rights are protected.

The other body offers what amounts to our way or no highway. We offer a bipartisan alternative. I hope all of my colleagues will support it. It is the first vote at hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3582.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 244 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Kirk	Tester
Casey	Klobuchar	Thune
Coats	Landrieu	Toomey
Collins	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Manchin	Walsh
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—26

Blunt	Chambliss	Cochran
Boozman	Coburn	Cornyn

Crapo	Johanns	Risch
Cruz	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Fischer	Lee	Scott
Flake	McCain	Sessions
Heller	McConnell	Shelby
Hoeven	Moran	Vitter
Inhofe	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3583

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the Carper amendment.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, let me say to our Republican colleagues, this bill is going back to the House. We can send it back to the House correcting what I think is a misguided approach on pension smoothing. We can knock out that $3 billion pension smoothing. We can set a dynamic that will ensure we do something this year—that we do our jobs this year and get it done.

Across the country, AAA, American Trucking Associations, Governors, Senators, want us to do our job and finish it this year. Let's vote yes on the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment and do our job this year.

I yield for the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, to my colleagues, we are now on the Senate Finance Committee bill. There is one major flaw in this bill. It has $2.8 billion worth of pension smoothing. This amendment does away with that. What it means is it would be a better bill, but we would also have to solve this problem.

We have had 11 short-term reauthorizations of the highway bill. It is unbelievable. We have had five general transfers such as this, which is nothing but generational theft. So what this amendment will do is cause us to do our job by year-end.

I urge a ''yes'' vote. I thank our cosponsors and hope this amendment will pass.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Franken	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murphy
Begich	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Grassley	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hagan	Paul
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coats	Landrieu	Thune
Coburn	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Manchin	Walsh
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	McCain	Warren
Enzi	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Flake	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—31

Ayotte	Heller	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Cornyn	Kirk	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	
Hatch	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3584

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the Lee amendment.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the amendment we are about to consider would empower States to collect and spend on the transportation infrastructure they need. We have a desperate need within our transportation infrastructure system that is not being satisfied by our current Federal system, one that has been bloated over the years and has centralized too much power within Washington, DC. This has resulted in gridlock within our transportation infrastructure projects. We increased the Federal gasoline tax by 460 percent between 1982 and 1994. Instead of using that to back up and secure the Federal highway trust fund, we instead overreached. We instead expanded dramatically the power of the Federal Government and the expenses we incur.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this measure which would reempower States and move our interests further in the 21st century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to speak to Senators for a minute and tell Members this amendment is the end of the Federal highway system. The States oppose it.

My friend from Utah gave a very impassioned speech earlier in which he essentially said: Free the States. Let them be free. But the States oppose this amendment. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials strongly oppose it and so does the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Trucking Associations, American Society of Civil Engineers, the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association. The fact is it would result in an immediate 80-percent cut to our States at a time when we still have 700,000 unemployed construction workers and thousands of businesses that are waiting—just waiting—to rebuild the infrastructure.

I hope Members will vote no on this radical amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 69, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Chambliss	Grassley	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	
Cruz	Moran	

NAYS—69

Baldwin	Cantwell	Enzi
Barrasso	Cardin	Feinstein
Begich	Carper	Franken
Bennet	Casey	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Cochran	Hagan
Blunt	Collins	Harkin
Booker	Coons	Hatch
Boxer	Donnelly	Heinrich
Brown	Durbin	Heitkamp

Heller	McCaskill	Schumer
Hirono	McConnell	Shaheen
Hoeven	Menendez	Shelby
Johanns	Merkley	Stabenow
Johnson (SD)	Mikulski	Tester
Kaine	Murkowski	Thune
King	Murphy	Udall (CO)
Kirk	Murray	Udall (NM)
Klobuchar	Nelson	Walsh
Landrieu	Pryor	Warner
Leahy	Reed	Warren
Levin	Reid	Whitehouse
Manchin	Rockefeller	Wicker
Markey	Sanders	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 3585

There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Toomey amendment.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, in 2011 the Federal Highway Administration estimated the average transportation project in America takes 79 months to go through the National Environmental Policy Act review process—6½ years to get permission to build a road or a bridge. Ben Nelson, a Democrat from Nebraska, recognized the problem and suggested an amendment. The amendment simply says if a bridge or a road is damaged or destroyed by a declared natural disaster or emergency and we rebuild the bridge or road in the exact same place, with the same footprint, the same dimensions—everything is the same—then we don't have to go through the entire environmental permitting process again. This would save a lot of time and money and allow us to maintain our roads and bridges.

I know my friends on the other side think this problem was solved. It was not solved. The Department of Transportation can exclude certain projects, but can choose not to, and does not have the discretion to provide an exclusion for the Army Corps of Engineers or the Fish and Wildlife Service—the very reviews that take the most time and cost the most money. So I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this issue was dealt with in MAP–21 in the committee. My friend from Pennsylvania talks about using regular order, and we did. We had a very serious debate and we had many different views and we compromised, and there is an expedited process to deal with replacement facilities. It is in MAP–21. It deals with a way to get this done.

The problem with the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is it totally eliminates all of the protections that are in the law. It eliminates all of the protections under the Clean Water Act and under the NEPA process.

We handled this in the committee. It was bipartisan. It was done. There is no need for this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Ayotte	Fischer	McCaskill
Barrasso	Flake	McConnell
Begich	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heitkamp	Portman
Chambliss	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Hagan	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 5021, as amended.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Baldwin	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Begich	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Nelson
Blunt	Heitkamp	Pryor
Booker	Heller	Reed
Boozman	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johanns	Shaheen
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Stabenow
Casey	Kaine	Tester
Chambliss	King	Thune
Coats	Kirk	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Klobuchar	Udall (NM)
Collins	Landrieu	Vitter
Coons	Leahy	Walsh
Corker	Levin	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Warren
Durbin	Markey	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Feinstein	McConnell	Wyden
Fischer	Menendez	
Franken	Merkley	

NAYS—18

Burr	Hatch	Risch
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cornyn	Lee	Scott
Crapo	McCain	Sessions
Cruz	Paul	Shelby
Flake	Portman	Toomey

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Roberts	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 5021, as amended, is passed.

PROVIDING FOR THE CORRECTION OF THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5021

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 108, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 5021.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the concurrent resolution is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) was agreed to.

SUPPORTING ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST HAMAS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 526) supporting Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 526) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution is sponsored by me, the Republican leader, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator CORKER, and others.

I want the record to reflect that Senator MCCONNELL and I have talked about this personally and we have agreed, without any hesitation, about this legislation.

I have always been a supporter of the United Nations my whole career.

What I saw last week disgusted me. As the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva voted to adopt a resolution accusing Israel of human rights violations in the ongoing Gaza conflict, the resolution was so incredibly one-sided and anti-Israel biased that it makes zero—none—mention of Hamas and the atrocities Hamas has committed by indiscriminately barraging Israel and using Palestinian civilians as human shields.

Hamas perpetrated this conflict. They wantonly fire rockets, and they don't care where the rockets go. Hamas has fired almost 3,000 missiles during a 3-week conflict.

In fact, the very day the U.N. Human Rights Council exonerated Hamas, it fired dozens of rockets into Israel the same day.

These aren't firecrackers. These are very violent, powerful weapons. They have a number of rockets. It is estimated they have 10,000 of them.

They have something called WS–1E. It is a Chinese rocket, but they got the blueprints—Iran did from the Chinese—and, of course, they shipped these surreptitiously into Gaza. They will travel some 30 miles and they carry about 40 pounds of explosives.

They have another one called the Fajr-5. This is an Iranian rocket. It is the most prestigious weapon of Hamas.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard gave Hamas the technology to manufacture those. They carry a warhead of 400 pounds. They will travel about 55 miles. I repeat, these aren't firecrackers.

They have another missile in their arsenal. It is called a Khaibar M–302. It is a Syrian-made missile with a range of some 12 miles. They carry a 300-pound warhead and, of course, it goes far enough that they believe that with the Fajr and this one, Tel Aviv is within their sights.

The one they have the most of is called the Qassam-1 manufactured in Gaza, with no guidance system, a 3-mile distance, and a 10-pound warhead; the Qassam-2 has 9-mile distance and a 20-pound warhead.

They have something called a Grads. They have lots of weapons—lots of them—and they indiscriminately fire into Israel. These aren't grenade launchers; these are missiles, huge weapons. These rockets are professionally engineered from Iran, Syria, and other countries. They are smuggled into Gaza. They manufacture a few of their own, as I have indicated. These are serious weapons of war.

Hamas also continues to try to construct and use its sophisticated tunnels into Israel, which as one Member of Hamas recently bragged, allow Hamas fighters to invade Israel and kill Israelis.

Hamas's responsibility in the Gaza clash is a fact, but the U.N. Human Rights Council didn't make a single mention of this terrorist organization.

How many of these nations, such as Venezuela, China, Vietnam, and other nations—I wonder how this organization feels about their human rights. How many of these nations which condemned Israel would allow their own citizens to suffer through endless rocket fire—endless rocket fire.

I talked to one American doctor who goes to Israel, as he does often, and all night long there was one air raid siren after another. It has been going on there for weeks. This U.N. resolution that was passed does not mention a single word, nothing.

What is Israel supposed to do?

We all lament the loss of life. It is heartrending. But what else is Israel to do after rocket after rocket after rocket plunges into its territory.

I met with a man today who owns an oil company, oil exploration. They do oil exploration in Nevada. It is called Noble Energy. They are the ones who helped develop gas and oil fields in Israel. This is relatively new, but they say there are rockets dropping all over.

As I mentioned earlier this morning, Iron Dome doesn't protect all of Israel. They need more Iron Domes. Everyone, no matter what they are doing, they can be out in Gaza working in the oil fields and missiles are flying all over from Hamas.

I condemn Hamas's terrorism. We should. Their terrorism is not only against Israel; it is against their own people. As I heard the Republican conservative columnist in the New York Times David Brooks say in the NewsHour—I am paraphrasing, but this is what he said: This is the first conflict I have known where the enemy says: Kill more of us.

I join my friend the Republican leader in doing what other nations refuse to do: condemning the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased resolution. We in this resolution condemn Hamas. The countries that have voted for this are Venezuela, Cuba, China. I repeat, how would they like to look at their human rights violations?

In this resolution, we as a country support in this conflict a lasting peace which can only be realized through the demilitarization of Gaza.

They talked about tunnels. These are not tunnels; these are major operations costing millions of dollars to dig a hole in the ground.

Why? To go into Israeli settlements and kill innocent people.

In offering the resolution before the Senate we stand with Israel and its right to defend itself, its security, and most importantly its people.

I said earlier I am disgusted—as someone who has been a supporter of the United Nations ever since I have been in government—and the United Nations better take a look at this organization. This is ''disgusting''—I use it for the third time, as I mean it.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MEDICARE

Mr. MERKLEY. I rise today to address a topic that is vital to seniors in

Oregon and to seniors across our Nation, and that is our Medicare program.

I know how important Medicare is because I grew up in a blue-collar working family. My dad was a millwright and a mechanic. He believed in hard work. He took a lot of satisfaction from his job. A millwright is the individual who does all the mechanical work to keep the mill running. He said if he did his job right, the mill was open, the workers had a payday, the company made money, and everyone was happy.

Meanwhile, my mother managed the finances, and she stretched a dollar as far as anyone possibly could. She shopped for bargains. She used coupons. She collected Green Stamps, and they were able to save, to buy a home, and to have a foundation for raising their children.

I benefited from that enormously.

But despite the foundation they had, their prospects in retirement were dependent upon two critical programs: Social Security and Medicare. Social Security and Medicare—a basic pension and affordable health care—are simply essential for millions of working families in retirement. They are the difference between poverty and stability. The way I see it, Medicare is a covenant with our seniors. It is a covenant with the 650,000 Oregonians who are on Medicare now. It is a covenant with the hundreds of thousands who will utilize Medicare in the years to come. It is certainly a covenant with the millions across America who depend on it—families. Those working families across America are families like my parents, who worked hard their whole lives, paid into Medicare, and expect Medicare to be there for them when they retire. We cannot break that covenant.

The first step in keeping faith with our seniors is this: protecting what works. Pretty simple. We would think that is a no-brainer. But in fact, in Washington, a simple proposition like this—a no-brainer—is sometimes enormously controversial.

For several years now, many in Washington here, and including this Chamber, have been pushing to privatize, to voucherize or to just plain weaken Medicare. They don't understand how important this program is for the secure retirement of our seniors. They don't understand how important this covenant is between each working generation and our retirees. In fact, the House of Representatives has repeatedly voted to effectively end the Medicare Program that Americans know and love and to stick our seniors with an enormous financial burden in their retirement years. This is just a simple way to describe that, and that is to say it is simply wrong.

Others have said: Let's raise the Medicare retirement age to 67 or perhaps 70. I think, when I hear that, about my townhalls. In my townhalls—and I hold one in every county in every year—people come and talk about whatever they would like. I recall a woman coming to a townhall and she said: Senator, I am in my early sixties. I have several major health problems. She went on to describe them, and she said: I am just trying to stay alive until I can make it to age 65 and have access to Medicare.

I have heard that theme of just trying to make it until they can reach that Medicare age in townhall after townhall.

Sometimes those who work in offices, in company circumstances, don't realize how much actual physical labor takes a toll on the body. If someone is working in a post office and moving bags of mail day in and day out, as one good friend of mine has done throughout his career, it is very likely one would have a bad back and so on and so forth. Then of course there are the diseases that strike like lightning.

Yes, those who happen to have jobs with corporations that provide a wonderful health care program are in a little better shape. But for our seniors, Medicare is a gem—a gem they have contributed into their entire lives, and it needs to be there for them.

So for some who see the difference between 65 and 67 as some modest administrative change, for working Americans it is a monumental chasm and they fear falling into it.

The good news is there is a very simple action the Senate could take right now to protect our covenant with our seniors. The Medicare Protection Act, which I have cosponsored along with Senator PRYOR and others, makes three modest but important changes to our law: It expresses the sense of the Senate that the Medicare eligibility age should not be increased. It expresses the sense of the Senate that the Medicare Program should not be privatized or voucherized. Third, it amends the Congressional Budget Act so that any attempt to reduce or eliminate guaranteed benefits or to restrict eligibility criteria, such as raising the eligibility age, cannot be passed through the budget reconciliation process. This is particularly important since the House has made repeated attempts to end Medicare as we know it, and to do so using the budget process—the Ryan budget—rather than through stand-alone legislation.

It is time to ensure that we keep our covenant with our seniors. It is time to bring this bill to the floor, to debate it, and to pass it.

Tomorrow happens to be the anniversary on which Medicare was signed into law 49 years ago. Maybe a great way to celebrate the 49th birthday of Medicare would be for this Chamber to debate this bill tomorrow and pass it. If not tomorrow, I would like to see it done in this work period. And if not in this work period, let's come back and address this in September.

The days that are left in this 2-year cycle of the Senate are rapidly disappearing, and our seniors are concerned about this constant attack, this constant effort to undermine these programs such as Social Security and Medicare that they have paid into throughout their life and that they expect to be honored when they are retired.

Let's bring this bill to the floor. Let's ensure that American seniors can stop worrying about these assaults on their retirement—retirement security they so much deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

(The remarks of Mr. HELLER pertaining to the introduction of (S. 2658) are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HELLER. I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, first let me express my thanks to Senator GRASSLEY for letting me step ahead of him and I thank the Senator as well for a number of courageous votes today. I also express my gratitude to him and to the Presiding Officer.

I understand earlier on the vote on final passage of the transportation funding legislation 79 Senators voted for the bill as amended. That is a resounding majority of Democrats and Republicans.

The year when Senator GRASSLEY—longer ago than the Presiding Officer and I combined—came here, the idea was for Democrats and Republicans to work together to try to find the middle, to find principled compromises. It has been a while since the Senate actually did that. I feel as though today we were the Senate again. It is gratifying to me, and I just want to thank everyone who voted for the Corker-Boxer-Carper amendment, for Senator WYDEN's support, for everybody who helped to make that amendment part of the bill and supported it in final passage. I hope it sends a message to our friends in the House that will not be lost on them. I hope before they just reject it out of order they will sleep on it and when they wake up in the morning maybe we can have a good conversation. That is not why I rose tonight, but I wanted to get that off my chest and appreciate the chance to do that.

I rise this evening in support of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill introduced, I believe, last week by Senator MIKULSKI.

The bill as you will recall will provide some $2.7 billion in order to address the humanitarian challenge that is playing out in recent weeks on our southern border with Mexico. This money will ensure that the agencies

charged with securing our borders don't run out of money this summer. More importantly, it will address some of the underlying root causes of the problems we face along our southern border.

As we all know, we are facing an unprecedented surge in migration from three countries. They are El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. A large number of migrants from these countries are families. Some of them are unaccompanied children. Some of those unaccompanied children are as young as 4, 5 and 6 years old. Let me be clear. These children and these families are not slipping past our borders unprotected. They are being apprehended in large numbers by the Border Patrol almost as soon as they touch U.S. soil. Some of them, many of them actually, turn themselves in voluntarily to our Border Patrol.

Although the influx has slowed in recent weeks, the sheer number of children and families coming across our southern border in South Texas earlier this summer overwhelmed the Border Patrol—overwhelmed Health and Human Services and other Federal agencies. The administration and Secretary Jeh Johnson, Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, have responded to this situation with what I will describe as an ''all hands on deck'' approach.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency is coordinating the DHS-wide response to the problem. The Department of Defense has provided space on some of its military installations to house unaccompanied minors until Health and Human Services can find a placement for them. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has greatly expanded its ability to detain and remove families, and we have surged Border Patrol agents, immigration judges, and other personnel to the border to help process these people.

These measures have been working. For example, the amount of time people are detained before they are removed has decreased significantly in recent weeks, but these emergency measures are expensive and none of the Federal agencies involved have the money they need to sustain the aggressive steps they are taking to deal with this situation.

The consequences of not moving forward with this legislation are severe. Let me give some examples of what failing to act will mean. Without this emergency funding, Immigration and Customs Enforcement could be forced to release thousands of people currently being detained and to stop operating repatriation flights. Health and Human Services could be forced to cut back on the number of children it can care for. Children would be forced to stay longer at Border Patrol stations and Border Patrol agents would spend more of their time taking care of children and less time pursuing the smuggling networks operating along our borders.

Some of my colleagues are suggesting that we will not be able to pass this supplemental until September and that the administration can just move money around until then to make up for the shortfall. That may have been more feasible earlier in the fiscal year, but doing so now will likely have some significant unintended consequences. For example, it would impair our border security because DHS may have to reduce aerial support for the Border Patrol or stop replacing the badly needed x-ray machines at our ports of entry. Our ability to respond to natural disasters could also be harmed.

I also understand my colleagues in the House introduced a bill today that would provide $659 million to deal with this crisis. That is roughly one-quarter of what Senator MIKULSKI has introduced, and $659 million is just a drop in the bucket from what is needed. Incredibly our friends in the House are offsetting this funding by raiding other critical operations which is what Senator MIKULSKI's bill is trying to avoid. Failing to move an emergency supplemental this week would be in my view unconscionable. I urge all my colleagues to do the right thing and make sure we deal with this before we leave for 5 weeks.

Dealing with the challenge we are facing on the border is, rightly, our main focus right now. However, we cannot lose sight of the root causes that are driving the surge in migration in the first place. In this country all too often we focus so much of our attention on dealing with symptoms of problems and not enough attention on addressing the underlying causes. This is particularly true on our borders. Listen to this. Since 2003 we have spent $223 billion—that is almost one-quarter of a trillion dollars—enforcing our immigration and customs laws, strengthening our borders, strengthening the security of our borders—almost one-quarter of a trillion dollars. We have spent a small fraction of this—a very small fraction—actually less than 1 percent helping El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras improve conditions for their citizens.

I commend the President and Chairman MIKULSKI for including $300 million in this emergency supplemental request aimed at addressing what I am convinced are the root causes of this problem. What are they? The lack of economic hope, lack of jobs in Central America, combined with increasing violence and insecurity in the region. I know. I have been there. I have been to two of those three countries, Guatemala and El Salvador. This year down to Mexico, down to Colombia, which 20 years ago was just about a failed nation. Remember in Columbia roughly 20 years ago when a bunch of gunmen rounded up the Supreme Court judges in the country and took them out and shot them to death? That was Colombia 20 years ago. They are no longer a failed nation. They came back from the brink. They are a strong partner of ours, along with Mexico, to turn this situation around in these three Central American countries which are the source of all this migration to our country.

Based on my recent conversation with Central American leaders as recently as last week, the Ambassadors of these three small countries as well as the Ambassador to Mexico, and based on trips to the region, I believe one of the critical needs is to foster economic growth and create jobs. How might we do that? One, by helping restore their rule of law. In those countries we have police who don't police. We have prosecutors who don't prosecute and we have judges who don't adjudicate. We have prisons that either don't rehabilitate or punish. We have kidnappings and extortions. We have people who are scared to stay there and live there and they are bailing. They are voting with their feet. We need to help them restore the rule of law, much as we helped other countries such as Colombia from the last two decades.

Their energy costs are roughly three times what they ought to be. Most of their energy from the electricity grid comes from petroleum. They could use natural gas and spend half of what they spend for energy. They need to improve their education and workforce skills and access to capital. Those are some of the ways to strengthen their economy.

I am not suggesting any of this will be quick or easy to do. It will require a sustained investment and focus on the region by the United States and also by a number of others. This is not our job alone. This is a shared responsibility, and we need to keep that in mind. But it can be done. In fact, we have already done it with two of our most important allies in Latin America, as I mentioned Colombia and more recently with Mexico, where the economic situation was so bad that more than 1 million Mexicans were traveling across our borders every year—more than 1 million. Today both countries have vibrant democracies and vibrant economies and their citizens have hope for their future. Now there are more Mexicans leaving this country going back to Mexico than are coming this way.

I will say again what I just said. We cannot and we should not do this alone. This is not all on America. This needs to be a shared responsibility with the governments of these three countries, with all the partners in the region, including Mexico and Colombia, with all the private sector nonprofits and institutions of faith. Three hundred million dollars as an emergency supplemental

is a downpayment on what will need to be a long-term commitment to our neighbors in the region. This cannot be one and done. If we are serious about addressing the surge, we will need to do more, and frankly so will others—and I would underline ''so will others.''

Based on what I have seen, this crisis requires a holistic approach and one that tackles the underlying causes that are pushing people out of Central America and the factors that are pulling them to our borders.

If we turn our backs on these countries I am convinced we will be back 10 years from now dealing with another expensive humanitarian crisis on our border. We don't need that in any of these countries.

I urge all my colleagues to put politics aside and pass this emergency supplemental.

I yield the floor. Thank you so much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware and I came to Washington together, and I am so proud of the work he is doing and what he has done. He has been a Member of Congress, Governor, and now Senator and chairman of the Homeland Security Committee. He has done a remarkably good job, and I am very proud of the work he does.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President,

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY OLKEWICZ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Senate staffer who is retiring after 36 years of service. Nancy Pittore Olkewicz began her Senate career in February 1978 working for Senator Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, who was her home State Senator. She remained on his staff for 23 years, which included the birth of her three children. She values her time with Senator Sarbanes and is especially grateful for the opportunity to work part-time while her three children, Jenny, Brian and Eric, were small.

After leaving Senator Sarbanes' office in 2001, Nancy joined the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where she worked for me on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. She later joined the Legislative Branch subcommittee and served as clerk under Senators DURBIN, LANDRIEU and Ben Nelson. During that time she represented Appropriations Committee chairman Robert C. Byrd on the Capitol Preservation Commission and was instrumental in many high-level decisions regarding the construction and operation of the Capitol Visitor Center. Nancy joined the staff of the Senate Sergeant at Arms in 2011 as the legislative liaison to then-Sergeant at Arms Terry Gainer.

I wish Nancy the best of luck in all of her future endeavors. She will be greatly missed by many in the Senate.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I previously filed budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for budget year 2015 pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. Today I am adjusting those levels to account for three reported bills from the Appropriations Committee.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act allows the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Committee on Appropriations reported three bills that are eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act:

1) The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, which includes $8.625 billion in budget authority and $2.5 billion in outlays that is designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding.

2) The Homeland Security Appropriations Act, which includes $213 million in budget authority and $170 million in outlays that is designated as OCO funding and $6.438 billion in budget authority and $322 million in outlays that is designated as disaster funding.

3) The Defense Appropriations Act, which includes $59.719 billion in budget authority and $28.368 billion in outlays that is designated as OCO funding.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2015 by a total of $74.995 billion in budget authority and $31.360 billion in outlays. I am also revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the appropriations committee for 2015 by $16.416 billion in revised nonsecurity budget authority, $58.579 billion in revised security budget authority, and $31.360 billion in total outlays.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

$s in millions	2014	2015
Current Spending Aggregates*:		
Budget Authority	2,842,558	2,940,213
Outlays	2,819,514	3,004,326
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	0	74,995
Outlays	0	31,360
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,842,558	3,015,208
Outlays	2,819,514	3,035,686

*Current Spending Aggregates were revised on 6/16/2014 and 7/16/2014 to include a disaster cap adjustment for the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee and a deficit neutral reserve fund adjustment for terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

In millions of dollars	Current Allocation/limit*	Adjustments**	Adjusted Allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2015:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority	521,272	58,579	579,851
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	492,456	16,416	508,872
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,160,543	31,360	1,191,903
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority	1,013,728	74,995	1,088,723

*Current Allocation/limit to the nonsecurity category was revised on 6/16/2014 to include a disaster cap adjustment for the Agriculture subcommittee.

**Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2015 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(A) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
Defense:					
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	59.719	59.719
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.000	28.368	28.368
Homeland Security:					
Budget Authority	0.000	6.438	0.000	0.213	6.651
Outlays	0.000	0.322	0.000	0.170	0.492
State-Foreign Operations:					
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.625	8.625
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.500	2.500
Total:					
Budget Authority	0.000	6.438	0.000	68.557	74.995

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2015 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(A) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—Continued

$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
Outlays	0.000	0.322	0.000	31.038	31.360
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category:					
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	58.579	58.579
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	6.438	0.000	9.978	16.416
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.322	0.000	31.038	31.360

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CORPORAL GARY L. MOORE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Army CPL Gary L. Moore. Corporal Moore died March 16, 2009 of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device blew up next to his vehicle in Baghdad, Iraq.

Gary was born on January 18, 1984 in Del City, OK and graduated from Westmoore High School in Oklahoma City, OK in 2003. After graduation, he worked as a mall security guard before enlisting in the Army in January 2007.

Starting his career at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, Gary was reassigned to the 978th Military Police Company, 93rd Military Police Battalion in Fort Bliss, TX, where he deployed to Iraq in June 2008 to help provide training and oversight of the Iraqi police force.

BG David Phillips, the chief of the military police corps, praised Gary's unit for their service and accomplishments in Iraq. He said people in Baghdad are beginning to experience normal lives again because of the work of Moore and others. ''This past fall, when the elementary schools reopened, young girls were able to go to school,'' Phillips said.

Engaged to be married on November 14, 2009, his fiancee Randi Ivie said, ''He loved life. He wasn't a stranger to anyone. He always had a good smile and a strong handshake.''

Funeral services for Gary were held on March 24, 2009 and he was laid to rest with full military honors in Sunnylane Cemetery in Del City, OK.

At the funeral service, Sam Davison, the church's head pastor said ''Gary was 38 years younger than me, but he was one of my heroes. I'm proud of the service that he rendered. I'm proud of his bravery. I'm proud of Gary.''

Today we remember Army CPL Gary L. Moore, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL STEPHEN S. THOMPSON

Mr. President, I would also like to remember the life and sacrifices of CPL Stephen S. Thompson who died on February 14, 2009 of injuries sustained from small arms fire in Baghdad, Iraq.

Stephen was born on July 14, 1985 in Tulsa, OK and was a 2004 graduate of Memorial High School in Tulsa, OK. After enlisting in the Army on June 27, 2006, he attended boot camp at Fort Sill, OK. He was then assigned to the 1st Battalion, 22nd Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, TX. The unit had deployed to Iraq in March 2008 and was set to return home within weeks.

BG Ross Ridge, the deputy commander of Fort Sill, said Stephen ''constantly exuded enthusiasm'' and always sought more responsibility to lead men. To his fellow soldiers, he ''was an instant friend and confidante,'' the general said.

Corporal Thompson was buried at Floral Haven Cemetery, in Broken Arrow, OK. Army pallbearers from Fort Sill escorted his flag-draped coffin to the gravesite and an honor guard fired rifle volleys and a bugler played ''Taps.''

''I am so proud of my son. Stephen became a man the day he joined. This young man changed overnight. I remember when I went to his graduation from boot camp, I couldn't hardly believe who the person that was standing in front of me,'' his father Philip Thompson said.

Stephen is survived by his mother Tresa, his father Philip, and two brothers, Austin and Christopher of Tulsa, OK.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Stephen's family and friends. He lived a life of love for his family and country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom.

CHINESE DRYWALL

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, there has been an important development in the effort to bring fairness for the victims of poisonous drywall that was imported from China. Drywall sourced from China was found to emit dangerous chemicals that make people sick and damage metal components of air conditioning and other electronics, among other effects. In Louisiana, the defective drywall came at a particularly troubling time. Just as we were starting to rebuild after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the defective Chinese drywall was imported in large quantities. Many homeowners returned after their houses were rebuilt only to soon find them to be inhabitable yet again. We are still fighting today almost 9 years after the storm to bring justice to the affected families.

Some other companies, specifically German-owned entities, that supplied defected drywall from China have participated in the legal process and made settlements that have been helpful to homeowners. However, the Chinese company Taishan, a state-owned entity, refuses to take responsibility for its harmful products and continues to disregard U.S. law and our court system. If the homeowners' contractors got drywall from Taishan, they have thus far been out of luck in seeking fair compensation as Taishan continues to ignore our court system.

In February 2014, the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans upheld a $2.7 million default judgment requiring Taishan to cover the cost of removing its defective drywall. Even after losing the appeal, Taishan let the deadline pass for an appeal to the Supreme Court, meaning the case was back in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana and Judge Eldon Fallon. Earlier this month, Taishan disregarded our legal system and refused to appear in court proceedings in this case. Judge Fallon ruled that Taishan was in contempt of court for failing to appear to address the default judgment entered against the company. He ordered Taishan to pay $15,000 in attorney's fees of the plaintiffs and $40,000 in penalties. Most importantly, his ruling banned Taishan and any of its affiliates or subsidiaries from doing business in the United States unless and until it participates in the court's process on this ongoing case. To help ensure enforcement of the order, the court sent notice of its ruling to the Federal Government.

I applaud the court's effort to protect the integrity of our legal system in taking action to force the Chinese company to comply with the law and the court's orders. If state-owned Chinese companies such as Taishan want to do business in the United States, they must follow the law and must honor our legal system. If they will not honor commitments and work to resolve claims, how can we expect any Americans to trust any business relations with or products from Chinese government controlled companies? Our government must insist that Taishan return to the table and participate in the legal process.

To help stop this situation from happening again, I worked to pass into law bipartisan legislation to stop unsafe drywall from entering U.S. markets by

ensuring that the Consumer Product Safety Commission follows a voluntary consensus health and safety standard. Enacted in 2013, this law also ensures that unsafe drywall will not be reused by requiring that it be labeled and that its manufacturers are identified. I specifically offered an amendment to focus the emphasis of the legislation on high sulfur content, the main damaging element emitted from the defective drywall, and to make the origin of the drywall traceable to the manufacturer. This law protects homeowners going forward, but it cannot help the homeowners still looking for justice now. We know that the harmful drywall came from China, and the remedy for these homeowners is for Taishan to follow the court's order, come to the table, and reach a fair settlement.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, due to family commitments in Florida, I was unable to vote on the confirmation of Pamela Harris to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Had I been present, I would have voted against Ms. Harris's confirmation.

The Senate has few responsibilities more important than providing advice and consent on the President's judicial nominations. These are lifetime appointments with great power, whose decisions directly impact the life, liberty, and property of the parties who come before them.

Americans deserve a judiciary staffed by lawyers who are not just highly capable but who are also men and women of a particular character. We rightfully expect judges to understand their important but properly limited role to say what the law is, without bias, without agenda. As passionately as a judge may feel about a particular issue, when he or she puts on that black robe, all personal views must be set aside.

No one can deny Ms. Harris has a first rate mind or that she has built an impressive career. Unfortunately, many of her statements during that career suggest that her mind is better suited to academia, or elective office, than it is to the bench. She has identified herself as ''profoundly liberal'' and said she views the Constitution as ''profoundly progressive.'' These types of statements, along with troubling interpretations of the First Amendment among other issues, paint a picture of a nominee more likely to become a liberal activist judge than one who neutrally applies the law.

For those reasons, I would not have supported granting Ms. Harris the profound power that comes with lifetime tenure on the Federal bench.

TRIBUTE TO BRYSON BACHMAN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Bryson Bachman, who has served as a critical member of my staff for nearly 3 years, and as my chief counsel for the past year.

Bryson Bachman is an extraordinary judicial talent. His legal pedigree began at Harvard Law School and continued in his clerkship with the Honorable Thomas B. Griffith on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit and later as an associate at Sidley Austin. Bryson's talent and contribution do not come solely from his impressive background and experience but from his personal commitment to making a difference and adding value in everything he does.

I have valued and benefited greatly from his deep understanding of the law and his ability to approach each issue in a thoughtful, respectful and insightful way. Above all I have come to admire and trust him as a person of unmatched integrity. As a member of the judiciary committee Bryson's assistance and guidance have been invaluable. When he briefs an issue I know he has done the often unseen and unrecognized work of truly understanding the issue from all angles. His willingness to do the heavy mental lifting on a wide range of issues always provided me great confidence going into important judiciary hearings or voting on difficult legislation.

The test of a great leader and a great lawyer is not found simply by what they do in a given role, but more importantly, how they do it. Some walk into a room and people recognize them as the smartest person in the room. True leaders, such as Bryson Bachman, walk into that same room, as the smartest person in the room, but leave everyone in the room feeling smarter and better as a result of how the dialogue and discussion were fostered. Creating space for every member of the team to participate in and contribute to a discussion, while still driving the most salient points to consider and evaluating an array of scenarios, is the hallmark of Bryson's time as a member of my staff.

Bryson will be sorely missed in our office but we wish him, his wife Destiny and son Hamilton continued success in their next season of life and work. This CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is but a small note in history of Bryson Bachman's impact on the important work done in the Senate. However, his more important work and longer lasting impact is found in the imprint he has made on the hearts and minds of those with whom he has worked. I count myself as one of those deeply influenced by Bryson. I admire him for his talent, I acknowledge him for his loyal service and thank him for his friendship.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING MOOREMART

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I recognize and commend MooreMart, an outstanding charitable organization based in Nashua, NH, that is devoted to supporting America's servicemen and women. For more than 10 years, MooreMart has shipped care packages to American soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq—lifting the spirit of our brave military members serving in harm's way.

What began in February 2004 as a family project started by Paul Moore and Carole Moore Biggio to support their brother—New Hampshire Army National Guard SSG Brian Moore, who was deployed to Iraq—has developed into a major volunteer effort. Over the past decade, MooreMart has sent more than 63,000 care packages to our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. Their effort came to be known as ''MooreMart,'' because the soldiers receiving the packages remarked that the boxes ''carry more supplies than WalMart.'' It's a clever nickname that is now well known in the Granite State

Once word spread about MooreMart's wartime effort, hundreds of New Hampshire citizens, and dozens of organizations and businesses, gave their support to this very special organization. At packing events held several times throughout the year at the Nashua National Guard Armory, volunteers have assembled packages containing goods that make deployments a little easier—including candy, toothpaste, dental floss, energy bars, trail mix, lip balm, playing cards, puzzles, white tube socks, crackers, and notes of encouragement. At Christmas, MooreMart has sent Christmas stockings filled with candy canes, Christmas lights, and cookies. In addition to sending these goodies to our troops, they have also treated veterans in New Hampshire and remembered our wounded warriors at Walter Reed.

MooreMart's generosity has also extended to children in Iraq and Afghanistan, sending them school supplies and toys. Through these donations, Afghan and Iraqi children have seen the warmth and generosity of the American people.

The Moore family and all the MooreMart volunteers represent the very best of New Hampshire and our Nation: patriotic Americans coming together to support our troops. This exemplary organization has touched the lives of our brave soldiers serving on faraway battlefields—making sure they know they're not forgotten during tough deployments.

As MooreMart celebrates its 10th Anniversary, I join citizens across New Hampshire and the Nation in commending Paul Moore and Carole Moore Biggio, the Moore family, and all the

tremendous MooreMart volunteers for the inspiring work they have done supporting our troops.●

RECOGNIZING STEWART'S 96 RANCH

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of the founding of Stewart's 96 Ranch in Paradise Valley, NV, which serves as an example of the rich and prosperous history that makes the Silver State so unique.

This year commemorates a very special year—not only for Stewart's 96 Ranch, but also in Nevada's history—during which we celebrate 150 years of statehood. From those days of bitter conflict, Nevada forged a State dedicated to preserving liberty and bettering America. Our dramatic entrance is why our State calls itself Battle Born and why Nevadans, over the past 150 years, have been entrepreneurial, fiercely independent, and as diverse as our terrain. It is an honor to recognize Stewart's 96 Ranch in conjunction with our great State's sesquicentennial here today.

Founded in 1864 by William Stock, a German immigrant, Stewart's 96 Ranch is one of Nevada's most iconic ranching operations. Over the past 15 decades, the ranch has faced many obstacles, from aiding our country in World War II efforts to constantly maintaining and modernizing the operation to keep up with the current demands. Due to the ranch's long and fascinating history, it was chosen as the subject of a 1980 Library of Congress project called ''Buckaroos in Paradise.'' It is considered to be one of the most iconic cattle ranches in the West and one of the last true ''old time outfits'' still in original family ownership. Over the years, the ranch has grown and changed, but the original love of Paradise Valley and commitment to agriculture has never wavered.

What started as a simple homestead has grown into a thriving ranch with a new cattle herd that has grown to nearly 800 mother cows and is continuing to flourish. Today, the ranch is still owned and operated by the fourth and fifth generations of William Stock's direct descendants. Fred Stewart, with the help of his wife Kris and daughter Patrice, currently manages the ranch. Fifth generation Patrice Stewart is now a young woman who owns and manages her own small herd of top commercial beef cattle on the ranch, actively helps her parents on the ranch and is involved in all ranch decisions. She also competes in youth and high school rodeo and takes a leadership role in her local Future Farmers of America. Patrice is the future of the ranch and one day aims to manage the same Paradise Valley ranch that her great-great-grandfather William Stock founded in 1864.

Stewart's 96 Ranch truly exemplifies what it means to be a Nevadan, and I am proud to recognize it and the generations of Stewarts that have worked to ensure the survival of one of Nevada's oldest and largest family-owned ranches. Today, I ask my colleagues and residents of the Silver State to join me in recognizing Stewart's 96 Ranch for this great achievement and honor.●

REMEMBERING WAYMAN GRAY SHERRER

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, it is proper that we note the death of an American patriot who served the U.S. government with dedication for many years. The Nation lost Wayman Gray Sherrer, 86, on March 12, 2014. He graduated from the fine Howard College, now Samford University, where he was senior class president, and the University of Alabama School of Law in the class of 1956. Before college, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Following law school, he served 6 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after which he was elected county solicitor (district attorney) for Blount County, AL. In 1969, he was appointed U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Alabama and served ably in that position for 8 years. During that time, I served as an assistant U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Alabama and came to know him. We maintained contact over the years and were able to talk over those special times. He served his county and country with distinction, was active in community and civic affairs, and as a member of the Lester Memorial United Methodist Church.

Wayman loved his country and served her with fidelity. I was proud to know him.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13441 WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To The Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2014.

Certain ongoing activities, such as continuing arms transfers to Hizballah, which include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems, undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 29, 2014.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 653. An act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1104. An act to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 2:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 594. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to Federal research on muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1771. An act to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2952. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3107. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3202. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3635. An act to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3696. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3846. An act to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4156. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4250. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4490. An act to enhance the missions, objectives, and effectiveness of United States international communications, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office''.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Galvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Galvez.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1771. An act to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2952. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3107. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3202. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3635. An act to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3696. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3846. An act to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4156. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4490. An act to enhance the missions, objectives, and effectiveness of United States international communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4572. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2673. A bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

H.R. 3393. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2685. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 29, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 653. An act to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1104. An act to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6621. A communication from the Director, Office of Special Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program'' (CFDA No. 84.133A–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6622. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of one (1) officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6623. A communication from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, the Board's Report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated December 26, 2013); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6624. A communication from the Director, Office of Special Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Research Fellowships Program'' (CFDA No. 84.133F–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6625. A communication from the Director, Office of Special Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133B–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6626. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings'' (RIN9000–AM64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6627. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–76; Introduction'' (FAC 2005–76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6628. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments'' (FAC 2005–76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6629. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–76; Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2005–76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6630. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules Regarding the Health Insurance Premium Tax Credit'' ((RIN1545–BM23) (TD 9683)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6631. A communication from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2014 Annual Report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6632. A communication from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Disability Insurance (DI) Trust Fund becoming inadequate within the next 10 years and the Board's 2014 Annual Report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6633. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington and Imported Potatoes; Modification of the Handling Regulations, Reporting Requirements, and Import Regulations for Red Types of Potatoes'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0068; FV13–946–3 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6634. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Domestic Dates Produced of Packed in Riverside County, California; Revision of Assessment Requirements'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0090; FV14–987–2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6635. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas and Imported Oranges; Change in Size Requirements for Oranges'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0009; FV14–906–1 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6636. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0065; FV13–993–1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6637. A joint communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Housing and Partnerships) and the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the BRAC disposal of 12.31 acres and the acquisition of 59.95 acres in Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Rept. No. 113–221).

By Ms. MIKULSKI, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2015'' (Rept. No. 113–222).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 502. A resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 513. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

S. Res. 520. A resolution condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims.

S. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to be held in Washington, D.C., from August 4 through 6, 2014.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*George Albert Krol, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Nominee: Krol, George Albert.

Post: Ambassador to Kazakhstan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Anthony J. Krol, none; Anne E. Krol, none.

5. Grandparents: Albert Krol (deceased); Frances Krol (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: David A. Krol, none; Anthony J. Krol (deceased); Alice Milrod, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Marcia Stephens Bloom Bernicat, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Nominee: Marcia Stephens Bloom Bernicat.

Post: Bangladesh.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Olivier Bernicat: none.

Children and Spouses: Sunil C. Bernicat (deceased), Sumit N. Bernicat: none.

3. Parents: Rodney L. Bloom (deceased), Ruth S. Bloom (deceased).

4. Grandparents: Charles & Fanny Bloom (both deceased); Robert & Ruth Stephens (both deceased).

5. Brothers and Spouses: Rodney L. & Cindy Bloom: none.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Kathryn D. Bloom & Luther D. White, Jr.: none.

---

*James D. Pettit, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Moldova.

Nominee: James D. Pettit.

Post: Ambassador to Moldova.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Sarah M. Pettit: none, Joshua M. Katzenstein: none, Elizabeth M. Pettit: none.

4. Parents: John L. Pettit—deceased; Doris W. Pettit, none.

5. Grandparents: Leon Pettit—deceased; Ines Pettit—deceased; Edgar White—deceased; Lila White—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Jerry L. Pettit, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Lila Dan, none; Richard Dan, none; Lark Pettit, none.

---

*John R. Bass, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

Nominee: John R. Bass.

Post: Republic of Turkey.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Holly C. Holzer Bass: none.

3. Children and Spouses: no children.

4. Parents: Father—John R. Bass—deceased; Mother—Dianne K. Klinger: $100, 10/1/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; $100, 9/26/2010, Gordon, Tim, via Friends of Tim Gordon; $100, 11/5/2010, Murphy, Scott, via Friends of Scott Murphy.

5. Grandparents: Edward Schmuckmier—deceased; Vilma Schmuckmier—deceased; Glenn Bass—deceased; Maude Bass—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Sister—Kristin Bass; $500, 9/30/2013, Young, David, via Young for Iowa, Inc; $1000, 4/30/2013, The Hawkeye PAC; $500, 6/23/2012, Biggert, Judy via Judy Biggert for Congress; $500, 4/28/2010, Lincoln, Blanche L., via Friends of Blanche Lincoln; $500, 9/30/2010, Lincoln, Blanche L., via Friends of Blanche Lincoln; $1000, 5/6/2010, Grassley, Charles E., via Grassley Committee Inc; Pharmaceutical Care Management Association; Political Action Committee (PCMA PAC); $1153, 03/19/2013, 13961282667; $1346, 06/25/2013, 13964045379; $961, 09/24/2013, 13964682308; $2500, 5/24/2012, 12961317589; $1153, 9/20/2012, 12972557013; $1346, 12/20/2012, 13960525485; $3269, 09/22/2011, 12970787657; $1730, 12/08/2011, 12950084309; $1923, 7/16/2010, 10931439655; $2115, 12/10/2010, 11990042374; Sister—Kimberley E. Bass; None.

---

*Allan P. Mustard, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkmenistan.

Nominee: Allan P. Mustard.

Post: Ashgabat.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Fiona Mustard, none.

4. Parents: Donald Mustard: deceased; Barbara Mustard: deceased.

5. Grandparents: Stanley Mustard: deceased; Vida Mustard: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard Mustard: deceased; Edward Mustard: none.

---

*Todd D. Robinson, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala.

Nominee: Todd David Robinson.

Post: Guatemala.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $300.00, 02/13/07, Barack Obama; $500.00, 03/31/08, Barack Obama; $1040.00, 06/04/08, Barack Obama; $1040.00, 06/04/08, Barack Obama; $2300.00, 06/04/08, Barack Obama; $250.00, 04/05/11, Barack Obama; $1000.00, 06/30/11, Barack Obama; $250.00, 05/05/12, Barack Obama; $250.00, 08/21/12, Barack Obama; $1500.00, 09/30/12, Barack Obama; $1259.00, 09/30/08, Obama Victory; $650.00, 06/07/12, Obama Victory.

2. Willetta BaCote (Mother): none.

3. All Grandparents—deceased.

4. Jeffrey E. BaCote (Brother): $2300.00, 09/30/07, John S. McCain; Mark D. Robinson: none; Rebecca Scharffe (Sister-in-Law): none; Maribel Robinson (Sister-in-Law): none.

5. Neil L. BaCote (Father)—deceased.

---

*Kevin F. O'Malley, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

Nominee: Kevin F. O'Malley.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Ireland.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee:

1. Self: Federal: 1/29/2010, $5,000, Democratic National Committee; 4/14/2010, $500, Mark Critz for Congress Committee; 6/30/2010, $250, Robin Carnahan for Senate; 5/27/2010, $500, Democratic Federal Campaign Committee of St. Louis; 6/30/2010, $250, Tommy Sowers for Congress; 6/30/2010, $500, Russ Carnahan in Congress Committee; 9/30/2010, $500, Russ Carnahan in Congress Committee; 9/30/2010, $500, Robin Carnahan for Senate; 10/20/2010, $250, Tommy Sowers for Congress; 6/30/2011, $500, Obama for America; 9/27/2011, $1,000, Russ Carnahan for Congress; 11/3/2011, $2,500, Obama Victory Fund 2012; 12/30/2011, $1,000, Kaine for Virginia; 3/11/2012, $1,100, McCaskill for Missouri; 3/31/2012, $1,000, Russ Carnahan for Congress; 3/31/2012, $1,000, Obama for America; 7/23/2012, $500, Kaine for Virginia; 7/30/2012, $250, Russ Carnahan for Congress; 8/24/2012, $1,000, Obama Victory Fund 2012; 9/25/2012, $704, Obama Victory Fund 2012; 9/30/2012, $1,000, McCaskill Victory Fund; 10/25/2012, $250, Obama Victory Fund 2012.

Local and State: 5/24/2012, $250.00, Wahby for St. Louis City Treasurer; 7/10/2012, $500.00, Wahby for St. Louis City Treasurer.

2. Spouse: Federal: 6/26/2011, $2,500, McCaskill for Missouri; 7/1/2011, $2,500, McCaskill for Missouri.

---

*Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the French Republic.

Nominee: Jane D. Hartley.

Post: Ambassador to the French Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: see attached.

2. Spouse: see attached.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine Schlosstein: see attached.

4. Parents: deceased.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: James E. Hartley, Jr.: see attached.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

JANE D. HARTLEY—FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT—ATTACHMENT

Jane D. Hartley:

Contribution, date, and amount:

Dodd—refund, 2/22/2010, ($2,400); Friends of Chris Dodd—refund, 2/22/2010, ($1,100); Martha Coakley, 1/5/2010, $2,400; Jane Harman, 2/1/2010, $1,000; Patrick Leahy, 2/8/2010, $1,000; Arlen Specter, 3/31/2010, $1,000; Michael Bennet, 3/31/2010, $2,400; Michael Bennet, 3/31/2010, $2,400; Friends of Barbara Boxer, 5/25/2010, $2,400; Betsy Markey, 6/20/2010, $1,000; Barney Frank, 6/25/2010, $1,000; William Owens, 9/20/2010, $1,200; Schneiderman Attorney General, 9/23/2010, $1,000; Scott Murphy, 9/30/2010, $1,200; Robin Carnahan, 9/29/2010, $500; Lee Irwin Fisher, 9/29/2010, $500; Paul Hodes, 9/29/2010, $500; Jack Conway, 9/29/2010, $500; Andrew Cuomo 2010, 10/20/2010, $10,000; Chicago for Rahm Emanuel, 10/27/2010, $25,000; Jack Conway for Senate, 10/29/2010, $1,000; Ohio Democratic Party, 11/1/2010, $5,000; McCaskill for Missouri, 2012 3/23/2011, $1000; Tri-State Maxed Out Women, 4/11/2011, $1000; Friends of Chris Murphy, 5/22/2011, $2500; Gillibrand for Senate, 5/23/2011, $2500; Kaine for Virginia, 8/11/2011, $5000; Kathy Hochul for Congress, 5/20/2011, $1000; Obama Victory Fund 2012, 4/21/2011, $35,800; Women for Cuomo 2014 5/10/2011, $5000; Bob Menendez for Senate 5/12/2011 $1000; Howard Berman for Congress 10/12/2011 $500; Howard Berman for Congress 10/12/2011 $500; Elizabeth Warren for MA 10/12/2011 $2500; DSCC, 10/12/2011, $2500; Montana Senate Victory, 2012, 10/12/2011, $2500; No Bad Apples Pac, 10/12/2011, $1000; Amy Klobuchar for Minnesota, 11/28/2011, $2500; Andrew Cuomo 2014, 11/28/2011, $2000; New Chicago Committee, 12/7/2011, $5000; SSVF (Swing State Victory Fund), 12/27/2011, $9200; Dan Garodnick, 2013, 1/6/2012 $1000; Debbie Wasserman Schultz, 1/10/2012, $1000; Joe Kennedy for Congress, 2/13/2012, $2500; Bob Menendez for Senate, 2/13/2012, $2500; Missouri—Montana Fund, 2/28/2012, $2500; Friends of Sherrod Brown, 4/19/2012, $2500; Lon Johnson, 4/20/2012, $500; Nita Lowey, 5/1/2012, $2500; Janet Cowell for Treasurer, 5/30/2012, $4000; Committee to Elect Joe Kearns Goodwin, 5/30/2012, $500; Nebraskans for Bob Kerrey, 6/11/2012, $2500; OVF 2012, 6/28/

2012, $27,300; Montanans for Tester, 6/28/2012, $1250; DSCC, 1/24/2013, $30,800; Friends of Max Baucus, 2/13/2013, $5000; Booker for Senate, 2/28/2013, $5000; Nita Lowey for Congress, 3/4/2013, $5000; Reshma for New York, 3/1/2013, $2500; The Markey Committee, 3/14/2013, $1000; DNC, 5/8/2013, $16,200; Udall for Colorado, 5/24/2013, $2600; Cy Vance for Manhattan DA, 5/28/2013, $1000; Friends of Congressman George Miller, 6/14/2013, $1000; Cory Booker for Senate, 6/25/2013, $2600; Gina Raimondo, 7/3/2013, $1000; Friends of Gale Brewer, 7/3/2013, $500; Reshma for New York, 6/30/2013, $2450; Bill Thompson for Mayor, 8/8/2013, $2000; Don Berwick for Governor, 8/26/2013, $500; Michelle Nunn for Georgia, 9/13/2013, $1000; Chicago for Rahm Emanuel, 9/20/2013, $5300; Off the Sidelines PAC, 10/30/2013, $5000; Friends of Mark Warner, 10/30/2013, $2600; Moulton for Congress, 11/12/2013, $2000; Alaskans for Begich 2014, 11/21/2013, $1000; Friends of Schumer, 12/4/2013, $5200.

Ralph Schlosstein:

Date, amount, and contribution:

03/01/07, $5,000, (D) Our Common Values PAC; 03/31/01, $2,500, (D) Friends of Chris Dodd; 04/18/07, $2,300, (D) Tom Allen; 05/17/7, $2,300, (D) Jay Rockefeller; 10/18/07, $5,000, (D) All America PAC; 11/06/07, $25,000, (D) Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; 12/04/07, $1,000, (D) Jack Reed; 01/09/08, $2,300, (D) Barack Obama; 01/31/08, $4,600, (D) Rahm Emanuel; 03/25/08, $1,000, (D) Tom Allen; 04/01/08, $2,300, (D) John Adler; 04/25/08, $3,200, (D) People for Chris Gregoire; 04/29/08, $1,000, (D) Mark Warner; 06/30/08, $28,500, (D) Democratic Victory Fund; 02/29/08, $1,000, (D) Operation Brian Schweitzer; 07/22/08, $2,300, (D) Udall for Colorado; 09/08/08, $2,500, (D) Jeanne Shaheen for Senate; 07/31/08, $2,300, (D) Hillary Clinton; 08/20/08, $2,300, (D) Barack Obama; 09/28/08, $2,300, (D) Friends of Chris Dodd; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Mark Schauer; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Gary Peters; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Steve Dreihaus; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Ann Kirkpatrick; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Ashwin Madia, 12/05/08, $2,300, (D) Bill Richardson for President; 04/06/09, $4,800, (D) Friends of Schumer; 06/03/09, $5,000, (D) Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; 03/07/10, $1,000, (D) Friends of John Marshall; 04/26/10, $4,800, (D) Friends of Harry Reid; 06/29/10, $2,400, (D) Gillibrand for Senate; 06/29/10, $2,400, (D) Bennet for Colorado; 09/20/10, $2,300, (D) Michael Bennet for Senate; 09/20/10, $1,000, (D) Scott Murphy for Congress, 09/20/10, $1,000, (D) Bill Owen for Congress; 03/30/11, $2,300, (D) Friends of Maria Cantwell; 04/01/11, $35,800, (D) Obama Victory Fund 2012; 10/05/11, $2,500, (R) Friends of Dick Lugar; 11/20/11, $1,500, (D) Andrew Cuomo; 12/14/11, $2,500, (D) Kaine for Virginia; 02/13/12, $2,500, (D) Joe Kennedy for Congress; 04/24/12, $2,000, (D) Hillary Clinton for President Debt; 06/19/12 ($2,000), (D) Hillary Clinton for President Debt; 04/10/12, $2,300, (D) Friends of Maria Cantwell; 06/11/12, $2,500, (D) Nebraskans for Kerrey; 06/29/12, $30,800, (D) Obama Victory Fund; 06/18/12, $2,500, (D) John Lewis for Congress; 09/24/12, $2,500, (D) Montanans for Tester; 10/16/12, $2,500, (D) Nita Lowey for Congress; 10/18/12, $2,500, (D) Donnelly for Senate; 12/21/12, $2,500, (D) Friends of Max Baucus; 08/07/13, $5,000, (D) Democratic Governors Association; 08/07/13, $5,000, (D) O Say Can You See PAC; 09/16/13, $32,400, (D) Democratic Senate Campaign Committee; 09/20/13, $5,300, (D) Chicago for Rahm Emanuel; 09/24/13, $5,000, (D) Booker for Senate; 12/03/13, $5,200, (D) Friends of Schumer [Check was written for $10,400—$5,200 for Jane Hartley]; 12/13/13, $5,200, (D) Reid Searchlight Fund.

Katherine Schlosstein:

Date, amount, and contribution:

10/13/11, $16,500 DNC Services Corp.; 10/13/11, $2,500, Obama, Barack; 10/13/11, $2,500, Obama, Barack.

James E. Hartley, Jr.

Contribution, date, and amount:

Friends of Chris Dodd, 6/23/2009, $250; Friends of Tate Reeves, 8/4/2009, $2,500; Malloy for CT, 3/5/2010, $155; O'Leary for Mayor, 7/1/2011, $1,000; Phyllis Newton for City Council, 12/7/2011, $500; Joseph Kennedy for Congress, 1/27/2012, $2,500; Larson for Congress, 3/30/2012, $250; Josh Stein for NC Senate Committee, 5/14/2012, $250; Elizabeth for MA, 6/11/2012, $2,500; Berger 2012, 6/28/2012, $100; Obama Victory 2012, 8/6/2012, $500; Bill Thompson for Mayor, 8/5/2013, $2,500; O'Leary for Mayor, 9/1/2013, $1,000; Old Lyme Democratic Party, 11/1/2013, $500; ND Republican Senate Caucus, 11/1/2013, $1,000.

---

*Erica J. Barks Ruggles, of Minnesota, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Nominee: Erica J. Barks Ruggles.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Rwanda

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Paul A. Barks—deceased.

Nancy E. Barks, $35.00, 2/10, Tarryl Clark for Congress, $50.00, 10/10, Friends of Tarryl Clark, $50.00, 3/12, Klobuchar for MN.

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Cynthia B. Lynn, none; Karen C. Barks, none.

---

*Brent Robert Hartley, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

Nominee: Brent R. Hartley.

Post: Republic of Slovenia.

Nominated: June 16, 2014.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Elizabeth Hayes Dickinson: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Eleanor Dickinson Hartley: none. Charles Dickinson Hartley: none.

Parents: Jennie Louise Clark, Jack Martin Hartley (deceased): none.

5. Grandparents: Houston and Jennie Pitts (deceased); Charles Alton and Elizabeth Martin Hartley (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Lynn Hartley: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Constance Louise Lister (deceased); Lawrence Lister; none. Brenda Hartley Landes; none. Fred Landes; none.

---

*Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Monaco.

Nominee: Jane D. Hartley.

Post: Ambassador to the Principality of Monaco.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: See attached.

2. Spouse: See attached.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine Schlosstein: See attached.

4. Parents: N/A.

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: James E. Hartley, Jr.—See attached.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

JANE D. HARTLEY—FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

ATTACHMENT

Jane Hartley: Contribution, date, and amount:

Dodd—refund, 2/22/2010, (2,400); Friends of Chris Dodd—refund, 2/22/2010, (1,100); Martha Coakley, 1/5/2010, 2,400; Jane Harman, 2/1/2010, 1,000; Patrick Leahy, 2/8/2010, 1,000; Arlen Specter, 3/31/2010, 1,000; Michael Bennet, 3/31/2010, 2,400; Michael Bennet, 3/31/2010, 2,400; Friends of Barbara Boxer, 5/25/2010, 2,400; Betsy Markey, 6/20/2010, 1,000; Barney Frank, 6/25/2010, 1,000; William Owens, 9/20/2010, 1,200; Schneiderman Attorney General, 9/23/2010, 1,000; Scott Murphy, 9/30/2010, 1,200; Robin Carnahan, 9/29/2010, 500; Lee Irwin Fisher, 9/29/2010, 500; Paul Hodes, 9/29/2010, 500; Jack Conway, 9/29/2010, 500; Andrew Cuomo 2010, 10/20/2010, 10,000; Chicago for Rahm Emanuel, 10/27/2010, 25,000; Jack Conway for Senate, 10/29/2010, 1,000; Ohio Democratic Party, 11/1/2010, 5,000; McCaskill for Missouri 2012, 3/23/2011, 1,000; Tri-State Maxed Out Women, 4/11/2011, 1,000; Friends of Chris Murphy, 5/22/2011, 2,500; Gillibrand for Senate, 5/23/2011, 2,500; Kaine for Virginia, 8/11/2011, 5,000; Kathy Hochul for Congress, 5/20/2011, 1,000; Obama Victory Fund 2012, 4/21/2011, 35,800; Women for Cuomo 2014, 5/10/2011, 5,000; Bob Menendez for Senate, 5/12/2011, 1,000; Howard Berman for Congress, 10/12/2011, 500; Howard Berman for Congress, 10/12/2011, 500; Elizabeth Warren for MA, 10/12/2011, 2,500; DSCC, 10/12/2011, 2,500; Montana Senate Victory 2012, 10/12/2011, 2,500; No Bad Apples Pac, 10/12/2011, 1,000; Amy Klobuchar for Minnesota, 11/28/2011, 2,500; Andrew Cuomo 2014, 11/28/2011, 2,000; New Chicago Committee, 12/7/2011, 5,000; SSVF (Swing State Victory Fund), 12/27/2011, 9,200; Dan Garodnick 2013, 1/6/2012, 1,000; Debbie Wasserman Schultz, 1/10/2012, 1,000; Joe Kennedy for Congress, 2/13/2012, 2,500; Bob Menendez for Senate, 2/13/2012, 2,500; Missouri—Montana Fund, 2/28/2012, 2,500; Friends of Sherrod Brown, 4/19/2012, 2,500; Lon Johnson, 4/20/2012, 500; Nita Lowey, 5/1/2012, 2,500; Janet Cowell for Treasurer, 5/30/2012, 4,000; Committee to Elect Joe Kearns Goodwin, 5/30/2012, 500; Nebraskans for Bob Kerrey, 6/11/2012, 2,500; OVF 2012, 6/28/2012, 27,300; Montananas for Tester, 6/28/2012, 1,250; DSCC, 1/24/2013, 30,800; Friends of Max Baucus, 2/13/2013, 5,000; Booker for Senate, 2/28/2013, 5,000; Nita Lowey for Congress, 3/4/2013, 5,000; Reshma for New York, 3/1/2013, 2,500; The Markey Committee, 3/14/2013, 1,000; DNC, 5/8/2013, 16,200; Udall for Colorado, 5/24/2013, 2,600; Cy Vance for Manhattan DA, 5/28/2013, 1,000; Friends of Congressman George Miller, 6/14/2013, 1,000; Cory Booker for Senate, 6/25/2013,

2,600; Gina Raimondo, 7/3/2013, 1,000; Friends of Gale Brewer, 7/3/2013, 500; Reshma for New York, 6/30/2013, 2,450; Bill Thompson for Mayro, 8/8/2013, 2,000; Don Berwick for Governor, 8/26/2013, 500; Michelle Nunn for Georgia, 9/13/2013, 1,000; Chicago for Rahm Emanuel, 9/20/2013, 5,300; Off the Sidelines PAC, 10/30/2013, 5,000; Friends of Mark Warner, 10/30/2013, 2,600; Moulton for Congress, 11/12/2013, 2,000; Alaskans for Beigich 2014, 11/21/2013, 1,000; Friends of Schumer, 12/4/2013, 5,200.

Ralph Schlosstein: Date, amount, and contribution:

03/01/07, $5,000, (D) Our Common Values PAC; 03/31/01, $2,500, (D) Friends of Chris Dodd; 04/18/07, $2,300, (D) Tom Allen; 05/17/7, $2,300, (D) Jay Rockefeller; 10/18/07, $5,000, (D) All America PAC; 11/06/07, $25,000, (D) Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; 12/04/07, $1,000, (D) Jack Reed; 01/09/08, $2,300, (D) Barack Obama; 01/31/08, $4,600, (D) Rahm Emanuel; 03/25/08, $1,000, (D) Tom Allen; 04/01/08, $2,300, (D) John Adler; 04/25/08, $3,200, (D) People for Chris Gregoire; 04/29/08, $1,000, (D) Mark Warner; 06/30/08, $28,500, (D) Democratic Victory Fund; 02/29/08, $1,000, (D) Operation Brian Schweitzer; 07/22/08, $2,300, (D) Udall for Colorado; 09/08/08, $2,500, (D) Jean Shaheen for Senate; 07/31/08, $2,300, (D) Hillary Clinton; 08/20/08, $2,300, (D) Barack Obama; 09/28/08, $2,300, (D) Friends of Chris Dodd; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Mark Schauer; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Gary Peters; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Steve Dreihaus; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Ann Kirkpatrick; 10/24/08, $2,000, (D) Ashwin Madia; 12/05/08, $2,300, (D) Bill Richardson for President; 04/06/09, $4,800, (D) Friends of Schumer; 06/03/09, $5,000, (D) Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; 03/07/10, $1,000, (D) Friends of John Marshall; 04/26/10, $4,800, (D) Friends of Harry Reid; 06/29/10, $2,400, (D) Gillibrand for Senate; 06/29/10, $2,400, (D) Bennet for Colorado; 09/20/10, $2,300, (D) Michael Bennet for Senate; 09/20/10, $1,000, (D) Scott Murphy for Congress; 09/20/10, $1,000, (D) Bill Owen for Congress; 03/30/11, $2,300, (D) Friends of Maria Cantwell; 04/01/11, $35,800, (D) Obama Victory Fund 2012; 10/05/11, $2,500, (R) Friends of Dick Lugar; 11/20/11, $1,500, (D) Andrew Cuomo; 12/14/11, $2,500, (D) Kaine for Virginia; 02/13/12, $2,500, (D) Joe Kennedy for Congress; 04/24/12, $2,000, (D) Hillary Clinton for President Debt; 06/19/12, ($2,000), (D) Hillary Clinton for President Debt; 04/10/12, $2,300, (D) Friends of Maria Cantwell; 06/11/12, $2,500, (D) Nebraskans for Kerrey; 06/29/12, $30,800, (D) Obama Victory Fund; 06/18/12, $2,500, (D) John Lewis for Congress; 09/24/12, $2,500, (D) Montanans for Tester; 10/16/12, $2,500, (D) Nita Lowey for Congress; 10/18/12, $2,500, (D) Donnelly for Senate; 12/21/12, $2,500, (D) Friends of Max Baucus; 08/07/13, $5,000, (D) Democratic Governors Association; 08/07/13, $5,000, (D) O Say Can You See PAC; 09/16/13, $32,400, (D) Democratic Senate Campaign Committee; 09/20/13, $5,300, (D) Chicago for Rahm Emanuel; 09/24/13, $5,000, (D) Booker for Senate; 12/03/13, $5,200, (D) Friends of Schumer [Check was written for $10,400–$5,200 for Jane Hartley]; 12/13/13, $5,200, (D) Reid Searchlight Fund.

Katherine Schlosstein: Date, amount, and contribution:

10/13/11, $16,500, DNC Services Corp.; 10/13/11, $2,500, Obama, Barack; 10/13/11, $2,500, Obama, Barack.

James E. Hartley Jr.: Contribution, date, and amount:

Friends of Chris Dodd, 6/23/2009, 250; Friends of Tate Reeves, 8/4/2009, 2,500; Malloy for CT, 3/5/2010, 155; O'Leary for Mayor, 7/1/2011, 1,000; Phyllis Newton for City Council, 12/7/2011, 500; Joseph Kennedy for Congress, 1/27/2012, 2,500; Larson for Congress, 3/30/2012, 250; Josh Stein for NC Senate Committee, 5/14/2012, 250; Elizabeth for MA, 6/11/2012, 2,500; Berger 2012, 6/28/2012, 100; Obama Victory 2012, 8/6/2012, 500; Bill Thompson for Mayor, 8/5/2013, 2,500; O'Leary for Mayor, 9/1/2013, 1,000; Old Lyme Democratic Party, 11/1/2013, 500; ND Republican Senate Caucus, 11/1/2013, 1,000.

---

*David Pressman, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

*David Pressman, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

*Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

*Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

*John Francis Tefft, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

Nominee: John Francis Tefft.

Post: Russia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Mariella C. Tefft: none.

3. Children and spouses: Christine Marie Tefft, daughter, none; Paul Stronski, Christine's spouse, none; Cathleen Mary Tefft, daughter, none; Andrew Horowitz, Cathleen's spouse, none.

4. Parents: Floyd F. Tefft, father, deceased; Mary Jane Durkin Tefft, Mother, deceased.

5. Grandparents: Floyd B. Tefft, Grandfather, deceased; Lucy Tefft, grandmother, deceased; James Durkin, grandfather, deceased; Julia Durkin, grandmother, deceased.

6. Brothers and spouses: Thomas Tefft, brother, none; Julie Crane Tefft, Tom's spouse, none; James Tefft, brother, Victoria Wise, James' Spouse, Joint Contribution of $220 in Five Installments April, September, October and two in November 2012 to Obama for America.

Sisters and spouses: Patricia Tefft, sister, deceased; Sheila Tefft, sister, none; Rajiv Chandra, Sheila's spouse, none.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2675. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to support religious freedom in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2676. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage States to adopt certain policies and procedures relating to the transfer and possession of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2677. A bill to reverse the listing by the Secretary of the Interior of the lesser prairie chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, to prevent further consideration of listing of the species as a threatened species or endangered species under that Act pending implementation of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan and other conservation measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2678. A bill to remove the American burying beetle from the list of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the financing for the Hazardous Substance Superfund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2680. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a voluntary program under which manufacturers may have products certified as meeting the standards of labels that indicate to consumers the extent to which the products are manufactured in the United States, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments in small business concerns, to establish small business savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for businesses to keep jobs in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2682. A bill to require certain Federal agencies to use iron, steel, wood products, cement and manufactured goods produced in the United States in public construction projects, to permanently extend the Build America Bonds program, to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2683. A bill to reform classification and security clearance processes throughout the

Federal Government and, within the Department of Homeland Security, to establish an effective and transparent process for the designation, investigation, adjudication, denial, suspension, and revocation of security clearances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2684. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2685. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 526. A resolution supporting Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 527. A resolution congratulating the members of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for 100 years of service throughout the United States and the world, and commending Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for exemplifying the ideals of brotherhood, scholarship, and service while upholding the motto ''Culture for Service and Service for Humanity''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 528. A resolution commemorating the 125th anniversary of North Dakota's Statehood; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 204

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 234, supra.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 531

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 531, a bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line.

S. 1397

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1397, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1702

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1702, a bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1712

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1712, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the

development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2301

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2405

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2405, a bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 2546

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to repeal a requirement that new employees of certain employers be automatically enrolled in the employer's health benefits.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2624, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2633

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2633, a bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes.

S. 2635

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2635, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 2650

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2650, a bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 2658

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2658, a bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2667, a bill to prohibit the exercise of any waiver of the imposition of certain sanctions with respect to Iran unless the President certifies to Congress that the waiver will not result in the provision of funds to the Government of Iran for activities in support of international terrorism, to develop nuclear weapons, or to violate the human rights of the people of Iran.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 506, a resolution recognizing the patriotism and contributions of auxiliaries of veterans service organizations.

S. RES. 511

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 511, a resolution establishing best business practices to fully utilize the potential of the United States.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 513, a resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 513, supra.

S. RES. 517

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 517, a resolution expressing support for Israel's right to defend itself and calling on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel.

S. RES. 520

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 520, a resolution condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims.

S. RES. 522

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 522, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to be held in Washington, D.C., from August 4 through 6, 2014.

AMENDMENT NO. 3585

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3585 proposed to H.R. 5021, a bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3626

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3626 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3629

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3629 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3630

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3630 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3631

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3631 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3632

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3632 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3633

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3633 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3635

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3635 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3636

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3636 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3656

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3656 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3657

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3657 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3687

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3687 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

AMENDMENT NO. 3698

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3698 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the financing for the Hazardous Substance Superfund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce with my colleagues Senator ROBERT MENENDEZ of New Jersey, and Senator BARBARA BOXER of California, the Superfund Polluter Pays Restoration Act of 2014. This bill reinstates an expired excise tax on polluting industries to help fund the cleanup of Superfund sites and restore communities back to health.

Across our Nation we have far too many un-remediated and dangerous Superfund sites sitting in our neighborhoods—properties that are literally poisoning our residents. This problem is particularly acute in my State of New Jersey, which is both the most densely populated State and the State with the most Superfund sites.

Nationwide, there are more than 1300 Superfund sites on the National Priorities List, NPL, which require long-term cleanups. The sites listed on the NPL are the most heavily contaminated in the country and are the sites that pose the greatest potential risk to public health and the environment. In the past five years, 94 new sites have been added to the NPL, but an average of only 7 have been removed each year.

Cleanup has not even begun at hundreds of these NPL sites. Officials at the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, and the Government Accountability Office, GAO, state that the reason why cleanup is not starting at hundreds of sites, and taking so long at others, is because of the limited funding available for cleanup activities.

There are more than 11 million Americans who live within one mile of a Superfund site, and of that, 3 to 4 million are children. Studies show that children are particularly susceptible to the health hazards presented by Superfund sites. Researchers have found increased autism rates, and recently researchers found that babies born to mothers living within 1 mile of a Superfund site prior to cleanup had a 20 percent greater incidence of being born with birth defects.

The need for more funding could not be clearer.

When Congress created Superfund in 1980, it established the Superfund Trust Fund from which the EPA receives annual appropriations for Superfund cleanup activities. For 15 years, the Trust Fund received a steady source of revenue from excise taxes on crude oil and certain chemicals. Those taxes expired at the end of fiscal year 1995. The Superfund program is now operating at 40 percent of 1987 levels, which is unsustainable according to a 2010 GAO report which found that current funding levels would likely not be sufficient to meet the future needs of the Superfund program. EPA officials estimate they will need 2 to 2.5 times more funding to effectively and efficiently cleanup unremediated sites.

It is unfair for the taxpayer to shoulder the burden of cleanup costs for these Superfund sites. To meet the need for additional funding and to protect the health of our families and children, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BOXER, and I have come together to introduce this act, aimed at holding polluting industries accountable, reducing the need to spend taxpayer dollars, and providing a steady flow of funds to the Superfund program.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2684. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation to authorize the Federal

Government to dispose of a piece of property on Alaska's North Slope that it no longer needs or wants but is of great importance to the Inupiat residents of the North Slope.

Specifically, I am introducing a companion bill to legislation that has also been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by my friend and fellow Alaskan, Congressman DON YOUNG. This legislation would enable the Olgoonik Native Village Corp. of Wainwright, AK to purchase at fair market value the 1,518-acre Wainwright Short Range Radar Site, SRRS, located in northern Alaska.

Originally deployed as the location for a Distant Early-Warning, DEW, Line radar station in northern Alaska, President Harry Truman withdrew the site for use as a military radar station during the Cold War in 1952. That station expanded in 1957 to enable the Air Force to track aircraft or rockets entering U.S. air space from the polar region. The station at Wainwright actually had a rather short lifespan, as its radars were replaced by more powerful systems in other locations starting in 1963.

In the years since then, the buildings and a fuel tank farm near an airstrip at the site—located several miles southeast of the village of Wainwright on Wainwright Inlet—have been abandoned by the U.S. Air Force. In 1974, the site was given to the Federal Bureau of Land Management, BLM, to manage. In 1976, the lands, then located in the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, were formally transferred from the Air Force to Department of the Interior's control when the area was renamed as part of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. While the site over the years was used by the National Weather Service as a short range radar site, the land is no longer in Federal use and has undergone environmental cleanup and restoration efforts. Those efforts began in 1998 and were completed in August 2013, with final testing and removal of contaminated soils expected to be finished by the end of summer 2014.

Management of the lands around the site has changed significantly with time. With passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in 1971, the Wainwright Native Village Corporation, Olgoonik, received title to the surface estate of about 175,000 acres surrounding the village. The subsurface of the lands were owned by the Arctic Slope Regional Corp., ASRC, part of the nearly 5 million acres that ASRC received from the lands claims settlement for the benefit of its nearly 8,000 Native shareholders who live in Arctic Alaska.

Olgoonik Corp., which has a variety of subcompanies, won the Air Force contract through its Specialty Contractors subsidiary, to demolish, clean up, and remediate the DEW Line site. Its development corporation has also acquired a lease on 27.5 acres of the site to allow its use for economic activities of benefit to the villagers. The company is now seeking to pay fair market value to buy the entire site, which would allow use of the existing fuel tank farm near the site's 6,000-foot runway. The site could well be used in the future to support activities in the Arctic Ocean, a northern port becoming an issue of great interest in Alaska given the reduction in the Arctic ice pack and concerns about greater maritime transit of the Northwest Passage.

Normally, legislation would not be needed to permit the sale of a surplus tract because BLM could use its existing authority to surplus the site and dispose of it. However, in passage of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Act, NPR–A, in 1976 Congress included a provision that does not permit the BLM to dispose of property inside the NPR–A without congressional approval. Thus, legislation in this case is needed simply to permit disposition of the surplus tract.

Under my legislation, Olgoonik will be allowed to purchase the site but only after the corporation pays for a required land survey and pays for an appraisal, based on fair market value for the property. I should add that this legislation is only being introduced after talks among the village and regional Native corporations, the city of Wainwright, and the Wainwright Traditional—tribal—Council resulted in signed resolutions of support for Olgoonik's acquisition of the site. All Native entities supported the legislation during a formal BLM tribal consultation effort that occurred on June 23, 2014, reaffirming a November 2013 resolution that supported the legislation and land sale/purchase. All parties agreed to support the land acquisition after careful consideration of the environmental issues involved with future management of the tract.

Clearly, the legislation is best for the BLM as it will relieve the agency of the cumbersome effort to manage the isolated parcel, which is located far away from other BLM land holdings inside NPR–A. It is best for the environment as the agreement among the corporation, city, and tribe will guarantee that no activities occur on the land that are not acceptable to village residents—the land's need for subsistence hunting being best protected by ownership by the Native Corporation. And the land sale will be best for the citizens of Wainwright and the entire North Slope as it will guarantee that any development activities will be controlled by residents of the village and not outside interests.

This is the best outcome for all concerned, and I hope this legislation will be given swift consideration and passage by Congress.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2685. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am going to speak on another issue. I see my distinguished colleague from Utah Senator LEE is on the floor. It is an issue he has worked with me on. We have tried to join together. It was more than a year ago that not only here in the United States but the whole world learned some very startling details about the massive scope of the National Security Agency's surveillance programs.

Since then the American people, and actually, all three branches of government have been debating the same fundamental questions about the extent of government power that the Framers considered when they crafted the Constitution. Many of us had been arguing those same issues, whether in the Judiciary Committee, the Intelligence Committee, or others. But it was hard to get anybody's attention.

Suddenly the whole world was listening.

The obvious question is, when and how should the government be permitted to gather information about its citizens? How do we protect our country while we preserve our fundamental principles and our constitutional liberties? These questions are even more relevant and more complex as technology develops rapidly, and as more data is created every second.

Nobody questions that the government cannot just walk into our houses, rifle through our drawers, our filing cabinets, and our cupboards, to see what we might have there. But that is not where we keep our data anymore. It is on computers. By the same token, they shouldn't have the right to rifle through our electronic files either. If they collect all this data, should the government be allowed to collect and use all of it?

To what extent does this massive collection of data improve our national security and at what cost to our privacy and free expression? If we pick up everything, do we actually have anything?

The Senate Judiciary Committee considered these and other important questions during the course of six public hearings held over the past year. During this deliberative process, the Committee considered whether the bulk collection of Americans' phone records has been effective in preventing terrorist attacks, the privacy implications of the program, and the effect on the U.S. technology industry. Those hearings helped to demonstrate the need for additional limits on government surveillance authorities.

As these hearings continued, the call for an end to bulk collection under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act grew louder and more persistent. The President's own Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology testified before the Judiciary Committee to call for an end to bulk collection, concluding that ''[t]he information contributed to terrorist investigations by the use of section 215 telephony meta-data was not essential to preventing attacks and could readily have been obtained in a timely manner

using conventional section 215 orders.'' The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board also called for an end to bulk collection, concluding that the program ''lacks a viable legal foundation under Section 215.'' Technology executives, legal scholars and privacy advocates called for an end to bulk collection. These witnesses also proposed meaningful reforms to other government authorities, such as Section 702 of FISA, the pen register and trap and trace authorities under FISA, and the national security letter statutes.

Then, earlier this year, President Obama himself embraced the growing consensus that the bulk collection of phone records should not continue in its current form.

Just this week two new reports highlighted the costs of not placing reasonable limits on government surveillance, not just the significant economic cost if you don't put limits but the impact of journalistic freedom and also our right to counsel—our right to counsel—something we assume is an unalienable right, and it is, but it is being undermined.

That is why the technology industry, the privacy and civil liberties community are unified in support for this bill. It is actually now time for Congress to act.

That is why I am introducing the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014. It builds on the legislation that was passed by the House of Representatives in May, as well as the original bicameral, bipartisan legislation I introduced with Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER 10 months ago—last October.

I continue to prefer the original version of the USA FREEDOM Act, but we are running short on time in this Congress. Since passage of the House version in May, I have been working to address concerns that the text of the House bill—though clearly intended to end bulk collection—did not do so effectively. I have worked with both Republicans and Democrats, House Members and Senators.

I spent the past several months in discussions with the intelligence community and a wide range of stakeholders, other Senators, privacy and civil liberties groups, and our U.S. technology industry.

The bill I am introducing today is the result of those hundreds of hours of negotiations and meetings.

First, and most importantly, this bill ensures that the ban on bulk collection is a real ban on bulk collection and that it is effective. It ensures the government cannot rely on section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act—the FISA pen register and trap-and-trace device statute or the national security letter statutes—to engage in the indiscriminate collection of Americans' private records: yours, mine or anybody else's who may be watching this debate.

Under this legislation, when the government uses these authorities to collect information, it has to narrowly limit its collection based on a ''specific selection term'' that identifies the focus of the collection. ''Specific selection term'' is carefully defined. For Section 215 and the pen register statute, the definition ensures that the government must use a term that is narrowly limited to the greatest extent reasonably practicable consistent with the purpose for seeking the information. The bill specifies the term cannot be a broad geographic area, such as city or State or ZIP Code or area code, nor can it simply be a service provider. For national security letters, the government must specifically identify the target about whom it seeks information. These provisions preclude the government from seeking large swaths of information that it does not need—and that might very well include private details about the lives of law-abiding Americans.

As a backstop, the bill also mandates additional minimization procedures when the government's collection under Section 215 is likely to be overbroad. It requires the government to destroy data unrelated to its investigation within a reasonable time frame.

Second, the bill enhances transparency regarding the government's use of surveillance tools. That is one of the best checks on a runaway government. FISA and other national security laws provide law enforcement with an extraordinary amount of power. The American people have a right to know how that power is exercised.

Among other things, this bill requires the government to report to the public key information about the scope of the collection under a range of national security authorities, including the number of queries about Americans that it conducts in databases collected under Section 702. It also allows private companies more leeway to disclose the number of FISA orders and national security letters they receive.

I see the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. FRANKEN, on the floor. I thank him in particular for his leadership and helping to draft these transparency provisions.

Likewise, I thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for his work on the bill's key reforms to the FISA Court. The bill requires the FISA Court and the FISA Court of Review, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, to appoint a panel of special advocates who can advance legal positions supporting individual privacy and civil liberties—in other words, it will not be just one voice that is heard, we will actually have dissenting voices—and improve judicial review.

The FISA Court would be required to appoint one of these advocates whenever it confronts a significant or novel issue of law, or it must issue a written finding that appointment of an advocate is not appropriate. The bill also requires the FISA Court to report the number of times that it appoints or declines to appoint an advocate when confronting a novel or significant issue of law. This bill additionally provides a certification mechanism for appellate review of FISA Court decisions when the government prevails, and it provides a declassification process for significant FISA Court decisions.

Finally, this bill improves the judicial review procedures for nondisclosure orders that accompany Section 215 orders and national security letters. These have been so overused. This legislation responds to decisions by Federal courts that found these provisions violate the First Amendment.

While this bill contains significant reforms and improvements, it doesn't fix every problem, and we know there is more work to be done—in particular, with regard to Section 702 of FISA and other broad government surveillance authorities that implicate the privacy rights of Americans.

We could spend the next 20 years waiting to get 100 percent of everything we need. I would like to get most of what we need and then work on the rest.

The bill provides for public reporting on Section 702. That will help set the stage for reform, but transparency alone is not enough. I will continue to work with both Republican and Democratic Senators and other outside experts to work on these issues.

For developing the legislation, I consulted closely with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the NSA, the FBI, and the Department of Justice—and every single word of this bill was vetted with those agencies. I am grateful for their receptiveness to the public's concerns and for their constructive participation in this process. Together, we worked hard to ensure that this bill enacts significant and meaningful reforms to protect individual privacy, while providing the Intelligence Community with operational flexibility to safeguard this country.

The Intelligence Community will still have the ability to safeguard this country—nobody is suggesting they shouldn't, but collecting everything is the same as having nothing. That was the mistake we had before 9/11, where we had the information that could have stopped the attack on 9/11, but we failed to look at it all.

I am pleased the executive branch supports our bill. I am pleased the President agrees it should be enacted as soon as possible. But ultimately we—Senators and our colleagues in the other body—have the responsibility of the American people to do what is right and to protect the privacy of the American people. That is why we have worked hard with everybody to ensure the bill enacts meaningful reforms.

This is the most important thing to remember: We can enact this bill, get it signed into law, and it would represent the most significant reform of government surveillance authorities since Congress passed the USA PATRIOT Act 13 years ago. It is a historic opportunity. We would be derelict in our duty to this country if we passed up that opportunity.

I think if people such as Senator LEE, Senator DURBIN, Senator HELLER, Senator FRANKEN, Senator CRUZ, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator TOM UDALL, Senator COONS, Senator HEINRICH, Senator MARKEY, Senator HIRONO, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator WHITEHOUSE have joined, this is not a partisan bill, this is not a Democratic or Republican bill, this is a good bill that protects America.

I also note the particular contributions over many years of Senator WYDEN and Senator MARK UDALL. They have worked tirelessly to protect Americans' privacy from their posts on the Intelligence Committee.

I am introducing this revised version of the USA FREEDOM Act today because we cannot afford to wait any longer to end the bulk collection of Americans' records. I am concerned that we are running out of time on the legislative calendar. Typically, my strong preference would be to take up the bill in the Judiciary Committee and mark it up. But given the need to act quickly, I am willing to forego regular order and take this bill directly to the Senate Floor.

We cannot let this opportunity go by. This is a debate about Americans' fundamental relationship with their government, about whether our government should have the power to create massive databases of information about its citizens or whether we are in control of our own government, not the other way around.

I believe we have to impose stronger limits on government surveillance powers. I am confident that most Vermonters, and most Americans, agree with me. We need to get this right, and we need to get it done without further delay.

I close with one very quick story I have used before. About the only thing I have actually saved from a newspaper that was written about me, and I liked it so much I framed it. As the distinguished Presiding Officer knows, I live on a dirt road, a place where my wife and I celebrated our honeymoon 52 years ago. The adjoining farmer has known me since I was a little kid.

The whole story in that paper goes like this: A man in an out-of-State car on a Saturday morning drives up, sees the farmer on the porch, and says:

Does Senator LEAHY live up this way?

He says: Are you a relative of his?

Well, no, I am not.

Are you a friend of his?

Well, not really.

Is he expecting you?

No.

Never heard of him.

We like our privacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2014'' or the ''USA FREEDOM Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''a statement'' and inserting ''in the case of an application other than an application described in subparagraph (C) (including an application for the production of call detail records other than in the manner described in subparagraph (C)), a statement''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (D), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) in the case of an application for the production on a daily basis of call detail records created before, on, or after the date of the application relating to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to protect against international terrorism, a statement of facts showing that—

''(i) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the call detail records sought to be produced based on the specific selection term required under subparagraph (A) are relevant to such investigation; and

''(ii) there is a reasonable, articulable suspicion that such specific selection term is associated with a foreign power engaged in international terrorism or activities in preparation therefor, or an agent of a foreign power engaged in international terrorism or activities in preparation therefor; and''.

(b) ORDER.—Section 501(c)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) in the case of an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C), shall—

''(i) authorize the production on a daily basis of call detail records for a period not to exceed 180 days;

''(ii) provide that an order for such production may be extended upon application under subsection (b) and the judicial finding under paragraph (1) of this subsection;

''(iii) provide that the Government may require the prompt production of call detail records—

''(I) using the specific selection term that satisfies the standard required under subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii) as the basis for production; and

''(II) using call detail records with a direct connection to such specific selection term as the basis for production of a second set of call detail records;

''(iv) provide that, when produced, such records be in a form that will be useful to the Government;

''(v) direct each person the Government directs to produce call detail records under the order to furnish the Government forthwith all information, facilities, or technical assistance necessary to accomplish the production in such a manner as will protect the secrecy of the production and produce a minimum of interference with the services that such person is providing to each subject of the production; and

''(vi) direct the Government to—

''(I) adopt minimization procedures that require the prompt destruction of all call detail records produced under the order that the Government determines are not foreign intelligence information; and

''(II) destroy all call detail records produced under the order as prescribed by such procedures.''.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRODUCTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.—

''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Attorney General may require the emergency production of tangible things if the Attorney General—

''(A) reasonably determines that an emergency situation requires the production of tangible things before an order authorizing such production can with due diligence be obtained;

''(B) reasonably determines that the factual basis for the issuance of an order under this section to approve such production of tangible things exists;

''(C) informs, either personally or through a designee, a judge having jurisdiction under this section at the time the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things that the decision has been made to employ the authority under this subsection; and

''(D) makes an application in accordance with this section to a judge having jurisdiction under this section as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things under this subsection.

''(2) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency production of tangible things under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this section for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

''(3) In the absence of a judicial order approving the production of tangible things under this subsection, the production shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time the Attorney General begins requiring the emergency production of such tangible things, whichever is earliest.

''(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.

''(5) If such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the production of tangible things is terminated and no order is issued approving the production, no information obtained or evidence derived from such production shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such production shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(6) The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements of paragraph (5).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(d) (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''pursuant to an order'' and inserting ''pursuant to an order issued or an emergency production required'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''such order'' and inserting ''such order or such emergency production''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the order'' and inserting ''the order or the emergency production''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''an order'' and inserting ''an order or emergency production''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''an order'' and inserting ''an order or emergency production''.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, is further amended by inserting before subparagraph (B), as redesignated by such section 101(a) of this Act, the following new subparagraph:

''(A) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production of the tangible things sought;''.

(b) ORDER.—Section 501(c) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking the semicolon and inserting '', including each specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) No order issued under this subsection may authorize the collection of tangible things without the use of a specific selection term that meets the requirements of subsection (b)(2).''.

(c) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—Section 501(g)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) for orders in which the specific selection term does not specifically identify an individual, account, or personal device, procedures that prohibit the dissemination, and require the destruction within a reasonable time period (which time period shall be specified in the order), of any tangible thing or information therein that has not been determined to relate to a person who is—

''(i) a subject of an authorized investigation;

''(ii) a foreign power or a suspected agent of a foreign power;

''(iii) reasonably likely to have information about the activities of—

''(I) a subject of an authorized investigation; or

''(II) a suspected agent of a foreign power who is associated with a subject of an authorized investigation; or

''(iv) in contact with or known to—

''(I) a subject of an authorized investigation; or

''(II) a suspected agent of a foreign power who is associated with a subject of an authorized investigation,

unless the tangible thing or information therein indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person or is disseminated to another element of the intelligence community for the sole purpose of determining whether the tangible thing or information therein relates to a person who is described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv); and''; and

(4) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking ''(A) and (B)'' and inserting ''(A), (B), and (C)''.

SEC. 104. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 501(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(1)) is amended by inserting after ''subsections (a) and (b)'' the following: ''and that the minimization procedures submitted in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(D) meet the definition of minimization procedures under subsection (g)''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(g)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(B) by inserting after ''adopt'' the following: '', and update as appropriate,''.

(b) ORDERS.—Section 501(f)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(A) by striking ''that order'' and inserting ''the production order or any nondisclosure order imposed in connection with the production order''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking clause (ii); and

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

SEC. 105. LIABILITY PROTECTION.

Section 501(e) (50 U.S.C. 1861(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e)(1) No cause of action shall lie in any court against a person who—

''(A) produces tangible things or provides information, facilities, or technical assistance in accordance with an order issued or an emergency production required under this section; or

''(B) otherwise provides technical assistance to the Government under this section or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014.

''(2) A production or provision of information, facilities, or technical assistance described in paragraph (1) shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of any privilege in any other proceeding or context.''.

SEC. 106. COMPENSATION FOR ASSISTANCE.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 102 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) COMPENSATION.—The Government shall compensate a person for reasonable expenses incurred for—

''(1) producing tangible things or providing information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with an order issued with respect to an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C) or an emergency production under subsection (i) that, to comply with subsection (i)(1)(D), requires an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C); or

''(2) otherwise providing technical assistance to the Government under this section

or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014.''.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 106 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADDRESS.—The term 'address' means a physical address or electronic address, such as an electronic mail address, temporarily assigned network address, or Internet protocol address.

''(2) CALL DETAIL RECORD.—The term 'call detail record'—

''(A) means session identifying information (including an originating or terminating telephone number, an International Mobile Subscriber Identity number, or an International Mobile Station Equipment Identity number), a telephone calling card number, or the time or duration of a call; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) the contents (as defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any communication;

''(ii) the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer; or

''(iii) cell site location information.

''(3) SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'specific selection term'—

''(i) means a term that specifically identifies a person, account, address, or personal device, or another specific identifier, that is used by the Government to narrowly limit the scope of tangible things sought to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, consistent with the purpose for seeking the tangible things; and

''(ii) does not include a term that does not narrowly limit the scope of the tangible things sought to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, consistent with the purpose for seeking the tangible things, such as—

''(I) a term based on a broad geographic region, including a city, State, zip code, or area code, when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i); or

''(II) a term identifying an electronic communication service provider (as that term is defined in section 701) or a provider of remote computing service (as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code), when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i), unless the provider is itself a subject of an authorized investigation for which the specific selection term is used as the basis of production.

''(B) CALL DETAIL RECORD APPLICATIONS.—For purposes of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2)(C), the term 'specific selection term' means a term that specifically identifies an individual, account, or personal device.''.

SEC. 108. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON BUSINESS RECORDS ORDERS.

Section 106A of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–177; 120 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and calendar years 2012 through 2014'' after ''2006'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) with respect to calendar years 2012 through 2014, an examination of the minimization procedures used in relation to orders under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons;''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))'';

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2012 THROUGH 2014.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2012 through 2014.'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall assess—

''(A) the importance of the information acquired under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) to the activities of the intelligence community;

''(B) the manner in which that information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the intelligence community;

''(C) the minimization procedures used by elements

the intelligence community under such title and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons; and

''(D) any minimization procedures proposed by an element of the intelligence community under such title that were modified or denied by the court established under section 103(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)).

''(2) SUBMISSION DATE FOR ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Justice submits the report required under subsection (c)(3), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2012 through 2014.'';

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)'' and inserting ''any report under subsection (c) or (d)''; and

(ii) by striking ''Inspector General of the Department of Justice'' and inserting ''Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that prepares a report to assist the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community in complying with the requirements of this section''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)'' and inserting ''any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)'';

(6) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)'' and inserting ''Each report submitted under subsection (c)''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (d)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)(2)''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term 'intelligence community' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

''(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).''.

SEC. 109. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 101 through 103 shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or eliminate the authority of the Government to obtain an order under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) as in effect prior to the effective date described in subsection (a) during the period ending on such effective date.

SEC. 110. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the production of the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication from an electronic communication service provider (as such term is defined in section 701(b)(4) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881(b)(4)) under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.).

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORM

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 402(c) (50 U.S.C. 1842(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''a certification by the applicant'' and inserting ''a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant to justify the belief of the applicant''; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the installation or use of the pen register or trap and trace device.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 401 (50 U.S.C. 1841) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) The term 'specific selection term'—

''(i) means a term that specifically identifies a person, account, address, or personal device, or another specific identifier, that is used by the Government to narrowly limit the scope of information sought to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, consistent with the purpose for the installation or use of the pen register or trap and trace device; and

''(ii) does not include a term that does not narrowly limit the scope of information

sought to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, consistent with the purpose for the installation or use of the pen register or trap and trace device, such as—

''(I) a term based on a broad geographic region, including a city, State, zip code, or area code, when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i); or

''(II) a term identifying an electronic communication service provider (as defined in section 701) or a provider of remote computing service (as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code), when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i), unless the provider is itself a subject of an authorized investigation for which the specific selection term is used as the basis for the installation or use of the pen register or trap and trace device.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'address' means a physical address or electronic address, such as an electronic mail address, temporarily assigned network address, or Internet protocol address.''.

SEC. 202. PRIVACY PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) PRIVACY PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall ensure that appropriate policies and procedures are in place to safeguard nonpublicly available information concerning United States persons that is collected through the use of a pen register or trap and trace device installed under this section. Such policies and procedures shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the need to protect national security, include privacy protections that apply to the collection, retention, and use of information concerning United States persons.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the court established under section 103(a) or of the Attorney General to impose additional privacy or minimization procedures with regard to the installation or use of a pen register or trap and trace device.

''(3) COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT.—At or before the end of the period of time for which the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device is approved under an order or an extension under this section, the judge may assess compliance with the privacy procedures required by this subsection by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was collected, retained, or disseminated.''.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—Section 403 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PRIVACY PROCEDURES.—Information collected through the use of a pen register or trap and trace device installed under this section shall be subject to the policies and procedures required under section 402(h).''.

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

SEC. 301. LIMITS ON USE OF UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED INFORMATION.

Section 702(i)(3) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(i)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Court orders a correction of a deficiency in a certification or procedures under subparagraph (B), no information obtained or evidence derived pursuant to the part of the certification or procedures that has been identified by the Court as deficient concerning any United States person shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired pursuant to such part of such certification or procedures shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of the United States person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—If the Government corrects any deficiency identified by the order of the Court under subparagraph (B), the Court may permit the use or disclosure of information obtained before the date of the correction under such minimization procedures as the Court shall establish for purposes of this clause.''.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

SEC. 401. APPOINTMENT OF AMICUS CURIAE.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) AMICUS CURIAE.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL ADVOCATES.—In consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b) shall, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this subsection, jointly appoint not fewer than 5 attorneys to serve as special advocates, who shall serve pursuant to rules the presiding judges may establish. Such individuals shall be persons who possess expertise in privacy and civil liberties, intelligence collection, telecommunications, or any other relevant area of expertise and who are determined to be eligible for access to classified information necessary to participate in matters before the courts.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b), consistent with the requirement of subsection (c) and any other statutory requirement that the court act expeditiously or within a stated time—

''(A) shall designate a special advocate to serve as amicus curiae to assist such court in the consideration of any certification pursuant to subsection (j) or any application for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court, presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a written finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and

''(B) may designate or allow an individual or organization to serve as amicus curiae or to provide technical expertise in any other instance as such court deems appropriate.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An application for an order or review shall be considered to present a novel or significant interpretation of the law if such application involves application of settled law to novel technologies or circumstances, or any other novel or significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law or of the Constitution of the United States, including any novel and significant interpretation of the term 'specific selection term'.

''(4) DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) designates a special advocate to participate as an amicus curiae in a proceeding, the special advocate—

''(i) shall advocate, as appropriate, in support of legal interpretations that advance individual privacy and civil liberties;

''(ii) shall have access to all relevant legal precedent, and any application, certification, petition, motion, or such other materials as are relevant to the duties of the special advocate;

''(iii) may consult with any other special advocates regarding information relevant to any assigned case, including sharing relevant materials; and

''(iv) may request that the court appoint technical and subject matter experts, not employed by the Government, to be available to assist the special advocate in performing the duties of the special advocate.

''(B) BRIEFINGS OR ACCESS TO MATERIALS.—The Attorney General shall periodically brief or provide relevant materials to special advocates regarding constructions and interpretations of this Act and legal, technological and other issues related to actions authorized by this Act.

''(C) ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A special advocate, experts appointed to assist a special advocate, or any other amicus or technical expert appointed by the court may have access to classified documents, information, and other materials or proceedings only if that individual is eligible for access to classified information and to the extent consistent with the national security of the United States.

''(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Government to provide information to a special advocate, other amicus, or technical expert that is privileged from disclosure.

''(5) NOTIFICATION.—The presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b) shall notify the Attorney General of each exercise of the authority to appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (1).

''(6) ASSISTANCE.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may request and receive (including on a non-reimbursable basis) the assistance of the executive branch in the implementation of this subsection.

''(7) ADMINISTRATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may provide for the designation, appointment, removal, training, or other support for an individual appointed to serve as a special advocate under paragraph (1) in a manner that is not inconsistent with this subsection.

''(j) REVIEW OF FISA COURT DECISIONS.—After issuing an order, a court established under subsection (a) shall certify for review to the court established under subsection (b) any question of law that the court determines warrants such review because of a need for uniformity or because consideration by the court established under subsection (b) would serve the interests of justice. Upon certification of a question of law under this paragraph, the court established under subsection (b) may give binding instructions or require the entire record to be sent up for decision of the entire matter in controversy.

''(k) REVIEW OF FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—

''(1) CERTIFICATION.—For any decision issued by the court of review established under subsection (b) approving, in whole or in part, an application by the Government under this Act, such court may certify at any time, including after a decision, a question of law to be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

''(2) SPECIAL ADVOCATE BRIEFING.—Upon certification of an application under paragraph (1), the court of review established

under subsection (b) may designate a special advocate to provide briefing as prescribed by the Supreme Court.

''(3) REVIEW.—The Supreme Court may review any question of law certified under paragraph (1) by the court of review established under subsection (b) in the same manner as the Supreme Court reviews questions certified under section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code.

''(l) PAYMENT FOR SERVICE AS SPECIAL ADVOCATE.—A special advocate designated in a proceeding pursuant to subsection (i)(2)(A) of this section may seek, at the conclusion of the proceeding in which the special advocate was designated, compensation for services provided pursuant to the designation. A special advocate seeking compensation shall be compensated in an amount reflecting fair compensation for the services provided, as determined by the court designating the special advocate and approved by the presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b).

''(m) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. When so specified in appropriation acts, such appropriations shall remain available until expended. Payments from such appropriations shall be made under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.''.

SEC. 402. DECLASSIFICATION OF DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

(a) DECLASSIFICATION.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**'' and inserting ''**OVERSIGHT**''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 602. DECLASSIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

''(a) DECLASSIFICATION REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (b), the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (as defined in section 601(e)) that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law, including any novel or significant construction or interpretation of the term 'specific selection term', and, consistent with that review, make publicly available to the greatest extent practicable each such decision, order, or opinion.

''(b) REDACTED FORM.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may satisfy the requirement under subsection (a) to make a decision, order, or opinion described in such subsection publicly available to the greatest extent practicable by making such decision, order, or opinion publicly available in redacted form.

''(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may waive the requirement to declassify and make publicly available a particular decision, order, or opinion under subsection (a) if—

''(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, determines that a waiver of such requirement is necessary to protect the national security of the United States or properly classified intelligence sources or methods; and

''(2) the Director of National Intelligence makes publicly available an unclassified statement prepared by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence—

''(A) summarizing the significant construction or interpretation of law, which shall include, to the extent consistent with national security, each legal question addressed by the decision and how such question was resolved, in general terms the context in which the matter arises, and a description of the construction or interpretation of any statute, constitutional provision, or other legal authority relied on by the decision; and

''(B) that specifies that the statement has been prepared by the Attorney General and constitutes no part of the opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title VI and inserting the following new item:

''TITLE VI—OVERSIGHT'';

and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 601 the following new item:

''Sec. 602. Declassification of significant decisions, orders, and opinions.''.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORM

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''may, using a term that specifically identifies a person, entity, telephone number, or account as the basis for a request''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114(a)(2) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(2)) is amended by striking the period and inserting ''and a term that specifically identifies a customer, entity, or account to be used as the basis for the production and disclosure of financial records.''.

(c) DISCLOSURES TO FBI OF CERTAIN CONSUMER RECORDS FOR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''that information,'' and inserting ''that information that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of that information,'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''written request,'' and inserting ''written request that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of that information,''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting '', which shall include a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of the information,'' after ''issue an order ex parte''.

(d) DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES OF CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)) is amended by striking ''analysis.'' and inserting ''analysis and that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of such information.''.

SEC. 502. LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no wire or electronic communication service provider that receives a request under subsection (b), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section.

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A wire or electronic communication service provider that receives a request under subsection (b), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (b) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

''(3) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any request under subsection (b) for which a recipient has submitted a notification to the Government under section 3511(b)(1)(A) or filed a petition for judicial review under subsection (d)—

''(i) an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, until termination of the nondisclosure requirement, review the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement annually and upon closure of the investigation; and

''(ii) if, upon a review under clause (i), the facts no longer support the nondisclosure requirement, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the wire or electronic service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.

''(B) CLOSURE OF INVESTIGATION.—Upon closure of the investigation—

''(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation may petition the court before which a notification or petition for judicial review under subsection (d) has been filed for a determination that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), if it notifies the recipient of such petition;

''(ii) the court shall review such a petition pursuant to the procedures under section 3511; and

''(iii) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall no longer be required to conduct the annual review of the facts supporting the nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A).''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no financial institution that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

''(3) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any request under subsection (a) for which a recipient has submitted a notification to the Government under section 3511(b)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, or filed a petition for judicial review under subsection (d)—

''(i) an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, until termination of the nondisclosure requirement, review the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement annually and upon closure of the investigation; and

''(ii) if, upon a review under clause (i), the facts no longer support the nondisclosure requirement, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.

''(B) CLOSURE OF INVESTIGATION.—Upon closure of the investigation—

''(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation may petition the court before which a notification or petition for judicial review under subsection (d) has been filed for a determination that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), if it notifies the recipient of such petition;

''(ii) the court shall review such a petition pursuant to the procedures under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(iii) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall no longer be required to conduct the annual review of the facts supporting the nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A).''.

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (e) is provided, no consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a), (b), or (c).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) is issued in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

''(3) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any request under subsection (a) or (b) or order under subsection (c) for which a recipient has submitted a notification to the Government under section 3511(b)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, or filed a petition for judicial review under subsection (e)—

''(i) an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, until termination of the nondisclosure requirement, review the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement annually and upon closure of the investigation; and

''(ii) if, upon a review under clause (i), the facts no longer support the nondisclosure requirement, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.

''(B) CLOSURE OF INVESTIGATION.—Upon closure of the investigation—

''(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation may petition the court before which a notification or petition for judicial review under subsection (e) has been filed for a determination that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), if it notifies the recipient of such petition;

''(ii) the court shall review such a petition pursuant to the procedures under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(iii) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall no longer be required to conduct the annual review of the facts supporting the nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A).''.

(d) CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that a government agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of the government agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the government agency described in subsection (a) or a designee.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request under subsection (a) is issued in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the head of the government agency described in subsection (a) or a designee, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the head or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

''(3) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any request under subsection (a) for which a recipient has submitted a notification to the Government under section 3511(b)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, or filed a petition for judicial review under subsection (d)—

''(i) an appropriate official of the agency described in subsection (a) shall, until termination of the nondisclosure requirement, review the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement annually and upon closure of the investigation; and

''(ii) if, upon a review under clause (i), the facts no longer support the nondisclosure requirement, an appropriate official of the agency described in subsection (a) shall promptly notify the consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.

''(B) CLOSURE OF INVESTIGATION.—Upon closure of the investigation—

''(i) the agency described in subsection (a) may petition the court before which a notification or petition for judicial review under subsection (d) has been filed for a determination that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), if it notifies the recipient of such petition;

''(ii) the court shall review such a petition pursuant to the procedures under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(iii) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the agency described in subsection (1) shall no longer be required to conduct the annual review of the facts supporting the nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A).''.

(e) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (c) is provided, no governmental or private entity that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or private entity that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) or a designee.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the head of the authorized investigative agency or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

''(3) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any request for which a recipient has submitted a notification to the Government under section 3511(b)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, or filed a petition for judicial review under subsection (c)—

''(i) an appropriate official of the authorized investigative agency making the request under subsection (a) shall, until termination of the nondisclosure requirement, review the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement annually and upon closure of the investigation; and

''(ii) if, upon a review under clause (i), the facts no longer support the nondisclosure requirement, an appropriate official of the authorized investigative agency making the request under subsection (a) shall promptly notify the recipient of the request, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.

''(B) CLOSURE OF INVESTIGATION.—Upon closure of the investigation—

''(i) the authorized investigative agency making the request under subsection (a) may petition the court before which a notification or petition for judicial review under subsection (c) has been filed for a determination that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), if it notifies the recipient of such petition;

''(ii) the court shall review such a petition pursuant to the procedures under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(iii) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in the harm described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the authorized investigative agency shall no longer be required to conduct the annual review of the facts supporting the nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A).''.

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) NONDISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a request or order for a report, records, or other information under section 2709 of this title, section 626 or 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u and 1681v), section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162), wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the request or order, the recipient may notify the Government or file a petition for judicial review in any court described in subsection (a).

''(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant request or order. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the order is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the request is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives a petition under subparagraph (A) or an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

''(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof or a response to a petition filed under paragraph (1) shall include a certification from the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office designated by the Director, or in the case of a request by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government other than the Department of Justice, the head or deputy head of the department, agency, or instrumentality, containing a statement of specific facts indicating that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period may result in—

''(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.''.

SEC. 503. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (b) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (b) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (m) as subsections (f) through (n), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (d) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(d) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(e) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (b) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

TITLE VI—FISA TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 601. ADDITIONAL REPORTING ON ORDERS REQUIRING PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS; BUSINESS RECORDS COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (6) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraphs:

''(1) a summary of all compliance reviews conducted by the Government for the production of tangible things under section 501;

''(2) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B) made for orders approving requests for the production of tangible things;

''(3) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied;

''(4) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C) made for orders approving requests for the production of call detail records;

''(5) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied;''.

SEC. 602. ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 603. ANNUAL REPORTS.

''(a) REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall annually submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, subject to a declassification review by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence, a report, made publicly available on an Internet Web site, that includes—

''(1) the number of applications or certifications for orders submitted under each of sections 105, 304, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704;

''(2) the number of orders entered under each of those sections;

''(3) the number of orders modified under each of those sections;

''(4) the number of orders denied under each of those sections;

''(5) the number of appointments of an individual to serve as amicus curiae under section 103, including the name of each individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae; and

''(6) the number of written findings issued under section 103(i) that such appointment is

not appropriate and the text of any such written findings.

''(b) MANDATORY REPORTING BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the Director of National Intelligence shall annually make publicly available on an Internet Web site a report that identifies, for the preceding 12-month period—

''(A) the total number of orders issued pursuant to titles I and III and sections 703 and 704 and a good faith estimate of the number of targets of such orders;

''(B) the total number of orders issued pursuant to section 702 and a good faith estimate of—

''(i) the number of targets of such orders;

''(ii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders;

''(iii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders who are reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection;

''(iv) the number of search terms that included information concerning a United States person that were used to query any database of the contents of electronic communications or wire communications obtained through the use of an order issued pursuant to section 702; and

''(v) the number of search queries initiated by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States whose search terms included information concerning a United States person in any database of noncontents information relating to electronic communications or wire communications that were obtained through the use of an order issued pursuant to section 702;

''(C) the total number of orders issued pursuant to title IV and a good faith estimate of—

''(i) the number of targets of such orders;

''(ii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders; and

''(iii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders who are reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection;

''(D) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(B) and a good faith estimate of—

''(i) the number of targets of such orders;

''(ii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders; and

''(iii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders who are reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection;

''(E) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(C) and a good faith estimate of—

''(i) the number of targets of such orders;

''(ii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders;

''(iii) the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to such orders who are reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection; and

''(iv) the number of search terms that included information concerning a United States person that were used to query any database of call detail records obtained through the use of such orders; and

''(F) the total number of national security letters issued and the number of requests for information contained within such national security letters.

''(2) BASIS FOR REASONABLE BELIEF INDIVIDUAL IS LOCATED IN UNITED STATES.—A phone number registered in the United States may provide the basis for a reasonable belief that the individual using the phone number is located in the United States at the time of collection.

''(c) DISCRETIONARY REPORTING BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence may annually make publicly available on an Internet Web site a report that identifies, for the preceding 12-month period—

''(1) a good faith estimate of the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to orders issued pursuant to titles I and III and sections 703 and 704 reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection whose information was reviewed or accessed by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States;

''(2) a good faith estimate of the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to orders issued pursuant to section 702 reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection whose information was reviewed or accessed by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States;

''(3) a good faith estimate of the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to orders issued pursuant to title IV reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection whose information was reviewed or accessed by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States;

''(4) a good faith estimate of the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(B) reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection whose information was reviewed or accessed by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States; and

''(5) a good faith estimate of the number of individuals whose communications were collected pursuant to orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(C) reasonably believed to have been located in the United States at the time of collection whose information was reviewed or accessed by an officer, employee, or agent of the United States.

''(d) TIMING.—The annual reports required by subsections (a) and (b) and permitted by subsection (c) shall be made publicly available during April of each year and include information relating to the previous year.

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) REPORTING BY UNIQUE IDENTIFIER.—If it is not practicable to report the good faith estimates required by subsection (b) and permitted by subsection (c) in terms of individuals, the good faith estimates may be counted in terms of unique identifiers, including names, account names or numbers, addresses, or telephone or instrument numbers.

''(2) STATEMENT OF NUMERICAL RANGE.—If a good faith estimate required to be reported under clauses (ii) or (iii) of each of subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) or permitted to be reported in subsection (c), is fewer than 500, it shall exclusively be expressed as a numerical range of 'fewer than 500' and shall not be expressed as an individual number.

''(3) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Subparagraphs (B)(iv), (B)(v), (D)(iii), (E)(iii), and (E)(iv) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall not apply to information or records held by, or queries conducted by, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(4) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Director of National Intelligence concludes that a good faith estimate required to be reported under subparagraph (B)(iii) or (C)(iii) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) cannot be determined accurately, including through the use of statistical sampling, the Director shall—

''(i) certify that conclusion in writing to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

''(ii) make such certification publicly available on an Internet Web site.

''(B) CONTENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The certification described in subparagraph (A) shall state with specificity any operational, national security, or other reasons why the Director of National Intelligence has reached the conclusion described in subparagraph (A).

''(ii) GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WHOSE COMMUNICATIONS WERE COLLECTED UNDER ORDERS ISSUED UNDER SECTION 702.—A certification described in subparagraph (A) relating to a good faith estimate required to be reported under subsection (b)(1)(B)(iii) may include the information annually reported pursuant to section 702(l)(3)(A).

''(iii) GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WHOSE COMMUNICATIONS WERE COLLECTED UNDER ORDERS ISSUED UNDER TITLE IV.—If the Director of National Intelligence determines that a good faith estimate required to be reported under subsection (b)(1)(C)(iii) cannot be determined accurately as that estimate pertains to electronic communications, but can be determined accurately for wire communications, the Director shall make the certification described in subparagraph (A) with respect to electronic communications and shall also report the good faith estimate with respect to wire communications.

''(C) FORM.—A certification described in subparagraph (A) shall be prepared in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

''(D) TIMING.—If the Director of National Intelligence continues to conclude that the good faith estimates described in this paragraph cannot be determined accurately, the Director shall annually submit a certification in accordance with this paragraph.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section affects the lawfulness or unlawfulness of any government surveillance activities described herein.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTENTS.—The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION.—The term 'electronic communication' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) INDIVIDUAL WHOSE COMMUNICATIONS WERE COLLECTED.—The term 'individual whose communications were collected' means any individual—

''(A) who was a party to an electronic communication or a wire communication the contents or noncontents of which was collected; or

''(B)(i) who was a subscriber or customer of an electronic communication service or remote computing service; and

''(ii) whose records, as described in subparagraph (A), (B), (D), (E), or (F) of section

2703(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code, were collected.

''(4) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER.—The term 'national security letter' means a request for a report, records, or other information under—

''(A) section 2709 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) section 1114(a)(5)(A) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A));

''(C) subsection (a) or (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(a), 1681u(b)); or

''(D) section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)).

''(5) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a))).

''(6) WIRE COMMUNICATION.—The term 'wire communication' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents, as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 602, as added by section 402 of this Act, the following new item:

''Sec. 603. Annual reports.''.

(c) PUBLIC REPORTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—Section 118(c) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (18 U.S.C. 3511 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''concerning different United States persons''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking '', excluding the number of requests for subscriber information'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) CONTENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each report required under this subsection shall include a good faith estimate of the total number of requests described in paragraph (1) requiring disclosure of information concerning—

''(i) United States persons; and

''(ii) persons who are not United States persons.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—With respect to the number of requests for subscriber information under section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, a report required under this subsection need not separate the number of requests into each of the categories described in subparagraph (A).''.

(d) STORED COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 2702(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) the number of accounts from which the Department of Justice has received voluntary disclosures under subsection (c)(4).''.

SEC. 603. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO FISA ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by sections 402 and 602 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 604. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO ORDERS.

''(a) REPORTING.—A person subject to a nondisclosure requirement accompanying an order or directive under this Act or a national security letter may, with respect to such order, directive, or national security letter, publicly report the following information using 1 of the following structures:

''(1) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders or national security letters with which the person was required to comply in the following separate categories:

''(A) The number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999.

''(B) The number of customer accounts affected by national security letters, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999.

''(C) The number of orders under this Act for contents, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999.

''(D) With respect to contents orders under this Act, in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999, the number of customer selectors targeted under such orders.

''(E) The number of orders under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999.

''(F) With respect to noncontents orders under this Act, in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999, the number of customer selectors targeted under orders under—

''(i) title IV;

''(ii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B); and

''(iii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C).

''(2) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply in the following separate categories:

''(A) The total number of all national security process received, including all national security letters and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 0–249 and thereafter in bands of 250.

''(B) The total number of customer selectors targeted under all national security process received, including all national security letters and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 0–249 and thereafter in bands of 250.

''(3) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders or national security letters with which the person was required to comply in the following separate categories:

''(A) The number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(B) The number of customer accounts affected by national security letters, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(C) The number of orders under this Act for contents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(D) The number of customer selectors targeted under such orders, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(E) The number of orders under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(F) The number of customer selectors targeted under such orders, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(4) An annual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, and national security letters the person was required to comply with in the following separate categories:

''(A) The total number of all national security process received, including all national security letters and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 0–100 and thereafter in bands of 100.

''(B) The total number of customer selectors targeted under all national security process received, including all national security letters and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 0–100 and thereafter in bands of 100.

''(b) PERIOD OF TIME COVERED BY REPORTS.—

''(1) A report described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a)—

''(A) may be published every 180 days;

''(B) subject to subparagraph (C), shall include—

''(i) with respect to information relating to national security letters, information relating to the previous 180 days; and

''(ii) with respect to information relating to authorities under this Act, except as provided in subparagraph (C), information relating to the time period—

''(I) ending on the date that is not less than 180 days before the date on which the information is publicly reported; and

''(II) beginning on the date that is 180 days before the date described in subclause (I); and

''(C) for a person that has received an order or directive under this Act with respect to a platform, product, or service for which a person did not previously receive such an order or directive (not including an enhancement to or iteration of an existing publicly available platform, product, or service)—

''(i) shall not include any information relating to such new order or directive until 540 days after the date on which such new order or directive is received; and

''(ii) for a report published on or after the date on which the 540-day waiting period expires, shall include information relating to such new order or directive reported pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii).

''(2) A report described in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) may be published every 180 days and shall include information relating to the previous 180 days.

''(3) A report described in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) may be published annually and shall include information relating to the time period—

''(A) ending on the date that is not less than 1 year before the date on which the information is publicly reported; and

''(B) beginning on the date that is 1 year before the date described in subparagraph (A).

''(c) OTHER FORMS OF AGREED TO PUBLICATION.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Government and any person from jointly agreeing to the publication of information referred to in this subsection in a time, form, or manner other than as described in this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTENTS.—The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER.—The term 'national security letter' has the meaning given that term under section 603.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents, as amended by sections 402 and 602 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 603, as added by section 602 of this Act, the following new item:

''Sec. 604. Public reporting by persons subject to orders.''.

SEC. 604. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

Section 601(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1871(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issues a decision, order, or opinion, including any denial or modification of an application under this Act, that includes significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law or results in a change of application of any provision of this Act or a novel application of any provision of this Act, a copy of such decision, order, or opinion and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion; and''.

SEC. 605. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS UNDER FISA.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 108(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1808(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,'' and inserting ''the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''.

(b) PHYSICAL SEARCHES.—The matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 306 (50 U.S.C. 1826) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,'' and inserting ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives''.

(c) PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 406(b) (50 U.S.C. 1846(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) each department or agency on behalf of which the Attorney General or a designated attorney for the Government has made an application for an order authorizing or approving the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device under this title; and

''(5) for each department or agency described in paragraph (4), each number described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).''.

(d) ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS.—Section 502(a) (50 U.S.C. 1862(a)) is amended by striking ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate'' and inserting ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''.

TITLE VII—SUNSETS

SEC. 701. SUNSETS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

Mr. LEE. First, I thank my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, for his leadership on this issue. I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of this legislation. As the lead cosponsor of this bill, I attest to the fact that this is an issue that is neither Republican nor Democratic, it is neither liberal nor conservative, it is simply American.

It is a fundamental concept of liberty that we have to control the government. The government and the immense power of government has expanded over time with advances in technology. Our country certainly has changed to an enormous degree over the centuries since James Madison penned our Bill of Rights. But the protection of liberty afforded by the Fourth Amendment has only become more important, not less important, as the government's ability to collect information has advanced.

This legislation, which has broad-based bipartisan support, is absolutely necessary. It can be implemented in a way that will still allow the government to protect us. It will also protect us from the risk of overreach by the government.

We have to remember it is not just the government that we have in place today, even if we assume, for purposes of this discussion, that everyone who works for the government, every government agent who participates in the collection of this information is doing what is right. We can't always assume that will be the case in the future.

I see my time has expired. I once again thank my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, for his sponsorship of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the transparency provisions in the USA FREEDOM Act. I am a proud cosponsor of Chairman LEAHY's bill, and I am particularly proud to have written the key transparency provisions with my friend Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada.

Senator LEE is right. This is not a Republican bill or a Democratic bill. This isn't a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. I thank Senator LEE for his leadership. Of course, we are all indebted to Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this issue.

Because of time constraints, I am not going to be able to give the speech I wanted to, so I will try to ask for time for tomorrow. I know today's floor is very busy.

I wish to say it is very important that there is enough transparency in our NSA surveillance that Americans can judge for themselves if we are striking the right balance between national security and our civil liberties.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, introduced legislation that would amend the PATRIOT Act. This new legislation reflects a bicameral and bipartisan compromise that ends the bulk data collection practices currently being used. It also gives our intelligence officials specific rules to follow so they can keep the operational capabilities necessary to protect the United States from a terrorist attack without compromising the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. I thank Senator LEAHY for his work, and I am grateful for his partnership.

This important step is necessary for restoring Americans' privacy rights which were taken by a well-intended but overreaching Federal Government in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

The expanded authority given to the National Security Agency through executive action and the PATRIOT Act was intended to prevent another attack on America. While I was not a Member of Congress on 9/11, I shared the horror all Nevadans felt watching the murder of thousands of innocent Americans, and the profound sadness as buildings in New York and Washington, DC, sat smoldering. I understand as well as anyone here the reason behind the actions our Nation's leaders took to ensure that another attack on America never materialized, and why our leaders felt that no limits should be imposed. No matter what the cost, Americans had to be protected against another attack.

Viewing the situation from that lens, it is easy to understand how the Fourth Amendment was brushed aside as the Senate expanded law enforcement surveillance capabilities with just one dissenting vote.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation then used section 215 of the PATRIOT Act to expand the scope of surveillance far beyond even what some of the authors believed they were authorizing. The FBI argued that section 215 provided authority to collect phone data of law-abiding citizens without their knowledge. Specifically, they could use the business records provision to force phone companies to turn over millions of telephone calls when there is a reasonable ground or relevance to believe that the information sought is relevant to an authorized investigation of international terrorism.

As a result, we now have a bulk collection program in existence where

telephone companies hand over millions of records to the NSA as part of a massive pre-collection database.

As someone who voted against the PATRIOT Act time and time again, I believe such data collection practices are a massive intrusion of our privacy, which is why I partnered with the senior Senator from Vermont to end these programs. Our legislation tightens the definitions of ''specific selection term'' for section 215 of the PATRIOT Act and FISA pen register trap-and-trace devices so that the information requested is limited to specifically identifying a person, account, address, or a personal device.

With this legislation, bulk collection will be eliminated and the records will stay with the telephone companies. The massive information grabs from the Federal Government based on geography or email service will no longer be permissible. And of the information that is collected, the legislation imposes new restrictions on its use and retention. These reforms will help shift the balance of privacy away from the Federal Government and back to the American people.

I am proud that this bill also includes the Franken-Heller Surveillance Transparency Act of 2013. I was pleased to join Senator FRANKEN on this legislation because, at the very least, Americans deserve to know the number of people whose information is housed by the NSA. For the first time in American history, the government is forced to disclose to the American people roughly how many of them have had their communications collected.

Our provision calls for reports by the Director of National Intelligence detailing the requests for information authorized under the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act. The reports would specify the total number of people whose information has been collected under these programs and how many people living in the United States have had their information collected. They would also permit the intelligence community to report on how many Americans actually had their information looked at by the NSA or any other intelligence agencies.

Furthermore, these provisions would allow telephone and Internet companies to tell consumers basic information regarding FISA court orders they receive and the number of users whose information is turned over.

The principles outlined in this bill to increase transparency for Americans and private companies would clear up a tremendous amount of confusion that exists within the programs. And our private companies need the added disclosure. The Information Technology & Innovation Foundation estimates that American cloud computing companies could lose $22 billion to $35 billion in the next 3 years because of concerns about their involvement with surveillance programs. The analytics firm Forrester put potential losses much higher, at $180 billion.

I want to be clear: I share the concerns of all Americans that we must protect ourselves against threats to the homeland. I believe terrorism is very real and the United States is the target of those looking to undermine the freedoms we hold as the core of our national identity. If the bulk collection programs in existence were bearing so much information to protect the homeland, it would change my opinion on the need for the USA Freedom Act. However, the bulk collection program has simply not provided the tangible results that justify a privacy intrusion of this level. We know this because on October 2, 2013, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, asked NSA Director Keith Alexander the following question:

> At our last hearing, deputy director Inglis stated that there's only really one example of a case where, but for the use of Section 215 bulk phone records collection, terrorist activity was stopped. Was Mr. Inglis right?

To which Director Alexander responded:

> He's right. I believe he said two, Chairman.

Congress has authorized the collection of millions of law-abiding citizens' telephone metadata for years and it has only solved two ongoing FBI investigations. Of those two investigations, the NSA has publicly identified one. In fact, that case could have easily been handled by obtaining a warrant and going to the telephone company. It is the case of an individual in San Diego who was convicted of sending $8,500 to Somalia in support of al-Shabaab, the terrorist organization claiming responsibility for the Kenyan mall attack. The American phone records allowed the NSA to determine that a U.S. phone was used to contact an individual associated with this terrorist organization. I am appreciative that the NSA was able to apprehend this individual, but it does not provide overwhelming evidence that this program is necessary. The Obama administration has come to the same conclusion and so has the intelligence community.

The operational capabilities the intelligence community relies on to conduct their mission to keep us safe will not be impacted by the USA FREEDOM Act. If it were, the Intelligence Community and the administration would not have brokered this compromise legislation. Ending the bulk collection programs and giving Americans more transparency so they can determine for themselves whether they believe these programs should exist is an obligation we have to all of our constituents.

We have a bill introduced today that would give our law enforcement authorities the tools they need to keep us safe and also stay true to the Fourth Amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support these important reforms and I hope it can quickly be considered by this Chamber.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 526—SUPPORTING ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST HAMAS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 526

Whereas Hamas, an organization designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the United States Department of State since 1997, has fired over 2,500 rockets indiscriminately from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Israel has a right to defend itself from Hamas's constant barrage of rockets and to destroy the matrix of tunnels Hamas uses to smuggle weapons and Hamas fighters into Israel to carry out terrorist attacks;

Whereas the Government of Israel has taken significant steps to protect civilians in Gaza, including dropping leaflets in Gaza neighborhoods in advance of Israeli military attacks, calling Palestinians on the phone urging them to evacuate certain areas before the military strikes targets, and issuing warnings to civilians in advance of firing on buildings;

Whereas Israel's attacks have focused on terrorist targets such as Hamas's munitions storage sites, areas sheltering Hamas's rocket systems, Hamas's weapons manufacturing sites, the homes of militant leaders, and on the vast labyrinth of tunnels Hamas's fighters use to penetrate Israel's territory and attack Israelis;

Whereas Hamas uses rockets to indiscriminately target civilians in Israel;

Whereas Israel has accepted and implemented numerous ceasefire agreements that Hamas has rejected;

Whereas Hamas continued to fire rockets into Israel during a 24-hour truce that Hamas had itself proposed;

Whereas Israel embraced the Egyptian-proposed ceasefire agreement, which Hamas resoundingly rejected on July 27, 2014;

Whereas Hamas intentionally uses civilians as human shields;

Whereas Hamas refuses to recognize Israel's right to exist;

Whereas Israel's Iron Dome has protected Israel's civilian population from the over 2,500 rockets that Hamas has indiscriminately fired into Israel since July 7, 2014;

Whereas, without Iron Dome's ability to intercept and destroy Hamas's missiles, Israeli neighborhoods would have been significantly damaged and Israeli casualties would have been much higher;

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Council voted to accept a biased resolution establishing a Commission of Inquiry to determine if Israel violated human rights and humanitarian law during the ongoing conflict with Gaza; and

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Council resolution makes no mention of investigating Hamas's indiscriminate rocket attacks against Israel, nor Hamas's policy of using Palestinian civilians as human shields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) laments all loss of innocent civilian life;

(2) condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's resolution on July 23, 2014, which calls for yet another prejudged investigation of Israel while making no mention of Hamas's continued assault against Israel, and also calls for an investigation into potential human rights violations by Israel in the current Gaza conflict without mentioning Hamas's assault against innocent civilians and its use of civilian shields;

(3) supports Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas's unrelenting and indiscriminate rocket assault into Israel and Israel's right to destroy Hamas's elaborate tunnel system into Israel's territory;

(4) condemns Hamas's terrorist actions and use of civilians as human shields;

(5) supports United States mediation efforts for a durable ceasefire agreement that immediately ends Hamas's rocket assault and leads to the demilitarization of Gaza; and

(6) supports additional funding the Government of Israel needs to replenish Iron Dome missiles and enhance Israel's defensive capabilities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 527—CONGRATULATING THE MEMBERS OF PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY, INC. FOR 100 YEARS OF SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD, AND COMMENDING PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY, INC. FOR EXEMPLIFYING THE IDEALS OF BROTHERHOOD, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE WHILE UPHOLDING THE MOTTO ''CULTURE FOR SERVICE AND SERVICE FOR HUMANITY''

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 527

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. was founded on the campus of Howard University in the District of Columbia on January 9, 1914, by A. Langston Taylor, Leonard F. Morse, and Charles I. Brown;

Whereas since the formation of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., the members of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. have maintained a strong commitment to brotherhood, community involvement, and service to all people;

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. has implemented a number of initiatives encouraging diversity, business opportunities, and advocacy;

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. has established the Sigma Wellness, Sigma Cares, and Living Well Brother to Brother programs;

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. was the first African-American fraternity to establish alumni chapters and youth mentoring clubs and is the only fraternity to form an African-American sorority counterpart, Zeta Phi Beta;

Whereas the men of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. have dedicated themselves to the promotion of civil rights, and the members of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. include influential leaders and activists such as Hosea Williams, A. Philip Randolph, and Lafayette Mckeene Hershaw;

Whereas members belonging to chapters of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. across the United States responded to a call for support of the war efforts of the United States during World War I;

Whereas members of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., such as Alain LeRoy Locke, Weldon Johnson, and A. Philip Randolph, made significant contributions to the Harlem Renaissance;

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. has over 700 chapters in the United States, Africa, Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean;

Whereas the men of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. have distinguished themselves as public servants, including members such as—

(1) a United States Congressman, civil rights activist, and chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee;

(2) the first African-American Speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives;

(3) the first African-American Democrat elected to the Congress of the United States;

(4) Demetrius C. Newton, Sr., elected in 1986 as the first African-American Speaker Pro Tempore of the Alabama House of Representatives; and

(5) Fleming Jones, Jr., the first African-American Democratic member of the West Virginia House of Delegates; and

Whereas Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. commemorated its history and promoted service during the Phi Beta Sigma centennial celebration on January 9, 2014, in the District of Columbia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for 100 years of service to communities throughout the United States and the world; and

(2) commends Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for a continued commitment to the ideals of brotherhood, scholarship, and service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 528—COMMEMORATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH DAKOTA'S STATEHOOD

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 528

Whereas the Dakota Territory was incorporated in 1861;

Whereas President Theodore Roosevelt came to the Dakota Territory in 1883 to hunt and begin cattle ranching near Medora, North Dakota;

Whereas President Theodore Roosevelt credited the fact he was elected President to the time he spent and the experiences he had in North Dakota;

Whereas North Dakota was admitted to the Union on November 2, 1889;

Whereas the population of North Dakota grew from 2,000 in 1870 to 680,000 in 1930, and reached a State record of 730,000 people in 2014;

Whereas the battleship USS NORTH DAKOTA, the first turbine-powered ship in the United States Navy, was launched in 1908;

Whereas the North Dakota State flag, the regimental flag carried by the North Dakota Infantry in the Spanish-American War in 1898 and Philippine Island Insurrection in 1899, was designated in 1911;

Whereas the Bank of North Dakota was established in 1919 and the State mill and elevator began operating in 1922;

Whereas, in 1932, the International Peace Garden was established on the border between North Dakota and the Canadian province of Manitoba, a symbol of peace between the governments of the United States and Canada;

Whereas, in 1949, the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park was dedicated, covering 3 areas of the badlands in western North Dakota;

Whereas, in 1953, President Eisenhower dedicated the Garrison Dam, the fifth-largest earthen dam in the world, which created Lake Sakakawea, the third-largest manmade lake in the United States;

Whereas North Dakota has a world-class system of higher education, which supports student development across a variety of fields, including aerospace, agriculture, architecture, education, engineering, law, medicine, and nursing;

Whereas the USS NORTH DAKOTA, a Virginia-class submarine was christened in November 2013;

Whereas North Dakota has had the lowest unemployment rate in the United States for over 5 years;

Whereas, in 2013, North Dakota was either 1st or 2nd in the United States in total agriculture production for 16 different commodities;

Whereas North Dakota is the second largest producer of oil and gas in the United States;

Whereas North Dakota produces over 1,000,000 barrels of oil each day;

Whereas the economy of North Dakota has grown faster than the economy of all other States of the United States for 4 consecutive years;

Whereas the personal income of people in North Dakota is nearly 30 percent above the national average;

Whereas, in 2012, exports from North Dakota topped $4,000,000,000; and

Whereas the economy and communities of North Dakota has experienced unprecedented development, resulting in national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates—

(A) the State of North Dakota on its 125th anniversary; and

(B) the people of North Dakota for their tremendous work and success in building the prosperity of current and future generations living in the State; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Governor of North Dakota.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3700. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3701. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3702. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3703. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3704. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3705. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3700. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 4. LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR EMPLOYER HEALTH CARE COVERAGE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—The term 'full-time employee' shall not include any individual who is a long-term unemployed individual (as defined in section 3111(d)(3)) with respect to such employer.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3701. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2569, to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 4. CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS EXEMPT FROM EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—The term 'applicable large employer' shall not include—

''(i) any elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965),

''(ii) any local educational agency or State educational agency (as such terms are defined in section 9101 of such Act), and

''(iii) any institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3702. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2032) is amended by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

''(13) Raleigh-Norfolk Corridor from Raleigh, North Carolina, through Rocky Mount, Williamston, and Elizabeth City, North Carolina, to Norfolk, Virginia.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ROUTE SEGMENTS ON INTERSTATE SYSTEM.—Section 1105(e)(5)(A) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (109 Stat. 597; 115 Stat. 872; 118 Stat. 293) is amended in the first sentence by inserting ''subsection (c)(13),'' after ''subsection (c)(9),''.

SA 3703. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1247. EXTENSION OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE MILITARY POWER OF IRAN.

Section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2544) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2018''.

SA 3704. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1616. PROHIBITION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF CHINA INTO MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF UNITED STATES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used to integrate a missile defense system of the People's Republic of China into any missile defense system of the United States.

SA 3705. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PAYMENTS FROM THE ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411(h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by striking ''Payments'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Payments''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) CERTAIN PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, as soon as practicable after October 1, 2015, of the 7 equal installments referred to in clause (i), the Secretary shall pay to any certified State or Indian tribe to which the total annual payment under this subsection was limited to $15,000,000 in 2013 and $28,000,000 in fiscal year 2014—

''(I) the final 2 installments in 2 separate payments of $82,700,000 each; and

''(II) 2 separate payments of $32,600,000 each.''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall take effect October 1, 2015.

(c) OFFSET.—For purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.)—

(1) oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities shall be considered to be compatible with the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established; and

(2) no further findings or decisions shall be required to implement those activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Revisiting the RESTORE Act: Progress and Challenges in Gulf Restoration Post-Deepwater Horizon.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 3 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Opportunities and Challenges for Improving Truck Safety on our Highways.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Breaking the Logjam at BLM: Examining Ways to More Efficiently Process Permits for Energy Production on Federal Lands.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Tobacco: Taxes Owed, Avoided, and Evaded.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014 at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Iran: Status of the P–5+1.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 29, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining the Threats Posed by Climate Change.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance be authorized to me during the session of the Senate on July 29, 2014 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement: Lessons Learned Two Years Later.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my counsel detailee, Helen Gilbert, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Shirin Panahandeh and Ryan Meyer, research associates in my office, for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Shelby Stepper, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kelli Andrews and Carter Burwell, who have been detailed to my staff, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAFTALI FRAENKEL REWARD ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. 2577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2577) to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2577) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REWARDS AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Rewards for Justice program authorized under section 36(b) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)), the Secretary of State shall offer a reward to any individual who furnishes information leading to the arrest or conviction in any country of any individual for committing, conspiring or attempting to commit, or aiding or abetting in the commission of the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel.

(b) LIMIT ON TOTAL REWARDS.—The total amount of rewards offered under subsection (a) may not exceed $5,000,000.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 103, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 106, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to,

and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) was agreed to.

PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY, INC. 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 527, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 527) congratulating the members of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for 100 years of service throughout the United States and the world, and commending Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. for exemplifying the ideals of brotherhood, scholarship, and service while upholding the motto ''Culture for Service and Service for Humanity''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 527) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution (S. Res. 527), with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH DAKOTA STATEHOOD

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 528.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 528) commemorating the 125th anniversary of North Dakota Statehood.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 528) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2685

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand S. 2685 is due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2685) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 521) designating July 26, 2014, as ''United States Intelligence Professionals Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 521) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, July 24, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2648, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 535, 783, and 729; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, we expect the nominations to be considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT OF 1998

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 475, H.R. 4028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4028) to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation that the Senate has passed H.R. 4028, a bipartisan bill Representatives GRACE MENG and DOUG COLLINS introduced that amends the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom. Last month, Senator RISCH and I introduced a Senate companion bill, S. 2466, to H.R. 4028.

In 1998, Congress passed the International Religious Freedom Act to affirm America's commitment to religious freedom, enshrined both in the U.S. Constitution and in numerous international human rights instruments. The act acknowledges the pressure and persecution that many people around the world face because of their religious beliefs and requires the Department of State to issue an annual report on international religious freedom.

Freedom of religion requires respect for those practicing their faith alone as well as in community with others. It also requires protection for those who identify as members of a religious community, for the symbols of the community, for the houses of worship, and for other institutions of the community. The defacing or destruction of a cemetery based on an affiliation with a particular religious or spiritual group should not be tolerated by governments and must factor into our international religious freedom reporting. This bill, H.R. 4028, will ensure inclusion of these acts in the annual State Department reports and will better aid those of us working to monitor and combat anti-Semitism and other religious discrimination.

There is no question that we need to report on these crimes. In recent years, we have witnessed with growing concern a number of

cases involving the desecration of Jewish cemeteries in the Netherlands, Hungary, Russia, Poland, France, Germany, Georgia, Moldova, and Argentina. This legislation is even more important and timely given the rise in anti-Semitism across Europe. In just the past few weeks, large-scale anti-Semitic protests have taken place in major cities across Europe. In this year's European Union elections, extremist parties espousing anti-Semitic platforms have made alarming progress. And in Hungary and Greece, extremist parliamentary parties associated with street militias have been successful in elections.

I have served on the Helsinki Commission for nearly 20 years. During my tenure, I have worked tirelessly to combat anti-Semitism and religious discrimination. Ensuring that religiously motivated cemetery desecration is reported is the first important step to combating this serious crime.

I thank Senator RISCH for his leadership on this issue. I also thank Senators MENENDEZ and CORKER for taking up H.R. 4028 and moving it quickly through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Finally, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle supporting this bill and for helping to recognize the desecration of cemeteries as a violation of the right to religious freedom.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4028) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 30, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2569; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at approximately 10:45 a.m. tomorrow morning, there will be a cloture vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. If cloture is not invoked, there will be an immediate cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2648, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senator GRASSLEY for up to 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

DETENTION OF DANIEL CHONG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to speak about the unconscionable way in which the Drug Enforcement Administration treated Daniel Chong, a San Diego college student, back in 2012. Unfortunately, the American people still do not know all the facts. They do not know what lasting changes are being made to make sure something like this never happens again. And they do not know what is being done to hold the DEA agents involved accountable because if people are not held accountable, there are not going to be any changes made. Most of the time, for people to be held accountable, heads have to roll, and there is no evidence that is the case in this particular case. But here is what we do know. It is a story that you might expect to hear set in some Third World country but never in the United States of America. So here it is.

Back in April 2012, Daniel Chong, a college student at the University of California, San Diego, was arrested by law enforcement conducting a sweep for drugs at a college party. He was taken into custody by the DEA and transported to the local DEA field office. He was questioned by the agents who had arrested him, and the agents apparently concluded that there was no basis to charge him with a crime. The young man may well have simply been in the wrong place at the wrong time.

The agents told him he was going to be released. But Daniel Chong was not released. Instead, he was taken back to a holding cell in handcuffs, and he was left there for dead for 5 days—5 days without food, 5 days without water, 5 days without sunlight, 5 days without any basic necessities of life, in a holding cell not much larger than a bathroom stall. He cried out for help. He kicked and banged on the door of the cell but to no avail. He became so desperate and dehydrated that he even drank his own urine in an effort to survive. Incredibly, the one thing Daniel Chong found in his cell that he tried to live on turned out to be some methamphetamine. That is right, he found an illegal drug in the DEA's own holding cell. Apparently, it was never searched before Mr. Chong was tossed inside. It got so bad that this young man tried to kill himself. He tried to carve the words ''sorry Mom'' into his own skin. He intended it to be the last message for anyone to pass on who might one day discover his lifeless body in that DEA holding cell.

After 5 days someone finally responded to Daniel Chong's call for help. He was taken immediately to the hospital. He was found to be suffering from extreme dehydration, hypothermia, kidney failure, and cuts and bruises on his wrists. It took 4 days to nurse him back to health.

This all occurred in April 2012. Soon after I learned of it, I sent a letter to the DEA Administrator demanding to know what could have led to such a calamity. I asked how, in a modern age of computers and surveillance cameras, it was possible that an innocent person could be left for dead in a DEA holding cell. I asked about the DEA policies and procedures in place to help prevent this from ever happening again. And I asked whether those responsible for what happened to Mr. Chong were going to be held accountable.

It took the DEA more than a year to respond to my questions—more than a year. In June 2013 the DEA trotted out the familiar response we so often hear from bureaucrats when they do not want to tell you what really happened. They said at that time the DEA could not comment on many aspects of the matter because the Department of Justice's own inspector general was conducting a review. The DEA assured me that, in their words, an ''interim'' policy had been adopted to make sure no other innocent people would be abandoned in a prison cell and left for dead. But the American people would have to wait for a permanent policy change and a full accounting until after the inspector general finished its investigation.

Just a month later, in July 2013, the DEA announced it would be handing over $4.1 million to Daniel Chong to settle his lawsuit. Mr. President, $4.1 million of taxpayer money—almost $1 million for each day he spent forgotten and also ignored in that dark and drug-infested DEA holding cell.

Now, up to date, finally, just this month and more than 2 years after this debacle, the Department of Justice's inspector general finally issued its report of the investigation. We still do not know the full truth about what happened to Daniel Chong. In many ways the inspector general's report raises more questions than it answers, and what the report does tell us is quite disturbing.

According to the report, Daniel Chong was not just forgotten by the agents who arrested him; he was ignored by other DEA employees who knew he was there but assumed he was somebody else's problem.

And the report suggests the DEA may have tried to cover up the whole event.

According to the report, there were three DEA agents and a supervisor directly responsible for making sure this

young man was not abandoned in that holding cell. So it is obvious these four agents failed miserably in their responsibilities. But it gets even worse. According to the report, at least four other agents passed in and out of the holding cell area during the 5 days Daniel Chong was imprisoned. These four agents admitted they had either seen or heard Chong in his cell, but they simply assumed someone else was going to take care of him—in other words, he was somebody else's problem.

Daniel Chong was arrested on a Saturday. One of those agents saw him in the cell on Sunday, and one saw him there on Monday, and another two agents either saw him or heard him on Wednesday, but nothing compelled these law enforcement officers to address his plight because they did not believe anything was amiss.

I hope to all my colleagues that what I just told you is very difficult to believe.

In addition, Daniel Chong's holding cell was near a workspace area used by dozens of DEA personnel. According to the report, anyone in that workspace could have clearly heard banging and yelling from inside the cell.

But not a single one of the 25 DEA employees interviewed by the inspector general who worked this area could recall hearing any unusual noises during the time Daniel Chong was imprisoned there. So this is very difficult to believe. It defies all common sense. It contradicts what Daniel Chong says he did by crying out for help and banging on his holding cell door. It contradicts what his injuries tell us he did. It contradicts what anyone left in a holding cell without the basic necessities of life for days would do.

Why did no one respond to Daniel Chong's cries for help? The report does not even attempt to answer that question.

These eight DEA agents were in some way responsible for this young man's wrongful captivity. The report does not say what happened to these agents. This is where you get into accountability. Who is responsible? Are heads going to roll so this behavior changes? Are these agents still working for the DEA? Have they been disciplined? Are they still arresting other people, tossing them behind bars and leaving them for dead?

The problem does not stop here. According to the report, the DEA may have tried to cover up this entire event. The inspector general learned about what happened to Daniel Chong from an anonymous whistleblower who called one of its field offices.

This is another example of the value of whistleblowers, heroes who stand up for what is right, sometimes at great personal risk. According to the IG's report, the whistleblower indicated that the DEA ''was trying to contain this matter locally.'' That is another way of saying, essentially, that a coverup could be in the works.

Incredibly, as it turns out the DEA office in San Diego assigned the very agents who were responsible for Daniel Chong's captivity to process the holding cell area where Chong was held for days. That is right. The agents who left Chong behind bars for 5 days were assigned to investigate their own egregious mistakes—kind of like the fox guarding the chicken house.

DEA management also decided that it was going to conduct its own internal management review of the incident; that is, it would conduct it is own interviews and investigations before DEA notified anybody else. DEA management justified this decision by telling the inspector general that it assumed the conduct ''which resulted in Chong's detention did not amount to misconduct and was not criminal.'' But, of course, as the inspector general found, it should have been readily apparent to DEA management that this was not true. Of course, DEA management may have calculated that undertaking its own investigation could head off an independent outside review; indeed, perhaps the investigation could even be contained ''locally.'' How many other DEA misdeeds have been similarly contained?

So it is obvious what happened. It is outrageous. How it was handled is outrageous. We need to know more about why the inspector general was not called in immediately—that is, even as DEA policy requires—rather than having people who conducted the wrongdoing investigating, in a sense, themselves. We need to know if indeed this was a deliberate attempt to sweep this dereliction of duty under the rug.

The DEA is entrusted with a lot of responsibility and authority. We ask the DEA to enforce our drug laws. We ask the DEA to protect our communities. The DEA has a very tough job. The Obama administration is not making that job any easier because this administration is undermining the DEA by turning a blind eye to illegal marijuana trafficking. It is trying to release convicted drug dealers from our prisons. It is trying to reduce the criminal penalties and minimum mandatory sentences for drug dealers who are still on the streets peddling death in our communities. So I understand these are very challenging times for the DEA.

When the DEA or any law enforcement agency neglects its responsibilities and then possibly even covers up wrongdoing, then those who are responsible must be held accountable. So I have to ask, if the employees at DEA are not held accountable, what needs to happen in order for action to be taken? Do we need to wait until someone dies?

The DEA's conduct in this case is inexcusable. After 2 years and more than $4 million of taxpayer money, the DEA owes the American people more answers. The American people deserve answers to the questions I posed in my letter to the DEA back in May of 2012, so, not getting a proper answer, I will be writing to the DEA again this week to pose additional questions, including about the possibility of a coverup.

Most importantly, the American people deserve to know that those responsible for the detention and the mistreatment of Daniel Chong will be held accountable for this horrendous event.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

I come to the floor also to discuss a constitutional amendment the Judiciary Committee has just reported to the Senate. The amendment would amend the Bill of Rights for the first time. Let me repeat that. The amendment would amend the Bill of Rights for the first time. I think that is a slippery slope. It would amend one of the most important of those rights—the right of free speech.

The first amendment provides that Congress shall make no laws abridging freedom of speech. The proposed amendment would give Congress and the States the power to abridge free speech. It would allow them to impose reasonable limits—whatever the word ''reasonable'' might mean at a particular time—on contributions and expenditures. By so doing, that has to be putting limits on speech, particularly speech that is very valuable in this country—political speech; in other words, trying to influence the direction of our country through elections. It would allow speech by corporations that would influence the elections to be banned altogether.

This amendment is as dangerous as anything Congress could pass. Were it to be adopted—I believe it will not be adopted—the damage done could be reversed only if two-thirds of both Houses of Congress voted to repeal it through a new constitutional amendment. Then, of course, three-fourths of the States ratify that new amendment.

I would like to start with some basic first principles. The Declaration of Independence states that everyone is endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights that governments are created to protect. Those preexisting rights include the right to liberty.

The Constitution was adopted to secure the blessings of liberty to Americans. Americans rejected the view that the structural limits on government power contained in the original Constitution would adequately protect the liberties they had fought the Revolution to preserve. So when the people came to the conclusion that the original Constitution would not protect their liberties, the people living in the States at that time insisted on the adoption of this very important Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights protects individual rights regardless of whether the government or the majority approve of their use. The first amendment in the Bill of Rights protects freedom of speech. That freedom is basic to self-government. Other parts of the Constitution foster equality or justice or representative government, but it is the Bill of Rights—that Bill of Rights is only about individual freedom. Free speech creates a marketplace of ideas in which citizens can learn, debate, persuade fellow citizens on the issues of the day. At its core it enables the citizenry to be educated, to cast votes, to elect our leaders.

Today freedom of speech is threatened as it has not been in many decades. Too many people will not listen and debate and persuade. Instead, they want to punish, intimidate, and silence those with whom they might disagree.

A corporate executive who opposes same-sex marriage—the same position that President Obama held at the very time—is to be fired. Universities that are supposed to foster academic freedom cancel graduation speeches by speakers some students find offensive. Government officials order other government officials not to deviate from the party line concerning proposed legislation.

This resolution filed by the Judiciary Committee, S.J. Res. 19, is cut from the same cloth. It would amend the Constitution for the first time to diminish an important right of Americans; that is, a right contained in the Bill of Rights. In fact, it would cut back on the most important of these rights—core free speech about who should be elected to govern us.

The proposed constitutional amendment would enable government to limit funds contributed to candidates and funds spent influencing the election. That would give the government the ability to limit speech. The amendment would allow the government to set the limit at low levels. There could be little in the way of contributions or election spending. There could be restrictions on public debate on who should be elected. Incumbents would find that outcome—well, you guessed it—to be very successful because it protects incumbents. They would know that no challengers could run an effective campaign against them.

What precedent would this amendment create? Suppose Congress passed limits on what people could spend on abortions or what doctors or hospitals could spend to perform them? What if Congress limited the amount of money people could spend on guns or limited how much people could spend of their own money on health care?

Under this amendment Congress could do what the Citizens United decision rightfully said it could not—make it a criminal offense for the Sierra Club to run an ad urging the public to defeat a Congressman who favors logging in the national forest or for the National Rifle Association to publish a book seeking public support for a challenger to a Senator who favors a handgun ban or for the ACLU to post on its Web site a plea for voters to support a Presidential candidate because of his stance on free speech. That should, for everybody, be a frightening prospect.

Under this amendment, Congress and the States could limit campaign contributions and expenditures without even complying with the existing constitutional provisions. Congress could pass a law limiting expenditures by Democrats, but not by Republicans—by opponents of ObamaCare, but not by its supporters.

What does the amendment mean when it says that Congress can limit funds spent to influence elections? If an elected official says he or she plans to run again, long before any election, Congress, under this amendment, could criminalize criticism of that official as spending to influence the elections.

A Senator on the Senate floor appearing on C–SPAN, free of charge could, with immunity, defame a private citizen. The Member could say that the citizen was buying the elections. If the citizen spent what Congress has said was too much money to rebut the charge, he could go to jail. We would be back to the days when criticism of elected officials was a criminal offense during the Alien and Sedition Acts. Yet its supporters say that this amendment is necessary to preserve democracy.

The only existing right that the amendment says it will not harm is freedom of the press. So Congress and the States could limit the speech of anyone except corporations that control the media. That would produce an Orwellian world in which every speaker is equal but some speakers are more equal than others.

Freedom in the press has never been understood to give the media special constitutional rights denied to others. Even though the amendment by its terms would not affect freedom of the press, I was heartened to read that the largest newspaper in my State, the Des Moines Register, editorialized against this amendment amending the Bill of Rights. They cited testimony from our hearing, and they recognize the threat that the proposed amendment poses to freedom.

But in light of recent Supreme Court decisions, an amendment soon may not be needed at all. Four Justices right now would allow core political speech to be restricted. Were a fifth Justice with this view to be appointed, there would be no need to amend the Constitution to cut back on the freedom.

Justice Breyer's dissent for these four Justices in the McCutcheon decision does not view freedom of speech as an end in itself the same way that our Founding Fathers did. He thinks free political speech is about advancing ''the public's interest in preserving a democratic order in which collective speech matters.''

To be sure, individual rights often advance socially desired goals, but our constitutional rights do not depend on whether unelected judges believe they advance democracy as they conceive it. Our constitutional rights are individual, not collective, as Justice Breyer says. Never in 225 years has any Supreme Court opinion described our rights as collective. Our rights come from God and not from the government or the public. At least that is what the writers of the Declaration of Independence said.

Consider the history of the past 100 years. Freedom has flourished where rights belong to individuals that governments were bound to respect. Where rights are collective and existed only at the whim of a government that determines when they serve socially desirable purposes, the results have been literally horrific: no freedom, no democracy.

We should not move even 1 inch in that direction that the liberal Justices did and that simultaneously this amendment would take us. The stakes could not be higher for all Americans who value their rights and freedoms. Speech concerning who the people's elected representative should be, speech setting the agenda for public discourse, speech designed to open and change the minds of our fellow citizens, speech criticizing politicians, and speech challenging government and its policies are all vital rights. This amendment puts all of them in jeopardy upon the penalty of imprisonment. It would make America no longer America.

Contrary to the arguments of its supporters, the amendment would not advance self-government against corruption and the drowning out of voices of ordinary citizens. No, just the opposite. It would harm the rights of ordinary citizens—individually, as well as in free associations—to advance their political views and to elect candidates who support their views.

By limiting campaign speech, it would limit the information that voters receive in deciding how to vote. It would limit the amount that people can spend on advancing what they consider to be the best political ideas. Its restrictions on speech apply to individuals. Politicians could apply the same rules to individuals who govern corporations. Perhaps individuals cannot be totally prohibited from speaking, but the word ''reasonable'' is in the amendment but that word limits can mean anything. Incumbents likely would set a low limit on how much an individual can spend to criticize them; that is, incumbents protecting their office. Then the individual would have to

risk criminal prosecution in deciding whether to speak, hoping that a court would later find that the limit he or she exceeded was unreasonable.

This would create not a chilling effect on speech, but, in fact, a very freezing effect.

This does not further democratic self-government. The amendment would apply to some campaign speech that cannot give rise to corruption.

For instance, under current law, an individual could spend any amount of his or her own money to run for office. An individual could not corrupt himself with his own money and could not be bought by others if he or she did not rely on outside money, but the amendment would allow Congress and the States to strictly limit what even an individual could contribute to or spend on his or her own campaign. That would make beating the incumbent, who would benefit from the new powers to restrict speech, much more difficult.

In practice, individuals seeking to elect candidates in the democratic process must exercise their First Amendment freedom of association to work together with others. This amendment could prohibit that altogether.

It would permit Congress and the States to prohibit ''corporations or artificial entities . . . from spending money to influence elections.'' Now, that even means labor unions. That means nonprofit corporations such as the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. That means political parties.

The amendment will allow Congress to prohibit political parties from spending money to influence elections. If they can't spend money on elections, then they would be rendered as a mere social club.

The prohibition on political spending by for-profit corporations also does not advance democracy.

Were this amendment to take effect, a company that wanted to advertise beer or deodorant would be given more constitutional protection than a corporation of any kind that wanted to influence an election.

The philosophy of the amendment is very elitist. It says the ordinary citizen cannot be trusted to listen to political arguments and evaluate which ones are persuasive.

Instead, incumbent politicians interested in securing their own reelections are trusted to be high-minded. Surely, they would not use this new power to develop rules that could silence not only their actual opposing candidates, but associations of ordinary citizens who have the nerve to want to vote them out of office.

As First Amendment luminary Floyd Abrams told our committee: ''[P]ermitting unlimited expenditures from virtually all parties leads to more speech from more candidates for longer time periods, and ultimately more competitive elections.''

Isn't that the goal that we should seek through the political process? Having parties led to more speech from more candidates for longer periods of time and ultimately more competitive elections.

Incumbents are unlikely to use this new power to welcome that competition.

In fact, the committee report indicates that State and Federal legislators are not the only people who would have the ability to limit campaign speech under this amendment.

It says that the States and the Federal Government can promulgate regulations to enforce the amendment. So you have unelected State and Federal bureaucrats, who do not answer to anyone, being empowered to regulate what is now the freedom of speech of individuals and entities that for 230 years has been protected by the Bill of Rights. That all makes a mockery of the idea that this proposed amendment would advance democracy and that argument is used by its proponents.

Another argument for the amendment—some voices should not drown out others—also runs counter to free speech. It also is elitist. It assumes that voters will be manipulated into voting against their interests because large sums will produce so much speech as to drown out others and blind them to the voters' true interests.

Tell that to the voters in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District. That incumbent Congressman outspent his opponent 26 to 1. Newspaper reports state that large sums were spent on independent expenditures on the incumbent's behalf, many by corporations. No independent expenditures were made for their opponent, but yet his opponent won.

That doesn't seem to be drowning out people making their own decisions in the ballot box, and it is not some undue influence that proponents of this amendment want you to believe that this constitutional amendment can do away with undue influence. Just think, 26 to 1, trying to convince people to vote for an incumbent Congressman, and he loses.

Let me say this. The exact amount of money that the winner of that primary spent was just over $200,000 to win 55 percent of that vote.

Since a limit that allowed a challenger to win would presumably be reasonable under the amendment, Congress or the States could limit spending on House primaries to as little as $200,000, all by the candidate with no obviously unnecessary outside spending allowed.

The second set of unpersuasive arguments concerns the Supreme Court decision Citizens United. That case has been mischaracterized as activist.

Again, I wish to say what Mr. Abrams testified before the committee. He said that case continues a view of free speech rights by unions and corporations that was expressed by President Truman and by liberal Justices in the 1950s.

What the Citizens United overruled was the departure from precedent. And Citizens United did not give rise to unfettered campaign spending.

The Supreme Court case in 1976, in Buckley v. Valeo, ruled that independent expenditures could not be limited. That decision was not the work of a supposed conservative judicial activist. Wealthy individuals have been able to spend unlimited amounts since then. And corporations and others have been able to make unlimited donations to 501(c)(4) corporations since then as well.

As Mr. Abrams wrote to the Judiciary Committee in questions for the record:

> What Citizens United did do, however, is permit corporations to contribute to PACs that are required to disclose all donors and engage only in independent expenditures.
>
> If anything, Citizens United is a pro-disclosure ruling which brought corporate money further into the light.

And it is this amendment, not Citizens United, that fails to respect precedent. It does not simply overturn one case. As Mr. Abrams responded, it overturns 12 cases, some of which date back almost 40 years. As the amendment has been redrafted, it may be 11½ now, depending upon what the word ''reasonable'' means.

Justice Stevens, whom the committee Democrats relied on at length in support of the amendment, voted with the majority in three of the cases the amendment would overturn. Some members of the committee may not like the long-established broad protections for free speech that the Supreme Court has reaffirmed, but that does not mean there are five activists on the Supreme Court. The Court ruled unanimously in more cases this year than it has in 60 or 75 years, depending on whose figures you use. Its unanimity was frequently demonstrated by rejecting arguments of the Obama administration.

I have made clear that this amendment abridges fundamental freedoms that are the birthright of Americans. The arguments made to support it are unconvincing. The amendment will weaken, not strengthen, democracy. It will not reduce corruption, but will open the door for elected officials to bend democracy's rules to benefit themselves.

The fact that the committee reported this amendment is a very great testimony to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in insisting on and adopting the Bill of Rights in the first place. As Justice Jackson famously wrote:

> The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials

and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts.

One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.

We must preserve our Bill of Rights, including our rights to free speech. We must not allow officials to diminish and ration any one of the Bill of Rights, but especially the first one, which is so important. We must not let the proposal become the supreme law of the land.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 30, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID NATHAN SAPERSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, VICE SUZAN D. JOHNSON COOK.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 29, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LARRY EDWARD ANDRE, JR., OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF MAURITANIA.

MICHAEL STEPHEN HOZA, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON.

JOAN A. POLASCHIK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

ROBERT ALAN MCDONALD, OF OHIO, TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAURINE WILLIAMSON CAIN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life of Maurine Williamson Cain of Rockwall who passed away June 19 at the age of 95. Maurine was a faithful church member; dedicated wife, mother, and grandmother; a crucial member of the Rockwall community in her role as an educator; and a dear friend of mine.

The youngest of five children, Maurine was born May 27, 1919 in Forney, Texas to two loving parents—Jim and Grace Williamson. She grew up in Chisholm and Rockwall and enjoyed an active and involved family life.

After Maurine graduated from Rockwall High School in 1936, her brother Clifford and his wife Elva helped Maurine with her first step into higher education. She studied two years at Texas Military College in Terrell, Texas and continued her education at East Texas State Teachers College (known today as Texas A&M University–Commerce) where she earned her Bachelor of Science and Master of Education degrees. She then began her 38-year career as an educator at Scurry Rosser High School and Quinlan High School.

On June 8, 1941, Maurine married Ted Cain in Holdenville, Oklahoma. The couple celebrated the birth of their son, Dewayne, as well as the births of two grandchildren and three great-grandchildren over the course of their 70-year marriage before Ted passed away in 2012.

One year after their marriage, Ted left Texas to serve overseas in World War II. At home, Maurine worked at the defense plant in Garland and began teaching in a one-room school known as Locust Grove Community School. She taught all seven grades by herself and also served as school janitor, cook, and nurse. Maurine spent the last 34 years of her career in education teaching various grade levels at Rockwall Elementary School and Dobbs Elementary School before retiring in 1987.

In honor of Maurine's dedication to educating the children of the Rockwall Community, on October 17, 1999 the Rockwall Independent School District named and dedicated Cain Middle School in her honor. Maurine enjoyed being involved with the school and attended many pep rallies, awards ceremonies, and other school events.

In addition to her involvement with the Rockwall school system, Maurine maintained close relationships with her church family at the First Baptist Church of Rockwall and its Ruth Sunday School class. She was also a member of Sigma Tau Delta, Alpha Chi, and the Texas State Teachers Association.

Maurine is survived by her son, Dewayne Cain, and his wife, Ann Atkins Cain; her granddaughter, Amy Cain Cox, and her husband, Wendell Cox; her grandson, Chris Cain, and his fiancée, Ami Wester; and three grandchildren, Jackson, Johnny, and Annie Cox.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Maurine Williamson Cain and the positive impact she had upon her community. She was a woman of faith and family who believed "you never stand taller than when you stoop to help a child." I believe we can all learn from her example.

IN RECOGNITION OF ELIZABETHTOWN COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Elizabethtown Community and Technical College (ECTC). Headquartered in Elizabethtown, KY, ECTC will celebrate 50 years of educational excellence and service to Kentuckians during the 2014–2015 school year.

For five decades, ECTC has enriched the lives of its students by providing access to quality and affordable academic, technical and community education programs. By partnering with the public, these efforts have been felt by the community as well.

From 355 enrolled students in 1964, to 7,000 today—it is clear that ECTC has blossomed into a strong institution of learning. With four campuses and additional extended campus sites, ECTC directly serves 12 counties in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To everyone at ECTC—your commitment to the education of future leaders is commendable and I hope you are very proud of this achievement. I join with all of Kentucky's Second District in congratulating everyone at ECTC on reaching this milestone and wish you many more years of continued success.

CONGRATULATING PADRÓN CIGARS ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Padrón family on the 50th anniversary of Padrón Cigars founding. Padrón Cigars is a landmark institution in the Miami community, and is well-deserving of recognition.

Mr. Jose Orlando Padrón arrived in Miami in 1962 from Cuba. He was thirty-six years old and soon began work as a carpenter, after receiving a small hammer from a friend. With that hammer he worked day and night in order to establish himself, and not live off government assistance. He toiled for months with the goal of opening his own cigar factory, so that he could produce cigars just like the ones he used to smoke in Cuba. After managing to save $600 he was able to open Padrón Cigars on September 8, 1964 in the Little Havana neighborhood of Miami.

Mr. Padrón began by using tobacco from Connecticut. However, in order to meet demand he opened a factory in Nicaragua in 1970. Political turmoil at the time led to the burning of their factory in 1978, but it was restored in 1979. Further issues arose in 1985, which forced him to shift production to Honduras. However, today his company continues to thrive, and is back to manufacturing its award-winning cigars in Nicaragua. Padrón's cigars are continuously rated as one of the best cigars in the world, and have won yearly awards for their exceptional quality. Mr. Padrón himself has been inducted into Cigar Aficionado's Hall of Fame.

On a more personal level, I have known the Padrón family for many years. Jose and my father were very good friends, and the family has since become very close friends of mine. They are truly one of the most exceptional, loyal, trustworthy, and caring friends I have and I cherish our families continued friendship. It is a privilege to know Jose, his children, and the rest of the Padrón family. In addition, they have been devoted to their company, their employees, and the Miami community since its inception. Today, the Padrón family's dedication has made Padrón Cigars an irreplaceable company for South Florida, and their family has become a treasure for the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate Padrón Cigars, and the entire Padrón family, as they celebrate this milestone. I am certain that we can all look forward to many more years of outstanding cigars, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing their outstanding achievement.

RECOGNIZING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT WILLIAM R. CHARETTE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Medal of Honor Recipient, Master Chief Hospital Corpsman William R. Charette, for his commendable service in the Korean War.

William Charette was born in Ludington, Michigan. He stayed in Michigan until he signed with the U.S. Navy on January 11, 1951. Charette served in the United States Navy from 1951–1977. During his years of service, William Charette served in Korea, where he was a part of the 2nd Battalion of the 7th Marines.

On March 27, 1953, Charette was serving near Panmunjom, Korea, when his company was attacked by enemy troops. Charette worked quickly to treat his fellow soldiers as best he could. While treating one soldier, a grenade landed near them, and Charette threw himself on top of the other soldier in an effort to absorb the blast. Although the blast destroyed Charette's medical kit he continued to treat soldiers by tearing off pieces of his uniform to help treat wounds. At one point, a soldier was so badly wounded that he was unable to move on his own accord. Charette stood up in the trench and lifted the man and carried him through enemy fire to safety. For his actions, William Charette was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 12, 1954.

William Charette stands as a shining example of bravery and determination that all Americans strive toward. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Master Chief Hospital Corpsman William Charette for his service to the United States of America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE LATE ASSEMBLYMAN VINCENT J. GRABER, SR.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the passing of a legislator, colleague and friend, the Honorable Vincent J. Graber, Sr., who passed away on July 2, 2014.

Vince Graber was a public servant of the highest caliber and during his career was among the most effective lawmakers in the nation. Following his service on the West Seneca Town Board, Vince was elected to the New York State Assembly in 1974, displacing a Republican incumbent who, after election to the state senate, would go on to be a close friend, colleague and ally within the powerful Western New York legislative delegation. In time, Vince rose to chair the Assembly's Transportation Committee; this is where he made his most significant mark.

Vince led the way in New York and in the nation in authoring legislation designed to make it safer to be a passenger in a motor vehicle in the state of New York. From landmark legislation mandating the use of safety seats for children to authorship of the first-in-the-nation mandatory seat belt law, to legislation combating and reducing incidences of DWI, Vince Graber was a leader in transportation policymaking in the United States for better than a generation. It is not hyperbole to suggest that a great many Americans—thousands, to be sure—are alive today because of Vince's good work.

Vince eventually rose to leadership in the State Assembly, ending his career as Speaker Pro Tempore, where he presided over the daily sessions of the Assembly. In so doing, Vince encouraged and facilitated an orderly and urbane atmosphere within the Assembly chamber, a sometimes difficult task in a legislative body known for occasionally raucous debate.

I never served in the State Assembly with Vince, as his service predated my own service in that legislative body by a few years. But I came to know Vince well, first as a local elected official, and later as Vince would visit my office as a government relations official following his years of public service. Vince Graber was always knowledgeable and always prepared, and gave those to whom he was responsible—his family, his constituents and, later, his clients—the very best he had to offer.

The son of the late Howard and Eileen Graber, Vince was a United States Army veteran of the Korean Conflict and was the recipient of countless honors and awards throughout his long career. Vince leaves behind a large and loving extended family, including his wife Patricia, their ten children and their own families.

Mr. Speaker, our community, our state and, yes, this nation owes a great debt of gratitude to Vince Graber. His skill and his vision made New York a safer place for motorists, passengers and pedestrians. I was honored to call Vince Graber my friend, and I am similarly honored to remember and commemorate his many contributions here today.

TRIBUTE TO PETE GIANOPULOS

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a teacher, soldier, public servant, and community leader who for 90 years has lived and breathed the city of Taft, California. Born and raised in Taft, Pete Gianopulos has become well-known throughout the city as a passionate American and an active member of his community.

When the foundation of American resolve was tested by the Second World War, Pete answered the call of duty and served honorably with occupational forces near Hiro, Kure, and Hiroshima, Japan as part of the 41st Infantry Division in the Intelligence and Reconnaissance Platoon. When he returned from the war, Pete completed undergraduate and graduate studies at Taft College and Fresno State College before continuing his graduate work at UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, Cal State Bakersfield, and Fresno State. Upon returning to Taft, Pete began teaching at Lincoln Junior High School, and continued his educational career for 35 years as an Industrial Arts teacher, a counselor, and the Director of Guidance for the Taft Union High School District. Though he retired from teaching in 1986 after 36 years, his service to the education community only represents a portion of his public service.

Pete has served in multiple positions at local levels of government, including the Oildorado Committee, the Kern County Water District, the Kern View Community Mental Health Center Committee, the State of California Resource Agency, and the Department of Water Resources. Notably, he served on the Taft City Council in 1961, where only one year later, Pete Gianopulos became Taft's mayor, and served as such through 1966.

Today, Pete continues to serve as an active member of the community. As the founder, host and producer of ''Taft Heritage,'' a local television program supported by the West Kern Oil Museum and Taft High School, and an active writer for his column in the local paper titled ''Remember When,'' Pete champions the message that there is always something to learn from the rich history of the city of Taft.

Pete's dedication and service to Taft has not gone unnoticed and next month, the Taft City Council will proclaim August 23, 2014 as ''Pete Gianopulos Day.'' On that day, it is my hope that all the residents of Taft look to this man's history as a source of inspiration for what it means to be a citizen of the people. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Pete Gianopulos a very happy 90th birthday, and thank him for his many years of dedicated service to the city of Taft.

HONORING KYLE MATTHEW OTA, EAGLE SCOUT, BOY SCOUT TROOP 611, SAN JOSE BUDDHIST CHURCH BETSUIN

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Kyle Matthew Ota, a member of Boy Scout Troop 611 at the San Jose Buddhist Church Betsuin and one of my constituents, on achieving of the rank of Eagle Scout in April of 2014.

Kyle, the son of Pat and Dorothy Ota, began his scouting career as a member of Cub Scout Pack 611 at the San Jose Buddhist Church Betsuin, where he earned the Metta and Sangha awards, as well as the Arrow of Light. Rising through the ranks, Kyle served as patrol leader, troop quartermaster, dharma scribe, troop scribe, senior patrol leader, and den chief.

Kyle's Eagle Scout project reflects his longstanding commitment to the people of San Jose, and the residents of Japantown in particular. Yu-Ai Kai, a stellar community-based organization that promotes healthy aging, independent living, and high quality of life, provides multi-lingual community services, social interaction, and a sense of belonging to our elderly citizens. Seniors and their families frequently pass in front of Yu-Ai Kai's Akiyama Senior Wellness Center on Jackson Street while traversing beautiful Japantown, so Kyle constructed an outdoor bulletin board in front of the building. This board displays flyers, schedules, and other information that allows seniors to better understand and utilize the Akiyama's many life-improving offerings.

Kyle was a scholar-athlete at St. Francis High School in Mountain View, where he participated in varsity track and intramurals,

earned entry into the honor roll and National Honor Society, and was awarded tuition assistance by the California Scholarship Federation. Kyle now attends San Diego State University, where the dedication to community service instilled in him by scouting continues to make his parents—and all of us in California's 19th District—very proud.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE AMERICAN FELLOWS IN THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate eight young Americans for their outstanding performance in the German Bundestag this summer as fellows in the prestigious International Parliamentary Scholarship.

Nathan Crist, Gaelen Strnat, Sheila Casserly, Cristina Burack, Betsy Crowder, Josef Nothmann, Joe Verbovszky, and Ian van Son have been fantastic representatives of the United States during their last five months working with a member of the Bundestag. They have learned about the German system of government and contributed to our strong bilateral ties. This experience promises to turbo-charge their future. IPS participants have gone on to serve as leaders in the public and private sectors around the world while maintaining close ties to Germany.

This prestigious program is a demonstration of the deep friendship the United States enjoys with the German people. I thank the Bundestag for hosting the fellows and I hope to see exchanges between our two countries, such as this one or the equally prestigious Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange, continue for many years to come.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF SLATINGTON

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Slatington as they prepare to celebrate their 150th anniversary. That would be their sesquicentennial, Mr. Speaker.

The Borough of Slatington is located in northern Lehigh County and is in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District. As their Member of Congress, it is my honor to enter these words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of this proud event.

The story of Slatington's founding is a very American story. Like so many communities, it began as a farm settlement. Nicholas Kern and his family settled the area in 1741. Their extensive farmstead included a gristmill, sawmill and a tavern. They farmed the fertile soil along the Lehigh River. Another European settler, Ambrose Remaley also established himself in the area, holding land warrants in what is now the southern portion of present day Slatington.

Agriculture remained predominant in the area until three Welshmen, Owen Jones, William Roberts and Nelson LaBar made a significant discovery in 1844. The area was rich in slate—and so Slatington soon gained its name.

By 1847 the first school slate factory in the United States opened in the town. The discovery of slate and subsequent quarrying and production of slate products brought about rapid growth. Slatington incorporated as a borough on September 7, 1864.

At its peak, the slate industry provided employment for 2,000 people. They worked in the quarries or they worked to produce curbing, roofing tiles, sidewalks and importantly, school blackboards and slates.

In fact, the specific type and color of the slate quarried in Slatington proved to be ideal for use in school blackboards. Slatington became known as the ''blackboard capital of America.'' The blackboards and school slates produced in Slatington played an important role in helping educate children across the country in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Slatington's slate products weren't just shipped all over the United States—they were shipped and bought across the World.

Even as the slate industry began to fade as other materials became cheaper and because of new technologies, Slatington continued to thrive.

Its rich history is a source of pride for the community and for Lehigh County. For example, the Borough boasts the oldest Halloween Parade in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Part of Slatington is a National Register Historic District, and the Borough has two statues of Firemen listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Present day citizens of Slatington are justifiably proud of their past, especially on the advent of their 150th Anniversary. At the same time, they have their eye on the future and remain intent on assuring that Slatington remains a great place for people to live, work and raise families.

I ask the House and the Speaker to join me in celebrating their Borough's 150th Anniversary and wishing them continued happiness, harmony and success moving forward.

RECOGNIZING TYLER TODAY MAGAZINE FOR 25 YEARS SERVING THE TYLER COMMUNITY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Tyler Today Magazine, the oldest and only local magazine dedicated solely to covering the events and people of Tyler, Texas. This publication recently celebrated 25 years of dedicated news service to its community.

As the representative of the 4th District of Texas, I had the privilege to represent Tyler for many years. It is a town rich with history, and Tyler Today accurately records and promotes the pride, passion, and personality of the people who make Tyler the remarkable and close-knit ''Rose Capital.''

I congratulate those who have contributed to Tyler Today Magazine's distinguished history, with best wishes for continued success.

CONGRATULATING ANNE FIROR SCOTT ON RECEIVING THE 2013 NATIONAL HUMANITIES MEDAL

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate North Carolina's Anne Firor Scott on receiving the 2013 National Humanities Medal. Dr. Scott is being cited ''for pioneering the study of southern women. Through groundbreaking research spanning ideology, race, and class, Dr. Scott's uncharted exploration into the lives of southern women has established women's history as vital to our understanding of the American South.'' I have the privilege of personally knowing Dr. Scott, W.K. Boyd Professor of History Emerita at Duke, as a former academic colleague, constituent, and friend.

Raised in Montezuma, Georgia, Scott graduated summa cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Georgia in 1941 before earning a master's degree in political science from Northwestern University in 1944 and a PhD from Harvard (Radcliffe College) in 1949.

Dr. Scott did not, however, immediately pursue an academic career. She held a job at International Business Machines (IBM) and briefly entered a graduate program for personnel managers. Scott notes that it was a United States Congressional internship, during which she had the opportunity to write speeches and listen to politicians talking, which had the greatest impact on her career. These experiences, she later wrote, ''made me so painfully aware of my ignorance that I went back to school.''

Following her master's and PhD work, Scott held temporary teaching appointments at Haverford College and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill before joining the history department at Duke University in 1961, where she stayed until her retirement in 1991. During her tenure at Duke, Dr. Scott became the first female chair of Duke's history department. In her autobiographical essay, ''A Historian's Odyssey,'' Scott reviewed her own journals and realized that she began to do history by chance. But, she added, ''If I came to history by indirection, my decision to study the history of women was not, in retrospect, accidental.''

Having been inspired to study women reformers after working for the National League of Women Voters in the 1940s, Scott later helped found the field of U.S. women's history. Her groundbreaking research—spanning ideology, race, and class—and her uncharted exploration into the lives of southern women has established women's history as vital to our understanding of the American South. The Anne Firor Scott papers, which include correspondence, subject files and videos from 1963–2002, are held at Duke University.

Her endowment, the Anne Firor Scott Research Fund, established in 1987, continues to support students conducting innovative independent research in women's history. And the annual Lerner-Scott prize, an award which is jointly named for Dr. Scott and historian Gerda Lerner, is annually awarded to the writer of the best doctoral dissertation in U.S. women's history.

Dr. Scott's accomplishments and accolades are many, including the authorship of ten books and more than twenty-five articles. Dr. Scott was appointed by President Lyndon Johnson to the Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women in 1965. She has served as president of the Southern Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians, and on the advisory boards of the Schlesinger Library, the Princeton University department of history, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

She has been the recipient of many fellowships, prizes and honorary degrees, including a University Medal from Duke in 1994, a Berkshire Conference Prize in 1980, and honorary degrees from Queens College, Northwestern, Radcliffe and the University of the South. Scott received the Organization of American Historians' Distinguished Service Award in 2002 and the American Historical Association's Scholarly Achievement Award in 2008. In addition, Dr. Scott was the 1994 winner of the John Tyler Caldwell Award for the Humanities, which is the highest honor given by the North Carolina Humanities Council.

This year, Dr. Scott is one of ten winners to be honored with the 2013 National Humanities Medal, presented by President Barack Obama. The National Humanities Medal honors individuals or groups whose work has deepened the nation's understanding of the humanities, broadened our citizens' engagement with the humanities, or helped preserve and expand Americans' access to important resources in the humanities. Previous medalists include Pulitzer Prize winners Philip Roth and Marilynne Robinson, Nobel Prize winner Toni Morrison, essayist Joan Didion, novelist John Updike, Nobel Peace Prize laureate Elie Wiesel, sociologist Robert Coles, poet John Ashbery, filmmaker Steven Spielberg, and Nobel laureate Amartya Sen.

As Jeffries Martin, chair of Duke's history department, has said, ''Anne is not only an amazing scholar whose work did much to shape the field of women's history; she is also an amazing person, full of curiosity and insight about the world.'' I would add that she is a warm and generous person, mentor and friend to many, and a committed citizen—an effective voice for social justice and inclusion for decades. She is the model of the engaged scholar, and one who has contributed greatly to the ''New South'' to which we aspire. It is therefore with great satisfaction and admiration that I commend Anne Scott today for this wonderful, well-merited recognition.

HONORING DAVE DOBILL FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE AS FRANKLIN COUNTY CLERK

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dave Dobill, who will be retiring at the end of this year after over 29 years as County Clerk for Franklin County, Illinois.

Dave Dobill began his service to the people of Franklin County in 1979 as Supervisor of Assessments. In June of 1985 he was appointed to the position of County Clerk and was elected to that position for the first time in 1986. He has held this office continually ever since.

Dave is not only one of the longest-serving county officials in Illinois, but he is well known among his peers as a knowledgeable leader willing to help his constituents and his colleagues. Dave is one of the foremost experts in property tax law in the State of Illinois and has assisted numerous colleagues and officials understanding the law to ensure fair and lawful taxation. He has also been a leader in election administration, having modernized the election process in Franklin County to an electronic voting system long before the Help America Vote Act mandated such improvements.

Dave has earned the respect of his peers and was recognized for his professional accomplishments last year when he was named the State of Illinois County Clerk/Recorder of the Year at the Illinois Association of County Clerks/Recorders fall conference.

Known as the "go-to guy" in Franklin County, Dave has not limited his community service to his official duties as County Clerk. The community and fraternal organizations that have benefited from Dave's involvement have included: the Franklin County Tourism Bureau, Six Mile Democratic Club, Benton Chamber of Commerce, Royalton Jaycees and Little League, Zeigler Rotary and Eagles and West Frankfort Moose.

Dave is also very active in his church, St. Aloysius, and has served as treasurer of the St. Aloysius Men's Club.

Dave and his wife, Dixie, had two children and have one grandchild. Dave looks forward to spending more time with his family, and more time engaging in his favorite pastime, fishing. The fish in Rend Lake and around Southern Illinois have reason to be worried as Dave approaches retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Dave Dobill well and thanking him for a lifetime of service to the people of Southern Illinois.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on July 28, 2014. I was visiting the Savannah River Site in the Second Congressional District of South Carolina with Department of Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz and National Nuclear Security Administrator Frank Klotz where I appreciate their recognition of the dedicated professionals at the site promoting vital missions. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present if the flight from Columbia had not been delayed.

Roll Number 455—H.R. 935—To amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes—''aye.''

Roll 456—H.R. 3202—Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment Act—''aye.''

Roll 457—H.R. 3107—Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act—''aye.''

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,611,454,807,678.76. We've added $6,984,577,758,765.68 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING VENEZUELAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY MEMBER AND OPPOSITION LEADER MÁRIA CORINA MACHADO

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an individual who, at great risk to her own life and safety, has been standing up for democracy and freedom in Venezuela. Mária Corina Machado, a Member of the National Assembly and a leader of the opposition, has taken a courageous stand against the repressive regime of President Nicolás Maduro, speaking out on behalf of those whose voices have been silenced by fear of arrest or violence.

Since the death of former President Hugo Chavez, the Maduro regime has maintained Venezuela on the path of suppressing democracy, silencing protest, preventing press freedom, and intimidating political opponents like Ms. Machado. In one instance, Maduro supporters physically assaulted opposition Members in the National Assembly chamber, and

Ms. Machado was beaten and had her nose broken. None of the perpetrators were brought to justice.

Over the past several months, Venezuela has seen a number of mass protests by those seeking greater democracy. These are not part of a 'coup d'etat,' as President Maduro has alleged, but a result of his oppressive regime. The Venezuelan people deserve the chance to build a free and democratic nation and choose their own future course, free from fear. As democracy continues to come under assault by the Maduro regime, Americans will continue to look to Venezuela with a deep concern for the safety of its people and solidarity with those seeking to restore their freedom.

Mária Corina Machado has helped draw international attention to the ongoing repression in her country, and for her work she will be honored by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems with its annual Charles T. Manatt Democracy Award on October 1. This annual award recognizes individuals who have demonstrated a commitment to advancing freedom and democratic values in their nations and around the world.

I will continue to monitor the situation in Venezuela closely, and I will continue to highlight the work of courageous pro-democracy activists like Ms. Machado, who have faced death threats and been accused of treason by the ruling regime. The United States is watching what takes place in Venezuela with great interest, and Congress will be paying particular attention to the safety and security of Ms. Machado and other opposition figures who have dared to speak out for the rights of the Venezuelan people.

I congratulate Ms. Machado on being chosen for the Charles T. Manatt Democracy Award, and I stand with her and other peaceful supporters of democratic reform as they seek to build a brighter future for all Venezuelans.

HONORING EMMITT AND PAT SMITH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emmitt and Pat Smith, the recipients of the Congressional Award Foundation's 2014 Horizon Award.

The Horizon Award is bestowed upon individuals who have made a significant commitment to expanding opportunities for all Americans through personal contributions. Emmitt and Pat Smith, exemplify the virtues of integrity, respect, accountability and character embodied by this award. Through their philanthropic activities, they have inspired young people throughout North Texas to reach for their dreams and to do the seemingly impossible.

The Pat and Emmitt Smith Charities create and fund unique educational experiences and enrichment opportunities for underprivileged youth. Because of their sacrifices and humanitarian efforts, these deserving children are given the opportunity to attend the most prestigious learning institutions throughout the city of Dallas.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Emmitt and Pat Smith's selfless contributions to the City of Dallas and communities beyond. Because of their partnership, the City of Dallas is better; our nation is better; and our future is brighter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 2014, I was unable to be present for all votes due to my attendance at a graduation ceremony at Fort Hood, TX.

If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following votes: H.R. 935, Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act—"aye"; H.R. 3202, Essential Transportation Worker Identification Credential Assessment—"aye"; and H.R. 3107, Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act—"aye."

HONORING BLUEGRASS COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Bluegrass Community and Technical College, located in Lexington, Kentucky, on the celebration of its 75th anniversary.

Since its establishment 75 years ago, the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) has set an example of excellence for central Kentucky and provided Kentucky's youth with strong higher education programs.

As the largest two-year institution in the State, BCTC offers daytime, evening and weekend classes at six convenient locations and online. With more than 11,500 students, BCTC has recently expanded to its third campus in Lexington—the Newtown campus—to accommodate its continued growth. The Bluegrass Community and Technical College is specifically designed to promote the advancement of academic achievements in young people. The BCTC education encourages students to achieve success at their own pace and to explore various technical programs to help further their careers.

BCTC's recent expansion is a testament to its continued success in the educational community and the positive impact it is making on students and employers across our Commonwealth. I commend BCTC for its dedication to education and community outreach, and I know that its varied educational services will continue to serve the people of our great district for years to come.

RECOGNIZING ISMAEL ''SMILEY'' CORDOVA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of New Mexico resident, and businessman Ismael "Smiley" Cordova.

Ismael "Smiley" Cordova was born on May 17, 1935 in Los Chavez, New Mexico. He would go on to accomplish many things in his life, but was best known for founding Belen Consumer Finance, which he owned and managed for over 25 years, providing loan services for the citizens of Belen and its surrounding area.

When he wasn't helping locals qualify for loans at work he was contributing in other ways. Ismael proudly served in the United States Army National Guard, was an active member of the Knights of Columbus, Elks Lodge, Moose Lodge, the Valencia County Sheriff's Posse, and an avid parishioner at Our Lady of Belen Catholic Church.

More than that, Ismael was a devoted husband and father. Together, Ismael and his wife Kandy made a dynamic duo full of life, knowledge and exuberant warmth to a community that they loved dearly. A savvy businessman and spirited legislator they inspired everyone who had the opportunity to share their company. Ismael loved his four beloved children whom he kept close to his heart and the family gatherings where everyone would reminisce on the amazing experiences growing up in Los Chavez.

A successful businessman, loving father and husband—Ismael was indeed a caring man of faith and courage. His character, love of family, charisma and selflessness were felt by all who knew him. My thoughts and prayers are with family, friends and everyone who has experienced Ismael's generosity and compassion. May the memory of Ismael live on in our hearts.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF A DIVIDED CYPRUS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the heels of the 40th anniversary of a divided Cyprus. A division that has left both Turkish and Greek Cypriots bogged down in an unacceptable status quo that continues to impede economic and social progress on the island. Until these differences are resolved, all Cypriots will feel the negative effects of this division and Cyprus will be unable to realize its full potential in the international community.

This past February represented a significant shift in the deadlock when both Cypriot leaders resumed long stalled negotiations and issued a joint statement outlining principles the two sides will use to work toward a reunification of Cyprus. Both sides have met regularly

since this announcement and real progress is being made. That said, many controversial issues remain and the path forward will be a difficult one. This makes it even more important that the United States Congress, the Administration, the United Nations, Turkey, Greece, and other stakeholders remain engaged and continue to encourage expeditious, good faith negotiations on both sides.

I believe these negotiations represent a historic opportunity to put all Cypriots on a path to peace and prosperity. During this process, it's important that all parties remain focused on the future of Cyprus and refrain from inflammatory dialogue that only serves to derail progress. A comprehensive settlement is within reach and I would encourage my colleagues to support this effort.

ALL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND INSTITUTIONS IN MOSUL, IRAQ DESTROYED BY ISIS TERRORISTS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following list of Christian churches and institutions in Mosul, Iraq, that have been destroyed by ''Islamic State of Iraq and Syria'' (ISIS) since the Islamist terrorist group captured the city on June 10. According to the Assyrian International News Agency, all of the 45 Christian sites in Mosul have been destroyed, occupied, converted to mosques, converted to ISIS headquarters or otherwise shuttered.

The following is the full list of destroyed Christian sites compiled by the Assyrian International News Agency, grouped by denomination:

SYRIAC CATHOLIC CHURCH

1. Syrian Catholic Diocese—Maidan Neighborhood, Mosul
2. The Old Church of the Immaculate—Maidan Neighborhood, Mosul (The church goes back to the eighth century AD)
3. The New Church of the Immaculate—Maidan Neighborhood
4. Church of Mar (Saint) Toma—Khazraj Neighborhood
5. Museum of Mar (Saint) Toma—Khazraj Neighborhood
6. Church of Our Lady of the Annunciation—Muhandiseen Neighborhood
7. Church of the Virgin of Fatima—Faisaliah Neighborhood
8. Our Lady of Deliverance Chapel—Shifaa Neighborhood
9. The House of the Young Sisters of Jesus—Ras Al-Kour Neighborhood
10. Archbishop's Palace Chapel—Dawasa Neighborhood

SYRIAC ORTHODOX CHURCH

1. Syrian Orthodox Archdiocese—Shurta Neighborhood
2. The Antiquarian Church of Saint Ahodeeni—Bab AlJadeed Neighborhood
3. Mar (Saint) Toma Church and cemetery, (the old Bishopric)—Khazraj Neighborhood
4. Church of The Immaculate (Castle)—Maidan Neighborhood
5. Church of The Immaculate—Shifaa Neighborhood
6. Mar (Saint) Aprim Church—Shurta Neighborhood
7. St. Joseph Church—The New Mosul Neighborhood

HOLY APOSTOLIC CATHOLIC ASSYRIAN CHURCH OF THE EAST

1. Diocese of the Assyrian Church of the East—Noor Neighborhood
2. Assyrian Church of the East, Dawasa Neighborhood
3. Church of the Virgin Mary (old rite)—Wihda Neighborhood

CHALDEAN CHURCH OF BABYLON

1. Chaldean Diocese—Shurta Neighborhood
2. Miskinta Church—Mayassa Neighborhood
3. The Antiquarian Church of Shimon alSafa—Mayassa Neighborhood
4. Church of Mar (Saint) Buthyoon—Shahar AlSouq Neighborhood
5. Church of St. Ephrem, Wady AlAin Neighborhood
6. Church of St. Paul—Majmooaa AlThaqafiya District
7. The Old Church of the Immaculate (with the bombed archdiocese)—Shifaa Neighborhood
8. Church of the Holy Spirit—Bakir Neighborhood
9. Church of the Virgin Mary—Drakziliya Neighborhood
10. Ancient Church of Saint Isaiah and Cemetery—Ras AlKour Neighborhood
11. Mother of Aid Church—Dawasa Neighborhood
12. The Antiquarian Church of St. George—Khazraj Neighborhood
13. St. George Monastery with Cemetery—Arab Neighborhood
14. Monastery of AlNasir (Victory)—Arab Neighborhood
15. Convent of the Chaldean Nuns—Mayassa Neighborhood
16. Monastery of St. Michael—Hawi Church Neighborhood
17. The Antiquarian Monastery of St. Elijah—Ghazlany Neighborhood

ARMENIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

1. Armenian Church—Maidan Neighborhood
2. The New Armenian Church—Wihda Neighborhood

EVANGELICAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

1. Evangelical Presbyterian Church—Mayassa Neighborhood

LATIN CHURCH

1. Latin Church and Monastery of the Dominican Fathers and Convent of Katrina Siena Nuns—Sa'a Neighborhood
2. Convent of the Dominican Sisters—Mosul AlJadeed Neighborhood
3. Convent of the Dominican Sisters (AlKilma Monastery)—Majmooaa AlThaqafiya District
4. House of Qasada AlRasouliya (Apostolic Aim) (Institute of St John the Beloved)

CEMETERIES

1. Christian Cemetery in the Ekab Valley which contains a small chapel.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ELIZABETH PARKER

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Elizabeth Parker of Harding Township, New Jersey for her distinguished career in journalism and to congratulate her on receiving the esteemed Emma C. McKinney Award from the National Newspaper Association. Liz has been an important presence in the media for over 30 years, providing readers an insightful digest of news and thoughtful commentary that has helped shape the community.

Liz has spent much of her career with the Recorder Community Newspapers, a premier outlet for New Jersey news and opinion. There she rose to the position of Editor, where under her leadership the Recorder's reach soon extended to 17 weekly newspapers serving the diverse constituencies of Morris, Somerset, Hunterdon and Essex Counties. She now serves as Co-Publisher and Executive Editor of the New Jersey Hills Media Group.

Liz's leadership has been recognized nationally, most notably with her selection as President of the National Newspaper Association in 2010. She became only the fourth woman and second New Jerseyan in its 129-year history to lead the institution representing the interests of community newspapers. She also previously served as President of the New Jersey Press Association.

Her passion for her community extends beyond the newsroom with her service on the boards for the Morris County Habitat for Humanity, Morristown Festival of Books and membership in the Rotary Club of Madison.

I congratulate Elizabeth Parker on this well-deserved honor and thank her for the many years of dedicated public service to journalism in New Jersey and indeed the Nation.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE—THE NFL IS OUT OF BOUNDS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, abuse is never okay. It can never be justified, defended or explained. However, the message that the NFL sent last week says otherwise.

Recently, a video emerged of Baltimore Ravens' running back, Ray Rice, dragging his unconscious then-fiancée out of an elevator after allegedly punching her in the face several times.

Rice was charged with third-degree aggravated assault. However, prosecutors later dropped the charge after a plea deal was reached. But what is equally as troubling and disturbing is how the NFL chose to handle the situation.

The league suspended Rice for two games. This pathetic punishment is just a mere slap on the wrist. The NFL has issued harsher punishments for ''offenses'' such as eating unapproved foods or taking fertility drugs without approval.

For better or for worse, our society idolizes its athletes. In 2013, over 108 million Americans watched Rice help the Ravens win the Super Bowl. Thousands of young Americans wore Rice's jersey with pride. After this decision, would a high school athlete think twice before pushing around his girlfriend? Would the abused girlfriend even bother to come forward?

Sadly, the NFL seems to be more concerned with protecting its image than taking a stand and sending a strong message that violence against women will not be tolerated.

Ravens' head coach, John Harbaugh, called the attack, a ''mistake.''

Mr. Speaker, a mistake implies an accident. Punching your fiancée until she becomes unconscious is no accident nor should it be treated that way.

Our society has come a long way; domestic violence was once seen as a ''family issue,'' not spoken of outside of the home. We have made some progress, but the NFL's actions show we still have a long way to go.

Those who commit violence against women—yes, even star football players—cannot get away with it. With the NFL's decision, another one just did. Abuse is never okay.

NFL greed, stardom and fame scores points over justice.

And that's just the way it is.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VA BONUS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, today Dr. DAN BENISHEK and I will introduce the VA Bonus Accountability Act. This bipartisan legislation claws back bonuses fraudulently paid to VA employees who manipulated wait times data.

The revelations that veterans at the Phoenix VA, and veterans at other VA facilities across the country, were placed on secret lists and had to wait months before seeing a doctor are immoral and un-American. That veterans who served our country honorably may have died while waiting for care is unconscionable. Those responsible for this disaster must be held accountable.

Ongoing audits by the VA and the VA Office of Inspector General reveal systemic problems with wait times, with the scheduling process, and with the honesty and integrity of the system. Evidence from multiple VA facilities shows intentional and systemic manipulation occurred to cover up long wait times and veteran deaths. Despite this misconduct and administrative failures, thousands of VA employees received bonuses for their performance.

In 2013, the VA awarded more than $380,000 in bonuses to executives and directors at 38 VA hospitals where investigations were ongoing regarding increased delays in patient care and potential falsification of appointment records. Last year in total, the VA gave out $2.7 million in extra pay to its top ranking officials.

Over the last three years, the Phoenix VA, ground zero for the VA scandal, paid out almost $10 million in bonuses to its employees. All of this as patient wait times increased, data was intentionally manipulated, and whistleblowers were ignored or punished.

Our legislation requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, based on the findings of the VA Office of Inspector General and after notice and opportunity for a hearing, to order employees who contributed to the purposeful omission of veterans from electronic wait lists, and received a bonus in part because of such omission, to repay the bonus.

The first priority of the VA and Congress must be providing our veterans the care they need. Many dedicated VA employees, many of them veterans themselves, work tirelessly to provide the best care to our veterans, but they are limited by this broken system, which is failing millions of our veterans.

If we are going to change the culture at the VA so that veterans truly come first, we must also hold accountable those who intentionally manipulated wait times data and received bonuses based on this fraudulent data.

We urge our colleagues to cosponsor our legislation to bring accountability and change the corrosive culture at the VA.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''CLEARANCE AND OVER-CLASSIFICATION REFORM AND REDUCTION ACT'' OR ''CORRECT ACT''

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce legislation today titled the ''Clearance and Over-Classification Reform and Reduction Act'' or ''CORRECT Act.''

The CORRECT Act recognizes that the massive proliferation of original and derivative classified material and the exponential growth in the number of individuals with security clearances present significant homeland security and national security challenges that warrant timely action. In addition to the high costs incurred by the Federal government to investigate an unnecessarily large number of individuals for positions requiring security clearances, over-designations have undoubtedly resulted in the Federal government recruiting, hiring, and paying individuals at rates that are higher than necessary and not hiring individuals who otherwise have the required knowledge and skills.

The CORRECT Act amends the existing Reducing Over-Classification Act by (1) requiring the President to establish a goal for the reduction of classified information by not less than 10 percent within five years through improved declassification and improved original and derivative classification decision-making; (2) creating standardized sampling techniques for use by Federal departments and agencies conducting self-inspections to assess their progress at improving classification decision-making within their organizations; (3) creating annual training to each employee with original classification authority; and (4) requiring the Inspector General of each department or agency to report on the progress of each respective department or agency with respect to implementation of the Reducing Over-Classification Act as well as the President's 10 percent classified information reduction goal.

The CORRECT Act also includes a sense of Congress that a position should only be designated as requiring a security clearance when it requires access to classified information, presents a risk of a material, adverse effect on the national security, or is a position of public trust for any agency that has the authority to issue security clearances.

Additionally, the CORRECT Act sets forth specific reforms at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to make it a leader among Federal agencies with respect to security clearance practices. The reforms at DHS are targeted at the designation, investigation, adjudication, denial, suspension, revocation, and appeals processes. In particular, to increase transparency and improve performance among investigation service providers, including Office of Personnel Management, it requires the DHS Secretary to publish on the Department's website an annual Department-wide satisfaction survey. If a pattern of performance problems with a particular investigation service provider emerges, the DHS Chief Security Officer is required to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding corrective action, including suspension or cancellation of services.

I urge support of this commonsense legislation.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF TERRY SCHNELL AND CAPTAIN KURT IRELAND

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the decorated careers of Chief Terry Schnell and Captain Kurt Ireland of the Olean Police Department. Longtime members of the department, Chief Schnell and Captain Ireland have a combined 68 years of dedicated service to the Olean community.

Terry Schnell joined the Olean Police Department in 1982 and rose to the rank of chief in 2006. Throughout his 32-year career, Chief Schnell earned the trust and respect of his fellow officers, city leaders, and citizens. During his time with the Olean Police Department, Chief Schnell completed training at the FBI Academy, learning advanced skills and strategies that have positively benefited the department. Throughout his tenure as chief, Mr. Schnell repeatedly fought to secure necessary funding and support for the police department. His career exemplifies the values outlined in the department's mission statement, serving with ''integrity, common sense, and sound judgment.''

Kurt Ireland joined the Olean Police Department in 1977. He spent the majority of his 36-year career with the department's patrol division, earning promotions to sergeant in 1993 and captain in 1998. While holding these leadership positions, Captain Ireland managed the daily operations of his unit and established department procedures. Captain Ireland was a responsible, dedicated, and hard-working officer who served his community with the highest level of integrity.

I congratulate Chief Terry Schnell and Captain Kurt Ireland on their retirement from the Olean Police Department. We owe these men a debt of gratitude for their combined 68 years

of service to the Olean community. Their impressive careers in law enforcement and numerous contributions to our community improved quality of life and made Olean a safer place to live.

HONORING ANGELA EVANS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the contributions of a respected and long-serving public servant, Angela Evans. This remarkable woman merits our recognition and gratitude for her dedication and commitment to public service, serving more than 35 years at the Congressional Research Service (CRS)—the Legislative Branch agency created by the U.S. Congress to serve as its primary source for policy research and analysis.

Angela Evans began her career at CRS in 1971 as an analyst working on welfare reform, health care finance, education and training, and budget reform. She quickly advanced in her management and policy roles, as she displayed a unique talent for advancing the mission of CRS, as well as strategically examining how the agency's role may evolve in the future. By 1982, she was serving as the Section Head for the Education and Public Welfare Division, where she secured the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as first-time clients for CRS. Additionally, in her role as Section Head she began the first formal student intern program, which was then adopted agency-wide.

In 1994, she was hand picked by the Librarian of Congress, James H. Billington, to be the Head of Congressional Relations and to assist with Deputy Librarian duties for the 1994 calendar year. Her leadership in these two roles led to the inauguration of the ''THOMAS'' website for the Library. Additionally she led the team that developed the ''Legislative Information System,'' or LIS, which was the first integrated confidential website for the Congress. For the next two years, as Acting Assistant Director for the Research at CRS, she achieved Senior Specialist status, the highest research position in CRS at the time, for her research undertaken on the social sciences. She also led efforts to evaluate all CRS research projects, resulting in the establishment of formal standards of quality and analytic rigor that are still in place today.

Beginning in 1996, and for the last 13 years of her time at CRS, she served as the Deputy Director of CRS. She was the first woman to hold this position—a feat worth recognizing on its own. Here she oversaw all facets of research, scholarship, development, and operations at CRS. She personally developed, managed, and supported organizational efforts to build and sustain relationships with Members of Congress, with policy and public administration scholars, university administrators, and with foundations. She believed in the mission of the agency and strived every day to exceed the goals and expectations set before her. Angela Evans led major organizational changes that not only enhanced the research capacity of CRS, but also improved the effectiveness of critical operations. Among her many achievements was developing the first agency-wide research framework used to identify public policy challenges, guide interdisciplinary research on these challenges, and assess the quality of the research. She also led the first agency-wide reorganization in 30 years, where a more streamlined structure was established to support interdisciplinary collaboration across research areas and professional disciplines to better serve Congress. These are just several examples of many contributions that Angela Evans made during her time at CRS that we are still seeing the direct impact of today. Her dedication, leadership, and commitment were recognized by CRS in 2009, when she was honored with the Distinguished Service Award.

Her public service did not end when she retired from the agency in 2009. She continues to serve the public now as a Clinical Professor in Public Policy Practice at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin. There, she has already received a variety of accolades from her students, fellow faculty, and alumni, including: the Best New Professor, 2010; the Most Valuable Class, 2011 and 2012; an alumni Texas Exes Teaching Award, 2012; and the Most Helpful Professor to Students each year 2010 through 2014. Angela Evans also continues to play essential roles in national organizations which focus on continuing the advancement of public service in this country. She is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and has served on its Nominating Committee and the Business Model Task Force. She is also the current President of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) and serves on the Executive Committee of the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA).

As 2014 marks the 100-year anniversary of CRS, it is only fitting that we recognize Angela Evans for her great contributions to the advancement of public service. I commend her for her lifetime commitment to this challenge and am pleased to recognize her achievements.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT CLYDE McDONALD

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute on the passing of a gracious and wonderful man who made a significant impact on his state, his community and his family. A man I was proud to call my father-in-law, Albert Clyde McDonald.

He was the kind of man who some may call old-fashioned with his quiet dedication to service—service to God, his family, his land, and his state.

Albert McDonald passed from this life on July 6, 2014 at his home in the Huntsville area, surrounded by his beloved family.

He was born in Dayton, Tennessee to Clyde McDonald and Nahoma Welch McDonald. He was preceded in death by both his parents and his siblings, Malcolm Rhea McDonald and Mary Lynn Goodwin.

He is survived by his wife of 58 years, Shirley Shields McDonald; and four children, Mark Russell McDonald, Stan (Mabel) McDonald, Caroline McDonald Aderholt, and Leah McDonald Engler. Also, he is survived by fourteen grandchildren, Dr. Matthew McDonald, Carter McDonald, Lewis McDonald, Locker McDonald, Lloyd McDonald, Mary Eleanor McDonald, Melissa Suzanne McDonald, Luke McDonald, Manie McDonald, Christian Rutherford, Mary Elliott Aderholt, Robert Hayes Aderholt, Bruce Erich Engler, and Anna Kate Engler.

After graduating from Auburn University in 1953, Commissioner McDonald made his home in North Alabama, planting cotton, soybeans, and grain on his family farm in the Huntsville area. He was a member of various agriculture-related organizations, such as the National Cotton Council, and served on the Cotton Incorporated Executive Committee, and as President of the Southern Cotton Growers Incorporated.

Recognizing that he could play a role in representing agriculture because of his talents and farming experience, Albert McDonald launched his political career in 1974. He served two terms in Alabama State Senate. During his second term, Albert served as chairman of the Senate Rules Committee. Then, in 1982, he ran for and was elected to serve as Commissioner of Agriculture and Industries for the State of Alabama and was re-elected to serve a second term in 1986. In 1991, he was appointed by President George H.W. Bush to be the Executive Director of the Alabama Farm Services Administration. Beginning in 1995, he was appointed by the Huntsville City Council to serve on the governing board of Huntsville Hospital, and was appointed by Alabama Governor Fob James to serve on the Auburn University Board of Trustees in 1996.

Sometimes, he was a man of few words. However, when Albert McDonald spoke, people listened. He was a leader and statesman in every sense of the word, as well as my father-in-law. He will be missed by so many at home and across the state. I can only imagine that he was welcomed to heaven with those sweet words, ''Well done, my good and faithful servant.''

TRIBUTE TO DARRELL G. RICE

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Darrell G. Rice, a dedicated firefighter, community member and friend who passed away on April 22, 2014. As a pillar of the community, he will be deeply missed.

By the nature of their jobs, firefighters must be committed individuals willing to put their lives in harm's way for the safety of their communities and for the protection of life and property for those surrounding them. Darrell

Rice not only fulfilled these responsibilities, but often went above and beyond the call of duty throughout his twenty-two years of service. Darrell took on the challenges of this position with full knowledge of the inherent dangers he would have to face daily. This willingness to accept a responsibility of such magnitude speaks to Darrell's courage and dedication.

Day in and day out, Darrell faithfully represented his department and acted as a refreshing inspiration to all who surrounded him. As a strong believer in teamwork, Darrell would continually provide encouragement to all staff. Darrell was successful in spreading this sentiment throughout the community as well during his time in his final assignment as an inspector. Working with the Fire Prevention Division's Petroleum Chemical Unit, Darrell worked with businesses to ensure their safety for the public, and understood the responsibility of his job.

As such a dedicated individual, Darrell will always be remembered for his incredible work ethic and charismatic leadership. I extend my deepest sympathies and condolences to Darrell's family and friends, most especially to his wife, Phyllis, and his daughter, Candace, of Corona, California. Although Darrell may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the community remains and will never be forgotten.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PAULETTE BROOKS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Paulette Brooks, of Holden, Massachusetts, who passed away suddenly on July 24th, and to offer my sincere condolences to her family, friends and colleagues. Ms. Brooks was a devoted civil servant at the Department of Homeland Security Office of the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman. Her untimely death leaves a great loss in the Department and in the world of immigration expertise. Her legacy is one of tireless, innovative and distinctive service to thousands of American citizens, their families and immigrants that include the most vulnerable among us.

Ms. Brooks completed law school after raising a family while a widow. She then offered pro bono legal services in her community and rose to serve the CIS Ombudsman with distinction in customer service excellence and legal acumen. She served as an expert in Child Status Protection Act matters, Violence Against Women Act protection cases and in assisting members of the military with immigration or naturalization matters impacting the soldier or his or her family. Ms. Brooks also wrote definitive recommendations for the Department that will serve a wide range of stakeholders for years to come.

On volunteer time, she led federal workplace charitable initiatives such as Feds Feed Families and the Combined Federal Campaign. She garnered the President's Award for exceeding Departmental fundraising goals with her infectious enthusiasm and innovation in inspiring others to participate in and enjoy giving. In addition, she served numerous charities in the New England region. Her colleagues at DHS will remember her love of service and learning; her passion for public service; and her integrity, good humor, justice, common sense, transparency and excellence in all she did.

I know my colleagues in the House join me in celebrating the life of Paulette Brooks and offering our deepest sympathies to those who knew and loved her.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE RESTORE OPPORTUNITY, STRENGTHEN, AND IMPROVE THE ECONOMY ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Restore Opportunity, Strengthen, and Improve the Economy (ROSIE) Act. Millions of workers are part of the ''federally dependent workforce'' and hold low-wage jobs with federal contractors. Seventy percent of these workers are women and 45 percent are people of color. With so many workers dependent on federal contracts, the federal government has the ability to use its purchasing power to incentivize private-sector firms to create good jobs for American workers, rebuild the middle class, address income inequality, and invigorate the economy by increasing the purchasing power of working Americans.

Under the bill, Congress finds that the disappearance of good jobs, the shrinking of the middle class, and growing income inequality are the greatest domestic challenges confronting our nation. The federal government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the nation's private-sector economy, spending over $1.5 trillion annually at firms that employ a quarter of American workers. Federal purchasing power is currently creating millions of poverty-level jobs, subsidizing labor-law-breakers, and funding ballooning executive compensation.

The bill also notes that the federal government is our nation's leading creator of low-wage jobs in the private sector, funding more than two-million jobs paying under 12 dollars per hour. The federal government awards taxpayer dollars to a substantial number of firms that violate federal labor, employment and occupational safety laws, and its purchasing subsidizes the excessive salaries of private-sector executives who do business with the American people. When federal purchasing power is used in such a manner, workers have less to spend on the necessities of life and are forced to rely on public assistance. Lack of purchasing power hurts job creation and undermines economic growth, ultimately imposing significant costs on American taxpayers.

Federal purchasing power can and should be used to create good jobs, rebuild the middle class, and curb rising income inequality. These good jobs would allow workers and their families to live in dignity without relying on public assistance or private charity, and would pay enough to provide for subsistence, healthcare, education, housing and savings, as well as enough disposable income to allow workers to enjoy quality time off with their loved ones. Federal purchasing power can and should be used to rebuild the middle class. A strong middle class stimulates the economy by increasing consumer spending and job growth. Federal purchasing power can and should be used to narrow the growing gulf between the richest one percent of the population and ordinary working families, which is threatening the survival of our participatory democracy.

The bill directs the Secretary of Labor to promulgate regulations implementing Good Jobs Model Employer Standards. Under these standards, whenever an executive agency awards a contract for the acquisition of supplies or services, it shall not award the contract to a source that is not a Good Jobs Model Employer, unless there is no offer from a source that is a model employer. An executive agency could not provide other forms of financial or nonfinancial assistance to entities that are not model employers when there is a similarly situated Good Jobs Model Employer that could receive the assistance, unless doing so would substantially undermine the value of the assistance to the public. These provisions do not apply to direct federal statutory requirements, mandatory awards, direct awards to foreign governments or public international organizations, benefits to an individual as a personal entitlement, or federal employment.

The bill defines a Good Jobs Model Employer as an employer that meets the following standards: (1) respects employees' rights to bargain collectively with their employers without being forced to take strike action to win better wages and working conditions; (2) offers to each employee living wages, decent benefits including, health care, paid leave for sickness and caregiving, and fair work schedules that are predictable and stable; (3) affirmatively demonstrates an exemplary standard of compliance with workplace protection laws, including laws governing labor relations, wages and hours and health and safety, as well as other applicable labor laws; (4) limits executive compensation to fifty times the median salary paid to the company's workers; (5) employs a workforce not less than 35 percent of which reside within one or more Historically Underutilized Business Zones; and (6) subcontracts only with other Good Jobs Model Employers.

This bill is just one step in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty and into the middle class. These contracting requirements will incentivize, rather than penalize, employers to raise their workplace standards to retain much sought-after federal contracts. They will also provide savings to the federal government by lowering the cost of the federal safety net because fewer workers will be reliant on federal benefits. With these standards, Demos has estimated an annual benefit savings of approximately $3.3 billion for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, $3.1 billion for Medicaid, and $2.5 billion for the Earned Income Tax Credit. Ultimately, the ROSIE Act will uplift our workers and benefit our entire country.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, I missed one recorded vote. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present.

On rollcall No. 434, I would have voted ''aye.''

COMMEMORATING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE NEW AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS BUILDING IN SCHAUMBURG, ILLINOIS

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA), their more than 200 employees and their beautiful new headquarters building to Schaumburg, Illinois.

The American Society of Anesthesiologists represents more than 52,000 members and is a cutting edge education and professional association. ASA is dedicated to the advancement and study of the practice of anesthesiology, with patient safety and standards of care at the core of its mission.

For more than 100 years, this association has worked to ensure that all Americans have access to high-quality and safe health care, and has been active in ensuring Congress does all it can to protect patient safety.

Anesthesiology was one of the first medical specialties to champion patient safety as a specific focus, leading to the creation of the independent Anesthesia Patient Safety Foundation in 1985. This organization, supported by the ASA, works to assure that no patient will be harmed by anesthesia. This has led to national standards of practice, a rare feat for a medical professional society.

In its new state-of-the-art headquarters, ASA can better highlight the important role of physician anesthesiologists and their responsibility for patient care before, during, and after surgery. Since 2008, ASA has showcased its focus on patient safety through the Anesthesia Quality Institute, which develops and maintains a registry of case data that helps physician anesthesiologists assess and improve patient care. Additionally, ASA has maintained focus on the best methods of improving patient safety and recovery, developing the Perioperative Surgical Home (PSH), an innovative model of delivering health care during the entire patient surgical experience from the time of the decision for surgery until patient recovery.

The new facility features an updated Wood Library and Museum of Anesthesiology, which highlights these and other important historical developments of the practice of anesthesiology from its origin as the first organized anesthesia society in Long Island, NY.

From the Land of Lincoln to our nation's capital, the importance of patient safety continues to be a top priority. This is reflected in the Dr. Crawford Long statue, the father of anesthesiology, here in the U.S. Capitol building, a reminder of the ongoing efforts to develop the safest and most effective methods of anesthesiology and pain relief. Through the education, advocacy and involvement of ASA, the medical field of anesthesiology continues to grow and advance.

I am proud to rise and stand in support of the American Society of Anesthesiologists. Thank you for all that you have done and continue to do for patient safety within the field of anesthesiology. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking them for their efforts and congratulating them on their new headquarters located in the Eighth District of Illinois.

A TRIBUTE TO INGRID WALKER-HENRY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ingrid Walker-Henry, an elementary school teacher, union leader, activist, mother, and wife from the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin.

Ingrid Walker-Henry was born and raised in Milwaukee and attended Milwaukee Public Schools. Her family has a history of teachers with both her mother and aunt having taught in the Milwaukee Public School System. She aspired to be a teacher from a young age. She graduated from Riverside University High School and joined the Young Educators' Society while attending school there. She graduated with a bachelor's degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and has a master's degree in Instructional Technology from Cardinal Stritch University.

Ingrid Walker-Henry is an elementary school teacher, as well as an instructional coach in the Milwaukee Public School System. She is also a union leader and activist. Ms. Walker-Henry has taught at several schools in the Milwaukee Public School System including: Silver Spring, Clemens, Auer, Hawthorne, Browning, and Gwen T. Jackson schools.

Ms. Walker-Henry serves as Secretary on the Executive Board of the Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association and is an active member in the Schools and Communities United Coalition. She is also active in the local NAACP efforts to increase voter turnout and voter registration in Milwaukee.

Recently, Ms. Walker-Henry was recognized by Essence Magazine in an article recognizing African American Moms involved in educational activism. As an educator and lifelong Milwaukee resident, Ingrid is a strong supporter of children and families and is a leader for her fellow union members in the fight for quality public education for every child. Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I rise to pay tribute to a woman who is a Milwaukee and Wisconsin treasure. I am proud that she hails from the 4th Congressional District.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO COLORADO SPRINGS (UCCS)

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of Colorado Colorado Springs on the occasion of its upcoming 50th Anniversary.

UCCS is one of the fastest growing universities in the United States, and is the designated growth campus for the University of Colorado with over 11,000 students. It is also one of the largest employers in southern Colorado with an economic impact of over $300 million annually to the state and local economies.

Since 1965, UCCS has brought the world-class standards of the University of Colorado System to southern Colorado and continues to educate and inspire not only the students, faculty, and staff of the university, but also the community-at-large. On behalf of the Colorado Fifth Congressional District, I wish UCCS a very happy 50th Anniversary and look forward to the next 50 years of growth and prosperity.

HONORING CELESTE WEINGARDT

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Celeste Weingardt, an inspiring leader and determined activist, who has assiduously worked on women's issues including protecting and promoting access to reproductive healthcare and services. For over two decades, Celeste has served as a beacon of empowerment for women in politics and community leadership in Ventura County.

Celeste first became involved with the Women's Political Appointments Coalition of Ventura County in 1990. Shortly thereafter, she joined the Commission for Women in Ventura County, where she served as chair of the organization during her years of dedicated service. Celeste has also offered her extensive and invaluable leadership and expertise to organizations such as the Ventura County Reproductive Rights Network; the Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence; the National Women's Political Caucus at the city, state, and national levels; and the Ventura County Women's Forum Collaborative.

Throughout her years of service, Celeste has advocated for a vast array of women's issues including reproductive rights and justice, teenage pregnancy prevention, the prevention and elimination of violence against women both locally and globally, as well as access to quality and affordable childcare. Her exemplary work has been a true inspiration to many women throughout our region.

In addition, Celeste currently sits on the organizing committee of the Women's Political Council of Ventura County and serves on the

board of the Planned Parenthood Action Fund of Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties, which actively works to protect family planning and reproductive rights.

It is my sincere pleasure to join the Ventura County Women's Political Council in recognizing Celeste Weingardt for her instrumental efforts and activities to engage and empower women. For her continued active and effective advocacy and leadership, I wholeheartedly commend Celeste Weingardt for her impressive career of service which she has selflessly given to her community.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRIS KINGSLEY

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Los Angeles Kings Head Trainer Chris Kingsley, a native of Greenfield, Massachusetts. I would like to congratulate Mr. Kingsley's contribution to the Kings' recent Stanley Cup win, and recognize his fundraising efforts on behalf of the Franklin County Hockey Association.

For over 40 years, the Franklin County Hockey Association has contributed to the development of our youth through the game of hockey. The FCHA provides young people with the opportunity to have fun while learning the basic skills of ice skating and how to play hockey. As a team sport, hockey affirms the importance of commitment, self-discipline, and sportsmanship. This helps young people develop skills and values they can carry with them for the rest of their lives.

My district is so fortunate that Mr. Kingsley has used his success in the game of hockey to help the sport in the community where he grew up. On behalf of the people of Franklin County, I congratulate Chris Kingsley for another championship season with the Los Angeles Kings and thank him for his continued support of the Franklin County Hockey Association.

TRIBUTE TO PAM HAZE

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Pam Haze, an individual whose dedication and contribution to public service is exceptional. Her extensive experience and knowledge have been a great benefit to the Department of the Interior, Congress, and the American people. Pam will soon be retiring from the Department of the Interior after 34 years of federal service.

Pam has tirelessly dedicated herself to public service, committing her career to a wide range of positions. Currently, Pam is the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition at the Department of the Interior, a position she was appointed to in October of 2009. It is in this current position that Pam has been responsible for the oversight and management of the Department's programs and policies in budget; finance; acquisition and property management; performance management; and small and disadvantaged business.

Pam has been an invaluable resource to me and my staff on the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. Whether she is testifying before our committee, or responding to a myriad of questions on behalf of the Department, Pam has been a key liaison between the Appropriations Committee and the Department. Pam is that rare individual who focuses on solving problems when faced with even the most challenging circumstances. She has earned the admiration and respect of Republicans and Democrats alike for her knowledge of the issues and ability to arrive at solutions considered fair and reasonable by all sides.

Pursuing her interests in the environment, Pam received both an undergraduate degree in wildlife biology and a graduate degree in environmental science and ecology from George Mason University. Pam took her passion with her to the Department of Interior, where she has spent the majority of her federal career within Interior bureaus, such as the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management and the former Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. It was in these Interior agencies that Pam was able to effectively lead as a planner, hydrologist, field biologist, contaminant biologist, program analyst, administrator, budget analyst and manager.

Prior to her current service as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition, Pam spent time as the Deputy Director and Co-Director of the Office of the Budget from 1999 to 2006 and from 2007 to 2009 as the director of the Department's Office of Budget. Pam also has a great depth of experience with other federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration and the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System in which she played a critical role in successfully facilitating the completion of the Alaska natural gas pipeline. In addition, Pam has also previously devoted her time and knowledge to Cambridge Scientific Abstracts.

For her many years of public service, Pam deserves our thanks and praise. Her tireless passion for service has contributed immensely to the betterment of our nation. Through her broad range of roles in our government, she has spent her working life in the service of others, and this merits my most sincere gratitude. I ask that the House join me in wishing Pam the best as she begins the next chapter of her life.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. DOUG NIECE OF FLEMINGTON, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Doug Niece of Flemington, New Jersey, who passed away earlier this month at the age of 93. Mr. Niece was a long-time Cubmaster for Cub Scout Pack 61 in Flemington, where he served for more than 60 years and influenced the lives of more than 6,000 scouts.

Mr. Niece was a beloved figure in the Boy Scout community and is believed to have been the longest-serving Cubmaster in the country when he retired from his scouting responsibilities in 2010. During the Boy Scouts of America 100th anniversary celebration, he was honored and recognized as one of the Top 100 Scouters in service to the Nation.

Mr. Niece was professionally involved with Hunterdon County's two major newspapers, first the Republican and later the Democrat. In Flemington, he led the annual Christmas tree lighting and organized the traditional pre-dawn Christmas carolling with the Flemington Children's Choir School. He also served as a board member of the Jennie Haver Scholarship Fund, as a volunteer aide at Franklin Township School and an elder, deacon, Sunday School teacher and superintendent at Flemington Presbyterian Church.

I had the great pleasure of knowing Mr. Niece and seeing many of his great contributions to the Flemington community. I know he will be missed by all who were influenced by his dedicated public service.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD ROOF

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Richard Roof for his extraordinary service to the people of Paducah, and Kentucky's entire First Congressional District. Mr. Roof is celebrating his fortieth year as manager of Barkley Regional Airport. Barkley Regional's existence is due in part to Paducah native Vice President Alben Barkley, for whom the airport is also named. The airport provides travel to Chicago's O'Hare, one of the best connected airports in the United States.

Richard's career in the aviation industry began in 1962 when he passed the commercial pilot's written exam, at age 18. Throughout Mr. Roof's college years he would work as a pilot, carrying overnight mail between Lexington, Huntington and Louisville.

Richard Roof took the job of assistant manager on July 1, 1974, and two months later, he took over as manager. Richard's role at the airport is not limited to sitting behind a desk. Richard is said to wear ''many hats,'' which has proven beneficial to the airport's operation. When not carrying out his managerial duties, you may find him snow plowing the airport's 80 acres of pavement.

Throughout Richard's 40-year tenure as manager at the airport, he has witnessed the evolution of the airline industry. Through Richard's leadership, the airport has survived the changes and weathered periods of unfavorable economic conditions, and has emerged as a $30 million economic mainstay in Western Kentucky.

Richard Roof serves as a symbol to all Americans that through hard work and dedication, one life can truly change the lives of hundreds. I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, Richard's many years of service to the people of Kentucky and urge all members of Congress to join me in congratulating him on this milestone.

HONORING DR. CORA B. MARRETT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a cherished colleague to the Science community, Dr. Cora Marrett. After serving with distinction for nearly two decades she will be retiring after serving as Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Dr. Marrett is a shining example of what it means to be an effective public servant She has built her career on bipartisanship, expertise and dependability. Dr. Marrett has always kept the needs of the American people close at heart. Dr. Marrett deserves to be commended for serving at the helm of NSF during tumultuous times, such as sequestration and the government shutdown. She earned NSF's Distinguished Service Award for her groundbreaking leadership of the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences directorate.

As Ranking Member for the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I have the distinct pleasure of working closely with Dr. Marrett. Over the years, she has demonstrated a tremendous mastery of the political process and led NSF's mission to achieve excellence in U.S. science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education at all levels. She has shown a clear commitment to furthering scientific and intellectual advancement here in the United States. I am especially grateful for the insights she provided as a witness a number of times. I thank her for her service and wish her the best of luck in her retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the American people will be losing a loyal advocate this August. I have an immense amount of respect for Dr. Marrett, and I wish her and her family all the best in any future endeavors.